

Hanne Eckhoff (University of Tromsø)

## The history of Slavic complementation: data and pitfalls

In this talk I use data from the Tromsø Old Russian and OCS Treebank (TOROT, <https://nestor.uit.no>) to compare the complementation strategies found in canonical OCS and Old/Middle Russian, and discuss problems encountered in annotating these structures, and especially the challenges a diachronic data set poses. The TOROT is a dependency treebank with syntactic annotation on the PROIEL enriched dependency scheme. For the purposes of this talk, it should be noted that the treebank has a separate syntactic relation label for complement clauses (COMP), and that subordinations are considered a separate part of speech.

In OCS, we find a relatively clear-cut situation. Complement clauses are either headed by subordinations (mostly *jako* (1) or *da*), or they are indirect questions (2).

- (1) вѣроуета ли ѣко мож се сътворити.  
'Do you believe that I am able to do this?' (Mar. Matt. 9.28)
- (2) не вѣмъ чѣто глши.  
'I don't know what you're talking about.' (Mar. Matt. 26.70)

Indirect questions are deemed to be headed by their main verb (*glagoleši* in 2), and *čto* is taken to be an interrogative pronoun, just like in direct questions. In OCS, it is largely unproblematic to make a distinction between the interrogative pronoun *čto* and the indefinite pronoun *čto*, and there seems to be no need to posit a subjunction *čto* or a relative pronoun *čto*.

In Old and especially Middle Russian, the situation is much more complex. While two main types of complement clauses are still prominent, there are a number of new structures and subordinations on the rise. Especially we see that interrogative pronouns are reanalysed as both relative pronouns and subordinations. Thus it is no longer possible to analyse all subordinate clauses containing *čto* as indirect questions. Even in the very earliest texts, there are examples where *čto* must be considered a relative pronoun (3), or even a subjunction in a complement clause (4), especially in later texts.

- (3) но что ѡи далъ мужъ. с тѣм же ѡи сѣдѣти.  
'but what her husband gave her, that she can keep' (*Russkaja pravda* 102)
- (4) да вижу что неладно колесница течеть.  
'and I see that the wagon is not running correctly' (*Avvakum* 26)

As soon as we open for these two types of analyses, however, many examples become ambiguous. An additional confounding factor is that conditional clauses, a common environment for the indefinite pronoun *čto*, often lack subordinators in Middle Russian texts, which can cause even more ambiguities.

I discuss the pragmatic annotation policies employed to make the different structures as retrievable as possible, while sticking to the annotation scheme's requirement that every sentence be assigned a single analysis.