Rizzi (1997) proposes a split CP: Force>Top>Int>Top>Fin>IP, but suggests that some languages have a non-split CP. We argue that in the past 2 centuries embedded clauses in Udmurt (an OV Finno-Ugric language spoken in the Russian Federation, see Winkler 2001) underwent a structural change TP → non-split CP → split CP.

**TP:** In the late 18th century all embedded clauses were non-finite (1) and featured no elements that sit in the CP layer (complementizer, relative operator, etc.). Topics and foci are in the higher TP-zone (Tánczos 2011), like in Hungarian (É. Kiss 2002), so there were no elements that unambiguously sat in any projection in Force>Top>Int>Top>Fin>IP. We suggest that at this stage embedded clauses were truncated: they lacked CP and were only TPs.

(1) Odig-pol [lud-kečleš oži ušti-ni kos-ām-zā] kion kilzām hear.PST.3SG
    ‘One time the wolf heard that the rabbit ordered (them) to open (the door) in such a way.’
    (Munkácsi 1887:118)

**Non-split CP:** Due to Russian influence, finite embedded clauses gradually appeared in the early 20th century, and OV order became looser. Finite clauses always have a CP layer, so at this stage CPs emerged in Udmurt. The presence of CP is also signaled by the appearance of an optional clause-final complementizer, *shuysa* 'that', (developed from the converbial form of *shuñy* 'say', a case of Van Gelderen's 2009 Verbal Cycle), which made the embedded CP phonologically visible.

**Split CP:** Later in the 20th century, Udmurt borrowed the Russian complementizer *shto* 'that', which was used clause-initially and could co-occur with the clause-final native C *shuysa* 'that' (2). We argue that this is evidence for the appearance of split CP in Udmurt: *shuysa* is a Fin complementizer, while *shto* is a Force complementizer. Their position in the clause obeys the Final-Over-Final-Constraint (Biberauer et al 2014). The same pattern can be observed in conditionals, too, which may have a clause-initial Russian 'if' and a native clause-final 'if'.

(2) (I think) [shto ton bertođ shuysa].
    that(Russ.) 2SG come.home.FUT.2SG that(Udmurt)
    'that you come home'

Further evidence for the appearance of split CP can be found in relatives. Originally, Udmurt relatives employed the gap strategy, but lately relative pronouns have appeared (in finite relatives, but no complementizer is possible in relatives). The relative pronoun is generally the first element in its clause, but some speakers allow subject or adjunct topics to precede it (3). We suggest that the Udmurt relative pronoun is in spec, FinP, and the topics preceding it are in a TopP within a split CP.

(3) (I know the child) [Izhkaryn kudiz Sashajež izhevsk.INESS which.NOM Sashaa.ACC uramish adziz].
    street.ABL see.PST.3SG
    'who Sasha saw on the street in Izhevsk'
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