WORKSHOP 2
Complementation and relativization

Lena Baunaz[a,b], Tabea Ihsane[a,b] & Tania Paciaroni[a,c]
([a]University of Zurich, [b]University of Geneva, [c]Ludwig Maximilian University of Munich)

Keywords : Subordination, complement clauses, relative clauses, morphosyntax, semantics/pragmatics

The question of the (syntactic) status of complement and relative clauses is an old one (see a.o. Klima 1964). Can we reduce these clauses to one type (and if yes, which one) or should we keep them separate? What about their subordinator (e.g., *that* in English)? Is it the same in both structures, or are they different? These are some of the on-going debates w.r.t to the phenomenon of complementation that we would like to refresh, with speakers from different schools of thoughts, working on a wide range of languages.

This workshop focuses on **clausal complements** and **relative clauses**. What we would like to investigate is the properties of these two types of constituents from the point of view of their subordinators (e.g., complementizers/relativizers) and of their selectors (if any) to see if they can be reduced to one and the same phenomenon or not.

In French, *que* can appear in clausal complements and relative clauses. This observation (followed by theoretical reasoning) lead Kayne (1976) to conclude that the complementizer *que* and relative *que* should be considered as instantiations of the same item, an analysis that extends to the English subordinator *that* (i.e., complementizer *that* is relativizer *that*). Kayne (2014) further claims that this subordinator is a special case of Dem(onstrative), i.e., a determiner-like element (see Kayne 1994 for preliminary ideas in that direction; Aboh 2005 on factives in Gbe; Arsenijevic 2009 for English/Serbo-Croatian; Sportiche 2011 for French). In a similar vein, Manzini/Savoia (2003, 2011) argue that the Italian complementizer, relativizer and interrogative *che* ('*that, that, what*' respectively) are all nominal elements, i.e., elements of the same category, but with different distributions (see Roussou 2010 for similar conclusions about Modern Greek subordinators). This path of research has led to claim that complement clauses and relative clauses should be reduced to one and **the same phenomenon** (Kayne 1976, 2014; Manzini/Savoia 2003, 2011; Arsenijević 2009; Roussou 2010).

Yet, the empirical evidence from multiple declarative complementizer systems shows a great wealth of (micro)variation concerning the form of subordinators, their syntax and their semantics (see, e.g., Baunaz 2015, 2016, 2018 about Romance and Balkan languages). Based on the comparative analysis of complement clauses in southern Italian dialects, many with a dual-complementizer system, Ledgeway (2000, 2005, 2016 *inter alia,* 2015, 2020 for a *parameter hierarchy* approach) argues for an alternance of two complementizer positions, possibly lexicalized, in accordance with a realis vs. irrealis distinction. See also Greco (2012, 2014) for the relationship between alternating complementizers and pragmatic factors in Latin texts. Moreover, Ledgeway argues that this binary opposition results from a ternary one, attested in the Greek and Romance varieties of the Extreme South, due to the loss of the factive complementizer function. Nonetheless, this complementizer is still maintained in its function as relativizer alongside the declarative complementizer. Since the loss of the factive complementizer function does not presuppose the loss of its relativizing functions, these data suggest that complement and relative structures are **distinct**.

Cross-linguistically, finite declarative complementizers are often identical to words of *other* categories (see Baunaz/Lander 2017, 2018 for cross-categorial syncretism with complementizers). In addition to the nominal category mentioned above, it is often formally identical to a verbal quotative marker (e.g., grammaticalization of the verb *say*), itself often identical to a verb (e.g., *say*, see Franco 2012 for Akkadian; Lord 1993 for Twi/Ewe/Engenni (Niger-Congo); Donohue 1999 and Klamer 2000 for Buru/Tukang Besi (Austronesian); Knyazev 2016 for Kalmyk (Mongolic); Chappell 2008 for Mandarin (Sinitic), a.o.). Also, some languages can display verbal and nominal complementizers (cf. English *that* (nominal) and *like* (verbal), see Rooryck 2000, Brook 2014 a.o).

Subordinators and their cross-categorial forms can be understood in light of their diachrony and grammaticalization paths. Noonan (2007) claims that they are often (historically) derived from pronouns, conjunctions, adverbs, adpositions/case markers, and verbs: e.g., English *that* and its Germanic cognates come from a demonstrative (see Ferraresi 1991, 1997; Kiparsky 1995; Longobardi 1991; Roberts/Roussou 2003; Noonan 2007); Romance *que/che* are reflexes of the Spoken Latin complementizer and relativizer *que*, replacing Latin *quod* (on this much debated question see Eufe 2010); some complementizers derive from verbs of saying, from the verb *give*, or from verbs of resemblance (see, a.o., Heine/Kuteva 2002, on different grammaticalization paths of complementizers cross-linguistically (from verbs or other categories)).

That subordinators often have the same form as words of other categories is not **universal**. Broader cross-linguistic comparisons show that languages may distinguish between complementizers and/or relativizers and/or *wh*-words: e.g., Swedish has three different words (complementizer *att* 'that' vs. relative *som* 'that' vs. *wh*-word *vad* 'what'), but Polish has only two (complementizer *że* 'that' vs. relative *co* 'that' and *wh*-word *co* 'what'). Similar observations can be made for verbal complementizers which can be analogous to or different from quotative markers (see Lord 1993 for Akan/Akuapem/Ewe; see also Chappell 2008 for Mandarin).

The above description shows that subordinators can represent diverse categories, with different morpho-syntactic properties, both synchronically and diachronically. To better understand those issues, we invite presentations on the following research questions:

Research Questions and Issues to approach

RQ1: What are the formal proprieties of clausal complements of V/N and of relative clauses?
- o What is/are the form(s) of *complementizers/relativizers*?
- o Is the form of *complementizer/relativizer* identical to other elements in the language (demonstratives, *wh*-words, equative particles etc.)?
- o What is/are the structure(s) of relative clauses and complement clauses? Are they similar? Are they (slightly) different?
- o What is the syntactic position of complementizers? Is it similar to (or different from) the position of categories it is homophonous with?
- o What is the syntactic position of relative clauses in the sentence?
- o What is the relation between noun complements and relative clauses?
- o What Is the left-periphery of relative clauses?

- - Impact of the morpho-semantic features of the verb on complementizers:
    - o Modality (e.g., mood particles in Balkan and Romance languages, etc.)
    - o Aspect
    - o Tense

- Can diachronic data complement synchronic data in the analysis?

RQ2: In complex sentences with embedded clauses, what are the morpho-syntactic and semantic properties of the matrix predicate?

o Complementizer deletion
o What are the syntactic atoms selected by the matrix predicate (categories or features? Quid of Category-selection, Chomsky 1965)? E.g., the complement of *think* can be a CP (*John thinks [$_{CP}$ that I am happy]*) but not a DP (**John thinks [$_{DP}$ that idea]*).
o Does the matrix predicate require a question, a proposition or an exclamation (Semantic-selection, Grimshaw 1979)? E.g., *think* requires a proposition.

References

Aboh, E. (2005), Deriving Relative and factive constructions in Kwa, in L. Brugè, G. Giusti, N. Munaro, W. Schweikert, and G. Turano (eds), *Contributions to the Thirtieth Incontro di Grammatica Generativa*, Venezia: Libreria Editrice Cafoscarina, 265-285.

Arsenijevic, B. (2009), Clausal Complementation as Relativization, *Lingua* 119, 39-50.

Baunaz, L. (2015), On the various sizes of complementizers, *Probus* 27(2), 193-236.

Baunaz, L. (2016), Deconstructing Complementizers in Serbo-Croatian, Modern Greek and Bulgarian, in C. Hammerly & B. Prickett (eds), *Proceedings of Proceedings of North Eastern Linguistic Society 46, vol 1*. 69-77.

Baunaz, L. (2018), Decomposing Complementizers: The Fseq of French, Modern Greek, Serbo-Croatian and Bulgarian Complementizers, in L. Baunaz, K. De Clercq, L. Haegeman and E. Lander (eds), *Exploring Nanosyntax. Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax*, New York: OUP, 149-179.

Baunaz, L. & E. Lander (2017), Syncretisms with nominal complementizers, *Studia Linguistica*. 72(3), 537-570.

Baunaz, L. & E. Lander (2018) Deconstructing categories syncretic with the nominal complementizer, *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 3(1), 31: 1-27.

Brook, m. (2014), Comparative complementizers in Canadian English: Insights from early fiction, *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 20(2), Article 2. Available at: https://repository.upenn.edu/pwpl/vol20/iss2/2/.

Chappell, H. (2008), Variation in the grammaticalization of complementizers from verba *dicendi* in Sinitic languages, *Linguistic Typology* 12(1), 45-98.

Chomsky, N. (1965), *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Donohue, M. (1999), *A grammar of Tukang Besi*, Berlin: De Gruyter.

Eufe, R. (2010), La genèse de *que* et la subordination en latin et français, in M. Iliescu, H. Siller-Runggaldier, P. Danler, Paul (eds), *Actes du XXVe Congrès International de Linguistique et de Philologie Romanes, Innsbruck, 3–8 septembre 2007, Bd. 2*, Tübingen: Niemeyer, 459-470.

Ferraresi, G. (1991), Die Stellung des gotischen Verbs im Lichte eines Vergleichs mit dem Althochdeutschen, Venice: University of Venice, MA thesis.

Ferraresi, G. (1997), Word order and phrase structure in Gothic, Stuttgart: University of Stuttgart, Doctoral Dissertation.

Franco, L. (2012), *Complementizers are not (Demonstrative) Pronouns and Vice Versa*. Available online: http://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/001539

Greco, P. (2012), *La complementazione frasale nelle cronache latine dell'Italia centro-meridionale (secoli X-XII)*, Napoli: Liguori.

Greco, P. (2014), Sull'alternanza dei complementatori *quod*, *quia* e *ut* in dipendenza da *verba dicendi et sentiendi* in alcune agiografie di epoca merovingica (VI-VII secolo), in P. Molinelli, P. Cuzzolin, C. Fedriani (eds), *Latin Vulgaire-Latin Tardif X. Actes du colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif. Bergamo, 5-9 septembre 2012.* Bergamo: Bergamo University Press, 287-303.

Grimshaw, J. (1979), Complement Selection and the Lexicon, *Linguistic Inquiry* 10(2), 279-326.

Heine, H. & T. Kuteva (2002), *World Lexicon of Grammaticalisation*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kayne, R. (1976), French relative "que". In F. Hensey & M. Luján (eds), *Current Studies in Romance Linguistics*, Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 255-299.

Kayne, R. (1994), *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Kayne, R. (2014), Why isn't *This* a complementizer?, in R. Kayne (ed), *Comparison and contrast*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 190–227.

Kiparsky, P. 2005. Blocking and Periphrasis. *Yearbook of Morphology* 2004, 113-135. Dordrecht: Springer.

Klamer, M. (2000), How report verbs become quote markers and complementizers, *Lingua* 110, 69–98.

Klima, E.S. (1964), *Studies in Diachronic Transformational Syntax*, Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University, Doctoral Dissertation.

Knyazev, M. (2016), Complementizers in Kalmyk, in K. Boye & P. Kehayov (eds), *Complementizer Semantics in European Languages*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 665-690.

Ledgeway, A. (2000), *A Comparative Syntax of the Dialects o Southern Italy: A Minimalist Approach*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Ledgeway, A. (2005), Moving through the left periphery: the dual complementiser system in the dialects of southern Italy. *TPS* 103, 336-396.

Ledgeway, A. (2015), Parallels in Romance Nominal and Clausal Microvariation, *Revue roumaine de linguistique* 60(2-3), 105-127.

Ledgeway, A. (2016), Clausal complementation, in A. Ledgeway & M. Maiden (eds), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ledgeway, A. (2020), Variation in the Gallo-Romance left periphery. V2, complementizers, and the Gascon enunciative system, in S. Wolfe & M. Maiden (eds), *Variation and Change in Gallo-Romance Grammar*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 71-99.

Longobardi, G. (1991), Alcune riflessioni informali sulla posizione del verbo in gotico e le prospettive di una sintassi comparata dei complementatori generici', ms., University of Venice.

Lord, C. (1993), *Historical change in serial verb constructions*. John Benjamins.

Manzini, M.R. & Savoia, L.M. (2003), The nature of complementizers, *Rivista di grammatica generativa* 28: 87–110.

Manzini, M.R. & Savoia, L.M. (2011), *Grammatical categories*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Noonan, M. (2007), Complementation, in T. Shopen (ed), *Language typology and syntactic description, Vol. II: Complex constructions*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 52–150.

Roberts, I. & Roussou, A. (2003), *Syntactic change: A minimalist approach to grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rooryck, J. (2000), *Configurations of sentential complementation: Perspectives from Romance languages*, London: Routledge.

Roussou, A. (2000), On the left periphery: Modal particles and complementizers. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 1, 65-94.

Roussou, A. (2010), Selecting Complementizers, *Lingua* 120(3), 582-603.

Sportiche, D. (2011), French Relative *qui*, *Linguistic Inquiry* 42(1), 83-124.