The rise of complementizers
and their relation to subjunctive mood and (ir)realis distinctions

Convenors:
- Björn Wiemer (JGU Mainz)
- Jasmina Grković-Major (U Novi Sad)
- Björn Hansen (U Regensburg)

The workshop addresses the diachronic development of complementizers against other clause-linking devices relevant for realis-irrealis/factive-non-factive distinctions and/or the lowering of assertiveness. First, how can distinctions between complementizers and subjunctive markers be compared coherently, so that variation on a scale between free and bound morphemes, its relation to the aforementioned distinctions and preferences of host types can be correlated with diachronic pathways? This is tantamount to asking whether 'dependent clause markers' code "at the level of the D[ependent] C[lause] as a whole" or only "at the level of its nucleus" (van Lier 2009: 69f.).

Second, which falsifiable methods are suitable for discerning complementizers from other connectives, quoted speech, *de dicto* vs. *de re*-readings, or epistemic/evidential/evaluational markers? Thus, while searching for a comparative 'complementizer' concept, we also ask for diagnostic criteria and theoretical premises needed in diachronic morphosyntax to identify (emergent) complementizers and to distinguish clausal complementation from juxtaposition and adverbial subordination.

Subjunctive morphemes and complementizers are conceived of as clause-linking devices used to make explicit the dependency of one clause on some other clause. On the one hand, complementizer definitions (e.g., "a word, particle, clitic or affix, one of whose functions it is to identify the entity as a complement", Noonan 2007[2]: 55) do not restrict the range of units on clines from free to bound morphemes, although linguists usually describe complementizers as free words (e.g., Engl. *that*, Russ. *čto*). On the other hand, subjunctives are commonly regarded as a morphological category marked by inflectional verb endings (Thieroff 2010: 2). Thus, typical subjunctive markers belong to the opposite pole of free-bound clines.

Here two interrelated problems arise. First, clitics with functional distinctions mentioned above can come to be restricted to heads of a specific syntactic class (e.g., verbs), or they may loosen linear constraints (e.g., the Wackernagel rule). The former happened with Balkan Slavic *da*, which has become a strictly verbal proclitic; the latter occurred with the „subjunctive particle" *by* in Russian, which simultaneously has been incorporated into previous complementizers (see below). Does this justify considering *da* a subjunctive marker, while *by* would rather classify as (part of) a complementizer? Moreover, does the degree of morphologization matter for complementizer—subjunctive distinctions, regardless of the host type (verbal, nominal, constituent type)?

Second, the distinction between subjunctives and complementizers gets blurred if mood is understood as a clausal phenomenon and complementizers as lexical(ized) manifestations of functional distinctions along different parameters of 'finiteness' (Nikolaeva 2013). Consequently, both mood markers and complementizers can occur „scattered" over clausal constituents. Certain descriptions (I) classify as 'complementizers' morphemes cliticized or agglutinated to verb stems (clausal nuclei), while in other descriptions (II) subjunctive markers are identified with morphemes agglutinated or cliticized to non-verbal hosts, or even with synchronically unanalyzable segments of clause connectives.

Instances of (I) are 'bound complementizers' of Turkic languages (Johanson 2013). Instances of (II) are numerous accounts of 'analytical subjunctive' markers identified with clause-initial (usually proclitic) particles in Balkan languages, as in the following Macedonian examples:

(1a) *Nareduvam   Marija   da   dojde   vednaš.*
     order:IPFV.PRS.1SG PN   COMP   come:PFV.PRS.3SG   immediately
     'I order Maria to come immediately.'

(1b) *Da   gi   prečekate!*
     PTC   3PL.ACC   wait:PFV.PRS.2PL
     'Wait for them!'

Extreme instances of (II) are segments of subordinators that can no longer be analyzed as distinct morphemes. See Russian/Polish *-by* in connectives such as Russ. *čtoby* 'that, in order' (Dobrushina 2015), Pol. *jakoby* 'as if' (Wiemer 2015). These lexical units require the same restricted inventory of verb categories (2) as does the enclitic subjunctive marker *by*, from which morphologically incorporated *-by* derives diachronically (3):

Russian
(2) *On   prosil,   čtoby   emu pomogli. / ...*čto   emu pomogli   by.*
     he   ask.PST COMP   him help.PST.PL   COMP   him help.PST.PL   SUBJ
     'He asked (them) to help him.'

(3) *Čto   ja   delal   by   bez   tebja?!*
     what   1.SG do.PST   SUBJ without you
     'What would I do without you?!'

Thus, subjunctives share with complementizers their clause-linking property, with an added function of (ir)realis modification for certain complementizers. The complementizer-subjunctive distinction seems to correlate with the status of the involved morphemes on a word-affix cline, but linguists' interpretations of these correlations differ enormously, in particular if changes have affected rules of linear structure or of constituent relations. This unsatisfying situation cries out for comparative concepts of 'complementizer' and 'subjunctive'. Such concepts are needed to reasonably answer questions like these:

[1] To what extent are complementizers and subjunctive markers really equivalent? This question is particularly interesting if, in a language, both types of markers are etymologically related, and/or they can be combined within the same clause.

[2] To what extent is the preference for predicate- vs. clause-level coding an outcome of the clitic behaviour of morphemes marking some sort of realis-irrealis distinction? Does this behaviour, in turn, result from more general conditions of clause prosody and/or morphosyntax?

[3] Which discourse and morphosyntactic conditions favour the rise of complementizer contrasts – in particular those pertinent to an epistemic/evidential/evaluational modification of the proposition – distinguishable from juxtaposition, coordination or adverbial subordination?

[4] Which diagnostics can be formulated to distinguish (a) clausal complementation from juxtaposition and (b) complementizers from other kinds of connectives (particles, sentence adverbs, etc.)? Which criteria should be used in diachronic studies and the study of oral and/or non-standard speech?

We invite papers representing different theoretical frameworks and methodologies, either with a crosslinguistic or a language-specific focus (preferably, but not exclusively addressing [1-4]).

References

Dobrushina [Dobrušina], Nina R. (2015): Pokazatel' soslagatel'nogo naklonenija kak čast' sojuza. *Dialog* 2015.

Johanson, Lars (2013): Selection of Subjunctors in Turkic Non-Finite Complement Clauses. *Bilig* 67, 73–90.

Nikolaeva, Irina (2013): Unpacking finiteness. In: Dunstan Brown, Marina Chumakina, Greville G. Corbett (eds.): *Canonical Morphology and Syntax*. Oxford etc., 99-122.

Noonan, Michael (2007[2]): Complementation. In: Shopen, Timothy (ed.): *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, vol. II: *Complex Constructions*. Cambridge etc., 52-150.

Thieroff, Rolf (2010): Moods, moods, moods. In: Rothstein, Björn, Rolf Thieroff (eds.): *Mood in the languages of Europe*. Amsterdam—Philadelphia, 1-29.

van Lier, Eva (2009): *Parts of Speech and Dependent Clauses (A typological study)*. Amsterdam.

Wiemer, Björn (2015): An outline of the development of Pol. *jakoby* in 14th-16th century documents (based on dictionaries). In: Wiemer, Björn (ed.): *Studies on evidentiality marking in West and South Slavic*. München etc., 217-302.