

THE GRAMMAR OF FEAR: MORPHOSYNTACTIC METAPHOR  
IN FEAR CONSTRUCTIONS

by

HOLLY A. LAKEY

A DISSERTATION

Presented to the Department of Linguistics  
and the Graduate School of the University of Oregon  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

March 2016

DISSERTATION APPROVAL PAGE

Student: Holly A. Lakey

Title: The Grammar of Fear: Morphosyntactic Metaphor in Fear Constructions

This dissertation has been accepted and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree in the Department of Linguistics by:

Dr. Cynthia Vakareliyska	Chairperson
Dr. Scott DeLancey	Core Member
Dr. Eric Pederson	Core Member
Dr. Zhuo Jing-Schmidt	Institutional Representative

and

Dr. Scott L. Pratt	Dean of the Graduate School
--------------------	-----------------------------

Original approval signatures are on file with the University of Oregon Graduate School.

Degree awarded March 2016.

© 2016 Holly A. Lakey

## DISSERTATION ABSTRACT

Holly A. Lakey

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Linguistics

March 2016

Title: The Grammar of Fear: Morphosyntactic Metaphor in Fear Constructions

This analysis explores the reflection of semantic features of emotion verbs that are metaphorized on the morphosyntactic level in constructions that express these emotions. This dissertation shows how the avoidance or distancing response to fear is mirrored in the morphosyntax of fear constructions (FCs) in certain Indo-European languages through the use of non-canonical grammatical markers. This analysis looks at both simple FCs consisting of a single clause and complex FCs, which feature a subordinate clause that acts as a complement to the fear verb in the main clause.

In simple FCs in some highly-inflected Indo-European languages, the complement of the fear verb (which represents the fear source) is case-marked not accusative but genitive (Baltic and Slavic languages, Sanskrit, Anglo-Saxon) or ablative (Armenian, Sanskrit, Old Persian). These two directional case inflections are generally used to represent the notion of movement away from. In simple FCs in these languages, the movement away is the subject/Experiencer's recoiling or desire to distance him-/herself from the fear Source. In this way the grammar of simple FCs of these languages mirrors, or metaphorizes, the reflexive avoidance behavior of the fear response.

In the subordinate clause of complex FCs in certain Indo-European languages (such as Ancient Greek, Latin, Old English, Baltic and Slavic languages, French, and

Catalan), irrealis mood marking on the verb together with a negative particle that does not affect syntactic negation of the verb syntactically mark the potentiality of the feared event or state represented by the subordinate clause (which has not yet occurred and may not occur) and its undesirability for the subject/Experiencer of the fear verb in the main clause. In this way the negative particle + irrealis mood fear clause metaphorizes on the morphosyntactic level the primary semantic features of the emotion of fear: anticipation of a potential undesired event that the Experiencer seeks to negate. The analysis of complex FCs is followed by a case study proposing the evolution of these constructions in Latin from negative purpose clauses.

This dissertation includes previously published material.

## CURRICULUM VITAE

NAME OF AUTHOR: Holly A. Lakey

### GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE SCHOOLS ATTENDED:

University of Oregon, Eugene  
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

### DEGREES AWARDED:

Doctor of Philosophy, Linguistics, 2016, University of Oregon  
Bachelor of Arts, Linguistics, 2008, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee  
Bachelor of Arts, Latin, 2008, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

### PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

Instructor (Graduate Teaching Fellow), Department of Linguistics, University of Oregon, 2008-2015

Undergraduate Research Assistant, Office of Undergraduate Research, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, 2007-2008

### GRANTS, AWARDS, AND HONORS:

Graduate Teaching, Research, Administrative Fellowship, Department of Linguistics, University of Oregon, 2008-2015

International Society for Gesture Studies Summer School Fellowship, 2010

First Place Barry Wind Prize, Honors College Essay Competition, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, 2007

### PUBLICATIONS:

Lakey, Holly. 2015. The grammaticalization of Latin *nē* + subjunctive constructions. *Journal of Latin Linguistics*, 14(1), 65-100.

Lakey, Holly. 2013. Morphosyntax of fear and distance. *Indo-European Linguistics* 1, 131-158.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the faculty of the Department of Linguistics at the University of Oregon for many years of careful advising, intellectual exchange, and academic fostering. The viewpoints presented by the faculty and my fellow students were integral to my development as a scholar. The financial support I received as a graduate teaching fellow was also instrumental in my ability to complete my graduate studies. Not to mention the delicious potlucks and numerous BFLs the department hosted, at which I learned that professors are people too, and that graduate students are always stressed out, but not too stressed for the occasional beer.

I wish to express my appreciation to my advisor, Cynthia Vakareliyska, for her tireless help in preparing this manuscript. Without her, my dissertation could have taken the rest of my life to write and might have ended up being thousands of pages of barely-connected ideas. I thank my advisor for repeatedly forcing me to narrow my topic and cite all my sources. Her help has been invaluable.

I would also like to thank my committee members: Professor Scott DeLancey for his insightful comments on every topic, and for always making Linguistics look cool (especially cooler than those Philosophy guys), Professor Eric Pederson for his ability to look at an issue from all sides and always provide probing questions (even though I was often nervous when those questions were posed to me), and to Professor Zhuo Jing-Schmidt, without whom this project might not exist, as it was in her seminar during my first year at the UO that I started working on the topic that would eventually become my dissertation.

I would like to thank the other faculty members in Linguistics at UO. Through many classes, colloquia, and conversations, you've stimulated my mind and encouraged me to keep moving forward. I've always felt very lucky to be among such bright lights. I'd like to thank the members of the Cognitive Linguistics group as well, members who were willing to sit through a discussion of a long-dead language and offer helpful comments when possible. I was always intrigued by the topics presented in the workshop. I'd also like to thank Linda Campbell for her tireless work and dedication to the department, and for always having a cheerful smile when you need it most.

To my fellow Linguistics graduate students: I am proud to call myself a member of your motley community. I've received support from so many of you, and honestly feel blessed to call you my friends. Although I always enjoyed "talking shop" with my Linguistics pals, I think my favorite times were when we could just relax and talk about anything but "work." I don't know if I could have kept going without pep talks from so many of you. Thank you for being a friend, as the old theme song goes.

Most of all, I would like to acknowledge the hard work and dedication on the part of my husband, Philip Lakey, and my family and friends for their support during this process. Pip, you've always been there for me, even when you had no idea what syntax was and why it was worth complaining about so loudly. I appreciate you standing by me while I worked to achieve my goal. I know it wasn't an easy journey, but at least it's been interesting. To my mother, and my sisters, thank you for believing in me. And to my friends, I appreciate you more than words can say.

I could not have done it without you. All of you.

To my parents

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. PREVIOUS RESEARCH .....	10
1. Introduction.....	10
2. The Etymology of Fear Lexemes.....	11
3. Fear Metaphors .....	13
4. Semantic and Cognitive Analyses of Emotions with a Focus on Fear .....	16
5. Morphological and Syntactic Marking of Emotion .....	20
6. The Grammar of Fear Constructions .....	22
7. Functional Change in Fear Constructions.....	24
8. Goals of This Study .....	27
III. THE MORPHOSYNTAX OF SIMPLE FEAR CONSTRUCTIONS.....	28
1. Introduction.....	28
1.1. Organization of Chapter.....	31
2. The Genitive.....	31
2.1. Genitive Case Meaning.....	32
2.2. The PIE Genitive and Ablative and Their Reflexes in Descendent Languages .....	36
2.3. Genitive Case Marking in FCs.....	38
2.4. Genitive of Negation.....	42
3. The Ablative.....	46
3.1. Ablative Case Meaning.....	47

Chapter	Page
3.2. The PIE Ablative and Its Relationship to the Genitive.....	48
3.3. Ablative Case Marking in FCs.....	49
4. Accusative Case Marking in FCs.....	52
5. Conclusion .....	54
IV. THE MORPHOSYNTAX OF COMPLEX FEAR CONSTRUCTIONS.....	57
1. Introduction.....	57
2. Definition and Function of the Irrealis Mood.....	58
3. Irrealis Verb Marking in FCs.....	60
3.1. Subjunctive .....	60
3.1.1. Subjunctive in Greek and Latin FCs.....	63
3.1.2. Romance Languages.....	66
3.1.3. Baltic and Slavic Languages.....	69
3.1.4. English.....	74
3.1.5. Celtic.....	76
3.2. Modal Auxiliaries .....	78
4. Irrealis Negative Particles.....	79
4.1. PIE Negators .....	79
4.2. Latin.....	81
4.3. Greek.....	83
4.4. French.....	84
4.5. English.....	86
4.6. Baltic and Slavic Languages.....	89

Chapter	Page
5. Conclusion .....	95
V. GRAMMATICALIZATION OF COMPLEX FEAR CONSTRUCTIONS IN LATIN: A CASE STUDY .....	96
1. Introduction.....	96
2. Grammaticalization of Latin <i>Nē</i> + Subjunctive Constructions.....	99
3. A Brief Historical Sketch of Negative Particles in Latin.....	101
3.1. Derivation of Latin Negators .....	102
3.2. Grammaticalization of <i>Nē</i> from Independent Clause Negator to Subordinator.....	105
3.3. Difference of Functions between <i>Nē</i> and <i>Nōn</i> in Subjunctive Constructions .....	107
4. Independent <i>Nē</i> + Subjunctive Constructions.....	110
5. Deontic Modality in <i>Nē</i> + Subjunctive Constructions.....	114
6. Dependent <i>Nē</i> + Subjunctive Constructions with Negated Subordinate Clauses .....	115
6.1. Indirect Negative Commands, Requests, and Warnings.....	115
6.2. Negative Wish Constructions .....	118
6.3. Negative Clauses of Proviso .....	119
6.4. Negative Purpose Constructions .....	120
7. Non-negated Dependent <i>Nē</i> + Subjunctive Constructions.....	124
7.1. Hindrance Clauses .....	125
7.2. Complex FCs .....	127
8. Conclusion .....	129
VI. CONCLUSION.....	130

Chapter	Page
APPENDICES	
A. LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS .....	134
B. LATIN SOURCES CITED .....	135
REFERENCES CITED.....	137

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. IE Negative Particles in Prohibitions and Statements.....	80

CHAPTER I  
INTRODUCTION

*I'm not afraid of death; I just don't want to be there when it happens.*

–Woody Allen

Emotional expression has been a topic of study since at least the time of Aristotle. Charles Darwin, in 1897, described in great detail the bodily states that accompanied the emotions of men and beasts in his *The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals*. More recently, scholars have started investigating the connection between the way we feel and the way we think. In modern times we have outlined links between emotion and cognition and have acknowledged that they can affect our speech. This study looks at one emotion, fear, to highlight the link between our physiological and cognitive reaction during a fear state and the grammar we use to express our fears.

Emotions interact with basic cognitive processes like perception, processing, and memory.<sup>1</sup> In general, however, very little work has been done on how the grammar of a language, specifically its morphosyntax, may mimic or metaphorize basic cognitive functions associated with a particular emotion. This dissertation provides detailed analyses of both simple and complex fear constructions (FCs) in several Indo-European languages with an eye towards elements of grammar that could be considered unexpected, or linguistically marked, and demonstrates how these marked grammatical elements metaphorize the fear response, which is the seeking or desire for avoidance.

The impetus for this project came initially from a simple confusion in Latin class.

---

<sup>1</sup> See, for example, Storbeck and Clore (2007) for a discussion of the link between cognition and emotion

In Classical Latin, when a fear verb introduces a subordinate clause, the complementizer is the negative particle *nē*. Although *nē* often functions as a complementizer in other construction types, including negative purpose clauses (NPCs), in FCs it does not negate the subordinate clause:

(1) Latin positive purpose clause

*incēdō ut Antonium videat.*

enter.1SG.PRS **COMP** Anthony-ACC see-3SG.PRS.SBJV

‘I’m going in so that Anthony might see me’<sup>2</sup>

(2) Latin NPC

*excēdō nē Antonium videat.*

exit.1SG.PRS **NEG.COMP** Anthony-ACC see-3SG.PRS.SBJV

‘I’m leaving so that Anthony won’t see me’

(3) Latin positive FC

*timeō nē Antonium videat.*

fear-1SG.PRS **NEG.COMP** Anthony-ACC see-3SG.PRS.SBJV

‘I’m afraid that Anthony might see me’

---

<sup>2</sup> Examples are mine unless otherwise cited.

(4) Latin negative FC

*timeō ut Antonium videat.*

fear-1SG.PRS **COMP** Anthony-ACC see-3SG.PRS.SBJV

‘I’m afraid that Anthony might not see me’

As the examples above indicate, fear constructions seem to be the reverse of the more typical grammar, exemplified by the purpose clause, in that the negative particle *nē* does not negate the verb in the subordinate clause. If the subordinate clause verb is negated, a different complementizer is required. This can be *ut*, the typical complementizer for positive purpose clauses (as seen in (4)), or it can be the combination of *nē nōn*, in which *nōn* is the element that negates the subordinate clause verb.

(5) Latin negative FC with additional negative element

*timeō nē Antonium nōn videat.*

fear-1SG.PRS **NEG.COMP** Anthony-ACC NEG see-3SG.PRS.SBJV

‘I’m afraid that Anthony might not see me’

What I considered to be a logical disconnect as I was learning Latin became the driving question in the initial stages of my research. The common explanation for the non-negating status of *nē* in FCs is that FCs work as a sort of reverse wish, in which the speaker does not want the event in the subordinate clause to take place (see, for example, Greenough et al., 1916, p. 365 and Mountford, 2011, pp. 90-1). While this makes sense conceptually, grammatically there are differences between wish constructions and FCs.

The subordinate clause following a wishing or hoping verb often contains an infinitive, especially when the subject of both verbs is the same, but even sometimes when the subject is different; in FCs, however, the verb in the subordinate clause is never an infinitive, but always in subjunctive form. Furthermore, the most frequent verb of desire, *volere* ‘wish, want,’ often can occur without a complementizer even when the complement clause is a subjunctive:

(6) *cupiō            mē    esse    clēmentem*

desire-1SG.PRS REFL be.INF merciful.ACC

‘I desire to be merciful’ (*Cat. 1.4*, from Greenough et al., 1916, p. 364)

(7) *volō            tē            scīre*

wish-1SG.PRS 2SG.ACC know.INF

‘I want you to know’ (*Fam. 9.24.1*, from Greenough et al., 1916, p. 364)

(8) *volō amēs*

wish-1SG.PRS love-2SG.PRS.SBJV

‘I want you to love’ (*Att. 2.10*, from Greenough et al., 1916, p. 365)

Dissatisfaction with traditional analyses changed my perspective, altering the research question from why Latin syntax behaves in this manner to questions about FCs in general. Was there something about these constructions that might motivate marked syntax? Could this phenomenon extend to other Indo-European (IE) languages besides

Latin? After broadening the scope of my inquiry beyond Latin, I found examples of FCs in a few other languages that also use a non-negating negative particle to introduce subordinate clauses after verbs of fearing. These are discussed in detail in Chapter IV.

Another type of markedness in FCs is the use of a case form other than the accusative for the complement of a fear verb (see Chapter III). For languages that have Nominative-Accusative morphological case marking systems, the accusative case marking is generally the default for the direct object. However, in some languages, including all the Slavic languages and Old Persian, the object of a fear verb is marked either genitive or ablative:

(9) Russian

*ja bojus' groma i molnii*

1SG.NOM fear.1SG.NPST.REFL thunder.GEN and lightning.GEN

'I'm afraid of thunder and lightning' (Magnus, 1916, p. 173)

(10) Old Persian

*hacā anīyanā mā tarsam*

from another.ABL NEG fear-1SG.PRS.INJ

'Let me not fear another' (Skjærvø, 2009, p. 129)

I have limited the analysis presented in this dissertation to IE languages, but FCs have marked morphosyntax in some non-IE languages also. For example, Georgian has genitive marking on the objects of fear verbs in simple ergative FCs:

(11) Georgian simple FC

*mis-i    kudianob-is    šenistana dedakac-eb-s*

his-NOM slyness-GEN like.you woman-PL-DAT

*e-šin-od-e-s*

EV-fear-EM-SBJV-3SG.SBJ

‘Women like you should fear his slyness’ (Boeder, 2010, p. 626)

In complex FCs in Georgian, the subordinate clause includes the negative particle *ar*, which does not serve to negate the subordinate clause verb:

(12) Georgian complex FC

*v-    šiš- ob bevr-s    ar    svam-d-e-s*

1SBJ-fear-TS much-DAT NEG drink-EM-SBJV-3SG.SBJ

‘I fear he drinks too much’ (Boeder, 2010, p. 617)

Japanese and Korean can use a non-negating (but non-subordinating) negative infix in complex FCs as well to indicate the speaker’s belief that the subordinate clause event is unlikely to happen (Yoon, 2011, p. 24):

(13) Japanese:

*John-wa Mary-ga ko-nai-ka(-to)    sinpaisi-te iru*

John-TOP Mary-NOM come-NEG-NFCOMP fear-ASP

‘John fears that Mary might come’ (Yoon, 2011, p. 24)

(14) Korean:

*John-un Mary-ka oci-**anh**-ul-ci/kka kekcengha-koissta*

John-TOP Mary-NOM come-**NEG**-FUT-NFCOMP fear-ASP

‘John fears that Mary might come’ (Yoon, 2011, p. 24)

This dissertation explores the motivation for marked grammar in FCs. Through examples from many IE languages, it will provide a limited typology of simple and complex FCs, detailing the morphosyntax of these constructions and attempting to explain why marked elements like case marking, mood, and negation appear in these constructions.

The grammar of FCs represents a metaphorization of the avoidance response to fear. One responds to a fear stimulus by moving away from it. This reflexive reaction becomes part of our conceptualization of fear, and, as illustrated by examples from the *Corpus of Contemporary American English*, we can extend the notion of physical recoil (e.g., recoiling from a spider) to a more abstract notion of recoil (e.g., recoiling at a thought):

(15) *...just as we have a nervous system that makes us reflexively recoil in self-protection when we spot a snake... (Psychology Today, 40(4), 2007)*

(16) ...it is easy to understand why others recoil from the idea of shooting barred owls... (*Newsweek*, 164(21), 2015)

Distancing behavior is reflected morphosyntactically in FCs as they use an oblique case in simple FCs, and/or a negative particle in complex FCs that does not syntactically negate the complement. The analysis in the following chapters of the marked morphosyntactic features of FCs in these languages shows that they all reflect on the grammatical level the distancing response to the fear emotion.

Specifically, I will argue that FCs in Latin and certain IE languages *metaphorize* the fear response morphosyntactically. Although some studies have looked at metaphorization in morphosyntax (see, for example, Halliday, 1985, Glynn, 2002, Panther et al. (eds.), 2009, and others), to my knowledge there are no other studies so far that discuss FCs in terms of metaphorization. It is hoped that this dissertation will add in a small way to the understanding of the connection between emotions and their expression in language generally.

The structure of this dissertation is as follows. Chapter II presents a review of the literature on FCs within the context of emotional constructions generally, including etymologies of fear lexemes, conceptual metaphors related to fear, and previous analyses of FCs. Chapter III focuses on case-marking of the NP representing the fear source in simple FCs that consist of a single clause, in certain case-inflected IE languages, and shows that the genitive and ablative inflections mark semantically for Source and movement away from Source. Chapter IV examines complex FCs, which feature a complement clause, showing that the distance markers in this construction type in Latin

are irrealis markers, that is, the subjunctive form of the verb in the subordinate clause, and the non-negating negative particle, which serves as both the complementizer and mood marker. Chapter V provides a case study of the grammaticalization of complex Latin *nē* + subjunctive FCs from NPCs. Conclusions are provided in chapter VI. Chapters III, IV, and V contain previously published material.

## CHAPTER II

### PREVIOUS RESEARCH

#### **1. Introduction**

The topic of emotion is a wide one, spanning several disciplines like psychology and physiology as well as linguistics. Even by narrowing the field to one emotion, namely fear, the breadth of scholarship is too large to be fully explored here. However, when one starts to look specifically for analyses related to the grammatical expression of fear, the field narrows. While this chapter will provide an introduction to studies that touch on the expression of emotion in language, the majority of the previous research presented pertains specifically to the topic of the grammar found in fear constructions.

To provide a view of the current field of research on emotional expression, this chapter will briefly explore semantic, cognitive, and corpora studies on emotional language in general and fear in specific. Unfortunately, little work has been done on the morphosyntax of fear constructions in Indo-European languages beyond basic descriptions found in grammars, which underscores the importance of the current analysis. Studies that highlight the connection between a bodily response to fear and its expression will be emphasized.

This chapter will begin with the etymology of fear lexemes and metaphors of fear,<sup>3</sup> with an eye towards their relationship with bodily fear reactions. Morphological markings that are used in constructions expressing emotions in general will then be

---

<sup>3</sup> The fear metaphors discussed here are conceptual metaphors (see, for instance, Lakoff and Johnson, 1980), which is a method of understanding one domain in terms of another domain. For fear metaphors, and many others, the domain of bodily experiences and behaviors provides the initial domain by which the emotion is conceptualized.

explored, before delving more specifically into existing analyses of the grammar of fear constructions. These analyses range from semantic to syntactic and pragmatic, and look at language both synchronically and diachronically.

## 2. The etymology of fear lexemes

Previous work on the etymology of fear words in Indo-European languages has indicated a possible basis for source lexemes in bodily states related to the emotion. Two authors who have addressed fear lexemes specifically are Buck (1949) and Schmalsteig (1983). While the authors do not agree on the etymology of IE fear lexemes, interestingly, they do seem to agree on bodily experience as a source for these lexemes.

Buck (1949) traces many fear roots back to words with the meanings of "tremble," "shake," "flee" and "be struck" (p. 1153). These earlier meanings are physical manifestations of the fear emotion. There are multiple examples of these roots, including *pavor* 'a shaking, quaking' in Latin, *dychryn* 'shiver, tremble,' in Welsh, and *screcchan* 'jump' in Old High German (Modern German *schrecken* meaning "frighten"). As section 3 of this chapter will discuss, conceptual metaphors relating to fear also reflect bodily reactions. The shift in meaning from a bodily reaction caused by fear to referring to the fear emotion itself can be considered a metaphorical extension. As the emotion caused the physical reaction, the bodily state became associated with fear and eventually these words came to mean 'to fear.'

Schmalsteig (1983), on the other hand, traces fear words in Baltic, Slavic and Indic back to the IE root for 'being,' which is *\*bhū*. Schmalsteig suggested that the earliest root for 'being' was *\*bhe/o*, which becomes *\*bhe-w-to* when a consonant follows

the root vowel. He gives *bhū-tá* in Indic and *bū-ta* in Baltic as example roots (p. 61).

Schmalsteig then provided several examples of fear roots in Indic, Baltic, and Slavic to illustrate their closeness to the root for 'being':

Several different ablaut grades of the root are represented in Indic, Baltic and Slavic. An etymological *\*bhey-C > \*bhī-C* is represented in Old Indic *bhī-má-* 'dreadful,' *bhi-ra-* 'terrifying,' *bhī-rú-* 'timid, fearful,' *bhī-ta-* 'excessively terrified,' *bhī-ti* 'fear, alarm, dread,' *bhī-smá-* 'frightful, dreadful,' Latvian *bī-ties* 'to be afraid,' 1st sg. present *bī-stuos*. The etymological *\*bhóy-e/oC = \*bhoy-* is represented in Baltic also by such nouns as Lith. *bái-mė*, Latv. *baī-me*, 'fear, anxiety,' such adjectives as Lith. *bai-lūs*, Latv. *baīls*, *baīļš* 'timid,' such causative verbs as Lith. *bai-dýti*, Latv. *baī-dīt* 'to frighten.' Note also the adjectives Lith. *bai-sūs*, Latv. *bai-ss* 'frightful' which Fraenkel, 1955, 29, connects with Slavic *běsb* 'devil' (p. 62).

These lexemes could be related to the root for 'being,' according to Schmalsteig, through Siever's Law, in which the form of the root showed both the vocalic and consonantal form of the resonant. Schmalsteig posits that the original form of the verb root had the meaning "to be," which came to represent a state as opposed to a process, and when it was construed with an object in the ablative or genitive case, it took on a fear reading (1983, p. 64). Originally the phrase with the genitive/ablative object would mean something like "I am away from X" or "I stay away from X," with X being the fear

stimulus in the genitive or ablative case (p. 65). This concrete expression of avoidance behavior then came to stand for the more abstract fear emotion itself.

As Chapter III of this dissertation will discuss, spatial case marking meaning “away from” (namely the ablative and genitive case markings) appear in fear constructions. Their use reflects avoidance behavior, in which the fear Experiencer seeks to distance him/herself from the fear stimulus. As with the bodily experience verb roots mentioned above, these constructions underwent extension, in this case from a concrete spatial meaning to a more abstract meaning focused on the fear emotion itself. By this same process a verb root meaning ‘be’ in Proto-Indo-European becomes a verb meaning ‘to fear’ in Indic and Baltic and Slavic languages.

### **3. Fear metaphors**

As work on embodiment has shown, human consciousness is embodied because our experiences are structured and categorized through our physical experiences and interactions with our environment (Maiese, 2011, p. 11). This embodied consciousness extends to our conceptual systems, where mental image schemas arise from bodily experiences and are used to structure thought (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999). An example would be conceptualizing the understanding of an idea as the grasping of an object. Thus our conceptualization of an abstract idea (understanding) is structured in terms of a bodily action (grasping) (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999, p. 51). The mapping from concrete to abstract domain is the basis of conceptual metaphor theory (see Lakoff & Johnson, 1980 for further discussion).

Common conceptual metaphors often reflect bodily states. A well-known example is the concept ANGER IS FLUID HEATED IN A CONTAINER, which leads to expressions such as “You make my blood boil” and “Simmer down.” (Lakoff, 1987, p. 383). Fear metaphors are often related to physical fear reactions as well, as the examples below will show.

Kövecses's work (1990, 2000, 2002) has focused on the linguistic expression of emotions; he has pointed out that many of the figurative phrases used to express emotions are either metaphorical or metonymic in nature. From a cognitive linguistics perspective, the fact that emotional expressions are metaphorical indicates a metaphorical structuring of emotions conceptually.

Kövecses (1990, pp. 70-73) lists the following common metonymies associated with fear: physical agitation (e.g., "He was *shaking* with fear"), increase in heart rate (e.g., "His heart *pounded* with fear"), lapses in heartbeat (e.g., "You made *my heart miss a beat* when you said you had left the money at home"), blood leaves face (e.g., "She turned *pale*"), skin-shrinking (e.g., "His skin was *prickling* with fear"), hair-straightening (e.g., "That was a *hair-raising* experience"), inability to move (e.g., "I was *rooted to the spot*"), drop in body temperature and inability to move (e.g., "I was *frozen in my tracks*"), inability to breathe (e.g., "He *gasped* with fear"), inability to speak (e.g., "He was *struck dumb*"), inability to think (e.g., "You scared me *out of my wits*"), release of bowels or bladder (e.g., "You scared *the shit out of me*"), sweating (e.g., "The cold *sweat* of fear broke out"), nervousness in the stomach (e.g., "He got *butterflies in the stomach*"), dryness in the mouth (e.g., "He was scared *spitless*"), screaming (e.g., "She was *screaming* with fear"), ways of looking (e.g., "There was *fear in her eyes*"), drop in body

temperature (e.g., "I was *chilled to the bone*"), startle (e.g., "That noise nearly made me *jump out of my skin*"), and flight (e.g., "He *fled* from persecution"). It quickly becomes apparent that these metonymies are all based in either physiological or behavioral bodily responses to experiencing fear.

The metaphors associated with fear expressions are also rooted in bodily experiences. For example, in FEAR IS FLUID IN A CONTAINER (e.g., "The sight *filled* her with fear"), the body itself is conceptualized as a container that can be "filled" with an emotion (Kövecses, 1990, p. 75). Other metaphors that reflect the feeling state of fear within the body are FEAR IS A BURDEN (e.g., "Fear weighed heavily on them") in which fear is equated to a physical weight pressing down on one internally, and FEAR IS AN ILLNESS (e.g., "The town was *plagued* by fear"), in which fear becomes sickness (pp. 75-77). Oster (2010) also examined metaphors of fear in English through the use of a corpus and found that FEAR IS SOMETHING INSIDE THE BODY is a pervasive conceptualization when one considers the prepositions and adverbials that often follow fear lexemes, such as *in*, *inside*, *within*, *into*, as in "strike fear into," "fear inside" or "fear within" (p. 743).<sup>4</sup>

Other fear metaphors imitate bodily states as well, but as an outside force acting against the body. Of the types highlighted by Kövecses (1990, pp. 74-78), these include FEAR IS A VICIOUS ENEMY (e.g., "He was *choked* by fear"), FEAR IS A

---

<sup>4</sup> Pérez Rull (2000-2001) looked at the conceptualization of emotions in English as locations, and found that the more general conceptualization for emotions, fear included, is EMOTIONS ARE DESTINATIONS. The author stated that although both positive and negative emotions share the same conceptualization, positive states are desired while negative ones are undesired (p. 356). A localist interpretation of states as locations is not new (see, for example, Chafe, 1970; Jackendoff, 1972, 1983, 1990; Diehl, 1975; Lakoff and Johnson, 1980; Lakoff, 1987, and others), but Pérez Rull pointed out that negative states are those that are met unexpectedly, and which are often owing to external circumstances. While a person may be 'in' a certain emotional state (internalized view), that state might be the result of an external force.

TORMENTOR (e.g., "They were *tortured* by the fear of what was going to happen"), FEAR IS A SUPERNATURAL BEING (e.g., "It was a *ghastly* scene"), FEAR IS AN OPPONENT (e.g., "Her fear *overcame* her"), FEAR IS A NATURAL FORCE (e.g., "She was *engulfed* by panic"), and FEAR IS A SUPERIOR (e.g., "His actions were *dictated* by fear"). These metaphors seem to relate to the avoidance response, as the Experiencer of the fear emotion seeks to avoid this negative force that presses from the outside. Just as Schmalsteig suggested above, avoidance behavior serves as the basis for expressions of fear. The metaphor of avoiding the stimulus of fear becomes embedded in the grammar itself in fear expressions (as will be seen in the following chapter). This avoidance behavior is motivated by the negative reaction one has to the fear stimulus, and this negativity is reflected in the metaphors that accompany fear.

Fear expressions, then, both lexically and metaphorically, are reflective of the bodily state one experiences when undergoing fear, as well as the behavioral reactions one makes in response to a fear stimulus. As this dissertation will show in Chapters III and IV, morphosyntax can also reflect these bodily reactions to fear, particularly in the use of distancing markers. Before beginning the analysis of morphosyntax as it relates to fear, however, let us look at studies that examine emotions from a cognitive and semantic viewpoint. Previous research on morphological markings as they relate to emotional expressions will also be considered in section 5.

#### **4. Semantic and cognitive analyses of emotions with a focus on fear**

There have been several studies centering on the meanings and groupings of emotion words within and across languages. Semantic analyses of fear lexemes might

focus on the comparison of one emotion to another, or of emotion words cross-linguistically, often through the use of various corpora. For example, Johnson-Laird and Oatley (1989) declared five emotions to be basic, namely happiness, sadness, fear, anger, and disgust. They then associated related words (e.g., adjectives related to “fear” such as *timid*, *tense*, *anxious*, *fearful*, *panicky*, and *craven*) into a semantic field of emotional relations in English. They found that a coherent semantic field of emotions built upon these five basic emotions could be assembled for English, and could be further categorized into lexemes that represent basic emotions, emotional relations, caused emotions, causes of emotions, emotional goals, and complex emotions (p. 106).

Studies similar to Johnson-Laird and Oatley’s work (see, for example, de Rivera, 1977; Fehr and Russell, 1984; Mees, 1985; and Frijda, 1986) looked at the connection between emotion, psychology, and cognition, and used language as a window into the categorization of emotions. Although these studies worked with emotional language, they did not necessarily approach the subject from a linguistic perspective.

Corpus studies focused on emotions often revolve around conceptual metaphor theory (see section 3 above). For example, work by Kövecses (e.g., 1990) and Stefanowitsch (2006) seeks to identify the metaphorical expressions that can accompany a specific lexeme like *fear*. Oster (2010) looked specifically at *fear* in a corpus-based analysis, examining the co-occurrence of other lexemes with *fear* and their bearing on five categories: the metaphorical understanding of fear, evidence for metonymic uses, relationships to other emotions, describing the emotion, and evaluating the emotion (pp. 736-737). The metaphor findings were similar to those discussed in section 3 above (e.g., FEAR IS AN ILLNESS, FEAR IS A FORCE, etc.). Results for metonymic uses were

also similar to those in section 3 (e.g., fear lowers body temperature, fear causes sweating, etc.). Looking at semantic subsets that occur with *fear*, Oster found information on the cause of the emotion, which included punishment, physical harm, social consequences, persons/groups, insecurity/violence, natural things, the dangers of the modern world, danger in general, and related sets (p. 753).

In terms of the descriptive results of Oster's semantic evaluation of *fear* in English, important aspects included intensity, form, quality, duration, origin, extension, and others. Turning to evaluative aspects, as expected a negative evaluation was most often present. The emotion was also discussed frequently as being justified or unjustified (p. 754). As a whole, the semantic analysis of *fear* was insightful in many ways, from identifying metaphors and metonymies to relating the emotion to other semantic subsets.

While studies using large corpora are quite useful for quantitative results, studies that are more qualitative in nature can provide a deeper semantic analysis. One well-known example of a semantic analysis of emotion concepts is by Wierzbicka (1999), who goes through several emotions in different languages. According to Wierzbicka (1999, pp. 2-4), the concept of "feelings" could include physical reactions (such as an increased heart rate, etc.). "Emotion," on the other hand, is comprised of both thoughts and bodily states. While languages seem to have a word that corresponds to "feeling," not all have a word similar to "emotion" in English. Wierzbicka stated that feelings, then, are universal while emotions are culturally specific (p. 4). In order to understand these more culturally-bound concepts, universal concepts are used as simpler components that define more complex ones.

Wierzbicka (1999, pp.34-38) used Natural Semantic Metalanguage (NSM) to get around problems of language-specificity. NSM takes universal human concepts (e.g., “good,” “bad,” etc.) and combines them to arrive at a semantic metalanguage that is driven by cross-linguistic, typological analyses of diverse languages, which is then used to describe lexemes. These descriptions could then be used to determine differences and similarities in specific emotions across and within languages. They are also useful for comparing different emotions to one another to determine how they might differ.<sup>5</sup>

In terms of fear emotions, Wierzbicka (1999, p. 49) grouped them under the theme “something bad can/will happen.” Her NSM analysis for *fear* in English is as follows:

*Fear* (X felt fear)

- (a) X felt something because X thought something
- (b) sometimes a person thinks:
- (c) “I don’t know what will happen
- (d) some bad things can happen
- (e) I don’t want these things to happen
- (f) I want to do something because of this if I can
- (g) I don’t know if I can do anything”
- (h) when this person thinks this person feels something bad
- (i) X felt something like this
- (j) because X thought something like this (Wierzbicka 1999, pp. 59-60).

---

<sup>5</sup> Others have used the NSM approach for emotional language. For example, Athanasiadou (1998) looks at fear in Modern Greek, sorting fear lexemes into three groups depending on the knowledge and degree of danger, the time frame of the situation, whether or not the self is affected, and whether or not action takes place as a result.

As can be seen within Wierzbicka's analysis, the concept of fear involves the realization of a possible future negative event (d), its undesirability (e), and its uncontrollability (g). These elements can be related to the grammar used for fear events, as will be seen in Chapter IV. Morphosyntactic marking devices such as mood/modality marking, negative marking, and complex clause structure are used to express these semantic aspects related to the fear emotion in Indo-European complex fear constructions. These markings, as will be shown later, are used to indicate distance within these fear constructions, again relating the grammar of fear to the bodily experience it is derived from.

Breaking down emotions into their semantic components sheds light into differences between these concepts within and across languages. Attempting to look objectively at these concepts can lead to a fuller understanding of the emotions themselves, as well as how they function among other concepts, and within various languages. There have been multiple studies looking at the semantics of emotional expressions, but that is not the case for morphology and syntax as it relates to emotion. The next sections discuss previous research on grammatical markings of fear in Indo-European languages and beyond.

## **5. Morphological and syntactic marking of emotion**

Few studies look specifically at the morphology and syntax of expressions of emotions in languages. Usually emotion or affect expression is one category among many in wider discussions of grammatical elements, such as the choice of mood (see Chapter IV for further discussion of mood). One well-known exception is Ochs' (1986)

discussion of Samoan. She found that emotional states were present in all levels of grammar in Samoan, from phonology to morphology and syntax (p. 253). Ochs noted that Samoans see feelings as reactions, and emotion verbs are accompanied by the preposition *i*, which also serves to highlight the conceptualization that the source of a feeling state comes from outside a person. This concept can be related to the fear metaphors, discussed above, which conceptualize fear as an outside force acting on a person and prompting the avoidance behavior that is mirrored in the grammar.

A few studies have looked at the grammatical constructions used in languages to express emotions. For example, Dirven (1997) looks at the prepositions that occur in emotional expressions in English to examine the conceptualization of emotional causality. The findings suggested that the choice of preposition relates to the conceptualization of emotion being seen as near, in, or around the Experiencer, while the cause of the emotion is spatially situated outside the Experiencer, either as spatial points (*at, from*) or surfaces in mental space (*about, over*). Osmond (1997) also looked at prepositions appearing in emotional expressions, discovering that preposition use in an *adjective/past participle + preposition* phrase (e.g., *terrified of, frightened by*) depended on the construal of the emotional situation.<sup>6</sup> For *terrified by*, the utterance refers to a specific instance of being terrified by something, while *terrified of* reflects a more general feeling towards a subject and is not referring to a particular instance. In a similar vein, Chapter III of this dissertation further discusses spatial relations of morphological markings in case-inflecting languages, linking fear to movement away from the fear stimulus.

---

<sup>6</sup> See also Radden (1998) for another analysis of prepositional collocates of emotion lexemes. This analysis focused on emotional causality and the container metaphor.

Another corpus study focusing on emotion is Bednarek's (2008), which examines emotional expressions in corpora of four different discourse types: conversation, news reporting, fiction, and academic discourse. This analysis focused on quantitative data, looking at the frequency of parts of speech (noun vs. adjective vs. adverb vs. verb), comparative and superlative occurrence, number (singular vs. plural), and verb form. The data showed that emotions are generally non-comparable (not comparative/superlative), non-countable (singular), and stative (verb form), although the frequency of parts of speech did vary according to discourse type. The author relates these discoveries to the conceptualization of emotion by Western and other "individualist" cultures in which the subjectivity of emotional expression is tied to the speaker's identity (pp. 61-2).

Although the connection between emotion and morphology and syntax is relatively unexplored, a handful of research has focused on fear expressions and their particular morphosyntax. The following section explores previous research that relates directly to the grammar of fear.

## **6. The grammar of fear constructions**

Very little work has been done on fear expressions specifically, cross-linguistically or language-internally. When looking for data on fear constructions, language grammars are not always helpful. Grammars may make mention of fear constructions if they contain a marked element, however. For instance, Latin grammars, such as Greenough et al. (1916, p. 365), Hale and Buck (1903, p. 263), and Morwood (1999, pp. 102-3) inform the reader that subordinate clauses following verbs of fearing are in the subjunctive mood, and use *nē* to introduce the subordinate clause in an

affirmative context, and *ut* or *nē nōn* when the subordinate clause is negated. Although a footnote in this grammar discusses the use of this particular mood and particle in fear clauses, no further discussion is given.

Similarly, Ancient Greek grammars like Goodwin (1900, p. 293), Smyth (1920, pp. 500-503), and Morwood (2001, pp. 180-2) talk about the use of the subjunctive mood after primary tenses and after secondary tenses, and the optative mood in complex fear constructions. Like Latin, a marked particle, *mē*, is used to introduce the subordinate clause in Greek. Although a description of the form and (sometimes) function of a fear construction may be given in a grammar, there is generally little or no discussion of the function of the grammatical elements themselves within the fear constructions.

Although the grammars give limited information about fear constructions, a few studies have look at them more closely. For instance, Madariaga (2010) discusses differences in morphosyntactic patterns between similar verbs in Greek and Old Church Slavonic, tying their object marking to their grammatical voice. Exploring psychological verbs that denote separation, including *fear*, she finds through a series of morphosyntactic tests that Greek verbs have an active-middle pattern in which the direct object is in the accusative case, while the OCS constructions have a reflexive passive pattern where the object is marked by the genitive case (see Chapter III for further discussion of this topic).

Madariaga attempts to analyze the marked grammar of fear constructions in these two languages in terms of structural case licensing, tying the development of these constructions to the shift from an intransitive/stative pattern in Proto-Indo-European. She does not, however, appeal to mechanisms outside of the language itself, such as the influence of the body on cognition and expression, when explaining these patterns.

Another comparative study, looking at Polish and English, provides strong quantitative data with qualitative analysis. Dziwirek and Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (2010) examined complement choices of emotional predicates in Polish and English, making use of a cognitive corpus linguistics methodology and searching out instances of grammatical category mismatches. In terms of fear, the authors discovered that, in the Polish corpus, roughly 40% of 1421 occurrences of *bać się* 'to be afraid' were in complex sentences: 275 had *że* 'that' complements, 234 had infinitival complements, 55 had *żeby* 'lest' complements, and 16 had *czy* 'whether' complements. The data led to the conclusion that the four types of complements represent gradually increasing syntactic complexity, which reflects the conceptual complexity of the situation itself. While the most basic emotional expression, *bać się*, expresses the simpler cause-and-effect notion of fear, the more complex expressions blend cognition and volition with the emotional expression in their expression of the desire that something not happen. This blending is reflected in the syntax, which features the subjunctive mood, and negation.

These elements of complex fear constructions can be related to distance. Syntactic complexity parallels conceptual complexity, and the use of marked syntax is a form of distancing which reflects the actual avoidance behavior of a fear reaction, as will be discussed further in Chapter IV.

## **7. Functional change in fear constructions**

Kitis (2009) analyses the Greek verb *fovame*, which means 'fear' or 'be afraid,' focusing on the development of this verb from spatial and emotional situations to constructions expressing propositional attitude, speech acts, and interpersonal functions.

She points out that the Greek *foveo* (Ancient Greek *phobeō*) meaning 'put to flight' or movement away during Homer's time transitioned to an expression of fear with a shift of semantic focus to the Experiencer by the time of the classical period (pp. 421-2). The next shift, present by the time of the New Testament, involved a movement from emotion to cognitive functions, where the fear verb was used to indicate the speaker's attitude towards the proposition of the subordinate clause in complex constructions (p. 422). The final transition was an interpersonal and pragmatic one, in which the fear construction comes to indicate regret. It became a device to express attitude in which the verb worked as a performative the speaker used to indicate the type of utterance being given (e.g. a rejection, etc.) depending on the context (p. 432).

Looking outside of the Indo-European language family but following a similar track as Kitis (2009), Lichtenberk (1995) discussed certain complementizers that occur in some Austronesian languages. To'aba'ita has *ada*, which signals the speaker's uncertainty about whether proposition is factual and therefore acts as an epistemic downtoner (p. 294). Not only does *ada* signal uncertainty, but it also denotes the undesirability of the situation. This combined function Lichtenberk terms "apprehensional-epistemic modality," and notes that this complementizer is found following fear verbs (p. 296). Lichtenberk further discusses apprehensional epistemic markers in other Australian languages, such as Diyari, which has a verbal suffix *-yaṯi*, and Marthuthunira, which varies case marking (accusative vs. locative/Ø) depending on whether there is "a causal link between the absence of a precautionary situation and an apprehension-causing situation" (p. 308).

Indo-European languages also make use of marked complementizers in fear constructions, as will be discussed in detail in Chapter IV. These complementizers, with their negative connection and specialized functions, serve as another method of indicating distance and paralleling fear bodily behavior. The cross-language comparison presented in this dissertation lends support to the theory that fear expressions are rooted in bodily reactions and perceptions that are common to humans across the world.

The development of specialized functions for fear constructions is the focus of Jing-Schmidt and Kapatsinski's (2012) analysis of fear constructions in English (*I fear, I am afraid, I'm afraid*), Mandarin (*kongpa*), and Russian (*bojus'*).<sup>7</sup> The authors consulted corpora, employing colostruational analyses to determine that the “apprehensive,” as they call these fear constructions, attract high-certainty propositions. The pragmatic function of this construction type is related to stance marking, as the speaker knows the unfortunate event being feared is likely to take place. The function becomes to prepare the addressee for bad news. Just as the fear Experiencer seeks to avoid the fear stimulus, a speaker seeks to avoid a negative reaction from the addressee when communicating bad news. “Cognitive appraisal of threat can be directly transferred from the psychological domain into the social domain of face-to-face interaction” (p. 370).

---

<sup>7</sup> There are a few studies that look at the development of pragmatic function in fear constructions. For instance, Leech (1983) stated that the use of a fear construction signals to the addressee that unwelcome news is coming. For *kongpa* in Mandarin, Hui (2009) tracked the shift in the function of the fear verb from a primarily psychological verb to a modal adverb with pragmatic functions. Yap et al. (2012) showed that fear verbs in Mandarin, Cantonese, and Malay undergo phonological reduction and syntactic repositioning to become epistemic markers similar to English's *probably*, and Yang and Yap (2015) showed the *kongpa* can appear in neutral or positive constructions, such as self-praise. Because an analysis of the pragmatic developments of fear constructions is not the focus of this dissertation, a complete review of all related literature is not presented here.

## **8. Goals of this study**

While previous studies on fear constructions have hinted at the relationship between fear conceptualization and the avoidance reaction that fear evokes, none has attempted to connect this relationship to the grammar itself.

The morphosyntax of fear constructions is rooted in the extension of metaphorical conceptualizations of the fear experience. This analysis, while limited to Indo-European languages, is comprehensive in its examination of the grammar of fear constructions. It looks at several languages and language families, examines both simple and complex fear constructions, and looks at historical change in the development of fear constructions from related constructions as well as the development of new functions for fear constructions.

CHAPTER III  
THE MORPHOSYNTAX OF SIMPLE FEAR CONSTRUCTIONS

**1. Introduction**

Parts of this work were published in volume 1 of the journal *Indo-European Linguistics* in May 2013 by the author.

This chapter discusses morphosyntactic elements found in expressions of fear in certain Indo-European (IE) languages. Specifically, it will investigate the morphosyntactic marking patterns of FCs in Latin, Greek, Sanskrit, and in certain Germanic, Romance, and Baltic and Slavic languages. By 'patterns' I mean the morphological case marking that is required or selected for the complements of fear verbs in IE languages. As this chapter will show, the morphosyntactic constructions of fear in IE languages are often built upon the extension of spatial avoidance behavior into the conceptual domain of emotional expression.

Abstract thinking is often based on more concrete bodily states, as was discussed in Chapter II when considering fear etymologies and the conceptual metaphors present within fear expressions. In terms of morphosyntax, the concrete domain of spatial movement can be extended to the more abstract state of emotional expression. This chapter will illustrate this extension of spatial domains into emotional states, centering on the use of case marking within simple FCs and the conceptualization that accompanies that marking. Movement through space is extended to the abstract domain of emotional experience, with the concept of movement away from Source paralleling avoidance behavior, which is the common reaction to fear.

The natural behavior associated with fear is flight, which is the automatic distancing of the Experiencer from the negative stimulus. This bodily behavior can be reflected in morphological genitive or ablative case marking. As will be discussed in Chapter IV, case marking is not the only element in FCs that relates to spatial and conceptual distance. The use of irrealis mood marking, negation, and other irrealis particles can also be connected to distance and therefore avoidance behavior, but in simple FCs, the marking is limited to case inflections.

Morphological case marking can serve to relate the semantic roles within an utterance as well as syntactic roles. As different case markings are related to different semantic roles, basic level meanings for each marking can be proposed for a given IE language with case inflections (see, for example, Jakobson, 1936/1984 for Russian). IE languages generally use one of three case markings on the NP that represents the complement of fear in simple FCs: the genitive, ablative, and accusative.<sup>8</sup> This chapter focuses on FCs with genitive or and ablative marking of the object NP. As this would be considered 'non-canonical' object marking from a grammatical relations perspective, the motivation for the use of such marking is worth exploring.

The term "morphosyntactic case marking" is being used here to mean morphological case markings. Some IE languages, including English, for example, have lost their morphological case inflections, and hence are not part of the discussion here. These languages without case markings are not discussed here. Examples (17) through (19) below are simple (i.e., not syntactically complex) FCs:

---

<sup>8</sup> When referring to the complement of a fear verb, the term "object" could be used. However, it would not have its usual syntactic meaning when the complement does not take the accusative case. In this sense, the "object" would signify the NP that has the semantic role of Source of fear.

(17) Latin FC with accusative-marked object:

*nimum timemus mortem et exsilium et*

too.much fear-1PL.PRS death-ACC and exile-ACC and

*paupertatem*

poverty-ACC

'We fear death and exile and poverty too much' (Cic. *Brut.* 1.17)

(18) Lithuanian FC with genitive-marked object:

*Vaikai dažnai bijo tamsos*

children.NOM often fear.3PL.PRS darkness-GEN

'Children are often afraid of the dark' (Madariaga, 2010, p. 173, quoting Savčenko 2003)

(19) Sanskrit FC with ablative-marked object:

*Viśvam bibhāya bhūvaban mahāvadhāt*

whole.NOM fear-3SG.PRS world.NOM the.mighty.weapon-ABL

'The whole world is afraid of the mighty weapon.' (Madariaga, 2010, p. 173, quoting Savčenko 2003)

The Latin example (17) represents the treatment of the object NP that represents the Source of fear as a regular direct object NP through "canonical" accusative marking.

The sections that follow will show how non-canonical genitive or ablative case marking of the object of the fear verb (as in (18) and (19)) serves to express the notion of spatial movement away from Source (i.e., the Source of fear), and that this spatial marking metaphorizes the avoidance reaction that fear provokes.

### *1.1. Organization of chapter*

The focus of this chapter is the connection between behavior motivated by fear in the form of spatial movement and its reflection in morphosyntax. It will be shown that the selection in some IE languages of non-canonical case markings for the objects of fear verbs is based on the core meaning of the case marking. The core meanings of the genitive case marker (section 2) and the ablative case marker (section 3) involve limitation and separation between the subject of the verb and the object, which mirror the desired physical separation of the Experiencer from the fear stimulus. Both the genitive and the ablative case mark for distance or separation from a Source. Section 4 focuses briefly on the accusative case marking of objects of fear verbs. The conclusion is presented in section 5.

## **2. The genitive**

The following subsections detail the meaning and function of the genitive case marker in some case-inflected IE languages, with particular emphasis on genitive object marking in simple FCs.

## 2.1. Genitive case meaning

Certain IE languages that have retained a morphological case marking system have genitive objects in fear constructions. Baltic and Slavic languages generally require the genitive marking of the objects of fear verbs. In Sanskrit and Ancient Greek FC's prepositions that require the genitive are used with the fear verb.<sup>9</sup>

The varied uses of genitive case marking usually prompt a list of frequent functions in language grammars. In terms of its occurrence with fear verbs, the genitive might be categorized as an aspect of the partitive use, as the genitive of Source, the genitive of origin, or the genitive of cause, depending on the individual language's reference grammar. Some scholars, most notably Jakobson (1936/1984) for Russian, however, have argued for a general meaning of morphological case marking that covers all functions of each case. Jakobson condensed the different functions of the Russian genitive case marking into a single basic meaning of limitation. The entity marked by the genitive is limited in its involvement in the events being discussed, and thus the genitive inflection is used to indicate "the limit of the referent's involvement in the content of the utterance ... The G[enitive] in itself indicates only that the scope of its referent's involvement in the content of the utterance is less than the referent's entire extension ...

---

<sup>9</sup> In Sanskrit, both the genitive and ablative case marking can be found on objects after verbs of fearing. In Ancient Greek, the genitive case marking (thought to be inherited from PIE; see Madariaga (2010), for example), was replaced by accusative marking in the earliest examples. However, the use of certain prepositions related to separation can still prompt the use of genitive marking in Greek. In many Baltic and Slavic languages, the genitive is preferred, but can be replaced by the accusative in substandard colloquial speech (examples here from Russian, Madariaga, 2010, p. 175-6):

*Ja bojus' teti*  
I fear-REFL aunt-GEN  
'I am afraid of my aunt.'

*Ja bojus' tetju*  
I fear-REFL aunt-ACC  
'I am afraid of my aunt.'

The referent of the G[enitive] can be either partially or negatively represented in the sentence" (p. 72).

Jakobson considered limitation to be central to the meaning of the genitive case in Russian, and Watkins (1967) have extended this core meaning to IE genitives in general. Watkins suggested that the genitive form can be reconstructed for Proto-Indo-European (PIE) with Jakobson's basic meaning for Russian, in that it the PIE genitive case relates to the extent to which the entity takes part in the message, "implying that the extent is not total" (p. 2195). Janda and Clancy's (2002) definition of the genitive in Russian also adopts Jakobson's concept of limitation, referring to it as reference-point status: "The genitive is a backgrounded item that yields focus of attention to something else which exists or maneuvers in its proximity" (p. 110). Thus the concept of limitation becomes one of limited attention in the conceptualization of the utterance.<sup>10</sup>

The core meaning of the genitive case marking as limited involvement is present in all instantiations of genitive constructions in actual discourse, according to Jakobson's (1958/1984, p. 107) concept of relational invariance. This concept allows for an abstract meaning *and* its varying subsets of meanings that are found in individual constructions. Following this line of thinking, the core meaning of genitive case marking encompasses domains which retain the invariant or prototypical meaning of limitation, but which have narrower specified variant meanings. In terms of FCs in IE languages, the relevant function of the abstract domain of limitation is the representation of Source. The Source is the stimulus of the fear emotion, and the Experiencer of that emotion seeks to put

---

<sup>10</sup> Janda and Clancy's (2002) reference-point function of the genitive parallels Langacker's (1993) proposal that possessive constructions (which are a type of genitive construction in Russian) are a type of reference-point construction. In a possessive construction, one entity (the possessor) acts as a reference point for establishing contact with the other entity (the possessed) (p. 8). Langacker's reference point for possession is the possessor on whom the attentional focus in the utterance is limited.

distance between him/herself and that stimulus. Thus, the grammar reflects the limitation of interaction between the Experiencer and the Source.

The genitive case has been tied to the concept of Source in grammars and dictionaries as well (see, for example, Smyth, 1920, pp. 331-332 for Ancient Greek; also Evans and Evans, 1957, p. 199 for English), in the sense of where something comes from, e.g. “wine from the casks” (Smyth, 1920, p. 331) or “hen’s eggs,” meaning eggs coming from the hen (Bergen and Evans, 1957, p. 199). The genitive marker is also required by certain prepositions in individual IE languages that denote Source, and some of these prepositions are used in FCs:

(20) Ancient Greek with Source-denoting preposition *apó*

*tò            apò   Xérxeō   deimainontes*

DEM.N/A **from** X-GEN fear-PART.PRS.NOM

‘fearing Xerxes’ reaction’ (Luraghi 2003, p. 125, from Herodotus 6.51)

(21) Ancient Greek with Source-denoting preposition *eks*

*Didakson, ei didaktón,   eks   hótou   phobēi*

explain   if explainable **from** what.GEN fear

‘Explain, if you can, what you are afraid of’ (Madariaga, 2010, p. 150, from Sophocles, *Trachiniae* 671)

(22) Old Church Slavonic with Source-denoting preposition *otъ*

*Nъ ne boi sę otъ mǫkъ*

but NEG fear REFL.ACC **from** tortures-GEN

‘But do not be afraid of suffering’ (Madariaga, 2010, p. 150, from *Codex Suprasliensis* 8b:7)

The genitive case occurs with spatial prepositions in several IE languages. For example, in the Slavic languages genitive marking is required on NPs governed by prepositions that are tied to the notion of Source. In Polish, for example *od* ‘from, away from,’ *spośród* ‘from among, out of,’ and *z* ‘out of, from, down from, off’ require genitive marking (Swan, 2002, p. 341). Similarly, in the modern Baltic Source-related prepositions require genitive marking of the NPs they govern: e.g., Latvian *no* ‘from, out of’ (Mathiassen, 1997, p. 185), Lithuanian *iš* ‘out of’, *nuo* ‘from’ (Mathiassen, 1996, p. 200).

In simple FCs, the Source is the fear stimulus, i.e., that which is feared. Hence the fear is coming *from* or *out of* the Source of the fear. Moreover, the Experiencer seeks to limit interaction or contact with the fear stimulus, altogether if possible. Thus the fear stimulus does not or may not take part in the fear event to its full extent, according to Watkins (1967, p. 2195). The next section will outline the functions of the genitive case in Proto-Indo-European and its descendent languages.

## 2.2. *The PIE genitive and ablative and their reflexes in descendent languages*

Eight cases have been proposed for PIE: nominative, vocative, accusative, genitive, ablative, dative, locative, and instrumental (See, for example, Beekes, 1995, p. 173; Meier-Brügger, 2003, p. 264-273; Forston, 2004, p. 102, Mallory and Adams, 2006, p. 56).<sup>11</sup> As noted in subsection 2.1 above, Jakobson's characterization of the general meaning of the genitive case marking in Russian, that of limitation, has been extended to other IE languages, including PIE itself (Watkins, 1967, p. 2191-2198; Lehmann, 1974, p. 193). However, although genitive case markers are found in some daughter IE languages, the other oblique cases, namely the ablative, dative, locative, and instrumental, are not often all present at the same time in those languages.<sup>12</sup> Instead, case syncretism has often taken place, in which one case marker absorbs the functions of another.

For example, while Latin has both the genitive and the ablative case inflections, like PIE, Greek has only the genitive, which took on the functions of the PIE ablative in addition to its original genitive meaning. For certain types of case syncretism to happen, the case markings which combine must be related semantically or functionally to motivate their combination (Baerman, 2009, p. 219). In the case of the IE genitive and ablative, certain commonalities existed which prompted their merger in some languages.

In the reconstructed PIE case paradigms, most singular nouns, with the exception of the *o*-stems, used the same form for both the genitive and the ablative (see Shields,

---

<sup>11</sup> A possible allative case has been suggested as well (see Forston, 2004, p. 102), but most authors list only eight cases.

<sup>12</sup> Although it is also common for dative case marking to remain, with the genitive meanings being subsumed under the dative (for example, the dative of possession), as in Bulgarian, Macedonian, and Modern Greek.

1982, p. 34-36). In fact, it is commonly believed that a partial case syncretism between the genitive and the ablative cases took place in PIE itself, and that the remnants of these paradigms can be seen in Sanskrit, Old Avestan, and Old Persian (see, for example, Wackernagel, 2009, p. 390 and Beekes, 1995, p. 91).

In Baltic and Slavic languages, as reflected in Old Church Slavonic and modern Lithuanian, the functions of the ablative were subsumed under the genitive marker, and ablative case marking was lost. A similar collapse of functions occurred in Ancient Greek.<sup>13</sup> However, particular uses of the Ancient Greek genitive are often referred to as "ablatival genitives" (Smyth, 1920, p. 328 for Greek; see Schwyzler, 1950, pp. 90-101, who provides a comprehensive list of the ablative functions of the Greek genitive, *inter alios*). The ablatival genitive includes the genitive-marked objects of certain emotion verbs, which represent the Source of the emotion. Grammars such as Smyth's (1920, pp. 328-332) for Greek group many of the verbs that occur with an ablatival genitive complement under headings such as "Genitive of Separation," "Genitive of Cause," and "Genitive of Source." Genitives of this kind also include the objects of transitive verbs that signify ceasing, releasing, removing, restraining, giving up, failing, being distant from, depriving, lacking, wanting, and emptying (pp. 328-330).<sup>14</sup> These verbs parallel verbs in Baltic and Slavic languages that require a genitive-marked complement (see section 2.4).

The ablatival genitive categorization indicates not only that the genitive and ablative cases overlapped semantically in some IE languages, but also that their meanings

---

<sup>13</sup> I wish to make clear here that I am talking about a syncretism in terms of function, and not case forms.

<sup>14</sup> Ablatival genitives in Greek also include some emotion words like "to wonder at, admire, envy, praise, blame, hate, pity, grieve for, be angry at, take vengeance on, and the like" (Smyth, 1920, p. 330).

reflected bodily and emotional experience in perception and spatial distance. The genitives of separation, source, origin, and cause all involve the perception of distance, physical or conceptual, between the Experiencer and the Source that is represented by the complement. The "separation" verbs involve acknowledging the distance between the Experiencer and the complement, perhaps in stopping an action and therefore moving "away" from the Source in a conceptual sense, or in no longer or perhaps never having the complement, in the sense of deprivation verbs.

### *2.3. Genitive case marking in FCs*

As the sections above have claimed, the basic meaning of the genitive involves the limitation of the genitive-marked argument in the event. This limitation in terms of a fear event relates to the desire of the fear Experiencer to limit his/her exposure to the fear object. As noted in subsection 2.1 above, this limitation takes the form of distance, the distance the Experiencer wants to put between him/herself and the fear stimulus. The genitive case marking in FCs also marks this fear stimulus or Source of the fear emotion. The use of the genitive case indicates the desire to move away from the Source, which actually happens during physical avoidance behavior or flight in the wake of a fear response.

Examples of genitive case marking in FCs are given below. Language families in which languages may mark the FC object with genitive marking include Indic, Germanic, Baltic and Slavic.

(23) Sanskrit (Indic)

*yeṣām bibhyati devāḥ*

who.GEN afraid-3PL.PRS god-PL.NOM

"‘of whom the gods are afraid’ (Meenakshi, 1991, p. 151)

(24) Anglo-Saxon (Germanic)

*ondrêd he þæs*

fear-3SG.PST he.NOM that.GEN

'He feared that' (John, xix, 8, in March, 1883, p. 155)

(25) Latvian (Baltic)

*Uldi, man tā vēja bail...*

Uldis-VOC 1SG.DAT DEM.MASC.SG.GEN WIND-SG.GEN afraid

'Uldis, I'm afraid of that wind...' (Rainis, 1980, p. 440, in Berg-Olsen, 2004, p. 139)

(26) Lithuanian (Baltic)

*bijo tamsõs*

fear-1SG.PRS darkness-F.SG.GEN

'I'm afraid of the dark' (modified from Ambrazas, 1997, p. 560)

(27) Russian (East Slavic)

*Ja bojus' sobak*

1SG.NOM fear-1SG.REFL.PRS dog-**GEN.PL**

'I'm afraid of dogs' (C. Vakareliyska, personal communication, January 10, 2016)

(28) Belarusian (East Slavic)

*Rasliny bajacca marozu*

plant-PL.NOM fear-3PL.REFL.PRS frost-**GEN**

'Plants fear the frost' (Marchant, 2004, p. 79)

(29) Ukrainian (East Slavic)

*Dítý boyat'sja litaká*

Children-PL.NOM fear-3PL.REFL.PRS airplane-SG.**GEN**

'The children fear the airplane' (Franko, 2012, p. 156)

(30) Slovak (West Slavic)

*Jana sa bojí psa*

Jane-F.NOM REFL fear-1SG.PRS dog-M.**GEN**

'Jane is afraid of a dog' (Ružička, 1994, p. 90)

(31) Sorbian (West Slavic)

*bojeć so chorosće*

fear-INF REFL sickness-F.**GEN**

‘to fear (a) sickness’ (Schuster-Šewc, 1996, p. 66)

(32) Czech (West Slavic)

*Bál se trestu*

fear-3SG.PST REFL punishment-M.**GEN**

‘He was afraid of punishment’ (Naughton, 2005, p. 197)

(33) Polish (West Slavic)

*Zabijaki bały się jej*

Rabble-rousers-NOM.PL fear-3PL-PST REFL her.**GEN**

‘Rabble-rousers feared her’ (Swan, 2002, p. 328)

(34) Slovene (South Slavic)

*bojím nikógar*

fear-1SG.PRS nobody.**GEN**

I fear nobody’ (Herrity, 2000, p. 329)

(35) Bosnian-Croatian-Serbian (South Slavic)

*Da li se zaista bojiš grmljavine?*

Q.PRT Q.PRT REFL really fear-2SG.PRS thunder-GEN

‘Do you really fear thunder?’ (Alexander, 2006, p. 125)<sup>15</sup>

In the Baltic and Slavic languages, genitive case marking is also used on NPs that are objects of negated verbs. The following section discusses the genitive of negation in these languages and draws a parallel between negation and the semantics of separation and avoidance verbs, including fear verbs.

#### 2.4. *Genitive of negation*

The use of the genitive with verbs of fearing and avoidance in Baltic and Slavic languages is an old construction, attested in Old Church Slavonic (OCS). As the examples below will show, the semantics of fear and avoidance verbs lend themselves to a negative categorization, despite the fact that the verbs themselves are not actually negated.

Moreover, the verb category under which the subset of fear verbs falls, generally denotes not only limitation, but also, more specifically, the conceptualization of distance on the part of the speaker. However, there are two senses of distance with emotion verbs. As seen in languages that make use of genitive case marking on objects of what is known

---

<sup>15</sup> In all Slavic languages except Slovene, the verb 'fear' takes a reflexive clitic or affix. These reflexive markings prohibit the object of the verb taking accusative case marking, meaning some other case marking must be substituted for it. Nonetheless, it is the genitive case that is selected, not the dative or instrumental, because of the genitive case's meaning and its function of indicating movement away from Source in FCs. Even in languages where there is no reflexive marking, such as in Slovene and the Baltic languages, the fear Source is nevertheless marked with the genitive as well.

as "intensional verbs," (subsection 2.2 above), a similar subset of verbs occur with this marking, including those meaning 'seek,' 'search for,' 'await,' 'demand,' 'want,' 'reach,' 'achieve,' and 'acquire,' but also those meaning 'be ashamed of,' 'mind,' and 'avoid.' As mentioned above in section 2.2, these verbs are similar to those that require the "ablative genitive" in Ancient Greek.

Timberlake (2004) made a distinction among the semantics of each type of these genitive-marked verbs for Russian, stating that the genitive object is one that is only potentially affected, and the contact between subject and object is only potential and not actual (p. 316-19). Thus, although the same case marking can be used for both subsets of verbs, and though limitation, the core meaning of the genitive, still applies to both types, the distance implied between the subjects of the two types of verbs and their complements is the result of a difference in conceptualization (p. 317). For each of these verbs that take genitive case marking, the concept of distance is present. This distance is modal (irrealis) in nature, in that the interaction has not yet taken place and may not at all. That is, the anticipated or feared interaction between the subject and the object is possible, but not yet actual. For avoidance verbs, including fear, the distance between the Experiencer and Source is one that is desired, while for the other subset of verbs, the distance indicates the potential of contact that has not yet occurred, but could possibly be welcomed.

As Jakobson (1936/1984, p. 72) indicates for Russian, the genitive referent is either partially or negatively represented, and much of the literature discussing the genitive in several Baltic and Slavic languages revolves around this negative representation, often referred to as the genitive of negation. Scholars have developed

many semantic and syntactic theories to account for this behavior, attributing the use of the genitive of negation to the individuation of the participant (Timberlake, 1975), the scope of negation (Babby, 2006), perspective structure, i.e., whether the event is framed from the perspective of the object or the location (Partee & Borschev, 2004), irrealis (Neidle, 1988), or "the absence of commitment to existence" (Kagan, 2010, p. 21).

These interpretations of the function of the genitive of negation are all enfolded within Jakobson's general meaning of limitation. Negation with a lack of individuation necessarily entails a limitation on the object's involvement in a negative sentence. Furthermore, the concept of limitation applies to existential statements, as the absence of existence (whether of the thing itself or its existence at a location) means limited involvement to the point of no involvement at all. Jakobson's general meaning of the genitive as limiting a referent's involvement in the event is clearly applicable to fear verbs, as the limitation is sought by the Experiencers themselves in their desire to avoid the possible negative event. Thus, in OCS, as in Baltic and the other Slavic languages, fear verbs and other avoidance verbs carry the implication of a desired or hoped-for movement away from the possible negative stimulus that is represented by the genitive complement, such that the instantiation of the conceptual distance between the Experiencer and the fear Source mirrors the physical distance sought in the fear response.

In Lunt's grammar of OCS (2001, p. 145), he notes that the verb *bojati se* 'be afraid of' takes a genitive object, as do verbs such as *lišiti* 'deprive,' *stradati* 'suffer loss of,' *sramljajotъ se* and *postyděti se* 'be ashamed of' and *běžati* and *běgajotъ* 'flee from.' These verbs, and their equivalents in the modern Slavic languages, take their

complements in the genitive although they are not negated in actuality, because their meanings involve desired separation from or avoidance of the object.

Not only are these verbs semantically negative, but fear and flight verbs in particular also include the notion of the desire to prevent the actual event. Both Baltic and Slavic languages have the genitive of negation, and in general the genitive is used for verbs of striving and avoidance. As in Slavic, Lithuanian verbs with meanings such as 'long for,' 'wait for,' 'wish for,' 'want,' 'hope for,' and 'yearn for' all take a genitive complement (Mathiassen, 1996, p. 184). While these verbs have the notion of positive expectation, verbs with the opposite notion also take the genitive. These verbs include *bijóti* (non-reflexive), *baidýtis* (reflexive) 'be afraid,' *išsigāsti* 'be frightened,' *gėdytis* (reflexive) 'be ashamed about,' *sáugotis* (reflexive) 'mind,' and *šālintis* (reflexive), *vėngti* (non-reflexive) 'avoid,' *ieškóti* (non-reflexive) 'look for,' *láukti* (non-reflexive) 'wait for,' *ilgėtis* (reflexive) 'long for,' and others.

The semantics of all of these verbs contain the notion of not yet achieving or confronting the object of the clause. While some of these verbs have a positive sense of expectation (e.g., *viltis* [reflexive] 'hope for'), others, such as "be afraid" or "avoid", anticipate an object that the Experiencer views negatively and seeks distance from.

Latvian behaves similarly, with *alkt* 'crave,' *kārot* 'desire,' *gaidīt* 'wait for,' *meklēt* 'search for,' *vajadzēt* 'need,' *vairīties* (reflexive) 'avoid, evade,' and, of course, *baidīties* (reflexive) 'fear,' take genitive marking (Nau, 1998, p. 24). The semantics of these verbs again imply the lack or possible nonexistence of something, as well as the desired separation from something, and thus they fall under the wide semantic category of limitation.

What these Baltic verbs have in common is the notion of distance, marking the Experiencer as spatially distant from the Source of the emotion. This spatial distance may not be actual physical distance or separation but the genitive case marking's function of indicating spatial distance can be extended to indicate conceptual distance, or a desired separation from the Source of fear. As in Slavic languages, this subset of verbs shares a single case marking, but with different narrower meanings. Whether the Experiencer desires to move towards or away from the stimulus of his desire, there is an implied distance between the Source and the Experiencer. For verbs of fearing, the Experiencer seeks to limit interaction with the fear stimulus, so that perhaps no part of the object feared is experienced.

The genitive of negation, by its reference to an interaction that is limited in that the genitive object is either partially or negatively represented, is connected to the irrealis mood, as will be discussed in more depth in Chapter IV.

The core meaning of the genitive is very similar to that of the ablative in terms of conceptualization; therefore, both the genitive and the ablative can be construed to have similar conceptualizations in terms of the response to fear, namely movement away from the fear stimulus. The following section discusses use of ablative marking on objects of fear verbs in some IE languages.

### **3. The ablative**

As shown in section 2 above, the spatial concept of movement away from Source can be marked by genitive marking on the direct object in FCs in some IE languages. As this section will show, ablative case marking can serve a similar function in FCs. The

ablative is a case whose basic meaning aligns well with the genitive, as case syncretism in IE languages indicates. The following subsections detail the meaning and function of the ablative case, in general and in FCs, as well as providing examples of FCs with genitive case marking.

### *3.1. Ablative case meaning*

The semantic relationship between the ablative and genitive cases seems to hinge on spatial conceptualization, of which FCs reflect one instantiation. Both the ablative and the genitive indicate the limitation of the Source in its involvement with the fear Experiencer. The concept of limitation is inherent in this conceptual distance, as the speaker attempts to limit his or her interaction with the Source and to separate him/herself from the fear stimulus (physically and conceptually).

The ablative shares many similarities with the genitive, and, as noted above in section 2.2, shared semantics between the two likely led to functional syncretism in some IE languages, such as Ancient Greek and the Baltic and Slavic languages, where some functions of the ablative were taken on by the genitive. However, other IE languages, such as Sanskrit and Latin, retained both the ablative and the genitive as separate case markings. While the genitive was frequently used to indicate possession, the ablative indicated movement away spatially (see, for example, Oberlies, 2003, p. 333 for Sanskrit, and Roby, 1875, p. 108 for Latin). Like the genitive, the ablative has an associated list of functions such as the ablative of origin, privation, and want, the ablative of Source, the ablative of cause, and the ablative of separation (examples here are given from Latin; see

Greenough et al., 1916). The Latin preposition indicating Source, *ā/ab* or ‘from,’ takes the ablative case (Morwood, 1999, p. 14).

Once again, with movement away from Source, limitation is present in not only the backgrounding of the ablative-marked referent in terms of the other argument of the utterance, but in the limiting of the referent's interaction. Movement away from Source in terms of emotional verbs such as 'fear' mimics the bodily reaction of flight and the desire to put distance between the Experiencer and the Source of the fear emotion.

### *3.2. The PIE ablative and its relationship to the genitive*

PIE had both the ablative and the genitive case markings, according to current reconstructions, with the ablative generally indicating spatial relations, such as the point of departure (Tichy, 2006, p. 67) or the place of origin (Meier-Brugger, 2003, p. 270), and the genitive expressing a relationship (Lehmann, 1974, p. 48; Voyles and Barrack, 2009, p. 17). As Voyles and Barrack (2009) stated, the main function of the genitive is to express "an open relationship" which "is left to the imagination of the speaker and hearer" (p. 17). This relationship could be one of possession, composition, or part-whole relations (Serbat, 1981, p. 288). As Nikiforidou (1991, pp. 173-175) pointed out for Greek, the partitive meaning of the genitive can be connected to the ablative through the metaphor WHOLES ARE ORIGINS.

The role of the genitive is to mark relationships, or “dependencies” (Luraghi, 1987, pp. 362-3). In events such as fear situations, the event would depend on the relationship between the two parties, or the Experiencer and the fear stimulus. Whether the Experiencer undergoes the emotion depends on the fear stimulus’s status as the

Source of that emotion. Luraghi (1987, p. 363) pointed out, the Source or starting point of an event can correspond to the Source of motion, which is metaphorically extended, then, to mean the cause of the event. The ablative marks spatial movement from Source and cause, just as the genitive can.

Therefore, these case markings had overlapping semantics due to the underlying conceptualization of each. The genitive is tied to limitation, but this characterization can also be extended to the ablative as both limit the interaction of the referent, often spatially.<sup>16</sup>

### 3.3. Ablative case marking in FCs

In some IE languages that have retained a morphological case system, including Sanskrit, Old Persian, Hittite, and Armenian, ablative marking is used on the object of fear verbs.

Some modern IE languages, including Hindi/Urdu, Pashto, Bengali, and Punjabi, also mark the object of fear verbs with an ablative marker, but it is not the traditional morphological affix attached to the noun. Instead, these languages make use of pre- or postpositions in their “ablative” case markings. Just as English uses a type of prepositional genitive marking for objects following the verb *afraid* (e.g., *She is afraid of spiders*), these languages make use of pre- or postpositions with ablatival meaning, generally “from” (see, for example, David, 2013 for Pashto; Yates, 1849 and

---

<sup>16</sup> This explains the merger of ablative functions into the genitive case in Slavic and Ancient Greek.

Gangopadhyay, 1990 for Bengali).<sup>17</sup> However, as these constructions do not fit the type of ablative marking discussed here, examples have not been included in this section.

Ablative case marking in Sanskrit generally indicates the Source or starting-point of an event (MacDonnell, 1927, p. 190), or movement away from the ablative-marked NP (Oberlies, 2003, p. 333). Spatial prepositions that occur with the ablative include *ádhi* and *pári*, which both have the meaning “from.” With verbs of fearing in Sanskrit, the ablative is used to mark the fear stimulus (Whitney, 1889, pp. 86-7).

(36) Sanskrit Ablative

*na bhetyam ca nahyāt*

NEG fear-2SG.PRS.OPT PART Nahuṣa-**ABL**

‘Do not be afraid of Nahuṣa’ (Meenakshi, 1983, p. 91)

(37) Sanskrit Ablative

*na bibhemi surāsurāt*

NEG fear-1SG.PRS god+asura-**ABL**

‘I do not fear the gods or asuras’ (Meenakshi, 1983, p. 91)

However, as seen above in section 2.3, genitive case marking could also occur with the same fear verb, *bhī-*:

---

<sup>17</sup> The English preposition *of* originally had Ablative meaning as well (*of < off*) although the sense of ‘away’ or ‘away from’ is now obsolete. As discussed in section 2.1, in Baltic and Slavic languages the preposition meaning ‘off’ triggers genitive case marking. English *of* over time has become associated with the genitive as well.

(38) Sanskrit Genitive

*bibhīmas tava*

be-afraid.1PL 2SG.GEN

‘we are afraid of thee’ (Whitney, 1889, p. 100)

(39) Sanskrit Genitive

*tasyā jātāyāḥ sarvam abibhet*

DEM.F.SG.GEN birth-SG.ABL everything.SG.NOM be-afraid.3SG.AOR

‘everything was afraid of her at her birth’ (Whitney, 1889, p. 97)

The genitive case marking with fear verbs in Sanskrit is considered to be an “ablative genitive” (see, for example, Meenakshi, 1991, p. 151), and other ablative genitive marking occurs with verbs of hearing and learning from, suspecting, release or escape from, and motion from in general. Because the genitive and ablative singular share the same form in most declensions, this use of either ablative or genitive case marking after the same verbs could be due not only to a similarity of function, but of form (Oberlies, 2003, p. 338).

In Old Persian, the ablative marking is required by the preposition *hacā* ‘from, out of,’ which has obvious spatial meaning (Slocum and Harvey, 2003-2004). This ‘movement away’ meaning is also present with the ablative-marked objects of fear verbs, where the marking functions to indicate movement away from the Source of fear. As Tolman (1892, p. 39) pointed out, the notion of movement away is related to the bodily response of fear, or “recoil from a dread object.”

(40) Old Persian

*pasāva hačā=ma atarsa Ūvjiyā*

thereupon **from**=me be.afraid-3PL.IMPF Elamites

‘thereupon the Elamites were afraid of me’ (Hewson and Bubenik, 2006, p. 134)

The ablative in Armenian generally marks a starting point for the action, either in terms of spatial movement, or in terms of the cause of an event. For the ablative case in general, it is likely that the more abstract (cause) meaning is an extension of the spatial meaning, as a literal spatial starting point came to indicate the starting point of an event. Several Armenian spatial postpositions assign the ablative case, including *durs* ‘out,’ *zat* ‘except, free from,’ and *sksac* ‘starting from.’ Verbs of fearing, including *vaxenal* ‘to be afraid of,’ and *erknč’el* ‘to fear,’ take an ablative object in Armenian (Dum-Tragut, 2009, p. 99).

While some IE languages use genitive and/or ablative marking on objects in FCs to indicate a movement away from Source, others mark FC objects with the accusative. The following section briefly discusses the motivation for such differences in markings.

#### 4. Accusative case marking in FCs

Although some IE languages mark the object of an FC with either the genitive or the ablative, others can use only the accusative case marking in FCs. Both the genitive and the ablative are oblique cases, i.e., they do not usually directly mark the main

participants (i.e., subject and object) of the utterance. The accusative case is often referred to as the object case because it is the default case marking used to mark the object in a clause. The accusative is generally associated with direct object<sup>18</sup> status in most grammars (see, for example, for Latin Greenough et al., 1916, pp. 247-248).

The basic meaning associated with accusative case marking entails the direct affectedness of the object in an event. One such definition would be found in Kittilä and Malchukov (2009, p. 549): “The core function of the accusative case is to encode the affected participant in a transitive clause.” Jakobson (1936/1984), speaking about Russian, also references affectedness: “The accusative always indicates that some action to some extent affects, is directed at, or is manifested on, the stated entity” (p. 66). However, in FCs, there is no affected patient. Instead, it is the Experiencer who is undergoing the emotional upheaval. The referent of the accusative-marked object need not be affected by the subject’s fear of it.

Because the accusative is often considered to be the "direct object" case, the use of the genitive or the ablative in languages like those discussed in sections 2 and 3 becomes a marked phenomenon, albeit one motivated by spatial movement which reflects avoidance behavior. A case can be made that the use of accusative marking in other languages for objects in FCs is unmarked, and therefore the use of this case marking in FCs is the same as any other regular direct object marking. These constructions may have once taken genitive or ablative marking, but on analogy with the majority of constructions that put objects in the accusative case, this marked case marking was abandoned and the accusative was picked up in FCs.

---

<sup>18</sup> Some grammars also distinguish between “cognate” accusatives and others, in which the verb is intransitive and the object is “a noun of kindred meaning” (per Greenough et al., 1916, p. 242), such as “to live life.”

## 5. Conclusion

As the sections above have demonstrated, FCs can use different morphosyntactic markings for objects. The use of genitive or ablative case marking mirrors avoidance behavior in that it indicates movement away by the fear Experiencer from the fear stimulus. The use of accusative case marking, however, indicates simply the absence of (dative-associated) cognitive engagement by the fear stimulus need not be cognitively engaged in the fear event.

As noted above in section 2, genitive and ablative case markings mark for source, separation, cause, and origin. These can all be collapsed into the semantic domain of Source. Source is the starting point or stimulus of the action or event expressed by the verb, and, in spatial terms, these case markings denote that the subject Experiencer is moving away, or desires to move away, from the marked Source. Thus the concept of separation is inherent, as moving away from the Source means a separation from it. Cause and origin can also be collapsed into Source, as the cause and the origin in terms of an event is also the starting point from which the event moves away, temporally and/or spatially.

For FCs, the use of genitive or ablative case marking indicates the same movement away, in this case movement away from the fear stimulus. Limitation in terms of a behavioral response to fear would be the desire of the Experiencer to have distance between him/herself and the fear-provoking stimulus or Source. The Experiencer of a fear verb may not actually come in contact with the fear stimulus or Source. Limitation is

present in the fact that the fear stimulus may not exist or come to pass in reality (see Chapter IV for further discussion).

This chapter has shown the ways in which the morphology and syntax of FCs can reflect, or metaphorize on a grammatical level, the conceptualization of fear events in terms of spatial movement. Concrete spatial movements are abstracted, and morphological marking such as the selection of genitive or ablative case marking can mirror human avoidance behavior. One seeks to avoid or move away from the thing that stimulates the fear response, and genitive and ablative case marking is used to mark "away from" spatially.

For those languages that do not use a marked non-accusative case for the direct object of fear constructions, it is possible that the accusative case marking is motivated by analogy. FCs which might have once marked the object with the genitive or ablative could come to use the accusative. This analogy would be possible because, like other accusative objects, the direct object of FCs, even though it acts as the fear stimulus, need not be cognitively engaged in the fear event itself.

The following chapter moves from simple FCs to complex ones that include a subordinate clause as the complement of a fear verb. It will be shown that the same notions that motivate oblique (non-accusative) case marking in simple FCs also are behind the "marked" elements in complex FCs. These more complex constructions make use of a marked mood, i.e., the irrealis. Where the complement in simple FCs represents the Source of fear, in complex FCs the subordinate clause now takes on that function. While marked case marking indicates distance in simple FCs, marked mood elements

have the same function in complex FCs. In both types of fear constructions, the bodily response to fear is paralleled in the grammar used to express the fear emotion.

## CHAPTER IV

### THE MORPHOSYNTAX OF COMPLEX FEAR CONSTRUCTIONS

#### 1. Introduction

Parts of this work were published in volume 1 of the journal *Indo-European Linguistics* in May 2013 by the author.

While the previous chapter focused specifically on morphological elements in FCs with one clause, this chapter looks at complex FCs, in which the main clause features a fear verb whose complement is a subordinate clause.

(41) *Marnie feared that she would fail the exam.*

(42) *The drummer was afraid he might break a cymbal.*

Just as in simple FCs, complex FCs can metaphorize avoidance behavior in their grammar. The genitive or ablative case marking can be used for object complements in simple FCs, and complex FCs make use of mood markings in the subordinate clause that function in a similar fashion. The object of a simple fear clause represents the stimulus of fear, or Source, and subordinate clauses in complex FCs also represent Source as the potential events contained in these clauses are undesirable. The subordinate clause is the fear stimulus, and it is marked in a way that highlights this role.

In some IE languages, including English as seen in the examples above, irrealis mood marking appears in the subordinate clause of complex FCs. Irrealis may be

expressed through morphological marking on the verb in some languages (e.g., Latin, Greek), or through the use of a modal auxiliary with the main verb of the subordinate clause (e.g., English, German). A third type of marking, the use of a negative particle as an irrealis particle, can also be found in IE FCs. This chapter discusses the function of the irrealis mood marking, as well as types of markings associated with irrealis in IE languages FCs.

Section 2 of this chapter focuses on the definition and function of the irrealis mood in general. Section 3 discusses some of the types of irrealis verb marking that can occur in FCs, pointing out that the subjunctive marker ultimately stands for the irrealis mood in IE FCs. Section 4 discusses the relationship between negative particles and irrealis mood in subordinate clauses within FCs. This relationship is further explored in section 5, in which a parallel is drawn between the use of the negative particle in subordinate clauses and the negative particle accompanying the genitive case in simple FCs. This parallel revolves around the notion of avoidance, which is inherent in FCs. The conclusion is presented in section 6.

## **2. Definition and function of the irrealis mood**

The grammatical terms "realis" and "irrealis" were used early in the 1900s to describe American Indian languages, including Sapir's (1930) description of Southern Paiute.<sup>19</sup> Since that time, the terms have been used with increasing regularity, although

---

<sup>19</sup> Elliott (2000, p. 55) states that this is one of the earliest uses of the term "irrealis" and quotes Sapir's description of a Southern Paiute modal suffix, in which he says the suffix "indicates that the activity expressed by the verb is unreal, i.e., either merely potential or contrary to fact" (1930, p. 168).

not without debate.<sup>20</sup> Nevertheless, cross-linguistically there seems to be a pattern of marking, be it morphologically or syntactically, unrealized events in many languages.

While there have been numerous discussions of realis/irrealis, too many to explore here within the scope of the dissertation topic, I will follow Givón's (2001, p. 302) definition of a irrealis assertion as a weaker assertion in which the proposition is "possible, likely, or uncertain (epistemic sub-modes), or necessary, desired or undesired (valuative-deontic sub-modes)."<sup>21</sup> As Givón notes, the focus of irrealis is not on the truth value of the proposition, but on the speaker's attitude towards the proposition and his/her negotiation with the addressee (p. 302).

The realis form is generally unmarked across languages, especially IE languages. The fact that the irrealis is the mood that is marked morphosyntactically supports the theory that the irrealis mood is also marked conceptually. Irrealis mood marks a difference in conceptualization, and as such, it is a form of distancing that is iconic in the grammar of FCs. The next section discusses FC grammar and the types of irrealis mood marking in the subordinate clause of complex FCs within IE languages. Because the irrealis functions to indicate a conceptual distance between reality and the event under discussion in the subordinate clause, its use in FCs makes sense. This distance parallels the actual desired distance the fear Experiencer wishes to place between him/herself and the fear stimulus.

---

<sup>20</sup> Although I consider "irrealis" a useful term, others do not: see, for example, Bybee (1998) who believes that categorizing grammar into a binary distinction like realis/irrealis does not reflect actual usage-based facts about language. However, cf., for example, de Haan (2012) for the counter-argument. I believe "irrealis" to be useful for the discussion about FCs because they generally refer to an unrealized state.

<sup>21</sup> For more in-depth discussion of irrealis, see, for example: Elliott (2000), who presents a typological analysis of several unrelated languages that concludes that the realis/irrealis distinction hinges on a grammatical category she terms "REALITY STATUS." Other scholars define realis/irrealis along similar lines: Mithun (1995) uses "actualized" and "nonactualized," Palmer (2001) uses "assertion" and "nonassertion," and Cristofaro (2012) uses "actualized" and "unactualized" state of affairs, for instance.

### 3. Irrealis verb marking in FCs

Many IE languages make use of morphological marking on the verb to indicate that the proposition expressed by the verb is an irrealis, most frequently subjunctive mood marking. Modal auxiliaries have arisen in languages like English and German and can be considered irrealis marking as well in their use in constructions like FCs. The following subsections detail the various markings and uses of these irrealis moods in some IE languages. This is not a comprehensive examination of all IE languages, but is rather meant to exemplify the means of marking irrealis in FCs. Examples of FCs in each language will be provided, and the expression of irrealis through verbal mood will be discussed.

#### 3.1. *Subjunctive*

The subjunctive is by far the most common ‘marked’ mood in FCs in IE languages. The subjunctive mood is often referred to as the mood of possibility (see, for example, Givón, 1994, 2001). However, this is not its only meaning, and the term “possibility” may not cover all the various uses of the subjunctive. According to Givón (2001), the subjunctive most frequently appears with the epistemic (low certainty) and valuative-deontic (weaker manipulation) functions of the irrealis mood (p. 313). Others, as articulated by Palmer (2001), relate the function of the subjunctive as irrealis mood marking to non-assertion (p. 3).<sup>22</sup> In some languages (e.g., Classical Greek and Latin), the subjunctive frequently occurs in subordinate clauses, matching the meaning of Latin

---

<sup>22</sup> Palmer (2001) builds his work on the basis of others, including Bolinger (1968), Terrell & Hooper (1974), Hooper (1975), Klein (1975), and Lunn (1995), who also break down mood in terms of assertion vs. non-assertion.

word the term was derived from, namely *subiunctivus*, meaning 'of or belonging together' (see, for example, Lewis & Short, 1891, p. 1777).

In IE languages, the subjunctive mood is generally polyfunctional. For example, in Latin this mood can have many functions within the language, often called “idiomatic functions” (see Greenough et al., 1916, p. 278, for example). The subjunctive can appear in expressions of will and desire, hypothetical situations, purpose and result clauses, and in the expressions of future events (see, for instance, Bennett, 1907; Hale and Buck, 1903; Greenough et al., 1916; and Molinelli, 1998). These categories of subjunctive fit both Givón’s and Palmer’s definition of subjunctive functions. While many grammars may list these functions without appealing to any unitary definition of the mood, in general it can be said that the subjunctive expresses some form of unreality when contrasted with the indicative, hence making it an expression of irrealis.

Because it has a range of seemingly unrelated functions, often subjunctive marking is considered to be semantically empty and conditioned syntactically. However, in FCs, this does not seem to be the case. The mood marking in FCs relates directly to the meaning of the utterance. Irrealis marking in FCs is expressed to reflect the conceptual distance between the Source of fear (now in the subordinate clause, where the subjunctive is used) and the Experiencer (in the main clause), a distance the Experiencer desires to effect by avoiding the Source.

In typical complex FCs the speaker expresses anxiety toward the proposition in the subordinate clause, and the function of the subjunctive could be to indicate distance, like the other markers employed in FCs. As stated above, an irrealis mood is used with events that are probable but not yet actual, and in that sense it is marked, or more

conceptually distant, than expression using the realis (indicative) mood. In FCs specifically, this conceptual distance is reinforced by the speaker's own desire to impose a distance between him/herself and the fear-inducing event. The behavioral flight response of actual spatial distance is represented in the conceptual distance expressed in the use of the subjunctive/irrealis mood. This conceptual distance in the grammar (by means of a marked mood) is an extension of the concept of spatial distance in the real world (see Haiman, 1983 and Kirsner, 1985).

Before moving on to exploring the types of mood marking that appear in IE FCs, a word should be said about the terminology being used. Some IE languages have preserved various moods from PIE, such as the subjunctive and optative moods, whereas others have lost their PIE moods and developed new means of expressing the same function.<sup>23</sup>

This analysis looks at the function of the mood marking, instead of relying on terminology that can vary from language to language although the function is the same. Subjunctive mood marking is the most common in the IE languages presented here. Additionally, the semantic category of subjunctive mood seems more suited to containing both the optative (generally involving wishes or volition) and the conditional (possible contingent future events) moods within it because it is less specialized in meaning as these other moods. The optative or the conditional may not be as suited to including all the notions of the subjunctive mood, which can include possibility/potentiality, wishes

---

<sup>23</sup> For example, in Baltic and Slavic languages, the verb form used to express irrealis in FCs is often what is known as the "conditional" form. However, because the function remains the same, namely expressing the Source of fear in complex FCs, an irrealis in that it is unrealized and undesired, I am including it as a subjunctive example. Additionally, in Welsh, the subjunctive verb form has declined, but the same function has been taken up by tense marking, which serve to mark the irrealis in FCs. This is similar to the situation in English, where the morphological subjunctive on the subordinate clause verb has been replaced by modal auxiliaries that perform the same function. Again, since the function remains the same, I am folding these examples in the subjunctive section.

and will (e.g., commands, etc.), possible contingent events, and grammatical subordination. For these reasons, the subjunctive is chosen to represent the mood forms and tenses that occur in IE languages. Function trumps more formal explanations in this analysis.

The next section will detail the mood forms found in IE FCs. It will demonstrate that irrealis mood forms, namely subjunctive marking, very frequently occur across IE languages in FCs, and that the use of a marked mood reflects marked conceptualization.

### *3.1.1. Subjunctive in Greek and Latin FCs*

In both Greek and Latin, the subjunctive mood serves to express irrealis in complex FCs. Although Ancient Greek retained both the optative mood, used for wishes and hopes, and the subjunctive mood, the optative collapsed into the subjunctive in Latin. In Latin the subjunctive mood took on the functions of the optative, as well as being used for polite imperatives. While the subjunctive could be used in main clauses to indicate commands or wishes, many of the constructions that require the subjunctive are subordinate in nature (see Chapter V for more discussion). Complex FCs in Latin require the subjunctive mood in the subordinate clause, which contains the anxiety-provoking possible event. These Latin FCs are not alone in their use of the subjunctive, however, or their use of the irrealis particle *nē* (see section 6.4 below). In fact, those Latin constructions that take *nē* plus the subjunctive mood in the subordinate clause can all be considered members of the same semantic domain of prevention/avoidance, which will be further discussed in Chapter V.

It may be expected that FCs belong to the domain of avoidance, as this mirrors the actual physical response to fear stimuli. The examples below illustrate this desire for avoidance. In (43), the Experiencer (grammatical Subject) in the main clause fears that he might be considered a co-conspirator in the wrongdoing mentioned in the subordinate clause:

(43) Latin

*Suberat*                      *et ille*                      *metūs,*              *nē*  
 undergo.3SG.PRET and DEM.M.SG.NOM fear.ACC COMP.NEG  
*damnātus*                                      *auctōrem*              *sē*  
 convict-M.PASS.PART.NOM author-ACC 3SG.ACC.REFL  
*nefānī*                      *facinoris*              *prōtraheret*  
 nefarious.GEN deed.GEN drag-in-3SG.IMPF.**SBJV**

“And he underwent the fear that the convicted one might drag him in as the author of the nefarious deed.” (Livy, *Ab Ur. Con.* 45.5)

The fear experience in (43) is provoked by the possible negative future event in the subordinate clause and the Subject’s desire to avoid that event. However, this type of construction is not limited to expression of actual physical fear, but can be used to indicate social anxiety, as well.



(45) Ancient Greek

*Efobeíto mē speúdōsi pròs tē kómēn*

afraid-3PL.IMPV NEG hasten-3PL.PRS.**SBJV** to the village

'He was afraid that they should be hastening to the village.' (Noonan, 2007, p.

63)

In Modern Greek, the non-past tense occurs in complex FCs, together with the irrealis particle *na*:<sup>24</sup>

(46) Modern Greek

*íx-e fóvo na-pés-i*

have.IPFV-PST.3SG fear **SBJV**-fall.PFV-NPST.3SG

'She was afraid she might fall.' (Takhtsis, 1986, cited in Haberland, 2010)

### 3.1.2. Romance languages

As the Romance languages descended from Latin, it might be expected that they would preserve subjunctive marking to express irrealis in FCs. The subjunctive mood is found in FCs in the major Romance languages. Spanish (see Garner, 1901, for example), Italian (see Minola, 1876; Lemmi, 1890; among others), French (see Godard, 2012 and L'Huillier, 1999, p. 171; Lang and Perez, 2004, pp. 100-1), Portuguese (see, for example,

---

<sup>24</sup> Modern Greek lacks verbal morphology to indicate the subjunctive, with irrealis instead being expressed through verbal particles and negative morphemes. As differences in usage in Modern Greek are often equated with their Ancient Greek counterparts, the name "subjunctive" is preserved (see Haberland, 2010, pp. 475-6 for further discussion).

Wall, 1908, pp. 227-8; Marques, 2004, p. 94) and Romanian (Becker, 2010, p. 257) use the subjunctive in subordinate clauses following fear predicates.

(47) Spanish<sup>25</sup>

*Tememos que llueva antes de la caída de la noche.*

fear-1PL COMP rain.**SBJV**-3SG before the fall of the night

'We fear that it will rain before nightfall.' (Garner, 1901, p. 226)

(48) Italian

*Temo che sia lui a-l telefono.*

fear.IND.PRS.1SG COMP be.**SBJV**.PRS.SG him at-DEF phone

'I am afraid it's him on the phone.' (Squartini, 2010, p. 243)

(49) French

*J'ai peur qu'il ne soit en retard*

be.PRS.1SG afraid COMP-3SG NEG be.PRS.**SBJV**.3S late

'I'm afraid that he may be late.' (Lang and Perez, 2004, p. 101)

---

<sup>25</sup> In Spanish, as in English, the indicative can appear in the subordinate clause after verbs of fearing. The indicative generally appears when the expression is one of politeness, akin to "I'm afraid" in English: *Me temo que has llegado tarde* 'I'm afraid that you have (indicative) arrived late' (Haverkate, 2002, p. 103). See Butt and Benjamin (2004, pp. 263-4) and Haverkate (2004, pp. 102-4) for further discussion. A similar situation exists in Romanian (see Becker, p. 2010).

(50) Portuguese

*Temo que não venha*

fear.IND.PRS.1SG COMP NEG come.**SBJV**.PRS.3SG

‘I fear he will not/may not come.’ (Wall, 1908, p. 227)

(51) Romanian<sup>26</sup>

*Se teme să vorbească*

CL.REFL.ACC.3SG fears să<sub>SBJV</sub> talk.**SBJV**.3SG

‘He is afraid to talk.’ (Niculescu, 2013, p. 159)

Various explanations have been offered for the occurrence of subjunctive mood markings in Romance FCs. In French, for instance, the general justification is that verbs of emotional and subjective feeling take the subjunctive (see, for example, Resnick, 2012, pp. 59-60). For Romanian, according to Becker (2010, p. 257), lexemes featuring deontic modality (as broadly defined; see Chapter V of this dissertation), meaning wishes, obligation, and purpose, select subjunctive marking, including *a teme* ‘to fear.’ Romance languages tie the use of the subjunctive in complements after emotional verbs, and this reinforces the idea that these subordinate clauses act as the Source of the emotion.

---

<sup>26</sup> Romanian has developed an irrealis marker *să* that serves as both a complementizer and a marker of subjunctive mood as the paradigms of the subjunctive and indicative differ only in 3rd person singular/plural in certain verbs for phonological reasons. Complements following this marker are considered subjunctive (see, for example, Hill, 2013).

### 3.1.3. Baltic and Slavic languages

Latvian and Lithuanian use the subjunctive mood in the subordinate clauses following fear verbs.<sup>27</sup>

(52) Lithuanian:

*jis                    bijojo,                    kad    ji*  
3SG.M.NOM   fear-3SG.PRET   COMP   3SG.F.NOM  
*nesušaltų*  
NEG.get.cold-3SG.PRS.**SBJV**

‘He was afraid that she would get cold.’ (Mathiassen, 1996, p. 133)

(53) Latvian:

*Vecāki baidījās,                    kaut   bērns   nenaslimtu*  
parents fear.3PL.PRET   COMP   child   NEG-fall-ill.3SG.PRS.**SBJV**

‘The parents feared that the child would fall ill.’ (Mathiassen, 1997, p. 129)

The use of the subjunctive in FCs in the Baltic languages has been tied to the type of modality being expressed (Holvoet, 2010, p. 439). FCs are thought to straddle the line between epistemic and deontic modalities, in that the event has the potential to occur, according to the speaker (epistemic modality), and the event is undesirable (deontic modality). As will be further discussed in the following chapter, constructions involving

---

<sup>27</sup> I am following Mathiassen (1996) and Ambrazas (1997) in calling the mood form discussed here “subjunctive.” The same forms could be referred to as “conditional” or “optative,” but, despite the difference in naming, the function is the same, expressing unreal situations or irrealis. This same verb form is used on both Latvian and Lithuanian to mean ‘would,’ which is why the morphological form in *-ų* is referred to as the ‘conditional’ generally. See Holvoet (2010), for example, for further discussion.

deontic modality frequently require a negative element (either a special negator, as in Latin and Greek, and *ka* and *lai* in Latvian, or the only negator, as in Lithuanian) and often take subjunctive marking. The connection between FCs and other deontic constructions may have led to the form of these constructions in present day, through a grammaticalization process similar to the one that will be laid out in Chapter V.<sup>28</sup>

Slavic languages, on the other hand, often use the indicative in complex FCs, as in this example from Russian:

(54) Russian Indicative:

<i>On</i>	<i>bojalsja,</i>	<i>čto</i>	<i>ej</i>
3SG.M.NOM	fear.3.IMPV.PST.REFL	COMP	3SG.F.DAT
<i>stanet</i>	<i>xolodno</i>		
become-3SG.PFV.PRES	cold-NOM.SG		

“He was afraid that she would get cold.” (C. Vakareliyska, personal communication, May 5, 2012)

Nevertheless, Slavic languages can allow either indicative or conditional mood marking in the subordinate clause after verbs of fearing:

---

<sup>28</sup> For the use of the negative here, see discussion in section 4 below. In Latvian and Lithuanian the use of the indicative is also possible, and the *ne-* prefix on the verb is not used with the indicative (Mathiassen, 1996 for Lithuanian and Mathiassen, 1997 for Latvian, Holvoet, 2010, pp. 439-40 for both languages). It is likely that the choice in marking relates to the function of the expression, whether it is expressing real fear or is being used in a more polite fashion. Further research is needed to confirm this hypothesis.

(55) Russian Conditional:

*Maša boitsja, kak by rebjonok ne upal*

Masha fear-1SG.PRS COMP child-NOM.SG NEG fall.PART

‘Masha is afraid that the child might fall.’ (Spencer, 2001, p. 299)

The conditional marking can be considered akin to the subjunctive in these contexts because it expresses the same general notion as the subjunctive: that is, unrealized events which are (un)desired by the speaker. As the examples below illustrate, irrealis mood marking can appear in FCs in Slavic languages. This usage could be considered part of the volitional function of the subjunctive mood, again relying on the connection to deontic modality. Still, the Source of fear is in the subordinate clause, making these constructions the counterpart to simple FCs in these languages that have the Source of fear in the genitive case.

Irrealis mood marking can appear in FCs in Russian, as shown in example (15) above, with negation in the subordinate clause. Irrealis markings can also appear in Czech (Naughton, 2005, p. 197) and closely-related Slovak (Meyer, 2010, p. 369), which requires negation as well. Slovene is much the same (Herrity, 2000, p. 184), with the negative being required if the conditional participle form is used. Polish (Swan, 2002, p. 260) also has the choice between indicative and irrealis marking, as does Bosnian-Croatian-Serbian (Szucsich, 2010, p. 405).

(56) Czech Indicative

*Bojím se, že spadnu*

afraid.1SG.PRS REFL COMP.IND fall.1SG.PRS

‘I’m afraid I’ll fall.’ (Naughton, 2005, p. 197)

(57) Czech Conditional

*Bojím se, abych nespádl*

afraid.1SG.PRS REFL COMP.**SBJV NEG.fall.PART**

‘I’m afraid I might fall.’ (Naughton, 2005, p. 197)

(58) Slovene Indicative

*Bojím se, da bo prišel*

afraid.1SG.PRS REFL COMP be.3SG.FUT come.3SG.PART

‘I am afraid that he will come.’ (Herrity, 2000, p. 184)

(59) Slovene Conditional

*Bojím se, da ne bi prišel*

afraid.1SG.PRS REFL COMP NEG **SBJV come.PART**

‘I am afraid that he might come.’ (Herrity, 2000, p. 184)

(60) Bosnian-Croatian-Serbian Indicative

*Strah me je što ideš tamo*

frighten.3SG.PRS REFL it COMP.IND go.2SG.PRS there

‘It frightens me that you’re going there.’ (Alexander, 2006, p. 253)

(61) Bosnian-Croatian-Serbian Subjunctive

*Boja-o se da bi to*

fear-PART-M.SG REFL **COMP.SBJV SBJV.3.SG** this-N.SG.NOM

*zvuča-l-o glup-o.*

sound-PART-N.SG stupid-ADV

‘He was afraid that this might sound stupid.’ (Szucsich, 2010, p. 405)

(62) Polish Indicative

*Boję się, że nie zdążymy*

afraid.1SG.PRS REFL COMP.IND NEG be.on.time.2PL.FUT

‘I’m afraid that we will not make it on time.’ (Swan, 2002, p. 260)

(63) Polish Conditional

*Boję się, żebyśmy nie zdążyli*

afraid.1SG.PRS REFL **COMP.SBJV** NEG **be.on.time.PART**

‘I’m afraid that we might not make it on time.’ (Swan, 2002, p. 260)

The occurrence of irrealis mood marking in FCs in these IE languages may be a choice tied to deontic modality and resulting from grammaticalization based on related constructions (as discussed further for Latin in Chapter V). For Polish, at least, the choice between indicative and subjunctive marking for contemporary speakers has been attributed to epistemic modality, or how likely the speaker considers the event in the subordinate clause to take place (Swan, 2002, p. 260). There may also be an element of politeness involved, as the indicative constructions come to be used for more formulaic and less actual expressions of fear (see Bielec, 1998, p. 54). In complex FCs, the subordinate clause contains the Source of fear, which is marked here by irrealis marking, just as it is marked by genitive case marking on the object of fear in Baltic and Slavic simple FCs. It is possible that for fears that are more probable (highly epistemic), the indicative mood is increasingly chosen, as in situations where the event is not really feared at all; in such situations, a FC is used metaphorically as a means of expressing politeness, such as I'm afraid we're out of time (see Jing-Schmidt and Kapatsinski, 2012 for further discussion). Because the subordinate clause in these instances is not a real Source of fear, the marked mood is no longer required.

#### *3.1.4. English*

During the Old English and Middle English periods, the subjunctive mood was the common marking in FC subordinate clauses (see Lakey, 2015 for fuller discussion of changes in subordinate clause mood marking over time).

(64) Old English

...*þeah ge ondrædað eow þæt ge hit to*  
and.yet you.NOM dread.PRS.IND to.you COMP you.NOM it.ACC too  
*hrædlice forlæton*  
quickly leave-PRS.**SBJV**  
'...and yet you dread that you might leave it too quickly' (late 900s, *YCOE*<sup>29</sup>)

(65) Middle English

*Heo is afereð, leste þeo eorðe hire trukie.*  
she.NOM is afraid COMP this earth her.ACC fail-PRS.**SBJV**  
'She is afraid lest this earth fail her'  
(~1225, *MEC*<sup>30</sup>)

In Early Modern English, modal auxiliaries start to overtake morphological subjunctives in FC subordinate clauses (see subsection 3.2 on these below):

(66) Early Modern English

*But as the mindes of men are variable, I feare many shall finde the Resolutions of great Ladies this yeare more mutable.* (1644, *LAMP*<sup>31</sup>)

---

<sup>29</sup> *York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose*

<sup>30</sup> *Middle English Compendium*

<sup>31</sup> *Lampeter Corpus of Early Modern English Tracts*

What is interesting to note is that English has a complementizer that occurs in specialized subjunctive contexts, somewhat similarly to the scenario Russian *kak by*, Polish *żeby*, Bosnian-Croatian-Serbian *da* in examples (15), (21), and (23) above. Unlike the Slavic irrealis complementizers, however, English *lest* always functions to introduce subordinate clauses containing events which the speaker considers to be both possible and undesirable (see subsection 4.5 below).

### 3.1.5. Celtic

The Welsh Potential verb form (also known as the Conditional) and the Irrealis (which also functions as the Pluperfect) are original tense forms that have taken on modal overtones despite being morphologically within the indicative mood. As these original tense forms took on mood-oriented functions, the subjunctive mood verbal form declined in use, almost disappearing from the spoken language except in frozen phrases (Heinecke, 2010, p. 315). This means that constructions that appear in the subjunctive in the other IE languages listed here appear in the Potential or Irrealis form in modern Welsh. For FCs, the Potential form is used:

(67) Welsh

*Mae o'n ofni y bydd-ai'r teulu i gyd yno.*

be.PRS.3SG he IPFV fear.VN PTL be-POT.3SG the family entire there

‘He’s afraid (he is fearing) that the whole family may be there’ (Heinecke,

2010, p. 321)

A similar process is in progress in modern Irish, in which the subjunctive verb form has almost disappeared, but where the conditional mood can appear in fear-related purpose clauses. The main clause phrase *ar eagla go* 'for fear that/in case' now prompts the conditional mood in the complement clause (Ó Baoill, 2010, p. 285). Although these constructions are more akin to purpose clauses, they still contain an element of fear, and thus still prompt a distancing element, here the irrealis conditional mood:<sup>32</sup>

(68) Irish

*Chuaigh mé i bhfolach ar eagla go bhfeicfí mé.*

go.PST.1SG I in hiding on fright COMP see.COND.AUT me.ACC

‘I went into hiding in case I should/would be seen.’ (Ó Baoill, 2010, p. 286)

This section has provided examples of IE languages that use an irrealis mood marker in the subordinate clause of complex FCs to represent the feared unrealized event, or Source of fear. The unrealized event is unwanted, and the Experiencer seeks distance from that event. This conceptual distance parallels the physical distance of the flight response invoked by a fear reaction. Subsection 3.2 below discusses another form of distance-marking in FCs, in which modal auxiliaries are used as irrealis markers rather than verb inflections.

---

<sup>32</sup> As will be shown in Chapter V, purpose clauses are related to fear constructions in their use of marked moods and particles.

### 3.2. Modal auxiliaries

Modal auxiliaries meaning ‘may’ or ‘might’ can be used in complex FCs in Germanic languages to indicate more uncertainty than the future tense (e.g., Eng. ‘will’). These auxiliaries have developed both deontic and epistemic functions:<sup>33</sup>

(69) English

*I'm afraid that the shelf **might/will fall**.*

(70) German

*Ich befürchte, das Regal **könnte fallen / wird fallen**.*

I'm afraid the shelf could fall / will fall (W. Barth, personal communication, February 1, 2016).

As modal auxiliaries arose in Germanic languages, they began to take on the functions of the already-present subjunctive form (which still exist but are rarely used) for marking irrealis situations.

As the previous subsections have shown, IE languages use a variety of morphological markings to indicate an irrealis in FCs. The modal auxiliary has the same function as the morphological verb marking: to mark an irrealis (unrealized) condition in the FC.

---

<sup>33</sup> On the historical development of these English modal auxiliaries, see, among others, Traugott (1989), Bybee (1995) and Bybee and Pagliuca (1985).

Section 4 below discusses the relationship between certain IE negative particles and irrealis in FCs. Connections are also made with the genitive of negation in Baltic and Slavic languages, and the overall concept of distancing from Source.

#### **4. Irrealis negative particles**

There are several IE languages that make use of negative particles to mark irrealis. This section discusses the basis of the connection between negation and irrealis. Negative events are by their very nature non-actualized: they have not happened and may never happen. Therefore, negative events are, by their nature, unrealized, and thus exist firmly in the realm of irrealis.

The following subsections explore the use of negative particles in FCs, beginning with subsection 4.1, which discusses the two negative particles in PIE and how they evolved in some of the descendent languages with respect to irrealis constructions. In subsection 4.2, I will discuss the relationship between irrealis and negation, as well as the parallel between the genitive of negation in simple constructions and negation in complex FCs. Finally, subsection 4.3 will highlight the connection between irrealis and distance, in to demonstrating how FCs metaphorize the concept of distance grammatically.

##### *4.1. PIE negators*

Through the comparison of many daughter languages, two negative particles have been reconstructed for PIE: *\*nē̃* and *\*mē̃*. The distribution of these particles differed, with *\*mē̃* being used in prohibitions while *\*nē̃* was used elsewhere (Lehmann, 1974, p. 124). As a comparison of several IE languages in Table 1 illustrates, the prohibitive made use

of a separate negative particle that co-occurred with an irrealis verb form (e.g., injunctive, which is defined in the next paragraph, imperative, subjunctive, optative).

<b>Table 1: IE Negative Particles in Prohibitions and Statements</b> (Reproduced from Clackson, 2007, p. 163)							
	PIE	Anatolian	Indo-Iranian	Greek	Latin	Tocharian A	Armenian
Neg. Prohibition	<i>*mē</i>	<i>*nē</i>	<i>mā</i>	<i>mē</i>	<i>nē</i>	<i>mar</i>	<i>mi</i>
Neg. Statement	<i>*ne</i>	<i>*na</i>	<i>ná</i>	<i>oú</i>	<i>nōn</i>	<i>mā</i>	<i>oč'</i>

Prohibitions in PIE were expressed with the injunctive verb form, which expressed both prevention and inhibition. Later, in certain daughter languages, the use of the negative particle with prohibitions in the imperative mood led to the reanalysis of the particle as a “modal negative,” which was used with certain moods to make negative commands (Clackson, 2007, p. 164).

This modal negative particle was preserved in some of the daughter languages either as the sole negative particle, (as in the early period of Latin, prior to the 5th century B.C.), or together with the reflex of the other PIE negative particle, (as in Greek). These negative particles began to make their appearance in the FCs of these daughter languages. In most IE languages, only one of the two PIE negator forms survived. In some languages that preserve only one of the two negators, however, the sole negator can appear in FCs as an irrealis marker. As shown in subsections 4.2–4.6 below, the negative particle, alone or along with other irrealis mood marking, serves as another strategy of marking distance.

#### 4.2. Latin

The two PIE negators *\*nē* and *\*mē* merged into one negator, *nē*, which appears alone in the earliest extant Latin writings (7th-5th century B.C.). Over time, a new Latin negative particle, *nōn*, was used exclusively to mark direct negation, while the particle *nē* was used in clauses with non-indicative moods as an irrealis marker. The *nē* particle could also appear in independent clauses featuring non-indicative moods, and was used to introduce dependent clauses as a subordinator (see Chapter V for more discussion of Latin negation).

Calboli (2011, 2012), in his study of Greek and Latin moods, relates the use of *nē* to desire and *nōn* to possibility in their modal contexts. As has already been discussed in 3.1 above, volition and deontic modality play a key role in FCs in general, and it will be shown in Chapter V that this is so also in Latin FCs. Since the event in the subordinate clause of a FC is often high-certainty, meaning it is likely to happen (see Jing-Schmidt & Kapatsinski, 2012 for example), the use of *nōn*, which marks for possibility, would not be appropriate in Latin FCs. Instead, FCs and their use of these irrealis particles are tied to the speaker's desire to avoid the negative event (see Chapter V for a comparison of the uses of Latin negators).

The clauses which feature the irrealis marker *nē* in Latin all belong to the semantic domain in which the function of *nē* plus subjunctive verb marking indicates the speaker's desire to limit his or her involvement with the event in the subordinate clause (see Chapter V for discussion of these elements in the grammaticalization of Latin FCs). Like the use of genitive/ablative case marking on the object NP representing the object of fear (as discussed in Chapter III), the negative particle *nē* was a means of indicating a

desired distance between the Experiencer and the Source or stimulus of the fear emotion, which, in complex FCs, takes the shape of a subordinate clause and the event it contains. The clause types that make use of this negative particle include negative purpose clauses and hindrance clauses as well as FCs.

When FCs in Latin are compared to other constructions which contain the irrealis particle *nē*, the particle does not negate the clause it introduces; it means not *I fear that X may not happen*, but *I fear that X may happen*. In fact, to negate an FC, another particle, *ut*, must be used instead, or the negator *nōn* must be added to *nē*. Examples (31) and (32) below illustrate the difference between non-negated and negated FCs in Latin:

(71) Latin with non-negated subordinate clause:

*Vereor*            *nē*            *illa*            *mē*

fear-1SG.PRES COMP.NEG DEM.F.NOM.SG 1SG.ACC

*videat*

see-3SG.PRS.SBJV

‘I am afraid that she might see me.’ (Morwood, 1999, p. 102)

(72) Latin with negated subordinate clause:

*Vereor*            *ut/nē nōn*            *illa*            *mē*

fear.1SG.PRS COMP/NEG DEM.F.NOM.SG 1SG.ACC

*videat*

see.3SG.PRS.SBJV

‘I am afraid that she might not see me.’

Why use a negative particle to express an affirmative idea? The answer may be that the semantics of the construction contain some inherent notion of undesirability. In FCs, emotion is particularly salient, as the strong negative emotion of fear in the main clause is being triggered by the event in the subordinate clause (i.e., the fear stimulus). Fear not only signals an emotional response, but also involves the Experiencer's desire for conceptual or physical spatial distance from the Source (the fear stimulus). This distance can be achieved by avoiding or preventing (i.e., negating) the potential situation that is represented in the subordinate clause. Thus, in Latin FCs, although *nē* does not syntactically negate the subordinate clause, it does signal an underlyingly semantic domain of avoidance/prevention/undesirability of an irrealis event, is shared by nearly all *nē* constructions in Latin, whether an independent clause construction or a dependent clause one.<sup>34</sup>

### 4.3. Greek

As shown in Table 1 above, Ancient Greek also had two negative particles to negate, namely *oú* and *mē*. Greek *mē* functioned like Latin *nē* in that it operated a modal particle (see Calboli, 1966, 1968, 2011, and 2012; also Goodwin, 1900, pp. 287-294, Wackernagel, 2009, pp. 712-754; Meier-Brügger, 1992, pp. 128-138), appearing in prohibitions and in subordinate clauses in situations involving emotions like fear, commands, prohibitions, wishes, oaths, purpose, and apprehension (Smyth, 1920, p. 608). Wackernagel (2009, p. 745) states that both Latin *nē* and Greek *mē* can function “to

---

<sup>34</sup> An independent construction with *nē* would be: *nē fuge mē* or 'Don't flee from me' (Morwood, 1999, p. 89).

justify an appeal or a declaration of will in the preceding clause,” tying their use to volitive (or deontic) modality.

Complex FCs in Ancient Greek take *mē* as the complementizer introducing the subordinate clause, as seen in (33) below (see also (7) above):

(73) Ancient Greek

*...kai hoi Athēnaíoi, ... phoboúmenoi mē sphísi dícha gígnoménois rhâion máchōntai...*

‘...and the Athenians, fearing lest they get divided and so fighting at a disadvantage...’ (Thucydides 6.100, after Kitis, 2009, p. 425)<sup>35</sup>

As in Latin, *mē* does not negate the verb in FCs, so that if the subordinate clause is to be negated, it requires the other negator, *oú*, following *mē*. Modern Greek retains two negators as well: *mi(n)* following the subjunctive marker *na*, and appearing in FCs, and *den*. Greek also uses the subjunctive mood marker, subordinate clause structure, and a specialized subordinator to indicate the desired distance between the speaker and the event in the dependent clause.

#### 4.4. French

Although both Latin and French use a similar negative particle to introduce their subordinate clauses, these particles are not identical. In French, the *ne* that occurs in FCs is referred to as the expletive negator (Horn, 2001, p. 458). In standard written French,

---

<sup>35</sup> The transcription is that of Kitis (2009, p. 421) with the insertion of diacritics according to the Loeb edition by C.F. Smith (1959, p. 364).

negation is generally accomplished with the two negators *ne ... pas*. However, in colloquial French, the *ne* is deleted or reduced. In FCs in formal French, however, *ne* occurs alone:

(74) French

*J' ai peur qu' il*  
 1.NOM.SG have-1SG.PRS fear COMP 3SG.M.NOM  
*ne vienne*  
 COMP.NEG come-3SG.PRS.SBJV

“I am afraid that he may come.” (Zeijlstra, 2004, p. 65)<sup>36</sup>

The negator appears with the subjunctive verb form (as in Latin), but it does not negate the subordinate clause verb.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> French is not alone among the Romance languages in having preserved this construction from Latin. Catalan also uses a negator in FCs in which nothing is actually negated:

*Temo (que) no vingui*  
 fear-1SG (COMP) NEG come-3SG.PRS.SBJV  
 ‘I fear that he will come’ (Ballesta, 1993, p. 39)

<sup>37</sup> Fear lexemes are not the only ones to trigger the use of the expletive *ne*; it also occurs with *empêcher* ‘prevent,’ *éviter* ‘avoid,’ and in negative constructions with *douter* ‘doubt,’ and *nier* ‘deny.’ Interestingly, Old English also had an expletive *ne* which occurred in very similar contexts. Old and Middle English verbs meaning ‘doubt,’ ‘deny,’ ‘dread,’ ‘forsake,’ ‘hesitate,’ and ‘refuse’ (but not ‘fear’) could occur with this expletive negator. For example:

*þan I haue no doute þat it ne schal wel kun telle þee of hem*  
 then I have no doubt that it neg will fully be-able tell you of them  
 “Then I have no doubt that it will be able to tell you all about them”  
 (Cloud of Unknowing 92.6–7, cited after van der Wurff, 1998, p. 295)

#### 4.5. English

The situation in English differs from the languages above in that it does not generally use two different negative particles to negate words, phrases, or sentences. Instead, we find a subordinator that functions similarly to these negative irrealis particles in that it introduces a subordinate clause that contains subjunctive mood marking. In these particular irrealis contexts, the subordinator *lest* serves the same function as the other particles discussed in this section.

The complementizer *lest* is believed to have arisen from the Anglo-Saxon expression *ðy læs ðe* meaning “whereby less that” (Skeat, 1882, p. 329; see also López-Couso, p. 2007). The phrase itself is comprised of the instrumental of the demonstrative pronoun *ðy*, followed by the adjective *læs* meaning “less,” and ending with the relative particle *ðe*. This phrase is first attested around 1000 and is used to introduce a clause containing a possible negative future event that should be watched out for or prevented, as in negative purpose clauses (*OED Online*, 2015). This phrase could also follow verbs of fearing or phrases indicating fear and introduce another clause expressing the feared event.

(75) Old English

...*he him ondræde, ðylæs he weorðe upahæfen*

he.NOM him.ACC fear-PRS.SBJV COMP he.NOM be-PRS.SBJV elate-SBJV.PL

*for his wordum...*

for his words-DAT.PL

'...he feared lest he would be elated by his words...' (~800s, *YCOE*)

Over time the phrase changed phonologically (see Skeat, 1882 for full discussion). First *ðy* dropped out, then *læs* became *les*. Next *les* and *ðe* collapsed into a single lexeme (*lesthe*), which later became *leste*, then *lest*. Skeat (1882, p. 329) hypothesizes that the *leste* form arose in the beginning of the 1200s.

(76) Middle English

*Therfor I drede lest god on us will take veniance*

Therefore I fear-1SG.PRS COMP God on us will take vengeance

'Therefore I dread lest God take his vengeance on us' (~1500, *MEC*)

(77) Modern English

*She dreaded lest the chambermaid had been mistaken. (Pride and Prejudice, 1813)*

(78) Contemporary English

*The Greeks of the polls feared lest they would share the collective fate of a mythical submerged Atlantis... (2006, COCA<sup>38</sup>)*

*Lest* is a complementizer used to signal an undesirable situation that should be avoided. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, *lest* is “a negative particle of intention or purpose, introducing a clause expressive of something to be prevented or

---

<sup>38</sup> *Corpus of Contemporary Modern English*

guarded against” (*OED Online 2015*). *Lest* only occurs with a verb with subjunctive marking in subordinate clauses, meaning that its distribution is highly constrained by its environment. *Lest* clauses are among the few remaining English constructions with which the subjunctive verb form (in the third-person singular) is required.

Lichtenberk (1995, p. 298), in his study on Austronesian languages, points out that complementizers that behave similarly in these languages can have avertive or precautionary functions, and the data of López-Couso (2007, p. 18) and *lest* seems to support that reading. López-Couso uses corpora to trace the use of the complementizer over time and finds that originally the particle occurred as an adverbial subordinator in negative purpose clauses, negative condition and negative cause clauses, and then expanded to become a complementizer but limited narrowly to FCs (p. 18). As will be shown in Chapter V, Latin's *nē* seems to have followed a similar process.

The choice of a particular complementizer, especially one associated with undesirability, is a method of signaling the "markedness" or non-canonical nature of FC constructions. FCs are marked in this manner because their conceptualization is marked. Fear is a basic emotion that is common to all humans and nonhumans. Fear is responsible for many health conditions (e.g., anxiety and panic disorders, phobias, and post-traumatic stress disorder) (LeDoux, 1995, pp. 210-11). As a negative emotion, it is part of the negativity bias found in humans, in which negative experiences are given greater weight and attention (Rozin and Royzman, 2001). Fear is strong enough to provoke reflexive flight behavior. For these reasons, the conceptualization of fear events can be considered marked compared to other events.

Marked grammatical elements reflect this marked conceptualization. The choice of distance-marking grammar is a mirroring of the avoidance behavior the fear emotion prompts. The subject desires to distance him/herself from the unwanted event, hoping that this distance will negate the feared outcome. The appearance of negative particles in FCs is a result of this desired distance.

The choice of *lest* in English FCs, a complementizer tied to constructions that, according to Noonan (1985, p. 119), put forth "an attitude of fear or concern [on the part of the Experiencer subject] that the complement proposition will be or has been realized," is another irrealis particle that helps signal both this distance from an undesired event, and the desire that the feared event be *negated*.

#### 4.6. *Baltic and Slavic languages*

Baltic and Slavic languages make use of a single negative particle (written orthographically as a verb prefix), *ne*, to negate words, phrases, and clauses. However, as in Latin, this negative particle shows up in FCs as well, although there is no grammatical negation of the subordinate clause.<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup> The negative particle is not always present in Slavic languages (see section 3.1.3 above for examples), but negation does occur with the subjunctive mood, while those languages that use the indicative do so without using the negative prefix on the subordinate verb.

(79) Lithuanian

*jis                    bijojo,                    kad    ji*  
3SG.M.NOM    fear-3SG.PRET    COMP    3SG.F.NOM  
*nesušaltų*  
NEG.get.cold-3SG.PRS.SBJV

‘He was afraid that she would get cold.’ (Mathiassen, 1996, p. 133)

(80) Latvian

*Vecāki baidījās,                    kaut    bērns    nenaslimtu*  
parents fear-3PL.PRET    COMP    child    NEG-fall.ill-3SG.PRS.SBJV

‘The parents feared that the child would fall ill.’ (Mathiassen, 1997, p. 129)

(81) Russian

*Ja bojus’,                    čtoby    on    ne    prišel*  
I    fear.1SG.PRS    COMP    he    NEG    come.PRF.M

‘I am afraid that he will come.’ (Mathiassen, 1997, p. 129f)

As (79), (80) and (81) illustrate (as well as the examples in 3.1.3 above), the negative particle *ne* can appear (as an independent particle or as a prefix on the verb) in FCs without negating the subordinate clause. However, as discussed in section 3.1.3 above, an alternate means of creating FCs involves using the indicative mood (through verbal marking or particles/complementizers), with which the negative element does not occur.

For example, in Czech, the subordinate clause verb following fear verbs can be either in the indicative mood without negation, or in the conditional with negation:

(82) Czech Indicative

*bál jsem se, že to najdou*

feared AUX.1SG REFL COMP it find-3PL

‘I was afraid that they would find that.’ (Meyer, 2010, p. 369)

(83) Czech Conditional

*bál jsem se, aby to **ne**našli*

feared AUX.1SG REFL COMP.**COND** this **NEG**-find-PST.PL

‘I was afraid that they would find that.’ (Meyer, 2010, p. 369)

The choice of mood and negation marking in Czech may be related to deontic modality (Meyer, 2010, pp. 368-373). The combination of the conditional mood and negation may emphasize volition on the part of the subject, which in this case is negative desire (that the fear event not happen).

In both Latvian and Lithuanian the situation is similar. Either the indicative is used without the negative form, or the negative and irrealis form is used:

(84) Lithuanian Indicative

*Bijau, kad pavėluosiu.*

fear-PRS.1SG COMP be.late-FUT.1SG

'I'm afraid I'll be late.' (Holvoet, 2010, p. 439)

(85) Lithuanian Subjunctive

*Bijau, kad nepavėluočiau.*

fear-PRS.1SG COMP NEG-be.late-SBJV.1SG

'I'm afraid I'll be late. (Holvoet, 2010, p. 439)

Holvoet (2010, p. 439) explains the alternation in Lithuanian and Latvian in terms of modality, calling upon Lichtenberk's (1995) term "apprehensional modality" and his observation that this kind of constructions straddles the line between epistemic and deontic modality. An additional possible hypothesis is that as the construction spread to more (inter)subjective uses, namely to signal regret or politeness, the event in the subordinate clause no longer need be a possible future event. This opens the door for different tenses to occur in the dependent clause. The English examples (86) and (87) illustrate these pragmatic uses of FCs:

(86) *I'm afraid he left at one o'clock.*

(87) *I'm afraid we are out of cream.*

What should be understood, then, is that in contexts of fear, in which the speaker fears the potential occurrence of the event in the subordinate clause, the irrealis mood is the favored form of expression. Not only does irrealis serve to indicate distance in respect to an unrealized event, but the use of negation in FCs reflects the desire to negate this unrealized event through distance. An irrealis particle in FCs, then, is another means of marking conceptual distance that mirrors the physical distance sought in the fear response. The use of a negative particle that does not grammatically negate marks the negative semantics of the FC utterance and can also be found in some IE languages in clauses expressing hindrance, doubt, and prohibition, as well as fear (as discussed in section 4 above).

The function of irrealis mood marking and these irrealis particles in the subordinate clause of complex FCs functions is the same as genitive or ablative marking of the object NP in simple FCs. As has been shown, the events in the subordinate clause marked by irrealis are events that are unrealized. Events that have been negated are also unrealized, as they may never come to pass. Negation, then, is a type of irrealis. As was shown in Chapter III, section 2.1.4, in Baltic and Slavic languages, the objects of negated verbs and objects following a subset of verbs which require negative marking (intensional verbs, like *fear*, *deserve*, *ask for*, *wait*) are both marked genitive.

As Kagan (2010, 2013) and Neidle (1988) have argued with respect to Russian, the genitive of negation and the intensional genitive are part of the same phenomenon. Kagan (2013) calls this phenomenon the “Irrealis Genitive,” stating that the use of this case is semantically motivated and that it marks the absence of existential commitment (p. 83).

(88) Russian negative existential

*Net/ne*      *bylo*              *Ivana*

is-not/NEG be-PST.SG.N John-MASC.SG.GEN

'There is no John' (also 'John isn't/wasn't here; C. Vakareliyska, personal communication, February 2, 2016)

Existential commitment exists for a noun phrase if in the sentence it appears within either entails or presupposes its existence. As the irrealis mood marks unrealized events, so the irrealis genitive can mark nominals that might not exist. As Kagan points out (2013, p. 72), following Farkas (2003), since a proposition marked by the subjunctive mood (i.e., an irrealis) is not entailed nor presupposed to be true, meaning the mood marking also signals the absence of existential commitment.

The lack of existential commitment is, as stated in Chapter III, an instance of limitation, which Jakobson (1936/1984) contends is the core meaning of the genitive case. The referent's involvement is limited (to the extent even of negation) in an event when the event may not take place. In the instance of fear verbs and others like them (e.g., verbs of avoidance, lacking, etc.), the limitation is one that is desired by the speaker. Here we see the combination of volition and irreality: the speaker desires that the marked event not take place. This avoidance remains the same, whether it is in simple clauses marked by genitive/ablative objects, or in complex clauses marked by irrealis moods and particles. The Experiencer seeks to avoid, or move away from, the fear object

or the feared potential (irrealis) event in the subordinate clause. Grammatical marking in both simple and complex FCs mirrors the avoidance behavior of an actual fear reaction.

## **5. Conclusion**

This chapter has explored additional distance-marking elements in FCs in certain IE languages, namely irrealis mood marking and the use of irrealis and/or negative particles. Like the use of morphological case marking analyzed in Chapter III, irrealis elements are another form of marked grammar that signal a difference in conceptualization, one that distances fear events from realis events.

In simple FCs, in which the direct object is the stimulus for the fear emotion, marked morphological case forms can be used to indicate a desired distance between the Experiencer and the Source. In complex FCs, the Source now becomes the event in the subordinate clause. Distance is now indicated by the use of irrealis elements, either irrealis mood marking on subordinate clause verbs or the use of modal auxiliaries, and/or through the appearance of an irrealis particle.

Just as the genitive and ablative case indicate movement away from the Source in simple FCs, the irrealis in complex FCs indicates a similar desired distancing. In this chapter several IE languages were shown to use an irrealis strategy in the subordinate clauses of FCs. The next chapter provides a case study of a group of related constructions in Latin, analyzing the grammaticalization of FCs within that group. As will be shown, elements discussed in this chapter such as irrealis mood and modal particles, along with deontic modality, have played a role in the grammaticalization of FCs in Latin.

CHAPTER V  
GRAMMATICALIZATION OF COMPLEX FEAR  
CONSTRUCTIONS IN LATIN: A CASE STUDY

**1. Introduction**

Parts of this work were published in volume 14 of the *Journal of Latin Linguistics* in May 2015 by the author.

The previous chapter has explored distance-marking elements in complex FCs in IE languages, and in particular, irrealis mood marking in subordinate clauses and the use of irrealis/negative particles. Like the use of morphological case marking seen in Chapter III, irrealis markers are another form of marked grammar that signals a difference in conceptualization, i.e., the distancing of fear events from realis events.

As shown in chapter III, in simple FCs, in which the direct object is the stimulus for the fear emotion, marked morphological case inflections (genitive or ablative) can indicate a desired distance between the Experiencer and the Source. In complex FCs, the Source is the feared event represented in the subordinate clause. Distance is indicated by irrealis markers, i.e., irrealis mood marking on subordinate clause verbs, modal auxiliaries, and/or an irrealis particle.

Just as the genitive and ablative case inflections mark for movement away from the Source in simple FCs, the irrealis marker in complex FCs indicates a similar desired movement. This chapter provides a case study of a group of related Latin constructions, *nē* + subjunctive constructions, in the same family with complex FCs, tracing Latin and the grammaticalization of FCs within that family. As will be shown, irrealis mood and

modal particles, along with deontic modality, have played a role in the grammaticalization of Latin FCs. These elements are directly relevant to FCs because of their dependence on an unrealized negative event.

Latin has been selected for the case study because its FCs requires multiple irrealis markers, i.e., irrealis mood marking and a negative particle. While other languages, such as Baltic and Slavic languages, also can also make use of irrealis mood marking and a negative particle, these languages have an alternative indicative mood construction without the negative for complex FCs (although with slight differences in meaning from the irrealis constructions, as discussed in chapter IV). Latin FCs do not vary in this way: all complex FCs require the negative particle and subjunctive marking. Finally, the Latin negator also functions as a subordinator in other types of dependent clauses, which can be analyzed together with FCs from a grammaticalization perspective. Complex FCs in other IE languages that have been mentioned previously in chapter IV, including Lithuanian, which will be discussed as a counterpoint to Latin, have a negative prefix that occurs on the verbs of the subordinate clause, but use subordinators which are not so easily confined to a family of related constructions.

A case study on the grammaticalization of FCs in a single IE language can shed light onto the development of these constructions in IE languages generally, by tracing how irrealis and negation markers came together to reflect metaphorically, on a grammatical level, the cognitive and bodily experience of the fear emotion: that is, the flight response, or desire to put distance between the Experiencer and the fear Source. In Classical Latin generally, as shown previously in Chapter IV, distance-marking elements include subjunctive mood marking, the specialized negator, and deontic modality. FCs

are part of a family of Classical Latin constructions which contain both the negative particle *nē* and the subjunctive marker.

As this chapter will discuss, Latin constructions that featured subjunctive mood and the negative particle *nē* belong to the domain of avoidance and prevention. Independent clause constructions like negative commands and negative wishes led to dependent clause constructions with the same grammatical marking and similar functions, like negative clauses of proviso and negative purpose clauses. Constructions like FCs and hindrance clauses were developed on analogy with these earlier constructions because they share the same domain of avoidance/prevention. In these constructions, the negative particle no longer negated the subordinate clause verb, however. Despite the absence of actual negation, the strong semantics of undesirability and other ties to irrealis remained in this subgroup of Latin *nē* constructions. These irrealis markers continued to mark distance in these extended constructions.

This chapter offers proposed stages of grammaticalization for these this family of constructions in Latin as a group, focusing on FCs. The analysis will include a comparison with FCs in Lithuanian, which is considered the most conservative modern IE language, and, as shown in earlier chapters, uses much the same irrealis markers in some FCs as Latin does.

Section 2 provides an overview of the Latin *nē* + subjunctive constructions as a group, and the introduction to their hypothesized grammaticalization process. In section 3, a brief history of Latin negation is given, and section 4 discusses deontic modality in *nē* + subjunctive constructions. Section 5 posits the initial stage of grammaticalization for *nē* constructions. Section 6 transitions to constructions which take the same form, but in

which the particle does not negate the subordinate clause it introduces. Conclusions are given in section 7.

## 2. Grammaticalization of Latin *nē* + subjunctive constructions

In Classical Latin, the negative particle *nē* (as opposed to the direct negator particle *nōn*) appears as an actual negator in independent clause constructions expressing prohibitions and negative wishes (see section 3.4 below), and also functions as a subordinator in complex clause constructions including negative purpose clauses, indirect commands, hindrance clauses, negative clauses of proviso, and FCs. The structure of these clauses, whether independent or dependent, is the same: *nē* plus subjunctive mood inflection on the verb (the main verb in independent clauses, and the subordinate clause verb in dependent clauses).

This analysis shows that it is the combination of *nē* and the subjunctive mood, and not the negator or the mood alone, which results in the semantics of these constructions and their development of new functions. The notion of preventing an undesirable future event exists in each *nē* + subjunctive construction, from independent clause constructions like (89) to dependent clause constructions in which the negative particle no longer negates the subordinate clause verb, like (90):

### (89) Independent clause prohibition

*hōc facitō; hōc nē fēceris*

this.ACC do-2SG.IMP this.ACC NEG do-2SG.PRF.SBJV

‘Do this, don’t do this’ (Cic. *Div.* ii. 127)

(90) Dependent hindrance clause

*Nam multitudo hostium nē circumvenire*

For multitude-ABL enemy-GEN NEG.COMP surround-INF

*queat, prohibent angustiae loci.*

be.able-3PL.SBJV prevent-3PL.SBJV narrow-NOM places-NOM-PL

'For our narrow places prevent the multitude of the enemy from being able to surround us.' (Sall. *Cat.* 58.20).

*Ne* + subjunctive constructions are found in the extant Early Latin writings (e.g. Plautus and Ennius c. 180-160 B.C.), and a pre-history has been postulated for them (e.g. Fruyt, 2011; see sections 3.1 and 3.2 below). The similarity in form and meaning among this family of constructions points to a chain of grammaticalization, with the construction's semantic domain of prevention/avoidance being retained while the function of these clauses widened.

The structure, semantics, and functions of the various *nē* + subjunctive constructions suggest a grammaticalization chain not only from independent to dependent clauses, but then further from constructions featuring genuine negation of the subordinate clause verb to ones in which the subordinate clause is not negated. However, because all the constructions within this analysis were already present by the time of the earlier writers, the analysis here relies on well-accepted general trends in grammaticalization. Unlike previous analyses (Fruyt, 2011; Torrego, 1986) of *nē* + subjunctive constructions,

which generally have focused on either the negative particle itself or the use of the subjunctive mood, this study examines the constructions in their entirety.

### 3. A brief historical sketch of negative particles in Latin

Latin inherited the Proto-Indo-European negator *\*ne*, which was sometimes stressed and other times unstressed, and which can be found in some of the oldest surviving Latin inscriptions dating to as far back as the 7th century to 5th century B.C.E.<sup>40</sup> It is also present in several compound words that indicate the complete negation of a concept, such as *neque* 'and not,' *nescio* 'I do not know,' *nefas* 'against divine law, crime,' and *nemo* 'no one.' The unstressed particle acted as a proclitic before these verbs, and eventually became a preposed bound affix (see, for example, Fruyt, 2011, pp. 713-16).

A second negator, *nōn*, which began appearing in prose texts during the 3<sup>rd</sup> century B.C.E., took over the duties of direct negation, with *nē* then becoming associated only with modal constructions generally taking the subjunctive mood. It is not unusual for languages to make use of two negators with specified functions for each (see, for example, Horn, 2001, pp. 447-449; van der Auwera [2010, p. 449]. Many languages with two negators distinguish between negation in declarative statements and negative imperatives/prohibitions (327 out of a sample of 495 languages in van der Auwera and

---

<sup>40</sup> Dating conventions differ, depending on the source. The particle *nē* appears in the Duenos Inscription, for example, which is one of the earliest known surviving inscriptions, having been dated to the 7<sup>th</sup> to 5<sup>th</sup> century B.C.E. (see Gordon, 1975, p. 54 on difficulty dating the inscription). The Twelve Tables, another example of early Latin inscriptions (see (91) below), have been dated to the mid-fifth century B.C.E. (Courtney, 1999, p. 13).

Lejeune's 2011 study).<sup>41</sup> Van der Auwera (2006, pp. 17-18) hypothesizes that a possible motivation for the use of different negators in these contexts is, in speech act theory terms, a difference in direction of fit. For prohibitions, and commands in general, the speaker tries to fit the world to the words, or to have the imperative followed so that the world matches the words uttered according to speech act theory (Searle, 1979, pp. 3-4). This topic will be taken up again below in section 4.

### 3.1. Derivation of Latin negators

As discussed in Chapter 4, two negative particles have been reconstructed for PIE: *\*mē* and *\*ne*. In PIE *\*mē* was used in prohibitions, while *\*ne* was used elsewhere. In early Latin (generally considered to span the period from 600s to 100s B.C.E.), the two reconstructed IE negative particles *\*mē* and *\*ne* likely collapsed into a sole negator.<sup>42</sup> The Latin negative particle *nē* shares its form with another in the language, the enclitic

---

<sup>41</sup> An example of a negator used in prohibitions comes from Bulgarian, where *nedej(te)*, originally the negative particle *ne* and the 2nd person imperative form *dej(te)* has grammaticalized into an auxiliary meaning "don't":

*Tatko, nedej                      razvalja                      igrata!*  
 dad    don't-IMP.2SG    spoil.3SG.AOR.IMPF    game-F.SG.DEF  
 'Daddy, don't spoil my game!' (Hauge 1999, p. 127)

Compare this construction to the regular Bulgarian negative imperative:

*ne    razvaljaj                      igrata!*  
 NEG    spoil-IMP.2SG    game-F.SG.DEF  
 'Don't spoil the game!' (C. Vakareliyska, personal communication, February 2, 2016)

*Nedej(te)* can stand alone meaning "Don't," as in English. It has a bit stronger meaning and is used colloquially. Van der Auwera (2006, p. 3) argued that even English has a special negative prohibitive marker, in the form of "don't you"/"doncha", in second-person imperatives that include the subject pronoun.

<sup>42</sup> See, for example, Lewis and Short 1987: 1193, who describe *nē* as the "primitive Latin negative particle." As there was originally only one negative particle in Latin, and it is very close phonetically to both *nē* and *mē* in PIE, the idea that the two PIE negative particles collapsed into one particle seems to be likely, but since another negator, *ně*, was also employed the derivation is uncertain.

*-ne* (used either to mark an interrogative or to add emphasis; see Warren, 1881). While there is likely a diachronic relationship between these forms (see Anderson, 1914 for discussion), this will not be the focus of the current analysis.

The remnants of early Latin are sparse and consist mainly of inscriptions. The surviving inscriptions often contain commands (e.g., laws and warnings against stealing items), which also require *nē* in later periods of Latin. This makes it difficult to pinpoint in time the particle's earlier function as the sole negator.

(91) Early Latin direct command

*HOMINEM MORTUUM IN URBE NE*  
 man.SG.ACC dead.SG. ACC in city.SG.ABL NEG

*SEPELITO NE<VE> URITO.*

bury.2/3SG.FUT.IMP **NEG** burn.2/3.SG.FUT.IMPRTV

'(You/One) must not bury or cremate a dead man within the city.'

(Twelve Tables, X 1-8, from Courtney, 1999, p. 15)

However, regardless of the lack of surviving evidence for a stand-alone *nē*, it is well accepted that the Classical Latin direct negator *nōn* derives from a combination of an earlier form, *nē*, plus a pronoun:

\* *ne-oinom* 'not one' → \* *ne-oino-* → *noino-* → *nōn* 'not' (de Vann, 2008, p. 403; see also Roby, 1875, p. 466; Glare, 1982, p. 1187; Lewis and Short, 1987, p. 1214; Beekes 1995, p. 222; Gildersleeve and Lodge, 2009, p. 287)

The particle *nōn* took over the basic negation duties in later Classical Latin:

(92) Latin commentary clause

*Cum servi aegrotarint, cibaria tanta*

When slave.NOM.PL be.ill.3PL.PRF.SBJV food.NOM.PL so.much

*dari nōn oportuisse.*

give.PRS.PASS.INF NEG proper.PRF.INF

'When the slaves were ill, so much food should not have been given to them.'

(Cato *Agr.*2.4)

After the development of *nōn*, there was a period in which both negators could indicate simple negation (see Lewis & Short, 1891, p. 1193). However, over time, *nē* began to occur overwhelmingly in constructions with non-indicative mood verbs, including FCs.

Not all IE languages with subjunctive FCs, however, make use of multiple negators. Lithuanian, for example, has only *ne* as its general negator.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup> Lithuanian *ne* can stand alone or act as a prefix. Other negative elements in Lithuanian do not function in the same way as the general negator *ne*. There is a strengthening or emphatic particle *nė*, which means 'not a single,' and needed to occur with *ne* to reinforce it. The combination of *nei...nei* meant 'neither...nor,' and *nie* occurred in negative adverbs and pronouns such as *niėkas* meaning 'nobody, nothing' which also required the appearance of *ne* (Mathiassen, 1996, pp. 176-77).

(93) Lithuanian subjunctive FC

*Bijaũ, kad neapsirikčiau*

fear-1SG.PRS COMP NEG-make.mistake-1SG.PRS.SBJV

'I'm afraid I may make a mistake' (Ambrazas, 2006, p. 260).

Lithuanian *ne* derives directly from PIE *\*ne*, and is cognate with the general negator *ne* that is found in Latvian and the Slavic languages (see Derksen, 2015, p. 331). Although there is no separate, modally-linked negative element in FCs in Lithuanian or these other languages, recall from Chapter IV that negativity in these expressions can be tied to irrealis. In Lithuanian, Latvian, and those Slavic languages (i.e., Czech, Slovene, Bosnian-Croatian-Serbian, Polish) that permit irrealis mood marking in positive FCs, the irrealis marker must be accompanied by the negator.

### 3.2. Grammaticalization of *nē* from independent clause negator to subordinator

This study traces the development of the negative particle *nē* in Latin from its function as an independent clause negator to a particle that can introduce a subordinate clause. Because this represents the development of a new grammatical function for the negative particle, a grammaticalization framework is used.

There are traditionally four main mechanisms in grammaticalization: 1) semantic bleaching, or the loss of meaning; 2) extension, in which the linguistic item appears in new contexts; 3) a change in categorization, which can include decategorization (a loss of characteristic properties) or transcategorization (a shift in categories); and 4) phonetic

reduction (see Heine & Kuteva, 2002, p. 2). The grammaticalization pattern discussed in this chapter does not entirely fit the traditional model. There is no phonetic reduction (which has been linked to frequency and not necessarily grammaticalization, see Campbell 2001, p. 123), for instance. This is a change in categorization, as *nē* shifts categories in subordinate clause constructions, taking on the new function of subordinator. This shift in categorization allows for extension into new environments (such as FCs). The negative particle in these constructions loses its ability to negate the subordinate clause verb.

Fruyt (2011, pp. 716-718) provides the stages for grammaticalization of the particle *nē* from its appearance in prohibitions to its use as a subordinator in complex clauses. The first stage involves a reanalysis from independent clause negator to the subordinator that links clauses, likely a result of the move from parataxis to hypotaxis. Fruyt suggests that this transcategorization first took place in what he calls completive (complement) clauses and circumstantial (purpose) clauses featuring the subjunctive mood. As will be seen in section 5.4, I believe that negative purpose clauses served as the pivot construction for the progression of *nē* + subjunctive constructions from negated dependent clauses to dependent clauses such as those in FCs, where the subordinate clause is not negated despite the presence of a negator morpheme. In Latin clauses that are complements of verbs of hindering and fear, the negative particle lost its negating function, acting syntactically as a subordinator only. Hence a different negator particle was added to the subordinate clause in instances where the clause was intended to be actually negated.

As noted earlier, the subordinator *nē* was used in a specific subset of clauses only, and these clauses each retain the same syntactic structure (*nē* + subjunctive) and the same semantics (prevention/avoidance). This chain of grammaticalization led to the development of FCs with the same syntax as other members of this group of constructions. Independent clause constructions precede dependent clause constructions, which develop by juxtaposition (discussed in 3.4), and as seen in (91) above, *nē* + subjunctive marking appeared in these constructions in the oldest extant Latin texts. These same markers then occurred in dependent clauses that expanded from independent sources, such as indirect commands in subordinate clauses developing from independent clause negative commands. These dependent clause constructions served as the basis later non-negated constructions, especially negative purpose clauses (NPCs) because of their frequency and their similarity in function to hindrance and FC, making intraference between constructions likely (see section 5.4 below).

The next subsection illustrates the difference in meanings between those Latin constructions that use *nōn* with the subjunctive mood, and those that have *nē* with the subjunctive.

### *3.3. Difference of functions between *nē* and *nōn* in subjunctive constructions*

As Chapter IV discussed in detail, subjunctive mood markers are used to denote irrealis, i.e., the non-actualized state of affairs of a clause (including absence, or the negative state). In Latin *nē* constructions, the subjunctive verb form represents an irrealis, but within this categorization, there exists a division between modality and speech act that is intimately tied to the choice of negator particle. The use of subjunctive marking

alone to indicate irrealis is not sufficient to describe the semantics of these constructions without the addition of the particle *nē*. This will be shown in this section through the comparison of constructions featuring *nē* plus subjunctive marking, subjunctive-marked constructions without *nē*, and subjunctive marking plus the default negator *nōn*.

I propose that constructions with *nē* + subjunctive involve an element of desire on the part of the subject and make reference to a reality (including a negative reality) that the subject would like to bring about. This desire is most obvious in prohibitions and negative wishes, for instance, as well as constructions involving intention, or NPCs. For FCs, this desire is to prevent the possible reality from taking place.

(94) Latin NPC (negating *nē*)

*nē*            *mīlitēs*            *oppidum*            *inrumperet,*

NEG.COMP soldier.NOM.PL town.ABL.SG break-into.3PL.IMPRF.SBJV

*portās*            *obstruit*

gate.ACC.PL bar.3SG.PRES.IND

'So that the soldiers wouldn't break into the town, he barred the gates.'

(Greenough et al. 1916, p. 341, from Caes. *Civ.* 1.27.3)

(95) Latin FC (non-negating *nē*)

*metuo*            *nē*            *numerum*            *augeam*            *illum*

fear-1SG.PRS NEG.COMP number.ACC increase-1SG.PRS.SBJV that.ACC

'I fear I may increase that number' (Plat. *Amph.* 334)

Constructions that take the subjunctive but use *nōn* as the negator do not have the same subjective element as *nē* constructions do. Instead, they are more akin to statements in which the probability of an event is expressed, and that probability is often high. Under this grouping would fall the so-called potential subjunctive, as well as clauses of characteristic and "natural likelihood" and "ideal certainty" (Hale and Buck, 1903, pp. 257-258). The construction that is most similar to the negative purpose clause is the result clause.

(96) Latin negative result clause

*...multīs gravibusque volneribus*  
 many.ABL.PL severe.ABL.PL-and wounds.ABL.PL

*cōnfecto ut iam sē sustinēre*  
 be-full.PART.SG.PRF.PASS.NOM COMP now himself hold-upright.INF

*nōn posset*

NEG able.3SG.PRS.SBJV

'...filled with many severe wounds so that he could not stand any longer...'

(Greenough et al., 1916, p. 347, from Caes. *Gall.* 2.25.1)

The example above describes a brave centurion who was severely wounded in battle, and who collapsed because of his wounds. As (96) shows, the result clause involves not the will of the subject, but rather a reporting of what would seem a natural conjecture: The injured man fell because of his extensive injuries. This contrasts with (94), in which the subject set out to affect the event in the subordinate clause through willful action. Thus

the difference between the two constructions hinges not on mood marking, because both have the subjunctive verb form in their dependent clauses, but on the combination of mood and negation.

Torrego (1986, p. 69) linked the use of the subjunctive, as well as the negation, to the communicative goal of the message: "The adverb *nē* corresponds to the negation of wishes and orders whereas *nōn* is used to deny objective facts...As a consequence, the mood-ending, as formal expression of verbal mood, and the negation are both morphological devices to identify the communicative function in the independent message." This conceptualization is useful for the understanding of *nē* + subjunctive constructions, as their various instantiations each reflect their modality. As the next section will show, the diachronic sources for these constructions are deontic, and it is the combination of modality, negation and the irrealis mood which leads to the shared semantics and the development of a chain of related constructions.

The following section will discuss source constructions for derived *nē* constructions that include FCs. In these source constructions, the negative particle still has syntactic negative force. The common thread that links these independent clause constructions is their shared syntax, and their shared semantics, specifically not just irrealis and negation, but also deontic modality.

#### **4. Independent *nē* + subjunctive constructions**

Before focusing on subordinate clauses introduced by *nē*, it is worth considering the corresponding independent clauses from which they are thought to arise. It can be assumed that Latin subordinate clauses generally are the result of hypotaxis of one of two

originally independent clauses (see Bennett, 1907, p. 223; see also Morris, 1901, pp. 113-149 for discussion of parataxis in Latin, and Hopper and Traugott, 2003, pp. 177-184 on subordination and grammaticalization).

(97) Latin clause juxtaposition

*timeo. nē veniat. --> timeo nē veniat.*

'I am afraid. Don't let him come --> I am afraid that he might come.'

Independent clause with fear verb + Independent negative wish -->

Fear clause + complement clause

The main clause in most complex *ne* + subjunctive constructions generally expresses either will (e.g., negative commands or prohibitions) or want (e.g., negative wishes). Although both types of clauses feature the subjunctive mood, they have different function. The constructions expressing will are generally believed to have come from volitive subjunctive constructions (e.g., jussive, prohibitions, hortatory; see, for example, Bennett, 1907, pp. 215-217; Handford, 1947, pp. 49-52), while those expressing want are believed to have descended from optative subjunctive constructions (e.g. wishes, prayers, hopes, and fears) (again, see Bennett 1907: 217; Handford 1947: 88-89).

The volitive subjunctive appears in jussive, prohibitive, and hortatory constructions. In these constructions, the speaker seeks to impose her/his will on others' behavior:

(98) Latin negative command

*nē miremini*

NEG be.surprised-2SG.PRS.SBJV

'Don't be surprised.' (Plaut. *Amph.* 87).

The optative constructions express the wishes or desires of the subject. These wishes, prayers, hopes, and fears may be realized or may be in vain:

(99) Latin negative wish

*nē vivam si scio*

NEG live.1SG.PRS.SBJV if know.1PSG.PRS.IND

'May I not live if I know' (Greenough et al., 1916, p. 280, from Cic. *Att.* 4.17.5)

Although diachronically volitive and optative constructions are believed to have different origins, synchronically it would be difficult to make a clear division between the two constructions in Latin, because the subjunctive mood is used for both in extant texts.<sup>44</sup> Each of these two construction types involve the speaker's desire, with the subjunctive mood serving to indicate that the situation described is generally considered a possibility and not actual reality. The subjunctive mood in Latin is often used to express will, expectation, wishes, and potential events (see Palmer, 1954, p. 309). In negative commands, it is also the expression of will or volition that prompts the use of the

---

<sup>44</sup> Negative prohibitions, which are volitive constructions, took injunctive marking in PIE, while optative constructions took optative marking.

subjunctive mood. Although there exist other constructions in Latin that can express negative commands, the subjunctive is often used instead in instances where the command is more suggestion-like, whereas the imperative mood is more fitting for a speaker who has absolute authority over the hearer (see Roby, 1896, p. 202).<sup>45</sup>

In Classical Latin optative constructions, which appear in the subjunctive form, the subjunctive indicates merely that the event is possible, but may not become actual. This is especially true for vain wishes, such as those that comment on a past event or state that cannot be changed (e.g., *I wish I had attended the lecture yesterday*). In these, *nē* provides negative polarity, and the subjunctive marking provides the irrealis reading. Together the two markings serve to build the semantic domain of prevention/avoidance.

It is often difficult, of course, to make a clear distinction between *nē* + subjunctive constructions that express will (i.e., imperative, jussive, or hortatory) and those that express wish since both involve the speaker's desire.<sup>46</sup> This expression of

---

<sup>45</sup> Negative commands that do not use the subjunctive marking include the imperative mood construction, and the *noli* + infinitive construction.

Imperative mood command:

*equo nē credite*  
horse.DAT NEG trust.2PL.IMP

'Do not trust the horse.' (Greenough et al., 1916, p. 285, from Virg. *Aen.* 2. 48)

Command using *noli* + infinitive:

*noli putare*  
not.2SG.IMP think.INF

'Do not think.' (Greenough et al., 1916, p. 285, from Cic. *Fam.* 14.1.1)

*Noli* is the 2nd person singular imperative form of the verb *nolo*, meaning "not to wish," grammaticalized into an imperative marker with the infinitive.

<sup>46</sup> Pinkster (1990, pp. 197-201) discusses the difference between commands and wishes in terms of controllability. The speaker attempts to control the addressee with the command, but a wisher has less control, as evidenced by the fact that wishes can comment on past events, which have become contrary to fact and therefore impossible in actuality. Negative commands cannot be given in the past (although morphological past tense can occur in commands, although tense here becomes aspectual in nature - see Handford, 1947, pp. 33-35 for further discussion). Wishes contrast with "hope" in which there is still a

desire determines the modality of these constructions, going beyond the basic "unreality" notion provided by irrealis. More specifically, as will be discussed in the following section, *nē* + subjunctive constructions are deontic in nature.

### **5. Deontic modality in *nē* + subjunctive constructions**

For the purposes of this analysis, I will use the term "deontic" to mean that there is an aspect of the speaker/subject's will in the utterance. I follow Palmer's (2001) use of the term to include Jespersen's (1924, pp. 320-1) subcategories of jussives, compulsives, obligation, advising, hortatives, permissives, optatives, desideratives, and intentional constructions (e.g., purpose clauses). Negative provisos contain an element of speaker will because they include the notion of a desired potential event. They are often of the form "Let X happen, as long as Y doesn't happen" (see section 6.3 below for further discussion).

While this umbrella use of the term "deontic" may not be useful for all languages, it supports the shared syntax and semantic functions of Latin *nē* constructions, as well as their extension into new functions. In speech act terms, deontic constructions, as defined here, can be loosely fit under 'directives' (Searle, 1979, pp. 13-14), in which the speaker is attempting to influence the addressee. I argue that the constructions analyzed here all feature some level of speaker or subject involvement. In many *ne* + subjunctive constructions, including (98) and (99) above, the speaker or the subject is exercising his/her own will. The speaker is not always the subject, however, as commands have 2nd person subjects. In some instances, the speaker may be interpreting the subject's will in

---

degree of probability/possibility that the event may take place. While you can't hope for a past event to change, you can wish that it would.

his actions, as in (94) above, where the subject is involved and not the speaker. But even in (91) above, which is an injunction against burial and cremation within the city, the speaker may be involved as a community member, one that is equally subject to the laws of the community. In this way *nē* + subjunctive constructions always feature some level of involvement by the speaker or subject because of their very nature as an expression of will, or deontic modality.

The following section will explore the path of change from independent-clause to dependent-clause *nē* constructions.

## **6. Dependent *nē* + subjunctive constructions with negated subordinate clauses**

As stated in section 3.4 above, subordinate clauses in Latin are believed to have arisen from the juxtaposition of independent clauses of either jussive or optative origin. The grammaticalization path laid out in the following sections is based primarily on the syntax and semantics of each subordinate clause type. This section will show that each type of *nē* + subjunctive construction possesses the semantic domain of prevention/avoidance, the same deontic modality, and the same syntactic structure.

### *6.1. Indirect negative commands, requests, and warnings*

Like commands in independent clauses, indirect commands express the speaker's desire to influence the behavior of another. Negative indirect commands contain subordinate clauses that are introduced by the particle *nē*, and subjunctive marking:

(100) Latin indirect command

*nunc adeo edico tibi: nē vim*

now so.far declare-1SG.PRS.IND you.DAT NEG.COMP force-ACC

*facias ullam in illam*

do-2SG.PRS.SBJV any-ACC in her-ACC

'Now I declare to you thus: that do not use any force against her' (Ter. *Eun.* 806).

The structure of indirect command constructions is very similar to that of NPCs (see section 4.5). This sometimes makes it difficult to draw a distinction between the two construction types as they are also semantically similar in expressing speaker/subject intention (Handford, 1947, p. 46). Likewise, indirect requests, persuasions and warnings can also have a purpose reading. Compare, for example, the following sentences:

(101) Latin indirect request

*tamen in hoc te deprecor nē*

Nevertheless in this.ABL you.ACC beg.1SG.PRS.IND NEG.COMP

*meum hoc officium adrogantiae condemnes,*

me.ACC this.ACC duty.ACC arrogant.GEN condemn.2SG.PRS.SBJV

*quod hunc laborem alteri delegavi...*

because this.ACC labor.ACC another.DAT delegate.1SG.PRF.IND

'Nevertheless in this I beg that you not condemn me as arrogant in this duty, because I have delegated this work to another' (Cic. *Fam.* 8.1.1).

(102) Latin indirect persuasion

*Hic propter conscientiam peccatorum suorum*

he next.to knowledge.SG.ACC error.PL.GEN their

*persuasit adulescentibus, nē repugnarent*

persuade.3SG.PRF youth.PL.DAT NEG.COMP resist.3PL.IMPF.SBJV

*seseque Vergilio traderent.*

themselves-and Vergilius.DAT surrender-3PL.IMPF.SBJV

'Next he, conscious of their errors, persuaded the youths that they should not fight back and should surrender themselves to Vergilius' (Caes. *Bell. Afr.* 28, 3).

(103) Latin indirect warning

*Terram cariosam cave nē*

land-ACC decaying-ACC beware.2SG.IMP NEG.COMP

*ares, neve plostrum neve pecus inpellas*

plow-2SG.PRS.SBJV nor cart.ACC nor cattle.ACC drive-2SG.PRS.SBJV

'Be careful that you don't plow the decaying land, nor drive a cart nor cattle over it.' (Cato *Agr.* 3.6).

In (101), the speaker is making a request, in (102) the speaker is persuading, and in (103), the speaker is giving a warning. In (100), (101), (102), and (103), either a command-oriented reading ("...do not do X...") or a purpose-oriented reading ("I declare,

persuade, beg, warn so that you don't do X") is possible. While the main clause of a negative purpose clause often contains an action verb ("I do X action so that Y event does not happen"), the speech-act verb in the main clause in examples (101) - (103) above can be arguably an action also (e.g., the act of declaring, requesting, warning).

## 6.2. Negative wish constructions

In Latin negative wish constructions, the subject has less control over the possible negative event than in prohibitive *nē* constructions. Indeed, the subject may have direct knowledge that the negative situation is unavoidable. In this sense negative wish constructions are the closest to the Latin complex FCs that are believed to derive from them (cf., however, subsection 6.4 below, and Hamp, 1982, p. 119), in that in both constructions the Experiencer subject is aware of the possibility of a negative event but no action is indicated to prevent it. In negative wishes, the idea of volition is still present though, as the subject wishes that the negative situation might not or had not happened.

### (104) Latin negative wish

*utinam nē vērē scrīberem*

WISH NEG.COMP truth write.1SG.IMPRF.SBJV

'I wish that I were not writing the truth.' (Cic. *Fam.* 5.17.3)

As in all of the constructions discussed in this chapter, the negative *nē* + subjunctive combines negativity and possibility to build the semantic domain of prevention/avoidance.

### 6.3. Negative clauses of proviso

Negative clauses of proviso are subordinate clause constructions whose interpretation depends on the accompanying independent clause. The dependent clause makes an assertion about what the speaker believes to be reality. As in prohibitions and NPCs, the direction of fit is world to words, not words to world; hence a deontic function is evident:

(105) *quo lubeant, nubant, dum dos*  
who-DAT desire-3PL.PRS.SBJV wed-3PL.PRS.SBJV while dowry.NOM  
*nē fiat comes*  
NEG.COMP become.PRS.SBJV companion-ACC

'Whoever they may desire, let them marry, provided that the dowry doesn't become their companion.' (Plaut. *Aul.* 491).

Negative clauses of proviso, like all *ne* + subjunctive constructions, express possibility. Furthermore, like the other constructions, they express a notion of avoidance or prevention. This desire to avoid/prevent is obvious in negative provisos: the possible situation expressed in the subordinate clause must not happen in order for the main clause action to happen (although neither has happened yet in actuality, and therefore they both still remain possible).

#### 6.4. Negative purpose constructions

NPCs involve the notion of intention on the part of the subject to avoid the event in the subordinate clause. This adverbial clause type requires the subjunctive mood in the subordinate clause and is introduced by *nē*, which in turn negates the proposition in the subordinate clause. The form of this construction is so close to indirect commands that it is often ambiguous (Handford, 1947, p. 50). Greenough (1870, p. 22) posits a jussive subjunctive source for NPCs, suggesting that the purpose clause becomes merged with the notion of command itself so that the purpose clause acts as the complement of the verb in the main clause. Handford (1947, p. 50) also proposes a jussive subjunctive source for NPCs, stating that once these clauses were established as subordinate clauses, their use was expanded to allow other types of verbs to appear in the main clause. Indeed, NPCs often seem like commands, in that the subordinate purpose clause indicates the speaker's intention.

- (106) *olea ubi lecta siet,*  
olive.SG.NOM then collect.PRF.PASS.SG.NOM be.3SG.PRS.SBJV  
*oleum fiat continuo, nē*  
oil.Sg.NOM make.3SG.PRS.SBJV immediately NEG.COMP  
*corrumpatur*  
ruin.3SG.PRS.PASS.SBJV  
'Then let the olives be collected and the oil made immediately, so that it does not spoil.' (Cato Agr. 5,2).

(107) (Two NPCs)

*Nunc, nē legio persentiscat, clam*  
Now NEG.COMP legion.SG.NOM detect.3SG.PRS.SBJV secretly  
*illuc redeundum est mihi, nē me*  
that.place return.SG.GRNDV.NOM me.DAT NEG.COMP my.ACC  
*uxorem praevertisse dicant prae re publica.*  
wife.SG.ACC precede.PRF.INF say.3PL.PRS.SBJV before republic.SG.ABL  
'Now, so that my legion might not find out, I have to secretly return to that  
place, so that they do not say that my wife goes before the republic.' (Plaut.  
*Amph.* 527sq.).

(108) *quamvis ille hoc temperamentum modestiae*

yet he.NOM this.ACC mixture.ACC moderation.SG.DAT  
*suae indixerit, nē praecipere*  
his.SG.DAT proclaim.3SG.PRF.SBJV NEG.COMP get.in.advance.PRS.INF  
*videatur.*  
see.3SG.PRS.PASS.SBJV  
'Yet at the same time it is his custom so to blend his learning with modesty  
that he never seems to be playing the schoolmaster.' (Plin. *Epist.* 3.1.6;  
translation here by Firth [1900])

NPCs express an action in the main clause that is undertaken to prevent or avoid  
the potential event in the subordinate clause. As in indirect commands, there is a desire

on the part of the main clause subject to avoid or prevent the possible negative event or state in the subordinate clause. Here too, as in other *ne* + subjunctive constructions, the subjunctive marking indicates the irrealis of a possible event, while the *nē* particle not only introduces the subordinate clause, but negates it, indexing the semantic domain of avoidance/prevention of a potential negative event or state.

NPCs run the spectrum from reports of actions taken to prevent a negative situation (exs. (106) and (107)), to the speaker's construal of the behavior of the main clause subject (ex. (108)). As mentioned above, arguments have been made for the derivation of FCs from Latin negative wish constructions (see Greenough et al., 1916, p. 365, for example). I contend that NPCs were the pivot construction type from which non-negated *nē* + subjunctive constructions developed through analogical extension. In a small corpus of dependent-clause *nē* + subjunctive constructions comprised of classical Latin literature ranging from letters to scientific treatises and rhetorical essays, NPCs were by far the most frequent type of subordinate clause construction found among a sampling of approximately 8,000 attested Classical Latin sentences from writings on history, biography, and philosophy, plays, and personal letters (Lakey, 2010). There were 168 *nē* + subjunctive constructions in total. Of these, 101 were NPCs, comprising well over half. Thirty-six were complex FCs, 18 were negative commands, seven were negative wishes, four were hindrance clauses, and two were negative clauses of proviso.

As the grammaticalization literature has stated (see, for example, DeLancey 1994 and 2004; Langacker, 1987 and 2008; and Hopper and Traugott 2004 for further discussion), frequency has an effect on grammaticalization, in that high-frequency forms become entrenched and schematized. This was most likely the case for NPCs also, in the

functional domain of avoidance/prevention which is present in all the types of *nē* + subjunctive constructions. The syntactic similarity between NPCs and non-negated constructions like FCs and hindrance clauses may have arisen through the process of constructional intraference, in which a frequent form with a particular function can affect a form that has a closely related function, causing this second form to become more similar to the first by analogy (Croft, 2006, p. 85).

Because NPCs appear to be the most frequent type of dependent-clause *nē* + subjunctive construction, at least in the small corpus sampled, it would not be surprising if they had been used as the model for FCs. Thus, as a result of to the overlap in their semantic domains and their closeness in function, I posit that NPCs served as the pivot point for the extension of the negative subordinator *nē* to non-negated subordinate clauses, including those in complex FCs.

Latin appears not to be the only language in which complex FCs followed this particular grammaticalization cline. For example, as shown in chapter IV, Lithuanian has a FC with both irrealis mood marking and a negator that does not negate the subordinate clause verb to which it is attached. It also features the complementizer *kad*, 'that,' which, as in English, appears in conditional clauses, FCs, and purpose clauses in Lithuanian as well as in indicative subordinate clauses:

(109) Lithuanian FC

*Jis bijójo, kad jiẽ nesugrĩš*

he.NOM fear-3SG.PST COMP they.NOM NEG-return-3PL.PRS.SBJV

'He was afraid that they might return' (Ambrazas, 2006, p. 726)

(110) Lithuanian NPC

*Išėjome anksti, kad nepavėliotume į traukinį*  
go.away.1PL.PST early COMP NEG-miss-1PL.PRS.SBJV to train-ACC  
'We left home early in order not to miss the train' (alternatively: 'We left  
home early so that we wouldn't miss the train' (Ambrazas, 2006, p. 747)

Considering Lichtenberk's (1995) observation, in a discussion of languages of Oceania and Australia, there is a general development from precaution clauses, including negative purpose clauses, to complex FCs (319), it would not be surprising if Lithuanian complex FCs with *ne* also developed by analogy to Lithuanian NPCs. Looking at *lest* constructions in English (discussed earlier in chapter IV), Schmidtke-Bode (2009, pp. 186-7) comes to the same conclusion, stating that negative purpose markers can come to be used in complex FCs. Thus the feasibility of the hypothesis that the non-negative *nē* particle in Latin complex FCs developed by analogy with Latin NPCs has support from other languages.

The next section focuses generally on Latin *nē* constructions, including complex FCs.

### 7. Non-negated dependent *nē* + subjunctive constructions

In these Latin *ne* + subjunctive constructions, which include hindrance clauses and FCs, the negative particle *nē* does not negate the subordinate clause. While *nē* in these constructions has lost its function as a syntactic negator of the verb phrase in the

subordinate clause, the marker *nē* continues to mark that the event or state in the subordinate clause is undesired, and the will of the subject is to avoid it. The negative particle's extension to these types of constructions results in its function as a supplementary (negative) irrealis marker that reinforces the subjunctive marking while also adding that the potential event or state expressed in the subordinate clause is undesirable. While some semantic bleaching has occurred to the extent that *nē* in these constructions no longer means 'not,' *nē* has undergone a shift in function from the syntactic level to the semantic or discourse level: that is, a shift in function, from syntactic negator to a marker of the speaker's stance of undesirability towards the event in the subordinate clause. In the sections that follow, I discuss the source of these constructions, as well as the functional changes that the negative particle undergoes.

### *7.1. Hindrance clauses*

Hindrance clauses, like NPCs, involve the realization of a possible undesirable situation and actions on the part of the subject to prevent that situation. As suggested in section 6.4, it is likely that hindrance clauses derived from NPCs. Because this clause type occurs with only a limited number of verbs meaning "hinder" or "prevent," it is likely that they indicate a later stage of grammaticalization than the dependent clauses in which the negative particle still negates the subordinate clause verb, such as NPCs.

The subject of the main clause usually has the semantic role of Agent, and the control the subject Agent exercises to prevent the undesirable situation is perhaps the strongest in all the *nē* + subjunctive construction types, since the verb itself has the meaning of deterrence:

(111) *Nam multitudo hostium nē circumvenire*

For multitudo.SG.ABL enemy.SG.GEN NEG.COMP surround.PRS.INF

*queat, prohibent angustiae loci.*

be.able.3SG.SBJV prevent.3PL.SBJV narrow.PL.NOM places.PL.NOM

'For our narrow places prevent the multitude of the enemy from being able to surround us.' (Sall. *Cat.* 58.20).

(112) *Labieni prospectum impediēbat nē*

Labienus.GEN look.SG.PRF.PASS impede.3SG.IMPRF NEG.COMP

*posset animum advertere ab equitatu*

be.able.3SG.PRS.SBJV mind.SG.ACC turn.PRS.INF by cavalry.SG.ABL

*Caesaris se intercludi*

Caesar.GEN himself surround.PRS.PASS.INF

'He impeded Labienus from looking out to see himself being surrounded by Caesar's cavalry.' (Caes. *Bell. Afr.* 40.1).

As in complex FCs, despite the lack of syntactic negation of the subordinate clause verb, the *nē* subordinator in hindrance clauses both reinforces the irrealis subjunctive marking on the verb in the subordinate clause, and marks the potential action or event in it as undesired. In this respect, as in complex FCs, *nē* in hindrance clauses reinforces the semantics of the main verb.

## 7.2. Complex FCs

Just as in the other *nē* + subjunctive dependent clauses, in complex FCs the subordinate clause represents a potential undesirable event or state. Although the fear verb in the main clause does not entail any action by the subject (Experiencer) to prevent that event or state, the semantics of fear verbs entail that the Experiencer has knowledge of it, as well as an emotional response. The Experiencer subject may know that the potential event or state expressed in the subordinate clause is unavoidable. Although the desire to avoid or prevent the undesirable event may be apparent, it is implied by the fear verb, and not expressed directly (cf. negative wishes, where the desire is expressed).

- (113) *Scribis*            *te*            *perterritum*                            *somnio*  
write.2SG.PRS you.NOM terrify.PART.SG.PRF.PASS dream.SG.ABL  
*vereri*                            *nē*            *quid*  
fear.PRS.PASS.INF NEG.COMP something  
*adversi*                                            *in actione*            *patiaris...*  
turn.against.SG.PART.PRF.PASS in suit.SG.ABL endure.2SG.PRS.SBJV  
'You wrote that having been terrified by a dream you fear that something  
might turn against you (while) you endure your lawsuit...' (Plin. *Epist.*  
1.18.1)

(114) *Ille vero, et ea quidem quae omnes eo*  
 he.NOM indeed and those.ACC very which.ACC all.NOM that.ABL  
*tempore nē acciderent timebamus.*  
 time.ABL NEG.COMP happen.3PL.IMPF.SBJV fear.1PL.IMPF  
 'Indeed he (did), and those very things which at that time we all feared might  
 happen' (Cic. *Div.* 2.114).

As discussed in section 5.3 above, complex Latin FCs have been traditionally believed to have derived from Latin negative wish constructions through a juxtaposition of clauses, and therefore it has been argued that they may have an optative source (Greenough et al., 1916, p. 365 and Mountford, 2011, pp. 90-1; see also chapter I). However, I have proposed that it is more likely that complex FCs, like hindrance constructions, arose by analogy to Latin NPCs: in other words, that they arose from a jussive source, as suggested by Hamp (1982, p. 119). Like verbs of hindrance/prevention, fear verbs are restricted to a small set, and in both hindrance/prevention constructions and FCs, the subordinator *nē* no longer negates the subordinate verb syntactically, but instead is a marker of the negative feature (i.e., undesirability or danger) of the event or state expressed in the subordinate clause.

In FCs, emotion is particularly salient, as the strong emotion of fear expressed in the main clause is being triggered by the possibility of the event or state expressed in the subordinate clause.

## 8. Conclusion

This chapter has proposed NPCs as the grammaticalization source for complex FCs in Latin. Semantic similarities are reflected in structural similarities in these two constructions as well as the general family of *nē* + subjunctive constructions to which they belong. As Chapter IV first showed, the grammaticalized negator particle *nē* and irrealis mood marking through the subjunctive in FCs together mark the unrealized nature of the feared event or state, and the undesirable nature of the feared event or state. This chapter has demonstrated further that in FC's, the subject Experiencer's desire to avoid the fear stimulus places this construction type in the realm of deontic modality. Other constructions in this family that take the same syntactic form are also deontic, in that they also combine unrealized events and states with the desire to avoid an undesirable possible event or state.

This case study on the development of a family of related constructions in Latin has shown that the above-mentioned shared combination in *ne* + subjunctive constructions of speaker intention (deontic modality), an unrealized state of affairs (irrealis marking), and the speaker's stance towards the possible event combined with the semantics of undesirability in the construction (irrealis particle/negator), has made it possible for constructions like FCs to take on the same form as other constructions which involve will, unreality, and a semantic domain of avoidance/prevention. Although this chapter has looked specifically at Latin, the data presented from Lithuanian indicates that parallels to other IE languages exist. Further research is warranted to determine whether similar grammaticalization chains can be reasonably postulated for constructions in other languages with non-negating negative particles.

## CHAPTER VI

### CONCLUSION

The goal of this dissertation was to show how the reflexive avoidance behavior present in a fear reaction is metaphorized in the grammar of FCs. Through the study of FCs in several IE languages, the analysis has identified a pattern of non-canonical marked syntactic features that appear in these constructions, and has demonstrated how these features mark the distance that is sought in the body's response to fear, i.e., avoidance behavior. These non-canonical features include genitive or ablative case marking on fear complements in simple FCs, and irrealis mood marking and the appearance of a non-negating negative particle in complex FCs. These features contrast with canonical ones, namely accusative case marking for typical direct objects in simple clauses, and realis marking and the absence of a negative marker in typical complex constructions.

Existing semantic and syntactic analyses of fear constructions in IE languages (such as Wierzbicka 1999 for English and Kitis 2009 for Greek) also make note of the undesirability and uncontrollability of fear responses. Comparative studies like Madariaga (2010) for Ancient Greek and Old Church Slavonic, and Dziwirek and Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (2010) for Polish and English, have discussed grammatical case marking and the use of irrealis mood, which, as this dissertation has shown, are markers of distance in FCs. This analysis has looked at FCs in a range of IE languages, examining multiple marked elements that can be tied to the complexity of the conceptualization of fear events, which involve future thinking, stance taking and subjectivity, and negativity. The grammar of FCs is shown to metaphorize the subject's

desire for distance from the Source of fear to these distancing-marking grammatical elements.

Simple FCs are marked with genitive or ablative case marking in several IE languages. These case markings with spatial functions are used on the objects of FCs to indicate movement away from the Source of the fear emotion. This distance limits the Experiencer's interaction with the fear Source, a limitation that the subject desires precisely because of the fear emotion. This case marking can also be considered a form of irrealis when considering the genitive of negation in Baltic and Slavic languages. When an object doesn't exist, the subject is naturally limited from interacting with it. Constructions that are marked similarly include the complement of verbs signifying ceasing, releasing, lacking, depriving, wanting, distancing, avoiding, and separating.

Irrealis marking also plays a part in complex FCs. In IE languages, verbs in the subordinate clauses of complex FCs are marked with irrealis forms, generally subjunctive mood markers, indicating the unrealized nature of fear events. The use of a negative particle in these FCs, whether it functions as a complementizer (as in Latin) or not (as in Lithuanian), reinforces the irrealis. Although the particle does not negate the subordinate clause verb, it does function to highlight the undesirability of the event, marking the subject's desire for distance from the event in the same way that the genitive or ablative case marking in simple FCs does. Like the genitive of negation, it can be considered an irrealis marking because negative events have not taken place, and it serves as a secondary irrealis marker in addition to the subjunctive in these complex FCs. Non-negating negative marking can be found in constructions with verbs signifying preventing

or avoiding, as well as doubting, denying, forsaking, and refusing, all of which involve a sense of not only unrealized events, but undesirable ones.

These negative particles have grammaticalized in IE complex FCs from source constructions in which these particles functioned to negate the subordinate clause verb, as in Latin. Negative purpose clauses, a frequent construction that combines subjunctive mood marking, deontic modality, and the negative particle, may have served as the basis for analogy in the development of complex FCs. Their functions are similar, as is their grammar. Support for this view comes from non-IE languages, which shows that negative purpose clauses, considered to have a precautioning function, can develop into FCs with an almost identical structure. Complex FCs are a combination of irrealis marking, negative particles, and deontic modality manifested as an unwillingness for the event in the subordinate clause to take place, and have grammaticalized on the basis of a family of constructions that have shared a similar structure and similar functions.

Although this analysis focused on Indo-European languages, other languages may have distancing elements similar to spatial case-markers, irrealis mood marking and negative elements within their FCs as well. As was mentioned in Chapter I, non-Indo-European languages like Georgian, Japanese and Korean FCs have the distancing elements discussed here. A wider typological survey of languages outside of Indo-European is needed to determine which elements might be present in FCs, and whether avoidance behavior is commonly metaphorized in morphosyntax.

The findings of this dissertation have implications that go beyond fear expressions. Because emotional states provoke bodily responses and behaviors, which in turn affect the conceptualization of the emotion, it is likely that other emotions have

bodily or behavioral reflections in the morphology and syntax of languages. Analyses of the expression of other emotions are needed to determine whether there are physical or behavioral correlates in their morphology or syntax. Further research on the reflections of emotions on grammar is warranted in order to determine the extent to which embodied reactions are reflected in a given language, or even in language in general.

## APPENDIX A

### LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

1	1 <sup>st</sup> person	F	feminine	POT	potential
2	2 <sup>nd</sup> person	FUT	future	PRET	preterit
3	3 <sup>rd</sup> person	GEN	genitive	PRS	present
ABL	ablative	IMP	imperative	PRV	perfective
ACC	accusative	IMPF	imperfect	PST	past
ADV	adverbial	IND	indicative	PTL	particle
AOR	aorist	INF	infinitive	Q	question
ASP	aspect marker	INJ	injunctive	REFL	reflexive
AUT	autonomous	IPFV	imperfective	SBJ	subject
AUX	auxiliary	M	masculine	SBJV	subjunctive
CL	clitic	N	neuter	SG	singular
COMP	complementizer	NEG	negative	TOP	topic
CONN	connective	NFCOMP	non-factive	TS	thematic
DAT	dative	NOM	nominative	VOC	vocative
DEF	definite	NPST	non-past	VN	verbal noun
DEM	demonstrative	OPT	optative		
EM	extension marker	PART	participle		
EV	e-version	PL	plural		

## APPENDIX B

### LATIN SOURCES CITED

- Caesar, J. (1901). *Commentarius de Bello Africo*. R. du Pontet (Ed.). Oxford: Oxford Publishing, Accessed online at  
<<http://www.forumromanum.org/literature/caesar/africo.html>>
- Caesar, J. (1914). *Commentarii de Bello Civili*. A.G. Peskett (Ed.). Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Accessed online at  
<<http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/caesar/bc1.shtml>>
- Caesar, J. (1914). *Commentarii de Bello Gallico*. T. Rice Holmes (Ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press. Accessed online at  
<<http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/caesar/gall1.shtml>>
- Cato, M. P. (1922, 1934) *De Agricultura*. Goetz (trans.) Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Accessed online at  
<[http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Cato/De\\_Agricultura/home.html](http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Cato/De_Agricultura/home.html)>
- Cicero, M. T. (1895). *Cato Maior de Senectute*. E. S. Shuckburgh (Ed.). London: MacMillian and Co. Accessed online at  
<<http://www.forumromanum.org/literature/cicero/sen.html>>
- Cicero, M. T. (1879). *De Divinatione*. R. Klotz (Ed.). New York: Harper and Brothers: Accessed online at <<http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/cicero/divinatione2.shtml>>
- Cicero, M. T. (1885). *Epistulae ad Familiares*. D. A. Wesenberg (Ed.). Leipzig: Teubner. Accessed online at <<http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/cicero/fam.shtml>>
- Cicero, M. T. (1901). *Letters to and from Brutus*. L. C. Purser (Ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1901.
- Cicero, M. T. (1912). *Epistulae ad Atticum*. E. O. Winstedt (Ed.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Accessed online at  
<<http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/cicero/epis.shtml>>
- Crispus, G. S. (1900). *De Coniuratione Catilinae*. J. W. Scudder (Ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon. Accessed online at  
<<http://www.forumromanum.org/literature/sallust/catilina.html>>

Livy, T. (1919). *Ab Urbe Condita*. B. O. Foster (Ed.) Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. Accessed at <<http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/liv.html>>

Plautus, T. (1890). *Amphitruo*. A. Palmer (Ed.). New York: Macmillan and Co. Accessed online at <<http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/plautus/amphitruo.shtml>>

Plautus, T. (1895). *Aulularia*. In F. Leo (Ed.). *Plauti Comoediae*. Berlin: Weidmann. Accessed online at <<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.02.0032>>

Pliny the Younger. (1969). *Epistulae*. B. Radice (Ed.). Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. Accessed online at <<http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/pliny.html>>

Terence Afer, P. (1857). *Eunuchus*. In E. St. John Parry (Ed.). *Publii Terentii Comoediae VI*. London: Whitaker and Co. Accessed online at <<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.02.0088>>

Vergilius Maro, P. (1900). *Aeneid*. In J. B. Greenough (Ed.). *Bucolics, Aeneid, and Georgics of Vergil*. Boston: Ginn & Company. Accessed online at <<http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/vergil/aen1.shtml>>

## REFERENCES CITED

- Alexander, R. (2006). *Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian, A grammar with sociolinguistic commentary*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Ambrazas, V. (Ed.). (1997). *Lithuanian grammar*. Vilnius: Baltos Lankos.
- Anderson, A. R. (1914). The unity of enclitic Ne. *Classical Philology*, 9(2), pp. 174-188.
- Athanasiadou, A. (1998). Conceptualization of the domain of FEAR in Modern Greek. In A. Athanasiadou & E. Tabakowska, *Speaking of emotions: Conceptualization and expression* (pp. 227-252). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Babby, L. (2006). The genitive of negation and unaccusativity. In S. Brown & A. Przepiórkowski (Eds.). *Negation in Slavic* (pp. 1-30). Bloomington, IN: Slavica Publishers.
- Baerman, M. (2009). Case syncretism. In A. Malchukov & A. Spencer (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of case* (pp. 219-230). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ballesta, J. M. (1993). The contemporary distribution of the subjunctive and the infinitive in complement clauses. *Catalan Working Papers in Linguistics*, 3(1), pp. 1-49.
- Becker, M. (2010). Mood in Rumanian. In Rothstein & Thieroff, pp. 251-269.
- Bednarek, M. (2008). *Emotion talk across corpora*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Beekes, R. S. P. (1995). *Comparative Indo-European linguistics: An introduction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Bennett, C. E. (1907). *The Latin language: A historical outline of its sounds, inflections, and syntax*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Berg-Olsen, S. (2004). *The Latvian dative and genitive: A cognitive grammar account*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Oslo: Oslo, Norway.
- Bielec, D. (1998). *Polish: An essential grammar*. London: Routledge.
- Boeder, W. (2010). Mood in modern Georgian. In Rothstein & Thieroff, pp. 603-632.
- Bolinger, D. (1968). Post-posed main phrases: An English rule for the Romance subjunctive. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics*, 14, pp. 3-33.

- Buck, C. D. (1949). *A dictionary of selected synonyms in the principal Indo-European languages*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Butt, J. & Benjamin, C. (2004). *A new reference grammar of modern Spanish* (4th ed.). London: Routledge.
- Bybee, J. & Fleischman, S. (Eds.). (1995). *Modality and grammar in discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Bybee, J. (1995). The semantic development of past tense modals in English. In Bybee & Fleischman, pp. 503-517.
- Bybee, J. (1998). "Irrealis" as a grammatical category. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 40, pp. 257-271.
- Bybee, J. & Pagliuca, W. (1985). Cross-linguistic comparison and the development of grammatical meaning. In J. Fisiak (Ed.). *Historical semantics, historical word formation* (pp. 59-83). The Hague: Mouton.
- Calboli, G. (1966). I modi del verbo Greco e Latino 1903-1966. *Lustrum*, 11, pp. 173-349.
- Calboli, G. (1968). I modi del verbo Greco e Latino 1903-1966. *Lustrum*, 13, pp. 405-511.
- Calboli, G. (2011). Die modi des Griechischen und Lateinischen verbums 1966-2010. *Lustrum*, 53, pp. 9-150.
- Calboli, G. (2012). Die modi des Griechischen und Lateinischen verbums 1966-2010. *Lustrum*, 54, pp. 7-207.
- Campbell, L. (2001). What's wrong with grammaticalization? *Language Sciences*, 23, pp. 113-161.
- Chafe, W. (1970). *Meaning and the structure of language*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Clackson, J. (2007). *Indo-European linguistics: An introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Courtney, E. (1999). *Archaic Latin prose*. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.
- Cristofaro, S. (2012). Descriptive notions vs. grammatical categories: Unrealized states of affairs and 'irrealis'. *Language Sciences*, 34, pp. 131-146.

- Croft, W. (2006). Evolutionary models and functional-typological theories of language change. In A. van Kemenade & B. Los (Eds.). *The handbook of the history of English* (pp. 68-91). Oxford: Blackwell.
- David, A. (2013). *Descriptive grammar of Pashto and its dialects*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Davies, M. (2008-). *The corpus of contemporary American English: 520 million words, 1990-present*. Available online at <http://corpus.byu.edu/coca/>.
- de Haan, F. (2012). Irrealis: Fact or fiction? *Language Sciences*, 34, pp. 107-130.
- DeLancey, S. (1994). Grammaticalization and linguistic theory. *Proceedings of the 1993 Mid-America linguistics conference and conference on Siouan/Caddoan languages* (pp. 1-22). Boulder: Department of Linguistics, University of Colorado.
- DeLancey, S. (2004). Grammaticalization. In G. Booij, C. Lehmann, J. Mugdan, & S. Skopeteas, (Eds.). *Morphology: An international handbook on inflection and word formation*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- de Rivera, J. H. (1977). A structural theory of the emotions. *Psychological Issues Monograph 40*. New York: International Universities Press.
- de Vann, M. (2008). *Etymological dictionary of Latin and the other Italic languages*. Leiden: Brill Publishing.
- Diehl, Lon. (1975). Space case: Some principles and their application concerning linear order in natural languages. *Working Papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of North Dakota Session, 19*, pp. 93-150.
- Dirven, R. (1997). Emotion as cause and the cause of emotions. In S. Niemeier & R. Dirven (Eds.), *The language of emotions: Conceptualization, expression, and theoretical foundation* (pp. 55-83). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Dum-Tragut, J. (2009). *Armenian*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Dziwirek, K. & Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B. (2010). *Complex emotions and grammatical mismatches: A contrastive corpus-based study*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Elliott, J. R. (2000). Realis and irrealis: forms and concepts of the grammaticalization of reality. *Linguistics Typology*, 4(1), pp. 55-90.

- Evans, B. & Evans, C. (1957). *A dictionary of contemporary American usage* (8th ed.). New York: Random House.
- Farkas, D. F. (2003). Assertion, belief and mood choice. Paper presented at the Workshop on Conditional and Unconditional Modality, ESSLLI, Vienna.
- Fehr, B., & Russell, J. A. (1984). Concept of emotion viewed from a prototype perspective. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 113, pp. 464-486.
- Firth, J. B. (1900). *The letters of the younger Pliny, Translated, with an Introductory Essay*. London: W. Scott Library.
- Forston, B. W. (2004). *Indo-European language and culture: An introduction*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Franko, Roma. (2012). *Ukrainian for speakers of English*. Calgary, Alberta: Brush Education Inc.
- Frijda, N. (1986). *The emotions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fruyt, M. (2011). Grammaticalization in Latin. In P. Baldi & P. Cuzzolin (Eds.). *New Perspectives on historical Latin syntax 4: Complex sentences, grammaticalization, typology*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Gangopadhyay, M. (1990). *The noun phrase in Bengali*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Garner, S. (1901). *A Spanish grammar for the use of colleges and schools*. New York: American Book Company.
- Gildersleeve, B. & Lodge, G. (2009). *Gildersleeve's Latin grammar*. Mineola, NY: Dover.
- Givón, T. (1994). Irrealis and the subjunctive. *Studies in Language*, 18(2), pp. 265-337.
- Givón, T. (2001). *Syntax: An introduction, volume 2*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Glare, P.G.W. (Ed.). (1982). *Oxford Latin dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Glynn, D. (2002). Love and anger: The grammatical structure of conceptual metaphors. *Style*, 36(3), pp. 541-559.

- Godard, D. (2012). Indicative and subjunctive mood in complement clauses: From formal semantics to grammar writing. In C. Piñón (Ed.). *Empirical issues in syntax and semantics 9* (pp. 129-148). Paris: Colloque de Syntaxe et Sémantique à Paris.
- Goodwin, W. W. (1900). *Greek grammar*. Boston: Ginn & Company.
- Gordon, A. E. (1975). Notes on the Duenos-vase inscription in Britain. *California Studies in Classical Antiquity*, 8, pp. 53-72.
- Greenough, J. B. (1870). *Analysis of the Latin subjunctive*. Cambridge: John Wilson and Son.
- Greenough, J. B., Kittredge, G. L., Howard, A. A., & D'Ooge, B. L. (Eds.). (1916). *Allen and Greenough's new Latin grammar for schools and colleges*. Boston: Ginn and Company.
- Haberland, H. (2010). Mood in Greek. In Rothstein & Thieroff, pp. 473-491.
- Haiman, J. (1983). Iconic and economic motivation. *Language*, 59(4), pp. 781-819.
- Hale, W. G. & Buck, C. D. (1903). *A Latin grammar*. Boston: Ginn & Company.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1985). *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Hamp, E. P. (1982). Latin ut/ne and ut (...non). *Glotta*, 60, pp. 115-120.
- Hauge, K. R. (1999). *A short grammar of contemporary Bulgarian*. Bloomington, IN: Slavica Publishers.
- Haverkate, H. (2002). *The syntax, semantics and pragmatics of Spanish mood*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Heine, B. & Kuteva, T. (2002). *World lexicon of grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heinecke, J. (2010). Mood in Welsh. In Rothstein & Thieroff, pp. 309-322.
- Herrity, P. (2000). *Slovene: A comprehensive grammar*. New York: Routledge.
- Hewson, John and Bubenik, Vit. (2006). *From case to adposition: The development of configurational syntax in Indo-European languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Hill, V. (2013). The emergence of the Romanian subjunctive. *The Linguistic Review* 30(4), 547-583.
- Holvoet, A. (2010). Mood in Latvian and Lithuanian. In Rothstein & Thieroff, pp. 425-443.
- Hooper, J. B. (1975). On assertive predicates. In P. Kimball (Ed.). *Syntax and semantics* 4 (pp. 91-124). New York: Academic Press.
- Hopper, P. & E. C. Traugott. (2003). *Grammaticalization, vol. 2*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Horn, L. (2001). *A natural history of negation*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Hui, M. (2009). *The multiple investigation of modality adverb "kongpa"* (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Henan University, Henan, China.
- Jackendoff, R. (1972). *Semantic interpretation in generative grammar*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Jackendoff, R. (1983). *Semantics and cognition*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Jackendoff, R. (1990). *Semantic structures*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Jakobson, R. (1984). Contribution to the general theory of case: General meanings of the Russian cases. English translation in Waugh & M. Halle (Eds.). *Russian and Slavic grammar: Studies 1931-1981*, 59-103. Berlin: Mouton. (Original work published 1936 as Beitrag zur allgemeinen Kasuslehre: Gesamtbedeutungen der russischen Kasus, *Travaux du cercle linguistique de Prague*, Bd. 6, 2. 240-288).
- Janda, L. A. & Clancy, S. J. (2002). *The case book for Russian*. Bloomington, IN: Slavica Publishers.
- Jespersen, O. (1924). *The philosophy of language*. London: G. Allen & Unwin.
- Jing-Schmidt, Z., & Kapatsinski, V. (2012). The apprehensive: Fear as endophoric evidence and its pragmatics in English, Mandarin, and Russian. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44, pp. 346-373.
- Johnson-Laird, P. N. & Oatley, K. (1989). The language of emotions: An analysis of a semantic field. *Cognition and Emotion*, 3(2), pp. 81-123.
- Kagan, O. (2010). Genitive objects, existence and individuation. *Russian Linguistics*, 34, pp. 17-39.
- Kagan, O. (2013). *Semantics of genitive objects in Russian*. Dordrecht: Springer.

- Kirsner, R. (1985). Iconicity and grammatical meaning. In J. Haiman (Ed.). *Iconicity in syntax* (pp. 249-270). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Kitis, E. (2009). From motion to emotion to interpersonal function: The case of fear predicates. In H. Pishwa (Ed.), *Language and social cognition: Expression of the social mind* (pp. 433-454). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kittilä, S. & Malchukov, A. (2009). Varieties of accusative. In A. Malchukov & A. Spencer (Eds.). *The Oxford handbook of case* (pp. 356-365). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Klein, F. (1975). Pragmatic constraints in distribution: The Spanish subjunctive. In R. Grossman, L. J. San, & T. J. Vance (Eds.). *Papers from the 11th regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society* (pp. 353-65). Chicago: The Chicago Linguistics Society.
- Kövecses, Z. (1990). *Emotion concepts*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Kövecses, Z. (2000). *Metaphor and emotion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kövecses, Z. (2002). Emotion concepts: Social constructionism and cognitive linguistics. In S. Fussell (Ed.). *The verbal communication of emotions: Interdisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 109-124). New York: Routledge.
- L'Huillier, M. (1999). *Advanced French grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lakey, H. (2010). *A collostructional analysis of two Latin constructions with nē*. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Linguistics, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.
- Lakey, H. (2013). Morphosyntax of fear and distance. *Indo-European Linguistics, 1*, pp. 131-158.
- Lakey, H. (2015). The grammaticalization of *nē* + subjunctive constructions. *Journal of Latin Linguistics, 14*(1), pp. 65-100.
- Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, fire, and dangerous things*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the flesh: The embodied mind and its challenge to western thought*. New York: Basic Books.

- The Lampeter Corpus of Early Modern English Tracts. (1999). Compiled by J. Schmied, C. Claridge, & R. Siemund. In K. Hofland, A. Lindebjerg, & J. Thunestvedt (Eds.). ICAME Collection of English Language Corpora (CD-ROM, 2nd ed.). Bergen, Norway: The HIT Centre, University of Bergen.
- Lang, M. & Perez, I. (2004). *Modern French grammar: A practical guide* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Langacker, R. (1987). *Foundations of cognitive grammar, vol. 1: Theoretical prerequisites*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Langacker, R. (1993). Reference-point construction. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 4, pp. 1-38.
- Langacker, R. (2008). *Cognitive grammar: A basic introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- LeDoux, J. E. (1995). Emotion: Clues from the brain. *Annual Review of Psychology* 46, 209-35.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman Group Limited.
- Lehmann, W. P. (1974). *Proto-Indo-European syntax*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Lemmi, E. (1980). *A theoretical and practical Italian grammar* (14th ed.). Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd.
- "lest, conj." *OED Online*. Oxford University Press, December 2015. Web. January 3, 2016.
- Lewis, C. T. & Short, C. (1891). *Lewis and Short's Latin dictionary*. New York: Harper and Brothers.
- Lichtenberg, Frantisek. (1995). Apprehensional epistemics. In J. Bybee & S. Fleischman (Eds.). *Modality in grammar and discourse* (pp. 293-328). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- López-Couso, M. J. (2007). Adverbial connectives within and beyond adverbial subordination: The history of *lest*. In U. Lenker & A. Meurman-Solin (Eds.). *Connectives in the history of English* (pp. 11-30). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Lunn, P. V. (1995). The evaluative function of the Spanish subjunctive. In Bybee & S. Fleischman, 429-449.
- Lunt, H. (2001). *Old Church Slavonic grammar* (7th ed.). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Luraghi, S. (1987). Patterns of case syncretism in Indo-European languages. In A. G. Ramat, O. Carruba, & G. Bernini (Eds.). *Papers from the VIIth international conference on historical linguistics* (pp. 355-371). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Luraghi, S. (2003). *On the meaning of prepositions and cases*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- MacDonell, A. A. (1927). *A Sanskrit grammar for students* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Madariaga, N. (2010). The development of Indo-European middle-passive verbs: A case study in Ancient Greek and Old Church Slavonic. *Indogermanische Forschungen. Zeitschrift für Indogermanistik und allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft* 115, 149-178.
- Magnus, L. A. (1916). *A concise grammar of the Russian language*. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company.
- Maiese, M. (2011). *Embodiment, emotion, and cognition*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Mallory, J. P. & Adams, D. Q. (2006). *The Oxford introduction to Proto-Indo-European and the Proto-Indo-European world*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- March, F. A. (1883). *A comparative grammar of the Anglo-Saxon language*. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers.
- Marchant, C. (2004). *Fundamentals of modern Belarusian*. Publisher: Author.
- Marques, R. (2004). On the system of moods in European and Brazilian Portuguese. *Journal of Portuguese Linguistics*, 3, pp. 89-109.
- Mathiassen, T. (1996). *A short grammar of Lithuanian*. Bloomington, IN: Slavica Publishers.
- Mathiassen, T. (1997). *A short grammar of Latvian*. Bloomington, IN: Slavica Publishers.
- McSparran, Frances et al. 2006. The Middle English Compendium (MEC). University of Michigan. Available online at <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/mec/>.
- Meenakshi, K. (1983). *Epic Syntax*. New Delhi: Meharchand Lachhmandas.
- Mees, U. (1985). Was meinen wir, wenn wir von gefühlen reden? Zur psychologischen textur von emotionswörtern. *Sprache und Kognition*, 1, pp. 2-20.

- Meier-Brügger, M. (2003). *Indo-European linguistics*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Meyer, R. (2010). Mood in Czech and Slovak. In Rothstein & Thieroff, pp. 358-375.
- Minola, N. (1876). *An Italian grammar* (2nd ed.). London: Whittaker and Company.
- Mithun, M. (1995). On the relativity of irrealis. In Bybee & Fleischman, pp. 367-388.
- Molinelli, P. (1998). The evolution of subjunctive (mood and tense) in subordinate clauses from Latin to Romance. In B. Garcia-Hernández (Ed.). *Estudios de lingüística Latina, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid 14-18 de Abril de 1997, Vol. 1*. (pp. 555-570). Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas.
- Morris, E. P. (1901). *On principles and methods in Latin syntax*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Morwood, J. (1999). *A Latin grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Morwood, J. (2001). *Oxford grammar of classical Greek*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mountford, J. F. (Ed.). (2011). *Bradley's Arnold Latin prose composition*. Mundelein, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers, Inc.
- Nau, C. (1988). *Latvian*. München: Lincom Europa.
- Naughton, J. (2005). *Czech: An essential grammar*. London: Routledge.
- Neidle, C. (1988). *The role of case in Russian syntax*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Niculescu, D. (2013). The prepositional object. In G. Pană Dindelegan (Ed.). *The grammar of Romanian* (pp. 157-159). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nikiforidou, K. (1991). The meanings of the genitive: A case study in semantic structure and semantic Change. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 2(2), pp. 149-205.
- Noonan, M. (1985). Complementation. In T. Shopen (Ed.). *Language typology and syntactic description, volume II: Complex constructions* (pp. 42-140). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Noonan, M. (2007). Complementation. In T. Shopen (Ed.). *Language typology and syntactic description, volume II: Complex constructions* (2nd ed.) (pp. 52-150). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ó Baoill, D. (2010). Mood in Irish. In Rothstein & Thieroff, pp. 273-291.

- Oberlies, T. (2003). *A grammar of epic Sanskrit*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Ochs, E. (1986). From feelings to grammar: A Samoan case study. In B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language socialization across cultures* (pp. 251-272). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Osmond, M. (1997). The prepositions we use in the construal of emotion: Why do we say *fed up with* but *sick and tired of*?. In S. Niemeier & R. Dirven (Eds.), *The language of emotions: Conceptualization, expression, and theoretical foundation* (pp. 111-133). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Oster, U. (2010). Using corpus methodology for semantic and pragmatic analyses: What can corpora tell us about the linguistic expression of emotions? *Cognitive Linguistics*, 21(4), pp. 727-763.
- Palmer, L. R. (1954). *The Latin language*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Palmer, F. R. (2001). *Mood and modality* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Panther, K., Thornburg, L., & Barcelona, A. (Eds.). (2009). *Metonymy and metaphor in grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Partee, B. & Borschev, V. (2004). The semantics of Russian genitive of negation: The nature and role of perspectival structure. In R. B. Young (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 14th semantics and linguistic theory conference* (212-234). Ithaca, NY: CLC Publications.
- Pérez Rull, J. C. (2000-2001). The conceptualization of emotions as locations in English. *Revista Española de Lingüística Aplicada*, 14, pp. 353-363.
- Pinkster, H. (1990). *Latin syntax and semantics*. (Hotze Mulder, trans.). London: Routledge.
- Radden, G. (1998). The conceptualization of emotional causality by means of prepositional phrases. In A. Athanasiadou & E. Tabakowska, *Speaking of emotions: Conceptualization and expression* (pp. 273-294). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Resnick, S. (2012). *Essential French grammar*. New York: Dover Publications, Inc.
- Roby, J. H. (1875). *Grammar of the Latin language from Plautus to Suetonius, volume 2*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rothstein, B., & Thieroff, R. (Eds.). (2010). *Mood in the languages of Europe*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Rozin, P. & Royzman E. B. (2001). Negativity bias, negativity dominance, and contagion. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 5, pp. 296-320.
- Ružička, Jozef. (1994). Valency and intention. In P. Luelsdorff, J. Panevová, and P. Sgall (Eds.). *Praguiana 1945-1990*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Sapir, E. (1930). The Southern Paiute language. *Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, 65, pp. 1-730.
- Savčenko, A. N. (2003) [1974]. *Sravnitel' naja grammatika Indoevropskix jazykov*. Moscow: URSS.
- Schmalstieg, W. (1983). An etymology of the word 'to fear' in Indic, Baltic, and Slavic. *Lituanus*, 29(3), pp. 60-65.
- Schmidtke-Bode, K. (2009). *A typology of purpose clauses*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Schuster-Šewc, H. (1996). *Grammar of the Upper Sorbian language*. (G. H. Troops, Trans.). München: Lincom Europa.
- Schwyzler, E. (1950). *Griechische grammatik ii, syntax und syntaktische stilistik*. München: C.H. Beck.
- Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Serbat, G. (1981). *Cas et fonctions: Études des principales doctrines casuelles du moyen-age à nos jours*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Shields, K. (1982). *Indo-European noun inflection: A developmental history*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Skeat, W. W. (1882). *A concise etymological dictionary of the English language*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- Skjærvø, P. O. (2009). Old Iranian. In G. Windfuhr (Ed.), *The Iranian languages* (pp. 43-195). New York: Routledge.
- Slocum, J. & Harvey, S.L. (2003-2004). *Old Iranian online: Old Persian master glossary*. Austin, TX: University of Texas. Available online at <http://www.utexas.edu/cola/centers/lrc/eieol/opeol-MG-X.html>
- Smyth, H. W. (1920). *A Greek grammar for colleges*. New York: American Book Company.

- Spencer, A. (2001). The paradigm-based model of morphosyntax. *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 99(2), pp. 279-313.
- Squartini, M. (2010). Mood in Italian. In Rothstein & Thieroff, pp. 237-250.
- Stefanowitsch, A. (2006). Words and their metaphors: A corpus-based approach. In A. Stefanowitsch & S.T. Griest (Eds.), *Corpus-based approached to metaphor and metonymy*, Trends in Linguistics (pp. 61-105). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Storbeck, J. & Clore, G. (2007). On the interdependence of cognition and emotion. *Cognition and Emotion*, 21(6), pp. 1212-1237.
- Swan, O. (2002). *A grammar of contemporary Polish*. Bloomington, IN: Slavic Publishers.
- Szucsich, L. (2010). Mood in Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian. In Rothstein & Thieroff, pp. 394-408.
- Taylor, A., Warner, A., Pintzuk, S., & Beths, F. (2003-). *The York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose*. Available online at <http://www-users.york.ac.uk/~lang22/YcoeHome1.htm>
- Terrell, T. & Hooper, J. B. (1974). A semantically based analysis of mood in Spanish. *Hispania*, 57, pp. 484-94.
- Tichy, E. (2006). *A survey of Proto-Indo-European*. Bremen: Hempen Verlag.
- Timberlake, A. (1975). Hierarchies in the genitive of negation. *The Slavic and East European Journal*, 19, pp. 123-138.
- Timberlake, A. (2004). *A reference grammar of Russian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tolman, H. C. (1892). *Old Persian language with the inscriptions of the Achæmenian kings and vocabulary*. Boston: Ginn and Company.
- Torrego, M. E. (1986). The system of substantive clauses as complement in classical Latin. *Glotta*, 64, pp. 66-83.
- Traugott, E. C. (1989). On the Rise of Epistemic Meanings in English: An Example of Subjectification in Semantic Change. *Language*, 65, pp. 31-55.
- van der Auwera, J. (2006). Why languages prefer prohibitives. *Journal of Foreign Languages*, 1(1), pp. 1-25.

- van der Auwera, J. (2010). Prohibition: Constructions and markers. In D. Shu & K. Turner (Eds.). *Contrasting meaning in languages of the east and west*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 443-475.
- van der Auwera, J. & Lejeune, L. (2011). The Prohibitive. In M. Dryer & M. Haspelmath (Eds.). *The world atlas of language structures online*. Munich: Max Planck Digital Library, chapter 71. Available online at [http://wals.info/chapter 71](http://wals.info/chapter_71).
- van der Wurff, W. (1998). On expletive negation with adversative predicates in the history of English. In I. Tieken-Boon van Ostade, G. Tottie, & W. van der Wurff (Eds.). *Negation in the history of English* (pp. 295-327). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Voyles, J. and Barrack, C. (2009). *An introduction to Proto-Indo-European and the early Indo-European languages*. Bloomington, IN: Slavica Publishers.
- Wackernagel, J. (2009). *Jacob Wackernagel lectures on syntax with special reference to Greek, Latin, and Germanic*. D. Langslow (Ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wall, C. H. (1908). *A practical Grammar of the Portuguese language* (4th ed.). London: D. Nutt Publishing.
- Watkins, C. (1967). Remarks on the genitive. In *To honor Roman Jakobson: Essays on the occasion of his seventieth birthday, volume 3* (pp. 2191-2198). The Hague: Mouton.
- Whitney, D. W. (1889). *Sanskrit grammar, including both the classical language, and the older dialects of Veda and Brahmana*. Boston: Ginn & Company.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1999). *Emotions across languages and cultures: Diversity and universals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Yang, Y. & Yap, F. H. (2015). "I am sure but I hedge": Fear expression *kǒngpà* as an interactive rhetorical strategy in Mandarin broadcast talk. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 83, 41-56.
- Yap, F. A., Chor, W., & Wang, J. (2012). On the development of epistemic 'fear' markers: An analysis of Mandarin *kongpa* and Cantonese *taipaa*. In W. Abraham & E. Leiss, (Eds.). *Covert patterns of modality* (pp. 312-342). Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Yates, W. (1849). *A Bengali grammar*. J. Wenger (Ed.). Calcutta: J. Thomas Baptist Mission Press.

Yoon, S. (2011). *'Not' in the mood: The syntax, semantics, and pragmatics of evaluative negation* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Chicago: Chicago, Illinois.

Zeijlstra, H. H. (2004). *Sentential negation and negative concord*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam.