

Pino Marco Pizzo (University of Mainz)

On the variability of syntactic structures from the Freising manuscripts to the East-Southslavic classical literary canon: sources and data

Observing syntactic patterns within nowadays Southern-Slavic languages, an obvious degree of variability can be noticed and has been stated within linguistic discourse. Often those differences are traced back to a common ancestor and divergent areal developments. However, examining the oldest sources of Southern-Slavic varieties, a remarkable diversification has to be stated likewise. Thus, syntactic variability within the Southern-Slavic area appears to be a given fact since very first attestations, which are represented by a broad range of documents running from the most Western Freising manuscripts to the East-Southslavic classical literary canon.

For better understanding diachronic and diatopic diversification, a holistic systematization of oldest syntactic data is required: Firstly, there has to be prepared a catalogue of available evidence, also stating crucial information retrieved from the primary sources mostly by (yet existing) philological analyses, locating every source in time, space and cultural context, the latter determining possible language contacts. Secondly, there is a high demand for exploiting as much data as possible, especially when speaking about variability and its diachronic changes. Therefore, it is obvious that existing corpora have to be checked for their usability from a target-oriented prospective and, where applicable, integrated into the evaluation.

As a first attempt to successfully approaching the complex reality of the oldest Southern-Slavic syntactic variability, a case study is conducted by observing the above-mentioned preliminaries: For this purpose a limited number of genetically related, multifaceted particles (*da*, *ěko*) and their competing syntactic realizations (with and without other particles) are analyzed with regard to their possible syntactic distribution and their respective functioning. Concerning this matter, a special interest is given to a few semantically restricted groups of complement taking predicates, which often seem to demand for those particles as (future) complementizers, according, among other things, to the semantic meanings of the dependent clause. Finally, including philological remarks within literature on inner-Slavic language contact, especially with respect to Old Church Slavonic as language model, a systematization of retrieved data is given both from a diatopic and diachronic perspective.