

Multiple complementation markers in postclassical Greek, early modern Greek, modern Albanian and other languages: A descriptive contrastive account

Ioannis Fykias, Eleni Karantzola* & Konstantinos Sampanis*

University of Salzburg, *University of the Aegean

ΠΕΡΙΛΗΨΗ

Το παρόν άρθρο διερευνά περιπτώσεις συνδυασμών συμπληρωματικών δεικτών ή συναφών δεικτών σε μια συμπληρωματική πρόταση, όπως *ότι + πως*. Οι συνδυασμοί αυτοί μαρτυρούνται σε ορισμένες διαλεκτικές ποικιλίες ή σε συγκεκριμένες διαχρονικές φάσεις διάφορων γλωσσών. Εξετάζονται οι συνδυασμοί (i) *ώς + ότι* της ελληνιστικής κοινής, (ii) *se + si, se + kush* κ.λπ. της σύγχρονης αλβανικής και (iii) *ότι + πως* της πρώιμης νέας ελληνικής του 16ου αι., σε αντιπαράθεση προς ανάλογα φαινόμενα που μαρτυρούνται σε διαλέκτους της γερμανικής. Αναπτύσσεται ένα πλαίσιο συγκριτικής αντιπαραθετικής ανάλυσης, το οποίο αποσκοπεί αφενός στο να παράσχει μια λεπτομερή, επαρκή περιγραφή των ομοιοτήτων αλλά και των διαφορών ανάμεσα στα γραμματικά συστήματα των υπό εξέταση γλωσσών, αφετέρου φιλοδοξεί να σκιαγραφήσει τη δυνατότητα ένταξης σε θεωρητικά ερμηνευτικά μοντέλα. Η αντιπαραθετική ανάλυσή μας θα εστιάσει στις λεπτομέρειες της δομής και συμπεριφοράς ενός μεγάλου αριθμού δυνατών συνδυασμών.

KEYWORDS: complementation markers, complementizers, doubly-filled-comp filter, evidentiality

1. Introduction*

Our contribution is part of a series of more comprehensive studies that investigate the nature and diachronic development of subordinate clauses in the history of Greek (cf. Fykias & Katsikadeli 2013, Karantzola & Sampanis 2016). This paper deals with the phenomenon of multiple complementation markers that introduce complement clauses. The commitment of taking into serious consideration and exploiting the methodology of contrastive linguistics constitutes an essential characteristic of our analysis. We explore the co-occurrence of multiple complement clause particles, which can either be currently observed in contemporary colloquial usage or –alternatively– have been attested during specific diachronic phases or in specific dialectal varieties of three different languages (Greek, Albanian and German). We develop a framework of contrastive analysis, which, on the one hand, aims at providing a detailed and accurate description of both similarities and differences among the grammatical systems of the languages under examination and, on the other hand, sets out to offer at least a sketch of an explanatory account. Our analysis will focus on the details of possible combinations of complementation markers. These specifics encompass such formal aspects as the linear word order of the elements involved, the matter of optional vs. obligatory status of these combinations in their respective contexts, the issue of selectional conditions in this concrete context (i.e. what counts as an eligible partner of the combination, such as the type of indirect questions that are combinable with the complementizer *se* in Albanian), and possible deviations from a more general pattern that has been established so far in the linguistic literature –especially in connection with Germanic languages (such as German and English) that have been studied more extensively. A further issue that is addressed concerns the question whether the subordinate/embedded clauses under investigation display main (root) sentence characteristics or not, along the lines of the distinctions that were first introduced by Emonds (e.g. 2004).

* We would like to express our gratitude to the organizers of the International Contrastive Linguistics Conference 8 (ICLC8), 25-28 May 2017 in Athens, where an earlier version of this paper was presented. We thank all the participants for stimulating comments and discussions. We would also like to kindly thank the two anonymous reviewers for their critical and constructive suggestions, as well as their detailed corrections.

The paper is organized as follows: The introductory section discusses, *inter alia*, the concept of “complement clause particles” and the structural environments in which they occur (cf. Noonan 2007, Joseph 2017). Section 2 presents evidence consisting of instances of complementizer and particle combination patterns, as well as isolated pleonastic complementizers, attested chiefly in Postclassical Greek, which is the primary concern of this part of the paper. A contrastive-descriptive approach is attempted that deals with the state of affairs in Classical Greek, on the one hand, and Later Greek and Modern Greek on the other. In section 3 we draw attention to a number of properties of indirect questions in Modern Standard Albanian, where numerous combinations of the complementizer *se* and *wh*-questions are allowed. All acceptable combination types in our data are traced and analyzed. In order to attain a deeper understanding of this syntactic pattern, a strategy that can be exploited is to compare the exact details of the constructions involved with their counterparts in other languages: in this specific case, we examine affine combinations also consisting of *wh*-words and complementizers in various dialects of German (Bavarian, Alemannic) and focus on the factors and details differentiating the two typological profiles (in a descriptive contrastive framework). In section 4 a part of the standard contemporary Modern Greek system is sketched and contrasted to the patterns exhibited by Early Modern Greek, in which some combinations of complementation markers are allowed that are ungrammatical in contemporary Standard Modern Greek. In a concluding –and possibly not very conclusive– section we address the question of the aetiology, i.e. the factors (e.g. sociolinguistic, language contact related) that have potentially played a role in connection with the emergence, diffusion and decline of these phenomena. One kind of explanation is related to the possibility of contact-induced language change.

One of the difficulties that we are faced with in every investigation addressing the subordinate finite clauses is the fact that there is no general consensus on the question of what exactly a complementizer is. According to Noonan (2007: 55), a complementizer is defined as “a word, particle, clitic, or affix, one of whose functions is to identify the entity [i.e. a complement type] as a complement”, that is a notional sentence that fills an argument role. As Joseph (2017: 272) puts it, this broad definition, “focuses [...] on those elements that allow a clause to function as a complement. However, for head-initial (right-branching) languages like those in the Balkans, such elements can be further differentiated by an added characteristic that at least some complementizers in other languages show, namely that of sharply delimiting a clause boundary.

Indicative complements are introduced by elements –complementation markers– that can be analyzed as canonical complementizers, while modal complements are accompanied by elements which are also a type of complementation marker in that they are associated with complement clauses that, for some of the languages at least, are probably best analyzed not as canonical complementizers *per se* but as mood markers.

2. Pleonastic or multiple complementizers in non-literary Post-Classical Greek

According to Jannaris (1897: 412), ὅτι and the less assertive ὡς were in general usage as canonical complementizers during the historical stage of Classical Greek (primarily the Attic dialect of the 5th and 4th centuries BCE). The principles governing the distribution of ὅτι or ὡς after verbs of saying can be outlined as follows. Some verbs take either an ὅτι- or ὡς- clause or an infinitival clause. Affirmative clauses are usually followed by the infinitive or ὅτι; on the other hand, ὡς is preferred to ὅτι if a writer wishes to mark a statement as an opinion, a pretext, as untrue, when the matrix clause is negative or when the dependent clause is negative (cf. Smyth 1920: 582). The same holds for verbs of thinking (cf. Thucydides 3.88). Examples (1) and (2) illustrate this:

- (1) λέγει δ' ὡς ὑβριστής εἰμι
 légei d' hōs hubristḗs eimi
 say.3SG.IND.PRES. PTC that (=COMP) insolent.M.NOM.SG. be.1SG.IND.PRES.
 “he says that I am an insolent person” (Lysias, On the Refusal of a Pension I,15)
- (2) νομίζουσι δὲ οἱ ἐκείνη ἄνθρωποι ὡς ὁ Ἥφαιστος χαλκεύει
 nomízousi dè hoi ekeinē ánthrōpoi
 believe.3PL.IND.PRES. PTC the.M.NOM.PL. that.F.DAT.SG. people.M.NOM.PL.
 hōs ho Hēphaistos khalkeúei
 that (=COMP) the.M.NOM.SG. Hephaestus.M.NOM.SG. forge.3SG.IND.PRES.
 “[In Hieria the people] in those parts believe that Hephaestus has his forge...”
 (Thucydides, 3.88)

So, the whole Classical period is characterized by the coexistence of the complementizers ὅτι and ὡς. For a more systematic analysis of the distribution of ὅτι and ὡς in Classical Attic, we refer the reader to a recent article by Van Rooy, who remarks that “linguists seem to agree that *hóti* denotes an actual fact in a neutral way, whereas *hōs* is connected –however vaguely– with subjectivity. It is clear that there is a certain functional contrast between the two complementizers, the precise nature of which still remains rather opaque and probably differs diachronically and dialectally” (2016: 19).

According to Horrocks (2010: 93ff.), the whole system of formal devices that had served for coding subordination (or indirect speech) underwent a series of serious changes in the Hellenistic period. The use of infinitival and participial constructions was drastically reduced, while the optative of indirect discourse in past-time contexts was abandoned. The accusative + infinitive complement clauses after verbs of thought and belief were widely replaced by ὅτι-finite clauses with an indicative verb, whereas accusative + infinitive complement constructions after impersonal modals and control verbs of wanting and expecting were replaced by finite clauses containing a subjunctive verb introduced by ἵνα or ὅπως.

With the close of the stage of Classical Greek ὡς retreated from the language and the domain of complementizers had to be defined anew. The aforementioned fine distinction concerning indirect discourse or –put differently– subordination features cannot be maintained any longer in non-literary Post-Classical Greek (i.e. the Koine of the 3rd century BCE to the 1st-2nd century AD). As Robertson (1919: 1032ff.) notes:

“The κοινή writers and the papyri show this same retreat of ὡς before ὅτι and the inroad of πῶς on ὅτι [...] There is, however, no doubt of the use of ὡς ὅτι in the declarative sense = ‘that.’ It is an unclassical combination, but it appears in the LXX (Esther 4:14)¹ and in the κοινή writers.” It is like the Latin *quasi* in the Vulgate. The late papyri (fourth cent. A.D.) show that ὡς ὅτι came in the vernacular to mean simply ‘that.’ Moulton cites also two Attic inscriptions from the first century B.C., which have ὡς ὅτι in the sense of ὡς or ὅτι alone. The editors have removed ὅτι from ὡς ὅτι in Xenophon's Hellen. III, ii, 14, εἰπὼν ὡς ὅτι ὀκνοίη. Moulton agrees to Blass' stigma of “unclassical” on ὡς ὅτι, but Paul has κοινή support for his use of it in 2 Cor. 5:19;² 11:21; 2 Th. 2:2;³ [...] 2 Cor. 11, 21

¹ Cf. Esther 4:14: ὡς ὅτι ἐὰν παρακούσης ἐν τούτῳ τῷ καιρῷ, ἄλλοθεν βοήθεια καὶ σκέπη ἔσται τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, σὺ δὲ καὶ ὁ οἶκος τοῦ πατρός σου ἀπολείσθαι· καὶ τίς οἶδεν εἰ εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον ἐβασίλευσας;

² Cf. 2 Corinthians 5:19: ὡς ὅτι Θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσων ἑαυτῷ, μὴ λογιζόμενος αὐτοῖς τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν, καὶ θέμενος ἐν ἡμῖν τὸν λόγον τῆς καταλλαγῆς.

³ Cf. 2 Thessalonians 2:2: εἰς τὸ μὴ ταχέως σαλευθῆναι ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ νοῦς μήτε θροεῖσθαι, μήτε διὰ πνεύματος μήτε διὰ λόγου μήτε δι' ἐπιστολῆς ὡς δι' ἡμῶν, ὡς ὅτι ἐνέστηκεν ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

κατὰ ἀτιμίαν λέγω ὡςὸτι ἡμεῖς ἡσθενήκαμεν. [...] 2 Cor. 5,18 δόντος ἡμῖν τὴν διακονίαν τῆς καταλλαγῆς ὡςὸτι θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσων ἑαυτῷ. 2 Thess. 2:2 ἐρωτῶμεν . . . ὡςὸτι (– διότι ?) ἐνέστηκεν ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ Κυρίου.”

In Bauer’s New Testament Dictionary (Danker 2000) we find –s.v. ὅτι– the following information concerning the occurrence and the interpretation of ὡς ὅτι in the aforementioned examples:

“ὡς ὅτι is found three times in Pauline letters and simply means ‘that’ in the later vernacular (exx. in Mt. 212; B-D-F §396; Rob. 1033). But the subjective meaning of ὡς must be conceded for the NT, since the Vulgate renders ὡς ὅτι twice w. ‘quasi’ (2 Cor 11:21; 2 Th 2:2) and the third time (2 Cor 5:19) w. ‘quoniam quidem’: δι’ ἐπιστολῆς . . . , ὡς ὅτι ἐνέστηκεν ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου *by a letter* ... (of such content) *that* (in the opinion of its writer) *the day of the Lord is (now) here* 2 Th 2:2. Paul says ironically: κατὰ ἀτιμίαν λέγω, ὡς ὅτι ἡμεῖς ἡσθενήκαμεν *I must confess to my shame that we have conducted ourselves as weaklings* (as I must concede when I compare my conduct w. the violent treatment you have had fr[om] others [vs. 20]) 2 Cor 11:21 [...]. Likew[ise] 5:19; we are a new creation in Christ (vs. 17). This does not alter the fact that everything has its origin in God, who reconciled us w[ith] himself through Christ (vs. 18), ὡς ὅτι θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσων ἑαυτῷ *that is* (acc[ording] to Paul’s own conviction), (*that it was God who was reconciling the world to himself in Christ.*”

Apart from the emergence of the non-canonical combination ὡς ὅτι in the Hellenistic period, following the collapse and the subsequent reorganization of the Classical Greek system of subordination and its signaling devices, there is ample evidence supporting the establishment of another innovation: the common usage of one of the typical “direct speech oriented” properties of a great number of ὅτι-complement constructions after *verba dicendi*. What is really novel is the high frequency, in which the so called “pleonastic” ὅτι occurs. Examples (3)-(7), all taken from the New Testament, illustrate this use.⁴

(3) καὶ τότε ὁμολογήσω αὐτοῖς ὅτι οὐδέποτε ἔγνων ὑμᾶς
 kai tote homologēsō autois hoti oudepote
 and then confess.1SG.IND.FUT. PRON.3.M.DAT.PL. that never
 egnōn humas
 know.1SG.IND.AOR. PRON.2ACC.PL

“Then I will tell them plainly, ‘I never knew you!’” (Mat 7:23)

(4) ἄρχων εἷς [...] προσεκύνει αὐτῷ λέγων ὅτι ἡ θυγάτηρ μου ἄρτι ἐτελεύτησεν·
 arkhōn heis prosekynei autō legōn hoti hē thygatēr mou arti eteleutēsen
 ruler.NOM.SG.MASC. INDEF.ART.NOM.SG.MASC. kneel.3SG.IND.IMPF.
 autōi legōn hoti hē thygatēr
 he.DAT.SG. say.PARTC.PRES.M.NOM.SG. that the daughter.F.NOM.SG.
 mou arti eteleutēsen
 PRON.1.GEN.SG. just end.3SG.IND.AOR.

“A ruler came in and knelt before him, saying, “My daughter has just died”” (Mat 9:18)

⁴ The phenomenon is not totally unknown in Classical Greek; cf. isolated, very sporadic instances of ὅτι + direct discourse such as: Οἱ δὲ εἶπον ὅτι ἱκανοὶ ἐσμεν εἰς τὴν χώραν εἰσβάλλειν (Xenophon, Anabasis 5.4.10).

(5) καὶ πάλιν ἠρνήσατο μεθ' ὄρκου ὅτι οὐκ οἶδα τὸν ἄνθρωπον.
 kai palin ērnēsato meth horkou hoti ouk
 and again deny.3SG.IND.AOR.MED. with oath.GEN.SG. that NEG
 oida ton anthrōpon
 know.1SG.IND.PRES. the man.ACC.SG.

“And again he denied it with an oath: ‘I do not know the man.’” (Mat 26:72)

(6) τότε ἤρξατο καταναθεματίζειν καὶ ὀμνύειν ὅτι οὐκ οἶδα τὸν ἄνθρωπον.
 tote ērksato katanathematizein kai omnye
 then begin.3SG.IND.AOR.MED. curse.INF.PRES. and swear.INF.PRES.
 hoti ouk oida ton anthrōpon
 that NEG know.1SG.IND.PRES. the man.M.ACC.SG.

“Then he began to invoke a curse on himself and to swear, ‘I do not know the man.’” (Mat 26:74)

(7) καὶ ἐμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τοῦ ῥήματος Ἰησοῦ εἰρηκότος αὐτῶ ὅτι πρὶν ἀλέκτορα
 φωνῆσαι τρίς ἀπαρνήσει με·

kai emnēsthē ho Petros tou rhēmatos
 and remember.3SG.IND.AOR.PASS. the Peter.NOM. the saying.N.GEN.SG.
 Iēsou eirēkotos autōi hoti prin
 Jesus.GEN. say.PARTC.PERF.GEN.SG. he.DAT.SG. that before
 alekto
 rooster.M.ACC.SG. crow.INF.AOR. thrice deny.2SG.IND.FUT. 1.CL.ACC.SG.

“And Peter remembered the saying of Jesus, ‘Before the rooster crows, you will deny me three times.’” (Mat 26:75)

With examples like (3) to (7) in mind, Jannaris remarks: “In this popular mode of direct discourse, it is very common to indicate the dependence of the *verbatim* clause by placing before it the conjunction ὅτι, which then seems redundant (so in New Testament about 120 times) and corresponds to our modern colon (:) or quotation marks” (1897: 472).

The combination ὡς ὅτι is confronted with a serious difficulty. The linear word order ὡς ὅτι is not supported by the principles of theoretical syntax, which postulate the pattern: Spec-CP (the landing site of the *wh*-phrase) + the respective C-head (the position of the complementizer).⁵ Both ὡς and ὅτι would normally occupy the position of the complementizer. Alternatively, there is the possibility of bringing into play a sort of recitative ὅτι, which is, in a sense, more external to the complement clause under a plausible interpretation of quotative elements as in examples (3) to (7). But this step would predict the linear order ὅτι ὡς and not ὡς ὅτι. With these serious difficulties in mind –under the conditions sketched above–, a univerbation hypothesis (ὡς ὅτι > ὡσότι) would represent a technically better solution for the problem, which would enable us to avoid the difficulties outlined above.

3. Modern Albanian: The homogenous pattern “pleonastic” *se* + indirect question.

This section deals with a typologically challenging construction, i.e. the case of Standard Modern Albanian (the Tosk dialect in particular), which is characterized by the possibility to freely (i.e. optionally) employ the combination: “pleonastic” complementizer *se* + *wh*-word in a great number of specific contexts.

The best-known constructions allowing a “redundant” or pleonastic complementizer are indirect questions (after verbs of saying, knowing and similar predicates), which are very frequently introduced by the combination: realis

⁵ For a quick introduction to the terms Spec-CP, C-head and their place in the framework of generative syntax, we refer the reader to Radford et al. (2009: 293-310).

complementizer *se* + *wh*-word. The first group of examples (8-12) below are taken from specimens of colloquial speech (their sources being popular news sites, advertisements, popular internet sites etc.) and illustrate the informal colloquial usage.

- (8) Harro çfarë të lëndoi në të
 forget. 2SG.IMP.ACT. what 2. ACC.SG. CL. hurt.3SG.IND.AOR. in the
 shkuarën, por kurrë mos harro **se çfarë**
 past but never NEG. forget. 2SG. IMP.ACT. that what
 të mësoi ky lëndim...!
 2.ACC.SG. CL. teach.3SG.IND.AOR. this injury.SG.NOM.
 “Forget what hurt you in the past, but never forget what this injury taught you”
- (9) Sali Berisha di **se ku**
 Sali Berisha.NOM.SG know.IND.PRES.3SG. that where
 ndodhet Frroku dhe se kush e
 find. 3SG.IND.PRES.M-P. F. NOM.SG and that who 3.ACC.SG.CL.
 liroi
 free. 3SG.IND.AOR.
 “Sali Berisha knows where Frroku is and who released him”
- (10) A e keni dëgjuar se
 Q-PARTICLE 3.ACC.SG.CL. have.2PL.IND.PRES. hear.PART.PERF. that
si këndon ministri Hajredin Kuçi?!
 how sing. 3SG.IND.PRES. minister+the . NOM. SG. H.K.NOM. SG.
 “Have you heard that how minister Hajredin Kuçi sings?”
- (11) Valencia e di shumë mirë **se**
 Valencia 3.ACC.SG.CL. know. 3SG.IND.PRES. very well that
çfarë dua unë
 what want.IND.PRES.1SG. PRON.1.NOM.SG.
 “Valencia knows very well what I want”
- (12) Provoni këtë mashtrim optik, për të
 try. 2PL.IMP.ACT. this.ACC.SG. deception. ACC.SG. optical for to
 parë **se si** funksionojnë ngjyrat
 see that how function.IND.PRES.3PL colour+the.NOM.PL.
 “Try out this optical deception to see how colours function”

Examples (13) to (23) come from a more formal register, since they are taken from modern Bible translations. The (a) variants offer evidence that the “pleonastic” complementizer *se* may co-occur with practically all *wh*-words. Most of the (b) variants show that the use of *se* in indirect questions is not obligatory.

- (13) *se* + *si* (“how”)
- (a) e kam parë **se si** po
 3SG.ACC.CL have. IND.PRES.1SG. see.PART.PERF. that how now
 i shtypin egjiptianët
 3PL.ACC.CL. suppress.3 PL.IND.PRES. Egyptian+the.M.PL.NOM.
- (b) dhe kam parë gjithashtu **se si**
 and have.1SG. see.PART.PERF. also that how
 Egjiptasit i shtypin
 Egyptian+the. M.PL.NOM. 3.PL.ACC.CL. suppress.3 PL.IND.PRES.
 “I have surely seen the affliction of my people which are in Egypt” (Exo 3:9)

(14) *se + ç'* ("what")

(a) do të të mësoj se ç'
 FUT.+M.PRT. 2SG.ACC.CL. teach.1SG.SUBJ.PRES. that what
 duhet të thuash
 must.3 SG.IND.PRES. M.PRT. say.2SG.SUBJ.PRES.

(b) dhe do të të mësoj atë
 and FUT.+M.PRT. 2SG.ACC.CL. teach.1SG.SUBJ.PRES. this.ACC
 që duhet të thuash
 that (Rel) must.3 SG.IND.PRES. M.PRT. say.2SG.SUBJ.PRES.

"I will [...] teach thee what thou shalt say." (Exo 4:12)

(15) *se + kur* ("when") + *të*

(a) Bëmë nderin të më
 do.2SG.IMP.PRES-1SG.DAT.CL. honor.the.F.Sg.Acc M.PRT. 1SG.DAT.CL.
 thuash se kur t' i
 say.2SG.SUBJ.PRES. that when M.PRT. 3SG.DAT.CL
 përgjërohem Perëndisë për ty
 entreat.1SG.SUBJ.PRESM-P God+the.M.SG.DAT. for PRON.2SG.ACC.

(b) Bëmë nderin të më
 do.2SG.IMP.PRES-1SG.DAT.CL. honor.the.F.Sg.Acc M.PRT. 1SG.DAT.CL.
 thuash kur të ndërhyj për
 say.2SG.SUBJ.PRES. when M.PRT. intervene.1SG.SUBJ.PRES. for
 ty
 PRON.2SG.ACC.

"Glory over me: when shall I entreat for thee" (Exo 8:9)

(16) combination *se + ç'* and *se + si*

(a) Ju e patë vetë se ç'
 PRON.2PL.NOM. 3SG.ACC.CL. see.2PL.IND.AOR. self that what
 u bëra egjiptianëve, se si
 3PL.DAT.CL. do.1SG.IND.AOR. Egyptian+the.M.PL.DAT. that how
 ju mbajta mbi krahë si
 PRON.2PL.ACC. hold.1SG.IND.AOR. on wing.PL.NOM. like
 shqiponjat
 eagle+the.PL.NOM.

(b) Ju e patë atë
 PRON.2PL.NOM. 3SG.ACC.CL. see.2PL.IND.AOR. PR.2PL.NOM.
 që u bëra Egjiptasve,
 that.(REL) 3PL.DAT.CL. do.1SG.IND.AOR. Egyptian+the.M.PL.DAT.
 dhe si ju solla mbi krahë
 and how PRON.2PL.ACC. hold.1SG.IND.AOR. on wing.PL.NOM.
 shqiponje pranë meje
 eagle+the. F.GEN.SG. near PRON.1.SG.ABL

"Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles' wings" (Exo 19:4)

(17) *se + kë* (“whom” [Acc.])

(a) *por nuk më ke thënë se*
 but NEG 1SG.DAT.CL. have.2SG.IND.PRES. say. PART.PERF. that
kë do të dërgosh me mua
 whom FUT.+M.PRT. send. 2SG.SUBJ.PRES. with PRON.1.SG.ACC.

(b) *por ti nuk më ke*
 but PRON.2SG.NOM. NEG 1SG.DAT.CL. have.2SG.IND.PRES.
thënë cilin do të
 say. PART.PERF. whom/which person FUT.+M.PRT.
dërgosh me mua
 send. 2SG.SUBJ.PRES. with PRON.1.SG.ACC.

“and thou hast not let me know whom thou wilt send with me” (Exo 33:12)

(18) *se + ku* (“where”)

(a) *deri më sot askush s’ e*
 until PRTCL today nobody.NOM. NEG. 3SG.ACC.CL.
di se ku gjendet
 know.3SG.IND.PRES. that where find.3SG.IND.PRES.M-P
varri i tij
 sepulchre+the.M.SG.NOM. POSS.3SG.M.

(b) *dhe askush nuk e ka*
 and nobody.NOM. NEG. 3SG.ACC.CL. have.3SG.IND.PRES.
mësuar deri më sot vendin
 learn.PART.PERF. until PRTCL today place+the.M.SG.ACC.
e varrit të tij
 ART sepulchre+the.M.SG. GEN. POSS.3SG.M.

“but no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day” (Deut. 34:6)

(19) *se + çfarë* (“what”)

(a) *Banorët e Gibeonit dëgjuan*
 inhabitant+the.M.PL.NOM. ART Gibeon+the.M.SG.GEN. hear.3PL.IND.AOR.
se çfarë i kishte bërë
 that what 3SG.DAT.CL. have.3.SG.IND.IMPF. do.PART.PERF.
Josiu Jerikosë dhe Ait
 Joshua+the.SG.NOM. Jericho+the.F.SG.DAT. and Ai+the.M.SG.DAT.

(b) *Por kur banorët e Gabaonit*
 But when inhabitant+the.M.PL.NOM. Gibeon+the.M.SG.GEN.
mësuan atë që Jozueu
 learn.3PL.IND.AOR. this.ACC. that (REL) Joshua+the.M.SG.NOM.
kishte bërë në Jeriko dhe në Ai
 have.3.SG.IND.IMPF. do.PART.PERF. in Jericho and in Ai

“And when the inhabitants of Gibeon heard what Joshua had done unto Jericho and to Ai” (Jos.9:3)

(20) *se + preposition + wh-word*

(a) *Na thoni se me çfarë*
 1PL.DAT.CL. say.2PL.IMP.PRES. that with what.ACC
duhet ta dërgojmë
 must.3SG.IND.PRES. M.PRT.+3SG.ACC.CL. send.1PL.SUBJ.PRES.
në vendin e vet.
 in place+the.M.SG.ACC. ART own/self

(b) Na trego mënyrën që
 1PL.DAT.CL. show.2 SG.IMP.PRES. way+the.F.SG.ACC that (REL)
 duhet të përdorim për
 must.3SG.IND.PRES. M.PRT. use.1PL.SUBJ.PRES. for
 ta kthyer përsëri në
 M.PRT.+3SG.ACC.CL. return.PART.PERF. again/back in
 vendin e saj
 place+the.M.SG.ACC. POSS.3SG.F

“tell us wherewith we shall send it to his place” (1 Sam. 6:2)

(21) *se + përse* (“why”)

(a) do ta merrni vesh se përse nuk
 FUT.+M.PRT.+3SG.ACC.CL. notice.2PL.SUBJ.PRES. that why NEG
 largohet nga ju dora
 remove.3.SG.IND.IMP.F.M-P from you.2PL.NOM. hand.+the.F.SG.NOM.
 e tij
 POSS. 3SG.M.

(b) do të mësoni pse
 FUT.+M.PRT.+3SG.ACC.CL learn.2PL.SUBJ.PRES. why
 dora e tij nuk ju
 hand.+the.F.SG.NOM. POSS. 3SG.M. NEG CL.2PL.ACC.
 ndahej
 separate.3SG.IND.IMP.F.M-P

“and it shall be known to you why his hand is not removed from you” (1 Sam. 6:3)

(22) *se + kush* (“who” [Nom.])

(a) ky do ta dinte se
 this.NOM.M. FUT.+M.PRT.+3SG.ACC.CL. know.3SG.IND.IMP.F. that
kush dhe ç’lloj gruaje është ajo
 who and what sort woman.F.SG.ABL. be.3SG.IND.PRES. this.F.NOM.
 (b) do ta dinte se kush dhe çfarë
 FUT.+M.PRT.+3SG.ACC.CL. know.3SG.IND.IMP.F. that who and what
 gruaje është kjo
 woman.F.SG.ABL. be.3SG.IND.PRES. this.F.NOM.

“This man [, if he were a prophet,] would have known who and what manner of woman this is” (Luk. 7:39)

(23) *se + sa* (“how much/how many”)

(a) që të njohësh plotësisht se
 in order that M.PRT. know.2SG.SUBJ.PRES. fully/completely that
sa të sigurt janë gjërat
 how-much certain be.3PL.IND.PRES. thing.+the.F.PL.NOM.

(b) që të jesh i sigurt për
 in order that M.PRT. be.2SG.SUBJ.PRES. certain for/about
 palëkundshmërinë e mësimëve që
 unshakability.+the.F.SG.ACC ART doctrine+the.F.PL.GEN. that.(REL)
 more
 take.2SG.IND.AOR.

“That thou mightest know the certainty of those things” (Luk. 1:4)

The co-occurrence of *wh*-phrase and complementizer is a relatively well-studied phenomenon that has been observed and described in connection with several Germanic languages and dialects. The state of affairs in these languages has been summarized as follows in an article by Bayer and Brandner (2008: 87):

“The Doubly-Filled-Comp Filter (DFCF) of the type *_[CP WH that] is known to be fully operative in standardized English, German etc. whereas in older stages of these languages and in various dialects, violations of this filter can be found. Examples are known from Bavarian, [...], but also from the Alemannic dialect spoken in the South-Western part of Germany:

- (1) *Ich weiss nicht wieviel (*dass) er für das Auto bezahlt hat* (Standard German)
 I know not how-much that he for the car paid has
 “I don't know how much he paid for the car”
- (2) *I woass nit wieviel dass er für des Auto zahlt hät* (Alemannic)
 I know not how-much that he for the car paid has
 “I don't know how much he paid for the car”

Standardly, it is assumed that both language varieties have the same structure, i.e. Spec-CP (the landing site of the *wh*-phrase) with the respective C-head (the position of the complementizer), the difference being that in the dialects the complementizer is allowed to be spelled-out overtly whereas it is phonetically null in the standardized varieties.”

The first distinctive property of the Albanian construction under investigation pertains to the remarkable fact that the presence of *se* is optional in practically every type of indirect *wh*-question. This conclusion can be supported by comparing the texts that represent the same register and the same time period, such as the aforementioned Modern Albanian Bible translations, which we have consulted. They were produced at the same time period and with practically the same audience in mind. One can easily draw the conclusion that the construction allowing the complementizer *se*, which immediately precedes the indirect question introduced by a *wh*-word (*kush* = who Nom., *kë* = whom Acc., *ku* = where, *kur* = when, *sa* = how much, how many, *si* = how, *ç'* or *çfarë* = what or which) is absolutely equivalent to (i.e. is a free variant of) the corresponding construction that does not employ the particle *se*, cf. (3a) *se kur* vs. (3b) *kur*; (17a) *se kë* vs. (17b) *cilin*.

Another salient property of the syntactic pattern that can be best appreciated, when we compare the Albanian constructions to its counterparts in other languages (such as the Germanic languages), is the uniform behaviour of all types of *wh*-indirect questions i.e. the fact that there is no differentiation whatsoever among the individual *wh*-words utilized in indirect questions despite their differing semantic and phonological attributes. This is in sharp contrast to the case of German dialects as described in Bayer and Brandner (2008: 87): “[I]t has been reported in various descriptive dialect grammars of Alemannic and Bavarian [...] that there are restrictions concerning the co-occurrence of *wh*-phrase and complementizer; specifically, *dass* virtually never co-occurs with the *wh*-expressions “what” and “who”.”

A significant theoretical problematic aspect of the pattern under examination can be summarized as follows. The construction *se + wh-* of Albanian does not harmonize with the pattern Spec-CP (the landing site of the *wh*-phrase) + the respective C-head (the position of the complementizer), as normally predicted by syntactic theory. This is in sharp contrast to the canonical word order of the subordinate clause pattern that is assumed to be valid in most languages that have been studied, e.g. the “well behaved” pattern of German *who that* in the history of English or dialectal German *wer dass*, as far as linear order is concerned.

Another prominent feature of Albanian complementation has to do with the position of the *se + wh-* indirect question within the overall organization of the Albanian system of interrogative constructions (both subordinate and main sentences). It must be

pointed out that the relationship between direct and indirect discourse clauses in Albanian is characterized by isomorphism. In other words, there is practically no difference –or to formulate it more carefully– there is minimal distance between direct and indirect questions. This principle does not only apply to *wh*-questions but also to *yes-no* questions, which –in Albanian– may involve the interrogative particle *a*, as examples (24) to (26) illustrate.

(24) Nuk e pashë a erdhi
 NEG 3SG.ACC.CL. see.1SG.IND.AOR. Q-PRCL come.3SG.IND.AOR.
 apo jo.
 or not

“I have not seen whether he came or not”

(25) A erdhi Gjoni?
 Q-PRCL come.3SG.IND.AOR. John.+ the.SG.NOM.

“Did John come?”

(26) Dhe s’ di a janë
 and NEG know.1SG.IND.PRES. Q-PRCL be.3PL.IND.PRES.
 të gjallë.
 ART alive.PL.NOM.

“And I do not know whether they are still alive”

Both main clause *yes-no* direct questions and subordinate clause *yes-no* indirect questions behave in exactly the same way and follow a uniform construction pattern. As a matter of fact, the only subordination trait in Albanian that may differentiate indirect questions from direct questions is that the tense agreement requirement is obeyed as a subordination trait, as example (27) illustrates.

(27) Nxënësit hynë në diskutim
 disciple+the.M.PL.NOM. enter.3PL.IND.AOR. in discussion.M.SG.ACC.
 se cili, vallë, nga ata ishte
 that which.SG.NOM. that perhaps from this.PL.NOM.M
 më i madh
 be.3SG.IND.IMPERF. the greatest.SG.NOM.

“...there arose a reasoning among them, which of them should be greatest”
 (Luk.9:46)

In sharp contrast to Albanian, in languages like German and English linear word order is utilized as an unambiguous signal of subordination; cf. *who is the author* vs. *I do not know who the author is* in English. Thus an (optional) epiphenomenal doubling of clause-introducing particles/complementizers seems to be a salient omnipresent characteristic across the whole set of subsystems of clause organization in Albanian. Intuitively, a kind of CP-recursion mechanism à la Vikner (1995) would capture the data in the most convincing way. Although this kind of explanation may not be considered up-to-date, it has a number of merits, since it freely predicts the possibility of recursion.

As a last issue, the function of clear demarcation even at the cost of redundancy has to be mentioned. It is noteworthy that the function of demarcation and its importance receives attention in Joseph’s treatise on complementation in the Balkans, as the following passage shows:

“Finally, it is important to realize that the notions “complementation” and “complementizer” overlap but are not coextensive. That is, complement clauses fill argument positions [...] but complementizers, i.e. delimiters of clause boundaries, introduce not just argument clauses but also adjunct clauses. Clause-demarkating words are found with adjuncts too, and express various sorts of semantic functions, including temporal relations, concession, conditions, and the like” (Joseph 2017: 277).

4. Combinations of complement markers in Early Modern Greek. The case of *ὅτι* + *πως*

An important feature of the complement markers of contemporary Standard Modern Greek (*ὅτι/πως*, *που* and *να*) is that they stand in strict complementary distribution, i.e. they never occur within a single complement clause simultaneously (cf. Roussou 2006). Still, diachronic research reveals that a parallel occurrence of these markers has been possible in the history of Greek (cf. Karantzola & Sampanis 2016). In this paper we will limit ourselves to the combination *ὅτι* + *πως* in Early Modern Greek.

The corpus that has been consulted for the investigation of pleonastic complement markers encompasses literary and non-literary texts of the 16th century. A variety of narrative texts (e.g. chronicles, lives of saints, homiletic texts, prophetic and apocalyptic visions, fiction, parody and satire, etc.) and non-narrative ones (e.g. legal works regulations, portolans, educational books, dictionaries, books of arithmetic, exorcisms, letters etc.) are available in manuscript and/or printed form. 250 extracts from all kinds of prose texts mentioned above –mostly unpublished– have been included in Kakoulidi-Panou et al. (in press). These originate from various regions of the Greek-speaking world (mainly Crete, Ionian Islands, Constantinople and mainland Greece) and offer valuable information about the linguistic situation of the time, with respect to the dialectic and stylistic variety and the overall development of Early Modern Greek. Because of its representativeness, this corpus has been our main body of reference for the study of the distribution of “pleonastic” use of complement markers in Early Modern Greek (cf. Karantzola & Sampanis 2016).

It should be borne in mind that texts by different authors and from different regions may have developed distinct systematic syntactic properties despite their belonging to the same linguistic continuum. Hence, in the absence of a well-established vernacular Modern Greek norm, the image of the Greek language at that time as a whole creates the impression of being in a state of flux or, as Hopper (1987) would put it, “emergent”.⁶

From the point of view of contemporary Standard Modern Greek, the combination of the complementizers *ὅτι* + *πως* is intuitively the “least acceptable” among the three constructions *ὅτι* + *να*, *πως* + *να* and *ὅτι* + *πως*, which are analyzed in Karantzola and Sampanis (2016). This is not surprising, if we take into consideration the fact that *ὅτι* and *πως* are supposed to occupy the same syntactic slot within a structure not only in contemporary Standard Modern Greek, but also in Early Modern Greek, since both of them can occur conjoined with a *να*-verbal form.

The *ὅτι* + *πως* clauses are mostly selected by verbs such as *λέω* “say” (28) or *γράφω* “write” (29), narratives i.e. predicates that “report” sayings or events (30), perception verbs (31) and verbs of knowledge (33):

⁶ We understand “emergent” here in the sense that the absence of a standardized variety enables us to observe the competing structures involved in a more lucid manner.

(28) Το Κάερος [...] λένε ότι πως έχει ρούγες δεκατέσσερις χιλιάδες
 to káeros léne óti pos
 the-Cairo.N.NOM.SG. say.3PL.IND.PRES. THAT THAT₂
 éçi rújes ðekatéseris çiljáðes
 have.3SG.IND.PRES. streets. F.ACC.PL. fourteen thousand. F.ACC.PL.
 “(People) say that Cairo has fourteen thousand streets” (Anthology 115)

(29) μου γράφεις ότι πως θέλεις κατέβεις εις την Θεοτόκον
 mu gráfis óti pos thélis
 PRON.1SG.GEN. write.2SG.IND.PRES. THAT THAT₂ will.2SG.(FUT.)
 katévis is tin theotókon
 descend.2SG.SUBJ.(+PERF). to the F.ACC.SG. God’s Mother. F.ACC.
 “You are writing to me that you are going to go to Theotokos’ church”
 (Anthology 234)

(30) Διηγάται ο παλαιός και σοφός ιστοριογράφος ο Ξενοφών ότι πως είχαν
 συνήθειαν οι Πέρσαι [...] ðiigáate o paleós ce sofós
 narrate.3SG.IND.PRES. the-ancient. NOM.SG. and wise. NOM.SG
 istoriografós o ksenofón óti pos
 history writer. NOM.SG. the-Xenophon.NOM. THAT THAT₂
 íçan siníthia i pérse
 have.3PL.IND.IMPF custom.F.ACC.SG. the-Persians. M.NOM.PL.
 “Xenophon reports that there was a custom among the Persians...” (Anthology 45)

(31) ήθελεν ακούσει ένα μήνυμα ότι πως έρχονται να τον ελευθερώσουν
 íthelen akúsi éna mínima óti pos
 would.3SG. listen.INF. one-message.N.ACC.SG. THAT THAT₂
 éçunde na ton eleftherósun
 come.3PL.IND.PRES. M.PRT. 3SG.M.ACC.CL liberate. 3PL.SUBJ.(+PERF)
 “(He) would hear a message that they were coming to set him free” (Anthology 45)

(32) Και τον εγνώριζαν ότι πως ήτον εκείνος οπού εκάθητον κατά την Ωραία
 θύραν του ιερού ζητώντας ελεημοσύνην
 ce ton egnórizan óti pos íton ecínos
 and him know.3PL.IND.IMPF. THAT THAT₂ be.3SG.IND.IMPF he-there
 ópu ekátheton katá tin oréan
 who (lit. where) sit.3SG.IND.IMPF at the-beautiful.F.ACC.SG.
 θίran tu ierú zitóndas eleimosínin
 door.F.ACC.SG. the-temple.N.GEN.SG. seek.CONV. alms.F.ACC.SG.
 “They knew that he was the man who used to sit and beg at the Beautiful Gate of
 the Temple” (Anthology 20)

In compliance with the selecting predicates, we observe that the *óti* + *πως* clauses occur in “narrative” contexts and refer to events, with respect to which the speaker or the subject of the predicate of the main clause has non first-hand knowledge.⁷ On these grounds, it may be reasonable to suggest that most *óti* + *πως* clauses encode a certain degree of evidentiality. Despite the fact that evidentiality is primarily associated with a verbal category, “there are hardly any morphological limitations on how evidential can be expressed” (Aikhenvald 2004: 69).

Syntactically, in turn, it may be rather erroneous to postulate univerbation for the two conjunctions. Although univerbation involving the head of a CP is possible (cf. e.g.

⁷ These events have been called in other terms “non-confirmative”, “indirective” and “mediative”, cf. Aikhenvald (2004: 25).

AG διότι “because”, “for the reason that” from δι’ ὅτι < διὰ ὅτι, i.e. from a configuration of preposition + neutral relative pronoun, cf. Schwyzer & Debrunner 1950: 661), univerbation of two complementizers should have been difficult at this early stage of emergence of this structure, since grammaticalization within phrases normally takes place when two or more lexical items which have a distinct categorial status form a collocation within a particular context (cf. also Hopper & Traugott ²2003: 134f). Since ὅτι and πώς shared the same categorial status, when they were separately used, univerbation at the early stage could not be possible. The “pleonastic” ὅτι in Early Modern Greek does not undertake the function of ὅτι recitativum, since it does not introduce direct speech as in the case of New Testament Greek –cf. examples (3) to (7) in section 2. Nevertheless, the role of the New Testament ὅτι as a marker of either direct or indirect speech would probably have influenced ecclesiastical scholars, since they constantly dealt with the language of the Bible.

Thus, we can put forward the idea that in the collocation ὅτι πώς the first element plays an introductory role, while the complement clause is an adjunct in apposition. If this analysis holds, ὅτι is a constituent of the main clause, quasi an argument, and thus is no more a genuine conjunction given that its content is less grammatical and more lexical, somehow “returning” to the etymological roots of ὅτι (< AG ὅτι, a neuter relative pronoun) and so the clause had the following structure: [x say THAT (ὅτι): [THAT₂ (pos)...]]. Surely, etymology did not play a crucial role here but the persistent presence of the ὅτι recitativum in the literary tradition of Greek offered a stylistic model that had an impact up to the Early Modern Greek. Furthermore, the conjunction πώς could convey an evidential reading in this configuration.⁸

5. Conclusions

In this article, we have investigated three combinations of complementation markers, instantiating three types of patterns that are characterized by distinctive properties. In Hellenistic Greek, the rather marginal combination ὡς ὅτι (with the meaning “quasi”) emerged in a period following the collapse and the subsequent reorganization of the Classical Greek system of subordination, which, inter alia, had the consequence that ὡς retreated from the language. In section 3, we dealt with the case of Standard Modern Albanian, whose most salient property consists in employing the combination *se + wh*-word in a very productive manner. This pattern is characterized by exceptional properties, which constitute a challenge for the theories we have developed so far.

In section 4, it is suggested that ὅτι in the combination ὅτι + πώς can be described as a marker introducing indirect speech. This is fairly straightforward after verbs of narration and perception that select ὅτι + πώς. The role of ὅτι is reminiscent of the ὅτι recitativum of New Testament (cf. section 2), the influence of which may have played a role. The case of ὅτι + πώς is challenging because of the scarcity of examples. A tentative analysis may propose that ὅτι introduces the indirect speech, whereas πώς is somehow associated with evidentiality in this particular constellation. The fact that both ὅτι and πώς were used to a great extent as complementizers in complementary distribution explains why this construction did not get established in the language.

⁸ We assume that this has to do with a characteristic property of ὅτι, when it is combined with other markers. Under these special circumstances, ὅτι does not serve as a proper realis marker; it is rather a general default complementizer, i.e. clause introduction marker. This allows ὅτι to co-occur even with *να*. In the combination ὅτι πώς, πώς follows the marker ὅτι, which introduces the clause, whereas πώς serves as a marker of evidentiality, a fact supported by its etymological origin.

A number of issues, including a more precise syntactic analysis of these structures, their dialectal differentiation on the basis of available Early Modern Greek texts and a systematic comparison with earlier phases of Greek, as well as with other languages with which Early Modern Greek was in contact, are objects of our ongoing research.

The phenomenon of multiple complementation markers seems to be connected with rather unstable stages in the history of a language. As soon as the system gets stabilized, it is not uncommon that phenomena of multiple complement clause particles become significantly scarce and eventually are no longer attested in the language development stages that follow. It is remarkable that languages not allowing the option of multiple complement clause particles usually involve standard varieties. There is a tendency for standardized language forms to opt for a single complementizer pattern after a period of oscillation, in which multiple complementation markers may be allowed to introduce complement clauses (as well as other subordinate clauses).

In future work, we plan to investigate further combinations of the type complementation marker + complementation marker in Standard Albanian (i.e. constructions involving *që* and *të*) and Early Modern Greek (i.e. *ὅτι* + *να* and *πως* + *να*) in a comparative contrastive analytical framework.

References

- Aikhenvald, A.Y. 2004. *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bayer, J. & Brandner, E. 2008. On wh-head-movement and the doubly-filled-comp filter. In C. B. Chang & H. J. Haynie (eds) *Proceedings of the 26th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project, 87-95.
- Danker, F. ³2000. *A Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian Literature revised and edited by Frederick William Danker, based on Walter Bauer's Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der frühchristlichen Literatur*. 6th edition.
- Emonds, J. 2004. Unspecified categories as the key to root constructions. In D. Adger, C. de Cat & G. Tsoulas (eds) *Peripheries. Syntactic Edges and their Effects*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 75-120.
- Fykias, I. & Katsikadeli, C. 2013. The rise of “subordination features” in the history of Greek and their decline. The “indirect speech traits cycle”. *Journal of Historical Linguistics* 3 (1), 28-48.
- Hopper, P. & Traugott-Closs, E. ²2003. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hopper, P. 1987. Emergent grammar. In J. Aske, N. Berry, L. Michaelis & H. Filip (eds) *Berkeley Linguistics Society 13: General Session and Parasession on Grammar and Cognition*. Berkeley: Linguistics Society, 139-157.
- Horrocks, G. ²2010. *Greek. A History of the Language and its Speakers*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Jannaris, A. 1897. *An Historical Greek Grammar chiefly of the Attic Dialect*. Repr. 1968. Hildesheim: Georg Olms.
- Joseph, B. D. 2017. The semantics and syntax of complementation markers as an areal phenomenon in the Balkans, with special attention to Albanian. In K. Boye & P. Kehayov (eds) *Complementizer Semantics in European Languages*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, , 265-293.
- Kakoulidi-Panou et al./ Κακουλίδη-Πάνου, Ε., Καραντζόλα, Ε. & Τικτοπούλου, Κ. (υπό δημοσίευση). *Δημώδης πεζός λόγος του 16ου αιώνα* [Demotic prose texts of the 16th century]. Θεσσαλονίκη/Αθήνα: Κέντρο Ελληνικής Γλώσσας & MIET.
- Karantzola, E. & Sampanis, K. 2016. On the “pleonastic” usage of complement markers in Early Modern Greek. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 16 (2), 202-231.

- Noonan, M. 2007. Complementation. In T. Shopen (ed.) *Language Typology and Syntactic Description. Vol. II: Complex Constructions*. 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 52-150.
- Radford, A., Atkinson, M., Britain, D., Clahsen H. & Spencer, A. 2009. *Linguistics. An Introduction*. 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Robertson, A. T. ³1919. *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Roussou/ Ρούσσου, A. 2006. *Συμπληρωματικοί δείκτες* [Complementizers]. Αθήνα: Πατάκης.
- Schwyzler, E. & Debrunner, A. 1950. *Griechische Grammatik (II – Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik)*. Munich: Beck.
- Smyth, H. W. 1920. *A Greek Grammar for Colleges*. American Book Company. (Reprints from the collection of the University of Michigan Library).
- Van Rooy, R. 2016. The relevance of evidentiality for Ancient Greek: Some explorative steps through Plato. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 16, 3-46.
- Vikner, S. 1995. *Verb Movement and Expletive Subjects in the Germanic Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.