

UDK 811.163.1*367

Izvorni znanstveni rad

Rukopis primljen 12. V. 2025.

Prihvaćen za tisak 4. IX. 2025.

<https://doi.org/10.31724/rihjj.51.2.3>

Josip Galić

Staroslavenski institut

Demetrova 11, 10 000 Zagreb

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4416-9241>

jgalic@stin.hr

CROATIAN CHURCH SLAVONIC CLAUSAL COMPLEMENTS AND THE IMPLICATIONAL COMPLEMENTATION HIERARCHY*

In this paper, complement clauses in Croatian Church Slavonic (CCS) are examined in light of the implicational complementation hierarchy (ICH) proposed by Susanne Wurmbrand and Magdalena Lohninger (2023). Wurmbrand and Lohninger classify complement clauses into three semantically defined types (*Propositions*, *Situations*, and *Events*). These types are ordered hierarchically according to their degree of syntactic complexity and can be distinguished by the distribution of morphosyntactic properties. The proposed hierarchy is implicational, which means that the distribution of morphosyntactic properties of adjacent complement types in the hierarchy is predictable to a certain degree. To test the ICH in CCS complementation configurations, we analyze the distribution of morphosyntactic properties such as the presence and distribution of complementizers, the finiteness of complements, the availability of overt subjects, the possibility of ECM constructions, and the clitic climbing. The analysis shows that CCS complementation patterns support the division of clausal complements into three types and that the distribution of morphosyntactic properties of these types aligns with the ICH.

* This work was created as part of the project *Dictionary of the Croatian Redaction of Church Slavonic*, funded by the European Union – Next Generation EU. Views and opinions expressed in it are those of the author only and do not necessarily reflect the official positions of the European Union or the European Commission. Neither the European Union nor the European Commission can be held responsible for them.

1. Introduction

The differences in the complementation strategies between various languages – and even within the same language – sometimes create the impression that no restrictions exist in clausal complementation, and that matrix verbs with different meanings can freely combine with different morphosyntactic types of complement clauses. However, typological studies of complementation configurations (e.g., Givón 1980, Cristofaro 2003, Noonan 2007, Dixon 2010, Wurmbrand and Lohninger 2023), despite their differences,¹ show that the combinations of matrix verbs and different morphosyntactic types of complement clauses are restricted and to some extent predictable (Lohninger and Wurmbrand /forthcoming/: 2). These restrictions arise from the relationship between the meaning of the matrix verb, the meaning of the complement clause, and its morphosyntactic properties (Lohninger and Wurmbrand /forthcoming/: 2). Various accounts of clausal complementation also share the observation that complement types are hierarchically ordered and stand in an implicational relation. This becomes evident when one considers the fact that the presence or absence of a certain morphosyntactic or semantic property in a complement type implies its presence or absence in a complement type positioned above or below it in the hierarchy (Lohninger and Wurmbrand /forthcoming/: 49–50; Bryant 2021: 526).

A very influential hierarchy of complement types that includes these determinants – called the implicational complementation hierarchy (ICH) – was proposed by Susanne Wurmbrand and Magdalena Lohninger (2023). Building on Talmy Givón’s *Binding Hierarchy* (Givón 1980) of clausal complements and relying on his claim that there are “systematic correlations (...) between the semantic structure of complement-taking verbs and the syntactic structure of their complements” (Givón 1980: 333), Wurmbrand and Lohninger propose a division of clausal complements into three broad classes. Adopting the terminology of Ramchand and Svenonius (2014), they label these as *Proposition*, *Situation*, and *Event* complements. *Proposition* complements occur most frequently with verbs of speech and epistemic verbs (e.g., *admit*, *affirm*, *announce*, *assume*, *believe*, *claim*, *discover*, *imagine*, *know* [factive], *say*, *suppose*, *tell* [speech]) (Wurmbrand and Lohninger 2023: 189). They are temporally independent (the embedded event can be simultaneous with the matrix event, precede it or follow it). *Situation*

¹ For an overview of selected functional-typological and structural-grammatical approaches to clausal complementation, see Lohninger and Wurmbrand (forthcoming).

complements are typically combined with emotive and strong attempt verbs² (e.g., *agree, ask, decide, demand, desire, order, plan, promise, tell* [imperative], *want, wish*) (Bryant 2021: 527; Wurmbrand and Lohninger 2023: 189). The tense value of *Situation* complements is partially predetermined, as they usually have a future reference (the embedded event follows the matrix event). *Event* complements are tenseless (the embedded event occurs simultaneously with the matrix event). They typically combine with implicative verbs (e.g., *begin, can, continue, finish, forget* [implicative], *manage, may, must, start, stop, succeed, try*) (Wurmbrand and Lohninger 2023: 191).

The three types of complements are defined semantically and ordered on an implicational scale according to their degree of syntactic complexity. Specifically, *Proposition* complements are more complex than *Situation* complements, which in turn are more complex than *Event* complements (cf. Wurmbrand and Lohninger 2023: 187). This proposed hierarchy of complement types has been tested on a relatively large number of languages.³ To date, empirical testing has confirmed the validity of the classification of clausal complements into three types and demonstrated that the distribution of morphosyntactic properties across these types aligns with the ICH.⁴

In this paper, we examine clausal complements in Croatian Church Slavonic (CCS) in light of the ICH. Specifically, we investigate whether the distribution of morphosyntactic properties across the three types of complements in CCS aligns

² Wurmbrand and Lohninger (2023: 188) claim that strong attempt contexts (besides implicative ones) are typically included in *Event* complements. However, they list most of the verbs that belong to the strong attempt class in Givón's classification (1980: 369) – on which Wurmbrand and Lohninger rely – among the matrix verbs that are combined with *Situation* complements (e.g., *ask, demand, tell* [imperative], *plan*) (Wurmbrand and Lohninger 2023: 189; cf. also Lohninger and Wurmbrand /forthcoming/: 34). The only exception is the verb *try*, which Wurmbrand and Lohninger (2023: 191) list among the verbs that are combined with *Event* complements, albeit with the remark “that it is a clear-border case (...), which may also show properties of the *Situation* class” (Wurmbrand and Lohninger 2023: 192). In view of this, and following Bryant (2021: 527), we therefore claim that strong attempt verbs are typically combined with *Situation* complements.

³ The functionality of the proposed hierarchy is demonstrated by examples from Brazilian Portuguese, Bulgarian, Buryat, English, Greek, Croatian, Macedonian, Slovenian, Serbian, Italian, among others (cf. Wurmbrand *et al.* 2020; Wurmbrand and Lohninger 2023; Wurmbrand 2024; see also Bryant 2021: 528^f). For language-specific studies on clausal complements within the ICH framework, see Bryant 2021 (Oromo), Pajančić 2021 (Akan), and Paul and Scott 2021 (Malagasy).

⁴ While confirming the three-way division of clausal complements and supporting the ICH, Shannon Bryant's (2021) analysis of complementation strategies in Oromo reveals a distribution pattern that differs somewhat from findings in other languages. In particular, strong epistemic verbs (e.g., ‘believe’, ‘think’, ‘know’, ‘claim’, ‘discover’, etc.) occur with *Situation* complements in Oromo, whereas in the languages discussed in Wurmbrand and Lohninger (2023) these verbs are combined with *Proposition* complements.

with the relations determined by the ordering of complement types in the proposed hierarchy. For our analysis of the distribution of morphosyntactic properties across complement types and their alignment with the ICH, we will examine clausal complements of matrix verbs previously established to typically combine with *Proposition*, *Situation*, and *Event* complements, respectively (see Bryant 2021; Pajančić 2021; Wurmbrand *et al.* 2020; Wurmbrand and Lohninger 2023: 189, 191). For *Propositions*, we examine complements of speech and epistemic verbs⁵ (e.g., *glagolati* ‘speak’, *ispovêdêti* ‘confess’, *mnêti* ‘think’, *poznati* ‘know’, *razumêti* ‘understand’, *reći* ‘tell’, *svêdêtelstvovati* ‘testify’, *vspomenuti* ‘mention, remember’, *vêdêti* ‘know’, *vêrovati* ‘believe’, *znati* ‘know’). For *Situations*, we analyze complements of emotive and strong attempt verbs (e.g., *hotêti* ‘want’, *moliti* ‘ask’, *naustiti* ‘persuade’, *obećati* ‘promise’, *pomisliti* ‘think, plan’, *poućati* ‘encourage, admonish’, *povelêti* ‘order’, *poždati* ‘expect’, *prositi* ‘ask’, *svêćati* ‘agree, intend, decide’, *vziskati* ‘look for’, *zadêti* ‘impose, order’, *zaklinati* ‘swear’, *zapovêdêti* ‘command’). Finally, for *Events*, we examine complements of modal and implicative verbs (e.g., *vzmoći* ‘can’, *moći* ‘can’, *naćeti* ‘begin’, *poćeti* ‘begin’, *prêstati* ‘stop’, *ustati* ‘stop’, *ustaêti* ‘stop’, *zabiti* ‘forget’, *znati* ‘know, be able to’).⁶

The research material was primarily excerpted from two existing corpora of CCS: the corpus for the *Dictionary of the Croatian Redaction of Church Slavonic* and the corpus being developed in the *Beram* database (*beram.stin.hr*), which was created within the framework of the Scientific Centre of Excellence for Croatian Glagolism. The corpus for the *Dictionary* was compiled by excerpting material from 62 Croatian Glagolitic manuscripts. It is maintained in card form and can only be searched manually.⁷ The *Beram* database corpus currently consists of grammatically annotated texts from two *Beram* missals and breviaries. This corpus can be searched computationally by morphological parameters. Additional relevant examples were collected by examining transliterations of Croatian

⁵ The canonical forms of the CCS words are given in the transliterated form and normalized according to the existing headwords in the *Dictionary of the Croatian Redaction of Church Slavonic* (RCJHR I–II), or according to the principles for the normalization of headwords set out in the dictionary (RCJHR I: VIII–X).

⁶ Clausal complements of some of these verbs have already been researched in CCS, however, within other theoretical frameworks. Mihaljević (2011a, 2011b) discusses complements of verbs of speech and perception in CCS, including various morphosyntactic types of clausal complements of these verbs. Vela’s (2018: 113–151) analysis of infinitive complements in CCS is also organized according to semantic classes to which verbs that take these complements belong, as is Eterović’s (2014: 133–145) analysis of participial complements in CCS. Clausal complements of certain verb classes that we discuss in this study have also been researched in (contemporary) Croatian (see especially Mihaljević, M. 2009; Oraić Rabušić 2016; Soćanac 2017; Wurmbrand *et al.* 2020; Krapova and Soćanac 2021; Batinić Angster 2024).

⁷ For more details on the corpus for the *Dictionary of the Croatian Redaction of Church Slavonic*, see RCJHR (I: I–III) and Vela (2018: 25–35).

Glagolitic codices written in CCS and from research papers analyzing aspects of clausal complementation in Croatian Glagolitic texts (see Reinhart 1993; Mihaljević, M. 2011a, 2011b; Eterović 2014; Vela 2018; Mihaljević, A. 2020).

The paper is structured as follows: In Section 2, we provide a more detailed description of the ICH. Section 3 presents the morphosyntactic properties of *Proposition*, *Situation*, and *Event* complements in CCS. Section 4 presents the ICH Signature effects in CCS. Based on the distribution of morphosyntactic properties, we demonstrate the validity of the division of clausal complements into three types and show that the morphosyntactic properties of clausal complements embedded under the same verb vary in CCS in a predictable way depending on the interpretation of the matrix verb. Section 5 provides concluding remarks.

2. Implicational complementation hierarchy (ICH)

In the ICH, complement types—as mentioned in the introduction—are hierarchically ranked on a scale reflecting their degree of syntactic complexity. Wurmbrand and Lohninger (2023: 188) define the syntactic complexity of complements using the criteria of independence, transparency, and integration: “Independence refers to properties such as the presence and/or interpretation of an independent subject or tense in the complement; transparency indicates whether the embedded clause is permeable for certain operations or dependencies; and integration gives the degree to which the embedded predicate is an integral part of (e.g., incorporated into) the matrix predicate”. Taking these criteria into account, Wurmbrand and Lohninger present the hierarchy of clausal complements as shown in Table 1.

MOST INDEPENDENT		LEAST INDEPENDENT
LEAST TRANSPARENT	Proposition > Situation > Event	MOST TRANSPARENT
LEAST INTEGRATED		MOST INTEGRATED

Table 1. Implicational complementation hierarchy (Wurmbrand and Lohninger 2023: 188).

The ICH does not predict what morphosyntactic properties a particular type of clausal complement will have. Moreover, Wurmbrand and Lohninger explicitly state that “there are no universal morphosyntactic properties that can be associated with any of the different classes of complements” (Lohninger and Wurmbrand

/forthcoming/: 36). The key point, however, is that implicational relations exist among different complement types. These indicate that “*Proposition* complements are more independent, less transparent, and less integrated than *Situation* complements, which in turn are more independent, less transparent, and less integrated than *Event* complements” (Lohninger and Wurmbrand /forthcoming/: 35). Accordingly, with respect to any morphosyntactic independence property (e.g., overt subjects), a complement type cannot be more independent than the complement type positioned to its left in the hierarchy (cf. Wurmbrand and Lohninger 2023: 187). This, for example, means that the ICH predicts that it is impossible for overt subjects to be available in *Event* complements but not in *Proposition* complements.

The existence of three types of clausal complements is demonstrated by morphosyntactic properties that exhibit distinct values across complement types. As Wurmbrand and Lohninger (2023: 196) emphasize, when a morphosyntactic property (or combination of properties) distinguishes complement types, those at opposite ends of the hierarchy – *Propositions* and *Events* – display opposing values, while *Situation* complements align with either *Propositions* or *Events* or permit both values. Wurmbrand and Lohninger (2023: 195–196) term this distribution of grammatical properties the ICH Signature effect. A typical example can be found in clause introducers in Bulgarian and Greek. Wurmbrand and Lohninger show that *Proposition* complements in these two languages are introduced by *če* and *oti*, *Event* complements by *da* and *na*, while *Situation* complements can be introduced by both clause introducers (*če* and *da* in Bulgarian, or *oti* and *na* in Greek), with the condition that in complements introduced by *če* and *oti*, a future marker must be expressed for these complements to be interpreted as *Situations* (Table 2).

Clause introducers	Proposition	Situation	Event
Bulgarian	če, *da	če (+ fut), da	*če, da
(Cypriot) Greek	oti, *na	oti (+ fut), na	*oti, na

Table 2. Distribution of clause introducers in Bulgarian and (Cypriot) Greek (Wurmbrand and Lohninger 2023: 196).

The distribution of clause introducers is expected given the ICH. Since they are located at opposite ends of the hierarchy, *Proposition* and *Event* complements exhibit opposing values, while *Situation* complements allow both options/values (with certain restrictions).

The implicational nature of the hierarchy and the ordering of the complement types within the hierarchy arise from the containment relations between the three basic clausal domains and the semantic objects corresponding to these domains. Wurmbrand and Lohninger (2023) adopt the view of Ramchand and Svenonius (2014) that the three basic clausal domains – the C-domain (operator domain), T-domain (TMA domain), and V-domain (theta domain) – correspond to three conceptual primitives: *Propositions*, *Situations*, and *Events*. These semantic objects, much like the clausal domains, stand in containment relations (*Propositions* contain *Situations* and *Events*, *Situations* contain *Events* and are themselves contained within *Propositions*, while *Events* are contained within both *Propositions* and *Situations*). Wurmbrand and Lohninger argue that complement types can be defined and classified in a similar way; i.e. they differ from one another based on the minimal structures they require and, consequently, also exhibit containment relations (see Wurmbrand and Lohninger 2023: 212–214). *Event* complements minimally require the presence of the V-domain (and may therefore lack projections from the T- and C-domains), *Situation* complements require the presence of the T-domain (and may lack projections from the C-domain), while *Proposition* complements require the presence of the C-domain. From this assumption, the implicational relations among complement types logically follow. *Proposition* complements, given their requirement for the C-domain, are syntactically more complex than *Situation* and *Event* complements. Between these latter two types, *Situation* complements – which minimally require the T-domain – are syntactically more complex than *Event* complements, which only require the V-domain (cf. Bryant 2021: 529).

However, the syntactic structures of complement types may exceed these minimal requirements (for example, *Situation* complements may project C-domain projections). This reflects the *synthesis model* of complementation, “where complements are not syntactically selected (...), but freely built in different forms, with the only restriction that the resulting structures need to match with the semantic requirements of the matrix verbs” (Wurmbrand and Lohninger 2023: 223–224). The *synthesis approach* to complementation also entails that the relationship between matrix verbs and clausal complements is bidirectional. This means that the matrix verbs can influence the meaning of complements, and complements can in turn affect the interpretation of matrix verbs. This is evident, for example, in the fact that some verbs can combine with different complement types.

3. Complement types in Croatian Church Slavonic

3.1. *Proposition* complements

Proposition complements in CCS can be finite and non-finite. Declarative finite *Proposition* complements are mostly introduced by the complementizer *êko* ‘that’⁸ (1).

- (1) a. *i vêrovaše êk(o) ti me pos’la* – MVb₁ 112d
 and believe.AOR.3PL. that you me.CL.ACC send.AOR.2SG.
 Gk. καὶ ἐπίστευσαν ὅτι σὺ με ἀπέστειλας (John 17:8)
 Lat. *et crediderunt quia tu me misisti* (John 17:8)
 ‘And they believed that you sent me.’
- b. *razumêvaet’ êko pomoč’ ego ot g(ospod)a est’* – BrVb₁ 62b
 understand.PRES.3SG. that help his from Lord be.PRES.3SG.
 Lat. *intelligat quia auxilium eius a Domino*
 ‘He understands that his help comes from the Lord.’
- c. *ne vête li êko cr(ê)ki b(o)žiče este* – BrVO 104c
 not know.PRES.2PL. PRT that church God’s be.PRES.2PL.
 Gk. Οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι ναὸς θεοῦ ἐστε (1Cor. 3:16)
 Lat. *nescitis quia templum Dei estis* (1Cor. 3:16)
 ‘Don’t you know that you are God’s church?’

Finite *Proposition* complements can also be introduced by the complementizer *da* ‘that’. Examples introduced by this complementizer are mostly of secondary origin, resulting from the influence of the spoken (Čakavian) language. They should be viewed in light of the tendency of *da* – originally restricted to *irrealis* meanings – to spread into *realis* contexts in the western part of the South Slavic area, a process that began on the northwestern periphery of the South Slavic area (cf. Wiemer 2021: 60; 2023: 199).⁹ That this represents an innovation adopted from

⁸ It is important to note that *êko* is polyfunctional in CCS. In addition to complement clauses, it also introduces causative, explicative, temporal, conditional, purpose, consecutive and even copulative clauses. It can also be used as an interrogative and relative (comparative) adverb as well as an affirmative particle (Mihaljević, M. 2016: 31).

⁹ The declarative complementizer *da* is already attested in the *Freising Manuscripts* from the late 10th / early 11th century (Sedláček 1967: 100; see also Grickat 1975: 74). For an overview of early attestations of the declarative complementizer *da* in the South Slavic area, see Grickat (1975: 158–163). The survey given in Grickat (1975) reveals that the spread of *da* as a declarative complementizer began in the northwestern part of the South Slavic territory.

the spoken language is confirmed by the distribution of *Proposition* complements introduced by *da* in Croatian Glagolitic texts. In the *Dictionary of the Croatian Redaction of Church Slavonic* (RCJHR II: 242), most of the cited examples of the so-called declarative conjunction *da* (i.e., the complementizer *da* introducing *Proposition* complements) come from non-liturgical miscellanies, which were typically written in a mixture of CCS and Croatian (Čakavian) language. On the other hand, in liturgical codices – particularly missals – *Proposition* complements introduced by the complementizer *da* are significantly rarer. Nevertheless, even in these texts the distribution of *da* reveals its status as an innovative feature gradually entering the texts from the spoken language. The rare examples found in biblical readings are often limited to a single liturgical codex, whereas in parallel positions in other liturgical codices, the complementizer *êko* appears (2). Importantly, examples with the complementizer *da* are usually attested in codices that exhibit innovative linguistic features and/or in texts known to have been retranslated from the *Vulgate* or adapted to the Latin biblical text (to the extent that the corresponding texts in other liturgical codices have not been).¹⁰

- (2) a. *vêste li da po dvêû dnu vazam' budetb* – CPar 238r
 know.PRES.2PL. PRT that after two days Passover be.PRES.3SG.
- a'. *vêste êko po dvoû dnu paska budetb* – MVat₄ 57c
 know.PRES.2PL. that after two days Passover be.PRES.3SG.
 Gk. Οἴδατε ὅτι μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας τὸ πάσχα γίνεται (Matt. 26:2)
 Lat. *Scitis quia post biduum pascha fiet* (Matt. 26:2)
 'You know that the Passover is in two days.'
- b. *egože vi g(lago)lete da e(st)b b(og)b v(a)šb* – MVb₁ 67a
 of whom you say that be.PRES.3SG. God your
- b'. *egože vi g(lago)lete êko b(og)b naš' est'* – MVat₄ 62d
 of whom you say that God our be.PRES.3SG.
 Gk. ὃν ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι θεὸς ἡμῶν ἐστίν (John 8:54)
 Lat. *quem vos dicitis quia Deus noster est* (John 8:54)
 'Of whom you say that he is your/our God.'

In specific syntactic contexts, complement clauses embedded under certain *Proposition*-type matrix verbs almost invariably take the complementizer *da* (i.e., in these contexts, examples of complement clauses introduced by *da* are

¹⁰ Specifically, in example (2a), the complementizer *da* is attested in MVb₁, a codex noted for its innovative linguistic features (Štefanić 1960: 345–346). In example (2b), *da* appears in the *Passion According to Matthew* in CPar, a codex whose texts of the four *Passions* consistently adhere to the Latin original and also exhibit linguistic innovations (Tandarić 1993: 110; cf. also Kušćović and Šimić 2024).

not limited to individual codices). For instance, finite clausal complements of the verb *mněti* ('think') in *yes-no* questions are almost always introduced by the complementizer *da* (3a)¹¹, whereas in declarative constructions, this verb typically takes *ěko*-complements (3b).¹²

- (3) a. *mnīši li da razuměši čto čteši* – MHRv 102a
 think.PRES.2SG. PRT that understand.PRES.2SG. what read.PRES.2SG.
 Gk. ἄρά γε γινώσκεις ἃ ἀναγινώσκεις (Acts 8:30)
 Lat. *putasne intelliges quae legis* (Acts 8:30)
 'Do you think that you understand what you are reading?'

¹¹ The anonymous reviewer notes that the complement clause is also introduced by the complementizer *da* in the *yes-no* question in example (2a), and asks whether this is a mere coincidence. The reviewer's remark is obviously triggered by the fact that in (2a) the complement clause is not embedded under the verb *mněti* ('think'), but under the verb *věděti* ('know'), which might indicate that clausal complements in *yes-no* questions generally take the complementizer *da*. However, it is unlikely that the presence of the complementizer *da* in (2a) is primarily related to the fact that the complement clause is an integral part of the *yes-no* question. A more reasonable explanation for the complementizer in (2a) is that the example is attested in the text of the *Passion According to Matthew* in CPar, which – as mentioned before – is generally known for its innovative linguistic features. This explanation is supported by the fact that in the *Passion* texts in CPar complement clauses embedded under *Proposition*-type verbs are quite frequently introduced by the complementizer *da* even in declarative contexts (i).

- (i) *ti gov(o)riši da kral' esm' ě* – CPar 263r
 you say.PRES.2SG. that king be.PRES.1SG. I
 Gk. σὺ λέγεις ὅτι βασιλεὺς εἰμι [ἔγώ] (John 18:37)
 Lat. *tu dicis quia rex sum ego* (John 18:37)
 'You say that I am a king.'

The fact that the complementizer *da* in example (2a) is probably not (directly) related to the complement clause being part of a *yes-no* question is further demonstrated by the consistent use of *ěko* in CCS in complement clauses embedded under the verb *věděti* in *yes-no* questions (ii).

- (ii) *věši li ěk(o) parisěi s'lišavše sl(o)vo i*
 know.PRES.2SG. PRT that Pharisees hear.ACT.PTCP.PF.1 word and
sab'laz'niše se – MVb, 53b
 scandalize.AOR.3PL.
 Gk. οἶδας ὅτι οἱ φαρισαῖοι ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγον ἐσκανδαλίσθησαν (Matt. 15:12)
 Lat. *scis quia Pharisei audito verbo, scandalizati sunt* (Matt. 15:12)
 'Do you know that Pharisses, when they heard this word, were scandalized?'

¹² The possibility of introducing complement clauses of epistemic verbs (e.g., *think* and *believe*) in questions and/or negated sentences with a complementizer different from the one typically used in declarative constructions has also been attested in Bulgarian (Krapova 2021: 255–258; see also Wiemer 2021: 80–81). Similar examples are discussed in Wurmbrand and Lohninger (2023: 196^F), who note that in Greek, the verb *know* (in its factive use) can combine with *na*-clauses (which are not typical for *Proposition* complements) in questions and when accompanied by negation. The authors argue that in such syntactic contexts, the matrix verb acquires an epistemic modal interpretation, which explains the switch of complement types. In any case, determining the precise extent of *da*'s prevalence in *Proposition* complements in CCS – particularly across specific groups of Croatian Glagolitic texts – and identifying the factors governing this distribution requires further investigation.

- b. *ona že mnêaše êk(o) vrtograd(a)rinь estь* – MBer₂ 87d
 she PRT think.IMPF.3SG. that gardener be.PRES.3SG.
 Gk. ἐκεῖνη δοκοῦσα ὅτι ὁ κηπουρός ἐστίν (John 20:15)
 Lat. *illa existimans quia hortulanus esset* (John 20:15)
 ‘She thought it was a gardener.’

Among infinitive *Proposition* complements, accusative-with-infinitive constructions – specifically ECM constructions – are well attested. In these constructions, the subject of the infinitive receives its thematic role from the embedded predicate while acquiring case from the matrix predicate. In CCS, ECM is possible with various matrix verbs, including verbs of speech (e.g., *glagolati* ‘speak’), epistemic verbs (e.g., *mnêti* ‘think’, *vêrovati* ‘believe’), and factive verbs (e.g., *vêdêti* ‘know’, *znati* ‘know’) (4).¹³

- (4) a. *mnêše i prizrak’ biti* – MVat₄ 29a
 think.AOR.3PL. him.CL.ACC ghost be
 Gk. ἔδοξαν ὅτι φάντασμα ἐστίν (Mark 6:49)
 Lat. *putaverunt fantasma esse* (Mark 6:49)
 ‘They thought that it was a ghost’
- b. *ego (...) zdravie moči dati vêruetь* – FgLab₁ 2b
 him health can give believe.PRES.3SG.
 Lat. *eum (...) salutem posse dare confidit*
 ‘He believes he can grant salvation’
- c. *kogo g(lago)lûtь ĉ(lovê)ci biti s(i)na ĉ(lovêĉa)skago* – MBrib 72b
 who say.PRES.3PL. people be son of man
 Gk. τίνα λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (Matt. 16:13)
 Lat. *quem dicunt homines esse Filium hominis* (Matt. 16:13)
 ‘Who do people say the Son of Man is?’

In passive constructions (*se*-passives) we find infinitives with nominative subjects (5).

- (5) *aĉe kto mnit se mudr’ biti* – BrVO 104c
 if somebody think.PRES.3SG. SE wise be
 Gk. εἴ τις δοκεῖ σοφὸς εἶναι ἐν ὑμῖν ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ (1Cor. 3:18)
 Lat. *si quis videtur inter vos sapiens esse* (1Cor. 3:18)
 ‘If any of you thinks that he is wise...’

¹³ ECM is not a universal property of *Proposition* complements. In some languages, ECM is unavailable in *Proposition* complements altogether. Among languages where ECM does occur, there is variation regarding which types of *Proposition* complements allow it. For restrictions on the availability of ECM in *Proposition* complements in Germanic languages, see Wurmbrand (2024: 65–69).

Control constructions – i.e., structures in which the subject of the infinitive is coreferent with an argument of the matrix verb¹⁴ – are rare among infinitive *Proposition* complements. In this respect, example (6) is particularly noteworthy, given that the Greek and Latin texts use finite complement clauses introduced by the complementizers *ὅτι* and *quod*, respectively, and that finite complement clauses (introduced by *ěko*) also appear in several Church Slavonic *apostolos* manuscripts.^{15,16}

- (6) a. *da ne mnitъ takъ ě(lově)kъ priěti*
 PRT not think.PRES.3SG. that man receive
česo ot g(ospod)a – BrDab 33d
 something from Lord
- a'. *da ne mnitъ ěl(o)v(ě)kъ jako*
 PRT not think.PRES.3SG. man that
priimetъ li čto ot g(ospod)a – Christ
 receive.PRES.3SG. PRT something from Lord
- Gk. μὴ γὰρ οἰέσθω ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος ὅτι λήμμεται τι παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου (James 1:7)
 Lat. *non ergo aestimet homo ille quod accipiat aliquid a Domino* (James 1:7)
 ‘Let not that man think that he shall receive anything from the Lord.’

Constructions have also been attested in which the subject of the infinitive is a dative NP not controlled by the matrix verb argument – the so-called true dative-with-infinitive constructions (7).¹⁷

¹⁴ The subject of the infinitive can depend on the subject or the object of the matrix verb. Depending on this, a distinction is usually made between subject and object control constructions. Another important distinction is the one between exhaustive and partial control. In exhaustive control constructions, the infinitival subject must be identical to the controller, while in partial control constructions, it need only include the controller (for more information on exhaustive and partial control, see Landau 2000 and Wurmbrand 2001). *Proposition* and *Situation* complements are claimed to allow partial control, whereas *Event* complements trigger exhaustive control (Wurmbrand and Lohninger 2023: 192–194; see also Lohninger and Wurmbrand /forthcoming/: 33–35). Recently, much attention has been paid to control constructions in contemporary Croatian (see Gnjatović and Matasović 2013; Batinić Angster 2019, 2024).

¹⁵ In (6a'), an example from the *Apostolos Christinopolitanus* (Kałuźniacki 1896: 73) is given. Finite complement clauses introduced by the complementizer *ěko* are likewise attested, for instance, in the *Apostolos of Matica Srpska* (Kovačević and Stefanović 1979: 86) and the *Slepće Apostolos* (Il'inski 1912: 75).

¹⁶ The control construction in the cited example may stem from the specific interpretation of the matrix verb *mněti* ‘think’ (used to express expectation), which triggers a shift in complement type. For variation in the morphosyntactic properties of complement clauses depending on matrix verb interpretation, see Section 4.

¹⁷ The true dative-with-infinitive construction implies that the dative NP functions as the actual subject of the infinitive, rather than as the indirect object of the matrix verb controlling the subject of the infinitive (for

- (7) *pomišlaem bo opravdit(i) se č(lově)ku verou* – BrVb₃ 36c
 think.PRES.1.PL PRT justify man.DAT faith
 Gk. λογίζόμεθα γὰρ δικαιοῦσθαι πίστει ἀνθρώπων (Rom. 3:28)
 Lat. *arbitramur enim iustificari hominem per fidem* (Rom. 3:28)
 ‘We believe that a person is justified by faith.’

Proposition complements can also take the form of an accusative-with-participle construction. In CCS, this construction occurs most frequently with perception verbs (see Mihaljević, M. 2011b; Eterović 2014: 133–145), but is not restricted to these contexts (8).

- (8) a. *i m'nes'ia i v' družině sučb* – MVb₁ 21c
 and think.AOR.3DU him.CL.ACC in company be.ACT.PTCP.PRES.
 Gk. νομίσαντες δὲ αὐτὸν εἶναι ἐν τῇ συνοδίᾳ (Luke 2:44)
 Lat. *existimantes autem illum esse in comitatu* (Luke 2:44)
 ‘They supposed him to be in the company.’
- b. *ěko věděhu i h(r)st)a samogo suča* – MVat₄ 49a
 because know.IMP.3PL. him.CL.ACC Christ very be.ACT.PTCP.PRES.
 Gk. ὅτι ᾔδεισαν τὸν Χριστὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι (Luke 4:41)
 Lat. *quia sciebant ipsum esse Christum* (Luke 4:41)
 ‘Because they knew that he was the Christ himself.’

Proposition complements are temporally independent, as evidenced by the fact that the embedded event may precede the matrix event (9a), be simultaneous with it (9b), or follow it (9c).

- (9) a. *mi věm ěk(o) moiséu g(lago)la b(og)b* – MPt 51a
 we know.PRES.1PL. that Moses speak.AOR.3SG. God
 Gk. ἡμεῖς οἶδαμεν ὅτι Μωϋσεῖ λελάληκεν ὁ θεός (John 9:29)
 Lat. *Nos scimus quia Moysi locutus est Deus* (John 9:29)
 ‘We know that God has spoken to Moses.’
- b. *i ta věstb ěko istin'naē gl(agole)t'b* – MBer₁ 83c
 and that know.PRES.3SG. that truth tell.PRES.3SG.
 Gk. καὶ ἐκεῖνος οἶδεν ὅτι ἀληθῆ λέγει (John 19:35)
 Lat. *Et ille scit quia vera dicit* (John 19:35)
 ‘And he knows that he is telling the truth.’

further discussion, see Vela 2023: 214–230).

- c. *g(lago)lú v(a)mb êko otimet se ot v(a)sb*
 say.PRES.1SG. you that take away from you
c(êsa)rstvo b(o)žie – MPt 38c
 kingdom God's
 Gk. λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ἀρθήσεται ἀφ' ὑμῶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ (Matt. 21:43)
 Lat. *dico vobis, quia auferetur a vobis regnum Dei* (Matt. 21:43)
 'I tell you that God's kingdom will be taken away from you.'

As evident from the examples provided so far, there are no restrictions regarding the lexical expression of the subject in *Proposition* complements. The subject can be overt in both finite (1) and infinitive complements (7).

No instances of classical clitic climbing have been attested in *Proposition* complements. Only cases of so-called subject clitic climbing in ECM constructions have been confirmed (10).

- (10) a. *vi že kogo me g(lagole)te b(i)ti* – MNY 223d
 you PRT whom me.CL.ACC say.PRES.2PL. be
 Gk. Ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι (Matt. 16:15)
 Lat. *Vos autem, quem me esse dicitis?* (Matt. 16:15)
 'But who do you say that I am?'
 b. *mnêše i prizrak' biti* – MVat₄ 29a
 think.AOR.3PL. him.CL.ACC ghost be
 Gk. ἔδοξαν ὅτι φάντασμα ἐστίν (Mark 6:49)
 Lat. *putaverunt phantasma esse* (Mark 6:49)
 'They thought that it was a ghost.'

The cited examples do not represent only cases where “the clitic is associated with a verb complex in a subordinate clause but is actually pronounced in construction with a higher predicate” (Spencer and Luís 2012: 162). Through movement from the embedded clause where it originated as subject, the clitic becomes the object of the matrix predicate and acquires accusative case marking. Moreover, this movement in ECM constructions is not limited to clitics alone – as (4) demonstrates, it occurs with non-clitic elements as well. Crucially, no instances of classical clitic climbing (e.g., the climbing of clitics that are objects of an embedded verb into the domain of the matrix verb, with no case marking changes) have been attested in ECM constructions. In the rare relevant examples, the clitic consistently remains adjacent to the embedded verb (11).

- (11) *tebe brate prie poz'nahъ živa me viditi* – BrN₂ 363b
 you.ACC brother before know.AOR.1SG. alive me.CL.ACC see
 ‘Brother, I know you’ve seen me alive before.’

3.2. *Situation complements*

Situation complements in CCS can be either finite or non-finite (infinitive). Finite complements are almost always introduced by the complementizer *da* (12).

- (12) a. *m(o)lú da prideši k mnê d(a)n(a)sъ* – BrVat₅ 218b
 beg.PRES.1SG. that come.PRES.2SG. to me today
 Lat. *obsecro ut venias ad me hodie* (Esther 5:4)
 ‘I beg you to come to me today.’
- b. *úže bo se bêhu složili iúdêi da aće kto isp(o)věstъ*
 already PRT agree.PLPF.3PL. Jews that if somebody confess.PRES.3SG.
i h(r)st)a otlučen’ budet’ sьn’mića – MVat₄ 57d
 him.CL.ACC Christ put out.PAS.PTCP.PF. be.PRES.3SG. gathering
 Gk. ἤδη γὰρ συνετέθειντο οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἵνα εἴαν τις αὐτὸν ὁμολογήσῃ Χριστόν,
 ἀποσυνάγωγος γένηται (John 9:22)
 Lat. *iam enim conspiraverunt Judaei, ut si quis eum confiteretur esse Christum,*
extra synagogam fieret (John 9:22)
 ‘The Jews had already agreed that if any man would confess him as Christ, he would
 be put out of the synagogue.’

Situation complements can also be introduced by the complementizer *êko* – though such occurrences are exceptionally rare. One attested example occurs with the commissive verb *zaklinati se* ‘swear’ (13).

- (13) *zaklinaû se domu elievu êko ne is'trêbit' se bezakonie domu*
 swear.PRES.1SG. to home of Heli that not purge.PRES.3SG. iniquity of home
ego žr'ivami i darmi – BrMosk₁ 161bc
 his sacrifices and offerings
 Gk. ὄμοσα τῷ οἴκῳ Ηλίου ἐξιλασθήσεται ἀδικία οἴκου Ηλίου ἐν θυμίματι καὶ ἐν θυσίαις
 (1Sam. 3:14)
 Lat. *idcirco iuravi domui Heli quod non expietur iniquitas domus eius victimis et*
muneribus (1Sam. 3:14)
 ‘I swear to the house of Heli that the iniquity of his house shall not be expiated by
 sacrifices and offerings.’

In the corpus, we found no other examples of complement clauses embedded under that verb. However, several instances of clauses embedded under the commissive verb *kleti se* (‘swear’) were attested, all introduced by the complementizer *da* (14).¹⁸

- (14) *i klet’se c(ěsa)rstvomъ i prĕstolomъ*
 and swear.AOR.3SG. kingdom and throne
svoimъ da otmet se ot vsĕhъ – BrBer_{2/1} 244b
 his that revenge.PRES.3SG. from all
 Lat. *iuravit per regnum et thronum suum quod defenderet se de omnibus* (Jth. 1:12)
 ‘He swore by his kingdom and throne that he would revenge himself of all (those people).’

The same complementizer introduces all finite clausal complements of the commissive verb *obeĉati* (‘promise’) (15) that we found in the corpus.

- (15) *ozie obeĉalbъ bĕše da mimošadši petъ dni*
 Ozias promise.PLPF.3SG. that pass.ACT.PTCP.PF.1 five days
prĕdastъ gradъ – BrVO 392b
 deliver.PRES.3SG. city
 Lat. *Ozias promississet quod transacto quinto die traderet civitatem* (Jth. 8:9)
 ‘Ozias had promised that after five days had passed, he would surrender the city.’

The corpus provides robust evidence for infinitive *Situation* complements. These most frequently appear in control constructions, where the subject of the infinitive is controlled by an argument of the matrix predicate (16).

- (16) a. *v zakonĕ že moiseovĕ zap(o)vĕdĕ namъ*
 in law prt Moses’s command.AOR.3SG. us
takovie kameniem’ pobiti – MKop 43a
 such by stones kill
 Gk. ἐν δὲ τῷ νόμῳ ἡμῖν Μωϋσῆς ἐνετείλατο τὰς τοιαύτας λιθάζειν (John 8:5)
 Lat. *in lege autem Moses mandavit nobis huiusmodi lapidare* (John 8:5)
 ‘But in the law Moses commanded us to stone such (women).’

¹⁸ We do not take into account semi-direct speech constructions where the reporting clause containing the verb *kleti se* (‘swear’) is syntactically linked to the direct speech content by the complementizer *ĕko* (i).

(i) *i klet se ei ĕko eže aĉe prosiši dam ti* – MBer₁ 180a
 and swear.AOR.3SG. her.CL.DAT that whatever ask.PRES.2SG. give.PRES.1SG. you.CL

Gk. καὶ ὡμοσεν αὐτῇ ὅτι ὃ ἕάν με αἰτήσης δώσω σοι (Mark 6:23)

Lat. *et iuravit illi quia quicquid petieris dabo tibi* (Mark 6:23)

‘And he swore to her: Whatever you ask for, I’ll give it to you.’

On semi-direct speech in CCS, see Gjurkova and Mihaljević (2014).

- b. *i pustiše ū iti poucaŭče ū*
 and let.AOR.3PL. her.CL.ACC go admonish.ACT.PTCP.PRES. her.CL.ACC
čtiti s'vekri – BrN₁ 210c
 honour parents-in-law
 Lat. *et dimiserunt ire, monentes eam honorare soceros* (Tob. 10:12–13)
 ‘And they let her go, admonishing her to honor her parents-in-law.’

Situation complements, like *Proposition* ones, can also take form of a true dative-with-infinitive construction (17).

- (17) *povelē stati kolēsnici* – MHrv 102b
 order.AOR.3SG. stop chariot.DAT
 Gk. καὶ ἐκέλευσεν στῆναι τὸ ἄρμα (Acts 8:38)
 Lat. *et iussit stare currum* (Acts 8:38)
 ‘He ordered the chariot to stop.’

However, unlike *Proposition* complements – where they are well-attested – ECM constructions rarely occur in *Situation* configurations (18).¹⁹

- (18) *g(ospod)i čto me hoč(e)ši stvoriti* – BrHum 22d
 Lord what me.CL.ACC want.PRES.2SG. make
 Lat. *Domine, quid me vis facere?* (Acts 9:6)
 ‘Lord, what do You want me to do?’

For several matrix verbs, *Situation* complements are attested in both finite (*da*-introduced) and infinitive forms. In some cases, these variants appear in parallel positions across different codices (19–20).

- (19) a. *i ot togo dne mišlahu da ubiŭtŭ ego* – MNov 69a
 and from that day plan.IMPV.3PL. that kill.PRES.3PL. him
 a'. *i ot togo d'ne miš'lahu i ubiti* – MOxf₁ 57d
 and from that day plan.IMPV.3PL. him.CL.ACC kill
 Gk. ἀπ' ἐκεῖνης οὖν τῆς ἡμέρας ἐβουλεύσαντο ἵνα ἀποκτείνωσιν αὐτόν (John 11:53)
 Lat. *Ab illo ergo die cogitaverunt ut interficerent eum* (John 11:53)
 ‘And from that day on, they planned to kill him.’

¹⁹ In this context, it is worth noting examples like (i), where the subject of the infinitive clause appears in the accusative case despite the matrix verb's inability to assign accusative case marking.

(i) *zemlŭ povelēvaeši izvesti dvižučago se i plodi prinesti* – BrVat₅ 58c
 earth.ACC. command.PRES.2SG. produce move.ACT.PTCP.PRES. and fruits bring
 Lat. *humum iubes producere reptantis et ferae genus*

‘You command the earth to bring forth moving creatures and bear fruit.’

For additional examples, see Vela (2018: 137–146).

- (20) a. *zapovidê* *da* *privedut'* *sid'raha misaha*
 command.AOR.3SG. that bring.PRES.3PL. Sidrach Misach
i *abêdênago* – MNY 120b
 and Abdenago
 a'. *zapov(i)dê* *privesti* *sedraha misaha* *i* *avedenago* – MOxf₂ 102d
 command.AOR.3SG. bring Sidrach Misach and Abdenago
 Gk. προσέταξεν ἀγαγεῖν τὸν Σεδραχ Μισαχ Αβδεναγω (Dan. 3:13)
 Lat. *praecepit ut adducerent Sedrac Misac et Abdenago* (Dan. 3:13)
 'He commanded that Sidrach, Misach, and Abdenago be brought.'

As evidenced by the cited examples, the subject in *Situation* complements may be overt in both finite and infinitive constructions.

Clitic climbing is possible in *Situation* complements in CCS (21). However, in most attested examples, clitic climbing occurs in cases where the Latin text contains an accusative-with-passive-infinitive construction, which CCS renders as a construction with (active) infinitive complement. In this process, the accusative subject of the Latin infinitive becomes the direct object in CCS.²⁰ Since CCS accusative clitic typically occupies the same position as the Latin accusative subject (i.e., directly after the matrix verb), it can be argued that in many CCS examples, clitic climbing in *Situation* complements reflects an influence from the Latin source text.

- (21) a. *pov(e)le* *ga* *k sebi* *privesti* – MHRv 23c
 order.AOR.3SG. him.CL.ACC to himself bring
 Gk. ἐκέλευσεν αὐτὸν ἀχθῆναι πρὸς αὐτόν (Luke 18:40)
 Lat. *iussit illum adduci ad se* (Luke 18:40)
 'He ordered him to be brought to him.'
- b. *povelê* *i* *v'* *tam'nici* *zatvoriti* – BrBer 3a
 order.AOR.3SG. him.CL.ACC in prison close
 Lat. *iussit eum in carcerem trudi*
 'He ordered him to be thrown into prison.'

Nevertheless, clitic climbing in *Situation* complements is not entirely dependent on Latin syntax, as shown by examples where CCS object clitics move to the matrix clause while their Latin counterparts remain in the embedded clause (22).

²⁰ This is a common translation technique in CCS (see Mihaljević, A. 2020: 251; Vela 2023: 238^f). For similar structural modifications in Old Croatian Bible translations from Latin, see Perić Gavrančić (2022: 90).

- (22) *hotê* *i* *po* *p(a)scê* *iz'ves'ti*
 want.ACT.PTCP.PRES. him.CL.ACC after Passover bring out
k' lûdemъ – MVb₁ 223a
 to people
 Gk. βουλόμενος μετὰ τὸ πάσχα ἀναγαγεῖν αὐτὸν τῷ λαῷ (Acts 12:4)
 Lat. *volens post pascha producere eum populo* (Acts 12:4)
 ‘Intending to bring him out to the people after the Passover.’

3.3. Event complements

Event complements in CCS are always non-finite – predominantly infinitival (23) – and they never take a complementizer.

- (23) a. *i načet sulzami močiti nozi ego* – MNY 74bc
 and begin.AOR.3SG. tears wet feet his
 Gk. τοῖς δάκρυσιν ἤρξατο βρέχειν τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ (Luke 7:38)
 Lat. *lacrimis coepit rigare pedes eius* (Luke 7:38)
 ‘She began to wet his feet with tears.’
- b. *zabihb sněsti hlěbъ moi* – PsLob 66r
 forget.AOR.1SG. eat bread my
 Gk. ἐπελαθόμην τοῦ φαγεῖν τὸν ἄρτον μου (Ps. 101:5)
 ‘I forgot to eat my bread.’

Phase verbs expressing the termination of an action (egressive verbs) can also take participial complements (24). Egressive verbs typically have participial complements when negated, but they may also take them in non-negated contexts to express the termination of a prolonged action (Vela 2018: 57).

- (24) a. *ne usta celivaúci nozi moi* – BrVat₆ 210a
 not stop.AOR.3SG. kiss.ACT.PART.PRES. feet my
 Gk. οὐ διέλιπεν καταφιλοῦσά μου τοὺς πόδας (Luke 7:45)
 Lat. *non cessavit osculari pedes meos* (Luke 7:45)
 ‘She has not stopped kissing my feet.’
- b. *i přestaše zizďúče grad'* – BrVO 137d
 and stop.AOR.3PL. build.ACT.PART.PRES. city
 Gk. καὶ ἐπαύσαντο οἰκοδομοῦντες τὴν πόλιν (Gen. 11:8)
 Lat. *et cessaverunt aedificare civitatem* (Gen. 11:8)
 ‘And they stopped building the city.’

The subject of *Event* complements is never lexically expressed, but remains covert. It is always controlled by the matrix subject and (unlike in *Situation* complements) cannot be controlled by an internal argument of the matrix verb.

In *Event* configurations, clitics can climb. In examples (25a–b), pronominal clitics that are arguments of the embedded verbs appear before the matrix verbs *moći* ‘can’ and *načeti* ‘begin’, respectively. In many cases, the clitic shows up in between the matrix verb and the embedded verb, and may be separated from the embedded verb by other constituents (as in 25c).

- (25) a. *otb z(a)p(o)v(ê)di ego niktože me*
 from commands his nobody me.CL.ACC
možetb otlučiti – BrHum 171d
 can.PRES.3SG. separate
 ‘No one can separate me from his commandments.’
- b. *on’ mu nače povidati o tom’ – ČŽg 82r*
 he him.CL.DAT start.AOR.3SG. tell about it
 ‘He began to tell him about it.’
- c. *ne mogući ũ svoimi proz’bami*
 not can.ACT.PART.PRES. her.CL.ACC his entreaty
obratiti – BrBer₁ 165a
 convert
 ‘Being unable to convert her with his entreaties.’

However, clitic climbing in *Event* configurations is not consistent, as seen in example (26), where the clitic remains with the embedded verb. Determining the factors that influence whether clitic climbing occurs or not requires further investigation.

- (26) *i niktože možaše otréšiti i – BrVO 223d*
 and nobody can.IMPF.3SG. untie him.CL.ACC
 Lat. *non poterat solvi*
 ‘No one could untie him.’

4. ICH Signature effects in CCS

Building on the data from the previous section, we demonstrate that the distribution of morphosyntactic properties distinguishing complement types aligns with the ICH, and that the combination of these properties justifies a three-way classification of complement types.

One of the properties that distinguishes the three types of complements in CCS is the use of complementizers. *Proposition* and *Situation* complements can be introduced by complementizers, whereas *Event* complements in CCS never take a complementizer. The presence (and/or distribution) of complementizers thus produces the ICH Signature effect in CCS, as it distinguishes different types of complements. The complement types at opposite ends of the ICH (*Proposition* and *Event* complements) exhibit different values regarding the possibility of being introduced by a complementizer, while *Situation* complements align with *Proposition* complements in this respect. *Proposition* and *Situation* complements differ from each other in the distribution of complementizers. Declarative finite *Proposition* complements are prototypically introduced by the complementizer *êko* and, less frequently (mostly due to the influence of the spoken language and as a result of the gradual loss of irrealis semantics of *da* in the western part of the South Slavic area; cf. Wiemer 2021: 60; 2023: 199–200), by the complementizer *da*. Finite *Situation* complements, on the other hand, are almost always introduced by the complementizer *da*. Examples of *êko* introducing *Situation* complements are exceptionally rare. From the described distribution of complementizers, the following generalization can be drawn: the more complex and independent a type of complement is, the more likely it is to be introduced by a complementizer in CCS (and specifically by the complementizer *êko*).²¹

Regarding the finiteness of complements, infinitive complements are possible in all three types of complements. By contrast, finite complements are available only with *Propositions* and *Situations*. This distribution of (non-)finiteness in CCS follows the implicational finiteness universal (Wurmbrand *et al.* 2020), according to which finiteness is allowed in a type of complement if it is also allowed in types of complements to its right in the hierarchy. In *Proposition* configurations, non-finite ECM constructions are well-attested. These constructions are possible with various embedding verbs (e.g., *glagolati* ‘speak’,

²¹ For a similar generalization on the distribution of complementizers in Bulgarian and (Cypriot) Greek, see Wurmbrand and Lohninger (2023: 198–199).

reći ‘say’, *mněti* ‘think’, *věrovati* ‘believe’, *věděti* ‘know’, *znati* ‘know’, *razuměti* ‘understand’ etc.). On the other hand, ECM constructions are rare in *Situation* configurations and entirely unattested in *Event* configurations.

The differences between the complement types in CCS are also reflected in the availability of overt subjects. In *Proposition* and *Situation* complements, the subject may be overt (regardless of the finiteness of the complement), and it need not be controlled by an argument of the matrix verb. *Event* complements, however, differ sharply: their subject cannot be overt and must be obligatorily controlled by the matrix subject. Since overt subjects are an independence property (Wurmbrand and Lohninger 2023: 200), this distribution aligns with the ICH. As *Event* complements represent the least independent complement type, the ICH predicts that in languages where complement types differ in their overt subject availability, *Event* complements will show the lowest availability of overt subjects (cf. Wurmbrand and Lohninger 2023: 200).

The possibility of clitic climbing further differentiates complement types. *Proposition* complements do not exhibit classical clitic climbing. Examples of clitic climbing in *Proposition* complements are restricted to those ECM constructions where a (null) subject of the embedded clause moves into the matrix verb’s domain, receiving accusative case and surfacing as a (clitic) object of the matrix verb. *Situation* and *Event* complements, by contrast, exhibit clear cases of clitic climbing. This distribution of clitic climbing across complement types aligns with the ICH, which predicts that if a language permits clitic climbing in a complement type, it will also allow it in complement types to its right in the hierarchy (Wurmbrand and Lohninger 2023: 205). Since clitic climbing is a property of transparency (Wurmbrand 2024: 63), this distribution clearly reflects the fact that *Proposition* complements are the least transparent type in the ICH.

The distribution of the examined morphosyntactic properties that distinguish complement types in CCS is shown in Table 3.

	Propositions	Situations	Events
clause introducers	+	+	-
finiteness	+	+	-
ECM	+	+	-

overt subject	+	+	-
obligatory subject control	-	-	+
clitic climbing	-	+	+

Table 3. Distribution of morphosyntactic properties distinguishing complement types in CCS.

As mentioned in Section 1, the basic types of clausal complements in the ICH (*Propositions, Situations, Events*) are defined semantically, rather than by specific matrix verbs that combine with them (Wurmbrand and Lohninger 2023: 196). Given this, certain matrix verbs – depending on their interpretation – may belong to different complementation configurations, resulting in variation in the morphosyntactic properties of their clausal complements that align with the properties of the complement type associated with the matrix verb’s interpretation (cf. Wurmbrand and Lohninger 2023: 196). In CCS as well, we find verbs whose varying interpretations directly correlate with the morphosyntactic properties of their clausal complements. A clear example is the verb *reči* (‘tell’): when functioning as a speech verb, it combines with *Proposition*-type complements, whereas as a command verb, it combines with *Situation*-type complements. This contrast is robustly reflected in complementizer choice. When used as a speech verb, *reči*’s finite complements are consistently introduced by *êko* – the prototypical complementizer of finite *Proposition* complements in CCS (27a). By contrast, when used as a command verb, its finite complements regularly take *da* – the prototypical complementizer of finite *Situation* complements (27b).

- (27) a. *ne rêh’ li ti êko ače*
 not tell.AOR.1SG. PRT you.CL.DAT that if
vêrueši uzriši slavu b(o)žiu – MVat₄ 60d
 believe.PRES.2SG. see.PRES.2SG. glory God’s
 Gk. οὐκ εἶπόν σοι ὅτι ἐὰν πιστεύσῃς ὄψῃ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ (John 11:40)
 Lat. *nonne dixi tibi quoniam si credideris videbis gloriam Dei* (John 11:40)
 ‘Did I not tell you that if you believe, you will see the glory of God?’
- b. *r’ci ūre nei da mi pomožetb – MHrv 175c*
 tell.IMP.2SG. so her that me.CL.DAT help.PRES.3SG.
 Gk. εἰπὼν οὖν αὐτῇ ἵνα μοι συναντιλάβηται (Luke 10:40)
 Lat. *dic ergo illi ut me adiuvet* (Luke 10:40)
 ‘So, tell her to help me.’

The verb *pomisliti* ‘think’ also displays distinct complementation patterns. As an epistemic verb, it combines with complements of the *Proposition*-type (e.g., finite complements introduced by the complementizer *êko*) (28a). By contrast, when it means ‘plan’, ‘intend’, or ‘agree’, its complements are of the *Situation*-type (e.g., finite complements introduced by *da* or infinitive complements) (28b, 28b’).

- (28) a. *ne pomisliše êk(o) b(og)b e(stb) videi* – PsFr 59a
 not think.AOR.3PL. that God be.PRES.3SG see.ACT.PTCP.PRES.
 Gk. οὐτε γὰρ ἐνεθυμήθησαν ὅτι ἐστὶ θεὸς ὁ καθορῶν (Comm. Ps. 63:6)
 ‘They did not consider that there is a God who watches.’
- b. *pomisliše da ubiûtb i* – MPt 38a
 plot.AOR.3PL. that kill.PRES.3PL him.CL.ACC
- b’ *pomis’liše ego ub(i)ti* – MKop 30d
 plot.AOR.3PL. him kill
 Gk. ἐπονηρεύοντο τοῦ ἀποκτεῖναι αὐτόν (Gen. 37:18)
 Lat. *cogitaverunt illum occidere* (Gen. 37:18)
 ‘They plotted to kill him.’

The verb *znati* ‘know’, when used as a factive verb, takes clausal complements of the *Proposition*-type (e.g., finite complements introduced by the complementizer *êko*) (29a). However, when functioning as a modal verb, its clausal complements exhibit morphosyntactic properties of the *Event*-type (e.g., infinitive complements with the embedded subject controlled by the matrix subject) (29b).

- (29) a. *z’navá êko sa e(stb) s(i)nb naú* – MRoč 49a
 know.PRES.1DU. that this be.PRES.3SG. son our
 Gk. οἶδαμεν ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς ἡμῶν (John 9:20)
 Lat. *scimus quia hic est filius noster* (John 9:20)
 ‘We know that this is our son.’
- b. *est’ ubo star(a)cb iže z’naetb č(lovê)ki*
 be.PRES.3SG. PRT elder who know.PRES.3SG. men
očičati – BrBer₁ 156d
 purify
 Lat. *est senior qui novit purificare homines*
 ‘There is an elder who knows how to purify men.’

5. Concluding remarks

The research demonstrates that general patterns of clausal complementation in CCS align with the implicational complementation hierarchy (ICH) proposed by Wurmbrand and Lohninger (2023). The distribution of examined morphosyntactic properties – including the presence and distribution of complementizers, finiteness of clausal complements, availability of ECM, overt subjects, and clitic climbing (specifically, the combination of values these properties exhibit across different complement types) – supports classifying clausal complements into three classes. The study further confirms that the distribution of these morphosyntactic properties in CCS aligns with the ICH, reinforcing the existence of implicational relations between the three types of complements. For instance, overt subjects are available in *Proposition* and *Situation* complements but excluded in *Event* complements, consistent with the ICH's claim that *Proposition* and *Situation* complements are more independent than *Event* complements. The study also corroborates that – as in other languages – the morphosyntactic properties of clausal complements embedded under the same verb vary depending on the matrix verb's interpretation, thereby supporting the synthesis approach to complementation, in which the matrix verb and its embedded clause mutually influence each other.

However, many questions related to clausal complementation in CCS and the ICH itself remain open for future research. First, this study has certainly not covered all the morphosyntactic properties that distinguish different complement types in CCS. Therefore, future research should identify other such morphosyntactic properties and thus further test the ICH. Second, it would be worthwhile to investigate how the ICH can explain systematic variation in morphosyntactic properties of clausal complements of the same verb (e.g., *mněti* 'think' in CCS) across different syntactic environments (e.g., declarative vs. interrogative constructions). Third, while Wurmbrand and Lohninger divide clausal complements into three basic types, they emphasize that this does not mean that more detailed classifications – including possibly language-specific sub-classes within the basic types – are irrelevant. Thus, it would be interesting to determine which grammatical features in CCS could allow further subdivision of clausal complements within the three types of complements. Additionally, a detailed examination of the morphosyntactic properties of clausal complements of specific groups of matrix verbs in CCS would be valuable. Finally, given the translated nature of CCS texts, future work should address how and to what

extent foreign models (particularly Greek and Latin) influence the distribution of morphosyntactic features across complement types in CCS within the ICH framework.

Sources

- FgLab₁ – *Ljubljana Homiliary* (13th century)
 BrBer₁ – *First Beram Breviary* (late 14th century)
 BrBer₂ – *Second Beram Breviary* (15th century)
 BrDab – *Dabar Breviary* (1486)
 BrHum – *Hum Breviary* (15th century)
 BrMosk – *Moscow Breviary* (1442–1443)
 BrN₁ – *First Novi Breviary* (1459)
 BrN₂ – *Second Novi Breviary* (1495)
 BrVat₅ – *Vatican Breviary Illirico 5* (mid-14th century)
 BrVat₆ – *Vatican Breviary Illirico 6* (mid- / third quarter of the 14th century)
 BrVb₁ – *First Vrbnik Breviary* (13th/14th century)
 BrVb₃ – *Third Vrbnik Breviary* (first half of the 15th century)
 BrVO – *Breviary of Vid Omišljanin* (1396)
 CPar – *Paris Miscellany* (1375)
 CŽg – *Žgombić's Miscellany* (16th century)
 MBrib – *Bribir Missal* (15th century)
 MHrv – *Hrvoje's Missal* (early 15th century)
 MKop – *Kopenhagen Missal* (late 14th century)
 MNov – *Missal of Duke Novak* (1368)
 MNY – *New York Missal* (15th century)
 MOxf₁ – *First Oxford Missal* (15th century)
 MOxf₂ – *Second Oxford Missal* (15th century)
 MPt – *Missal editio princeps* (1483)
 MRoč – *Roč Missal* (around 1420)
 MVat₄ – *Vatican Missal Illirico 4* (early 14th century)
 MVb₁ – *First Vrbnik Missal* (1456)
 PsFr – *Frašćić's Psalter* (1463)
 PsLob – *Lobkowitz's Psalter* (1359)

Abbreviations

1	first person
2	second person
3	third person
ACC	accusative
ACT	active
AOR	aorist
CL	clitic
COND	conditional
DAT	dative
DU	dual
IMPF	imperfect
PAS	passive
PL	plural
PF	perfect
PLPF	pluperfect
PRT	particle
PTCP	participle
PRES	present
SG	singular

References

BATINIĆ ANGSTER, MIA. 2019. Može li hrvatska anafora *svoj* biti dalekometna? Odgovor na temelju analize infinitivnih dopuna. *Rasprave: Časopis Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 45/2. 279–297. doi.org/10.31724/rihjj.45.2.3.

BATINIĆ ANGSTER, MIA. 2024. Monoclausal configurations with infinitives in Croatian. *The verbal kaleidoscope: Perspectives on the syntax and semantics of verbs*. Eds. Batinić Angster, Mia; Angster, Marco. University of Zadar. Zadar. 63–92.

BRYANT, SHANNON. 2021. Evidence from Oromo on the typology of complementation strategies. *Proceedings of the Linguistic Society of America* 6/1. 526–540. doi.org/10.3765/plsa.v6i1.4987.

- CRISTOFARO, SONIA. 2003. *Subordination*. Oxford University Press. Oxford.
- DIXON, ROBERT M. W. 2010. *Basic Linguistic Theory. Volume 2: Grammatical Topics*. Oxford University Press. Oxford.
- ETEROVIĆ, IVANA. 2014. *Sintaktička svojstva participa u jeziku hrvatskoglagoljskih misala*. Doctoral thesis. Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Rijeci. Rijeka. 266 pp.
- GIVÓN, TALMY. 1980. The Binding Hierarchy and the Typology of Complements. *Studies in Language* 4/3. 333–377.
- GIJURKOVA, ALEKSANDRA; MIHALJEVIĆ, MILAN. 2014. Upravni i neupravni govor u hrvatskoj i makedonskoj redakciji crkvenoslavenskoga jezika. *Vita Litterarum Studii Sacra. Zbornik u čast Radoslavu Katičiću*. Eds. Ježić, Mislav; Andrižanić, Ivan; Krnic, Krešimir. FF Press. Zagreb. 139–171.
- GNJATOVIĆ, TENA; MATASOVIĆ, RANKO. 2013. Some Observations on Verbs with Obligatory Control in Croatian. *Rasprave: Časopis Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 39/2. 405–422.
- GRICKAT, IRENA. 1975. *Studije iz istorije srpskohrvatskog jezika*. Narodna biblioteka SR Srbije. Beograd.
- IL'INSKI 1912 = *Slěpčenskij apostol' XII vėka*. 1912. Ed. Il'inski, Grigorij Andreevič. Lissner i Sobko. Moskva.
- KALUŽNIACKI 1896 = *Actus Epistolaeque Apostolorum Palaeoslovenice. Ad Fidem Codicis Christinopolitani Saeculo XII^o Scripti*. 1896. Ed. Kalužniacki, Aemilianus. Apud C. Geroldi filium. Vindobonae.
- KOVAČEVIĆ, STEFANOVIĆ 1979 = *Matičin apostol (XIII vek)*. 1979. Eds. Kovačević, Radmila; Stefanović, Dimitrije E. Introduction and description of the manuscript written by Dimitrije Bogdanović. Serbian academy of sciences and arts. Belgrade.
- KRAPOVA, ILIJANA. 2021. Complementizers and particles inside and outside of the left periphery: The case of Bulgarian revisited. *Clausal Complementation in South Slavic*. Eds. Wiemer, Björn; Sonnenhauser, Barbara. De Gruyter Mouton. Berlin – Boston. 211–269.
- KRAPOVA, ILIJANA; SOČANAC, TOMISLAV. 2021. Factivity in South Slavic Languages: Complement and Relative Clauses. *Selected Proceedings of the 14th Meeting of the Slavic Linguistics Society. In Honor of Peter Kosta*. Eds. Franks, Steven L.; Timberlake, Alan H.; Wieteka, Anna W. Peter Lang. Berlin. 91–113.
- KUŠTOVIĆ, TANJA; ŠIMIĆ, MARINKA. 2024. *Muka po Ivanu u Pariškome (Borislavićevu) zborniku Slave 73. Tragovima slavenske pismenosti na šibenskome području. Zbornik radova s međunarodnoga znanstvenoga*

skupa “Glagoljična i ćirilica baština šibenskoga kraja” održanoga u Šibeniku 22. veljače 2023. Eds. Čupković, Gordana; Juran, Kristijan. Državni arhiv u Šibeniku. Šibenik. 49–82.

LANDAU, IDAN. 2000. *Elements of Control. Structure and Meaning in Infinitival Constructions*. Kluwer Academic Publisher. Dordrecht.

LOHNINGER, MAGDALENA; WURMBRAND, SUSI. Forthcoming. Typology of Complement Clauses. *Handbook of clausal embedding*. Eds. Benz, Anton et al. Language Science Press. Berlin. 1–53. https://ich.univie.ac.at/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/Lohninger_Wurmbbrand_2020.pdf (accessed 25 April 2025).

MIHALJEVIĆ, ANA. 2020. *Hrvatskoglagoljični tekstovi prevedeni s latinskoga*. Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada – Staroslavenski institut. Zagreb.

MIHALJEVIĆ, MILAN. 2009. The Structure of Complements of Verbs of Perception in Croatian. *A Linguist's Linguist. Studies in South Slavic Linguistics in Honor of E. Wayles Browne*. Eds. Franks, Steven; Chidambaram, Vrinda; Joseph, Brian. Slavica Publishers. Bloomington. 317–353.

MIHALJEVIĆ, MILAN. 2011a. *Verba dicendi* in Croatian Church Slavonic. *Zbornik Matice srpske za filologiju i lingvistiku* 54/1. 63–77.

MIHALJEVIĆ, MILAN. 2011b. Dopune percepcijskih glagola u hrvatskome crkvenoslavenskom jeziku. *Suvremena lingvistika* 37/72. 187–200.

MIHALJEVIĆ, MILAN. 2016. Uzročne konstrukcije u hrvatskome crkvenoslavenskom jeziku. *Šesti hrvatski slavistički kongres. Zbornik radova. Prvi svezak*. Eds. Botica, Stipe et al. Hrvatsko filološko društvo. Zagreb. 25–37.

NOONAN, MICHAEL. 2007. Complementation. *Language Typology and Syntactic Description. Volume 2: Complex Constructions*. Ed. Shopen, Timothy. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge. 52–150.

ORAIĆ RABUŠIĆ, IVANA. 2016. Rečenice kao dopune uz psihološke glagole u hrvatskom jeziku. *Fluminensia* 28/2. 71–86.

PAJANČIĆ, CAROLINE. 2021. Akan complements on the implicational complementation hierarchy. *The size of things I. Structure building*. Eds. Laszakovits, Sabine; Shen, Zheng. Language Science Press. Berlin. 45–65.

PAUL, ILEANA; SCOTT, HOLLY. 2021. Clausal complementation in Malagasy. *The Proceedings of Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association (AFLA)* 28. 125–137.

PERIĆ GAVRANČIĆ, SANJA. 2022. The *accusativus cum infinitivo* in 16th–19th century Croatian texts. Contact-induced and internally motivated syntactic change. *Diachronic*

Slavonic Syntax. Traces of Latin, Greek and Church Slavonic in Slavonic Syntax. Eds. Mendoza, Imke; Birzer, Sandra. De Gruyter Mouton. Berlin – Boston. 81–105.

RAMCHAND, GILLIAN; SVENONIUS, PETER. 2014. Deriving the functional hierarchy. *Language Sciences* 46. 152–174. doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2014.06.013.

RCJHR I = *Rječnik crkvenoslavenskoga jezika hrvatske redakcije. Vol. I: a' – vrěďbь*. 2000. Staroslavenski institut. Zagreb.

RCJHR II = *Rječnik crkvenoslavenskoga jezika hrvatske redakcije. Vol. II: vrěďbь – zapovědnica*. 2015. Staroslavenski institut. Zagreb.

REINHART, JOHANNES. 1993. *Untersuchungen zur Syntax des Kroatisch-Kirchenslavischen. Das glagolitische Missale romanum*. Habilitation thesis. Universität Wien. Wien. 540 pp.

SEDLÁČEK, JAN. 1967. O nekim pitanjima proučavanja istorijskog razvitka složene rečenice u srpskohrvatskom jeziku. *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 10. 95–102.

SOČANAC, TOMISLAV. 2017. *Subjunctive Complements in Slavic Languages: A Syntax-Semantics Interface Approach*. Doctoral thesis. Department of Linguistics – University of Geneva. Geneva. 310 pp.

SPENCER, ANDREW; LUÍS, ANA R. 2012. *Clitics. An Introduction*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.

ŠTEFANIĆ, VJEKOSLAV. 1960. *Glagoljski rukopisi otoka Krka*. JAZU. Zagreb.

TANDARIĆ, JOSIP LEONARD. 1993. *Hrvatskoglagoljska liturgijska književnost. Rasprave i prinosi. Kršćanska sadašnjost – Provincijalat franjevac trećoredaca*. Zagreb.

VELA, JOZO. 2018. *Sintaksa infinitiva i supina u hrvatskome crkvenoslavenskome jeziku*. Doctoral thesis. Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Rijeci. Rijeka. 226 pp.

VELA, JOZO. 2023. *Spas-tradicija. Otkrivanje najstarije hrvatske crkvenoslavenske književnosti*. Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada – Staroslavenski institut. Zagreb.

WIEMER, BJÖRN. 2021. A general template of clausal complementation and its application to South Slavic: theoretical premises, typological background, empirical issues. *Clausal Complementation in South Slavic*. Eds. Wiemer, Björn; Sonnenhauser, Barbara. De Gruyter Mouton. Berlin – Boston. 29–159.

WIEMER, BJÖRN. 2023. Between analytical mood and clause-initial particles – on the diagnostics of subordination for (emergent) complementizers. *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 68/2. 187–260. doi.org/10.1515/slav-2023-0012

WURMBRAND, SUSANNE. 2003. *Infinitives. Restructuring and Clause Structure*. Mouton de Gruyter. Berlin – New York.

WURMBRAND, SUSANNE. 2024. The Size of Clausal Complements. *Annual Review of Linguistics* 10. 59–83. doi.org/10.1146/annurev-linguistics-031522-103802

WURMBRAND, SUSANNE ET AL. 2020. Finiteness in South Slavic Complement Clauses. Evidence for an Implicational Finiteness Universal. *Linguistica* 60/1 (*Topics on the Morphology of South Slavic Languages*). 119–137. doi.org/10.4312/linguistica.60.1.119-137

WURMBRAND, SUSANNE; LOHNINGER, MAGDALENA. 2023. An implicational universal in complementation – Theoretical insights and empirical progress. *Propositional Arguments in Cross-Linguistic Research. Theoretical and Empirical Issues*. Eds. Hartmann, Jutta M.; Wöllstein, Angelika. Narr Verlag. Tübingen. 183–229.

Hrvatske crkvenoslavenske rečenične dopune i implikacijska hijerarhija dopunjavanja

U radu se rečenične dopune u hrvatskome crkvenoslavenskom jeziku razmatraju u svjetlu implikacijske hijerarhije dopunjavanja Susanne Wurmbrand i Magdalene Lohninger (2023). Wurmbrand i Lohninger rečenične dopune dijele u tri semantički definirana tipa (propozicijske, situacijske, događajne dopune), koji su u hijerarhiji poredani s obzirom na stupanj sintaktičke složenosti te mogu biti izdvojeni na temelju raspodjele morfosintaktičkih svojstava. Predložena je hijerarhija implikacijskoga karaktera, što znači da je raspodjela morfosintaktičkih svojstava u susjednim tipovima dopuna u hijerarhiji do određene mjere predvidiva. Implikacijska se hijerarhija dopunjavanja u hrvatskim crkvenoslavenskim komplementacijskim konfiguracijama testira analizom raspodjele morfosintaktičkih svojstava kao što su prisutnost i raspodjela dopunjača, finitnost dopuna, mogućnost leksičkoga izražavanja subjekta, dostupnost konstrukcija s iznimnim padežnim označavanjem (ECM) te uspinjanje klitika. Analizom se pokazuje da obrasci rečeničnoga dopunjavanja u hrvatskome crkvenoslavenskom podržavaju podjelu rečeničnih dopuna na tri tipa te da je raspodjela morfosintaktičkih svojstava triju tipova dopuna usklađena s implikacijskom hijerarhijom dopunjavanja.

Ključne riječi: hrvatski crkvenoslavenski jezik, rečenično dopunjavanje, implikacijska hijerarhija dopunjavanja, dopunjači, finitnost, iznimno padežno označavanje, uspinjanje klitika

Keywords: Croatian Church Slavonic, clausal complementation, implicational complementation hierarchy, complementizers, finiteness, ECM, clitic climbing

