When embedded C^0 projects an argument

Irina Burukina

MTA Research Institute for Linguistics, Eötvös Loránd University (Budapest, Hungary)

irine.burukina@nytud.hu

OVERVIEW. The standard assumption that Spec,CP is always an A-bar position has been questioned for several languages where embedded C^0 appears to be involved in agreement and case-assignment (cf. Wurmbrand 2017 and references therein). In addition to this, several papers suggest that the highest functional heads on the clausal spine introduce silent operators corresponding to the discourse participants (Baker 2008; Zanuttini 2008; Diercks 2013, i.a.) The present paper contributes to these discussions by presenting novel object control data from Mari (Uralic; nominative, SOV) and arguing that, in this language, a particular type of C^0 is capable of thematically licensing an overt argument in Spec,CP: the complementizer *manən* used in infinitival complement clauses can project a dative Addressee, which is first merged in Spec,CP. This behavior of *manən* follows from its dual nature: it is a semi-grammaticalized verb 'say' that retains some verbal characteristics, such as the ability to project arguments.

DOUBLE DATIVES. In Mari object control constructions with a matrix verb of order/permission and an embedded non-finite clause two independent dative DPs can appear: the DP_{DAT1} refers to the Addressee (Goal of communication; the one who receives the message and can pass it on), while the DP_{DAT2} refers to the *mandee* (the one who should carry out the order) (1a); another option is to use just one DP_{DAT} that plays the two roles simultaneously (1b).

(1) a. Maša   **mə-la-m**   **tə-lan-et**   tol-aš   (manən)   kalas-en.
     Maša   I-DAT-POS.1SG   you-DAT-POS.2SG   come-INF   COMP   tell-PRET
     'Maša told me to tell you to come.' // 'Maša told me that you should come.'

    b. Maša   **mə-la-m$_i$**   tol-aš   (manən)   kalas-en.
     Maša   I-DAT-POS.1SG   come-INF   COMP   tell-PRET
     'Maša told me to come.'

In (1b) a single DP_{DAT} obligatorily controls the embedded PRO subject (control can be partial), while in (1a) the DP_{DAT2} is the controller. The following facts point towards the argument status of the <u>DP_{DAT1}</u> as the Addressee (similarly to a DP_{DAT} in (1b)): (i) it is restricted to animate (usually [+Human]) intermediaries only; (ii) double dative is prohibited with embedded finite clauses (which is not expected if a DP_{DAT1} is an adjunct) (2a); (iii) DP_{DAT1} is not always dative depending on the matrix predicate (see (2b) where *sörvalaš* 'beg' requires an ACC Addressee).

(2) a. Maša (*mə-lan-na)   **Petja-lan** [rveze-vlak kniga-m   už-ən-ət   manən] kalas-en.
     Maša (we-DAT-POS.1PL) Petja-DAT boy-PL   book-ACC see-PRET-3PL COMP   tell-PRET
     'Maša told Petja that the boys had seen the book.'

    b. Maša **jumə-m** / *jumə-lan **mə-lan-na**   tol-aš   (manən)   sörval-en.
     Maša God-ACC   God-DAT   we-DAT-POS.1PL come-INF COMP   beg-PRET
     'Maša begged God that we should come.'

<u>DP_{DAT2}</u> forms a constituent with the non-finite clause that excludes DP_{DAT1} and the matrix predicate: the DP_{DAT2} and the infinitival dependant cannot be separated by a matrix adverb, under dislocation, and in fragment answers (3).

(3) a. Mo-m   Maša **tə-lan-et**   kalas-en? **Mə-lan-na**   kaj-aš   (manən).
     what-ACC Maša you-DAT-POS.2SG tell-PRET we-DAT-POS.1PL go-INF   COMP
     'What did Maša tell you? For us to go.'

    b. *Mo-m   Maša **tə-lan-et**   **mə-lan-na**   kalas-en? Kaj-aš   (manən).
     what-ACC Maša you-DAT-POS.2SG we-DAT-POS.1PL tell-PRET go-INF   COMP

However, the DP$_{DAT2}$ is not the embedded subject: (i) DP$_{DAT2}$ must obey the [+Human] restriction (4), and (ii) the sentences do not pass the idiom chunk test. Note also that the double dative construction is restricted; for instance, the DP$_{DAT2}$ cannot appear with matrix modals.

(4) *Maša **mə-lan-na**   [**šör-lan** tünö   šinč-aš]   kalas-en.
     Maša   we-DAT-POS.1PL milk-DAT outside   sit-INF   tell-PRET
     Intended: 'Maša told us that the milk should be outside.'

PROPOSAL. From the properties of DP$_{DAT2}$ discussed above we can infer that there is an intermediate head that takes a non-finite clause as a complement and introduces DP$_{DAT2}$ in the specifier position. I argue that this head is the embedded complementizer *manən* (which can either be overt or covert (1)): *manən* not only selects a non-finite FinP/TP as its complement but also exceptionally projects an argument in Spec,CP and assigns to it the (second) Addressee role. This accounts for all properties of DP$_{DAT2}$, including selectional restrictions. Furthermore, this straightforwardly captures the correlation: the matrix predicates that allow double dative can always embed a non-finite clause with the *manən* complementizer; predicates that cannot embed a non-finite clause with *manən* do not allow double dative (modals, evaluative adjectives, etc.).

The exceptional status of *manən* (a complementizer that licenses an argument) results from its being a semi-grammaticalized complementizer diachronically derived from the speech act verb *manaš* 'say, tell' (cf. Savatkova 2002; Toldova & Serdobol'skaja 2014 on the history of grammaticalization of *manən;* Heine & Kuteva 2002 on grammaticalization of 'say'; Matić & Pakendorf 2013 on non-canonical uses of 'say'). On the one hand, (i) morphologically *manən* is identical to the converb *man-ən* say-CVB 'saying, telling', and (ii) unlike 'pure' complementizers *što* and *štobə̂*, borrowed from Russian to Hill Mari (there are no other complementizers in Mari), and similarly to lexical verbs it always appears at the right edge of an embedded clause. On the other hand, while converb clauses are usually adjuncts, the embedded CPs with *manən* under consideration are complements: they (i) cannot co-occur with a Theme DP argument, such as 'fact' or 'this', as in *Mary told this to John, saying that …*, (ii) resist right dislocation, and (iii) allow sub-extraction. The following facts support the analysis of *manən* as a complementizer: (i) its morphological form is fixed; for instance, it does not allow a negative converb form derived with the suffix *-de*; (ii) it cannot be substituted by a converb form of a synonymous speech act verb; (iii) it is desemanticized and can be embedded under mental and emotive predicates, such as 'know' or 'be afraid'.

DERIVATION. Adopting Landau's (2015) logophoric control analysis, developed for verbs of order and permission as attitude predicates and accommodating partial control, the following (simplified) structure corresponds to sentences with a single DP$_{DAT}$ (1b).

(5) [$_{VP}$ **DP$_{DAT}$** [$_{V'}$ [$_{CP}$ [$_{GP}$ … *pro$_y$*] [$_{C'}$ [$_{FinP}$ PRO$_i$ [$_{Fin'}$ [$_{TP}$ t$_i$ infinitive] Fin^0]] C^0 *manən*]] V^0]]

The GP (concept generator phrase) in Spec,CP introduces the AUTHOR, ADDRESSEE, TIME, and WORLD coordinates for the embedded proposition. In case of object control, the ADDRESSEE coordinate is syntactically projected as *pro$_y$* bound by the matrix Addressee argument (flexibility of binding relation allows partial coreference), and it further values the PRO variable via predication, established between *pro$_y$* (the subject of predication) and FinP (Landau 2015). The analysis for double dative sentences proposed in this paper is compatible with the structure in (5) under the assumption that DP$_{DAT2}$ – that is, the Addressee argument projected by C^0 – is an overtly introduced ADDRESSEE (6), in the spirit of Baker (2008).

(6) [$_{VP}$ **DP$_{DAT1}$** [$_{V'}$ [$_{CP}$ **DP$_{DAT2i}$** [$_{C'}$ [$_{FinP}$ PRO$_i$ [$_{Fin'}$ [$_{TP}$ t$_i$ infinitive] Fin^0]] C^0 *manən*]] V^0]]

Similarly to *pro$_y$* in (5), DP$_{DAT2}$ in (6) and PRO in the non-finite clause are connected via predication; the predication nature of the relation explains why in 'double dative' sentences, unlike in 'mono-dative' ones, partial control is no longer acceptable. The analysis further accounts for the incompatibility of the double dative with finite clauses, under the assumption

that the semi-grammaticalized *manən* should form a complex predicate with the embedded clause to introduce the DP$_{DAT2}$; hence, the FinP cannot be fully saturated, finite.

Selected reference: Baker, M. 2008. *The syntax of agreement and concord*. **Landau, I**. 2015. *A two-tiered theory of control*. **Toldova S.Ju. & N.V. Serdobol'skaja**. 2014. Glagol reči *manaš* v marijskom jazyke: osobennosti grammatikalizacii. [The verb manaš in Mari: grammaticalization] *Vya,* 6. 66-91. **Wurmbrand, S**. 2017. Formal and semantic agreement in syntax: a dual feature approach. *OLINCO 2016.* 19–36. Olomouc. **Zanuttini, R**. 2008. Encoding the addressee in the syntax: Evidence from English imperative subjects. *NLLT* 26: 185–218.