

When embedded C⁰ projects an argument

Irina Burukina

MTA Research Institute for Linguistics; Eötvös Loránd University

1 The standard assumption that Spec,CP is always an A-bar position has been questioned for several languages where embedded C⁰ appears to be involved in agreement and case-assignment, which suggests that at least some C heads can have A-features in addition to A-bar features (see Wurmbrand 2019 and references therein). The present paper contributes to this discussion by presenting previously undiscussed object control data from Hill Mari (Uralic; nominative, SOV) and arguing that, in this language, a particular type of C⁰ is capable of thematically licensing an argument in Spec,CP: the complementizer *manân* used in infinitival complement clauses can project a dative DP argument, which is first merged in Spec,CP and is assigned Addressee/Goal theta-role. This behavior of *manân* follows from its dual nature: it is a semi-grammaticalized speech act verb ‘say’ that retains some verbal characteristics, such as the ability to project arguments.

2 In Hill Mari, in 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 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). Double dative constructions of this type are not attested, for example, in Hungarian (another Uralic language) and Russian (a contact language).

- (1) a. Maša *mă-lün-em* *tă-lün-et_i* [PRO_i tol-aš (manân)] keles-en.
Maša.NOM I-DAT-POSS.1SG you-DAT-POSS.2SG come-INF COMP tell-PRET
‘Maša told me that you should come.’ (=‘Talking to me, Maša ordered you to come.’)
b. Maša *mă-lün-em_i* [PRO_i tol-aš (manân)] keles-en.
Maša.NOM I-DAT-POSS.1SG come-INF COMP tell-PRET
‘Maša told me to come.’

In sentences similar to (1b) a single DP_{DAT} obligatorily controls the embedded PRO subject (although coreference can be partial), while in (1a) the DP_{DAT2} is the controller. It might be suggested that in double dative constructions a DP_{DAT1} is merely an adjunct denoting the way of communication; however, the following facts point towards its argument status as the Goal of communication (similarly to a single DP_{DAT} in (1b)): (i) DP_{DAT1} is restricted to animate intermediaries only (2a); (ii) double dative is prohibited with embedded finite clauses (which is not expected if a DP_{DAT1} is an adjunct) (2b); (iii) DP_{DAT1} is not always dative depending on the matrix predicate (see (2c) where *sarvalaš* ‘beg’ requires an accusative Goal).

- (2) a. Maša (**smskă-lün*) *mă-län-nă* tol-aš keles-en.
Maša sms-DAT we-DAT-POSS.1PL come-INF tell-PRET
‘Maša told us in sms to come.’
b. Maša (**Petja-lan*) *mă-län-nă* keles-en [što šăšer olică-štă šönz-ă].
Maša Petja-DAT we-DAT-POSS.1PL tell-PRET that milk street-IN stay-NPST.3SG
‘Maša told us (**via* Petja) that the milk was outside.’
c. Maša *jâm-{âm/*lan}* {*mă-län-nă* / **măm-nă-m*} tol-aš sarval-en.
Maša god-ACC/DAT we-DAT-POSS.1PL we-POSS.1PL-ACC come-INF beg-PRET
‘Maša begged the god so that we would come.’

DP_{DAT2} forms a constituent with the non-finite clause that excludes DP_{DAT1} and the matrix predicate: the two cannot be separated by a matrix adverb (3a) or under dislocation (3b).

- (3) a. Maša Petja-lan [*mă-län-nă tagăčô* pičö-m
Maša Petja-DAT we-DAT-POSS.1PL today fence-ACC
(**irgodâm*) *törl-ăš*] keles-en.
tomorrow fix-INF tell-PRET
‘Maša told Petja that today we should fix the fence.’
Not available: ‘Today Maša have told Petja that we should fix the fence tomorrow.’

- b. Maša Petja-lan (**mä-län-nä*) keles-en [*mä-län-nä* pičö-m törl-äš].
 Maša Petja-DAT we-DAT-POSS.1PL tell-PRET we-DAT-POSS.1PL fence-ACC fix-INF
 ‘Maša told Petja that we should fix the fence.’

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 modals.

- (4) *Maša mä-län-nä [*ššer-län* olicä-štö šönz-äš] keles-en.
 Maša we-DAT-POSS.1PL milk-DAT street-IN stay-INF tell-PRET
 Intended: ‘Maša told us that the milk should be outside.’

3 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 *manân* (which can either be overt or covert (1)). In other words, I propose that *manân* 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 Goal role. This accounts for all properties of DP_{DAT2} listed above, 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 *manân* complementizer; predicates that cannot embed a non-finite clause with *manân* do not allow double dative (modals like *keleş* ‘need’, etc.) (5).

- (5) mä-län-nä (**Petja-lan*) tol-aš (**manân*) kel-eš.
 we-DAT-POSS.1PL Petja-DAT come-INF COMP be.necessary-NPST.3SG
 ‘For us (*for Petja) it is necessary to come.’

I further propose that the exceptional status of *manân* (a complementizer that licenses an argument) results from its being a semi-grammaticalized complementizer diachronically derived from the speech act verb *manaš* ‘say, tell’ (see Savatkova 2002; Toldova & Serdobolskaya 2014 for a discussion of the history of grammaticalization of *manân*). On the one hand, (i) morphologically *manân* is identical to the non-agreeing converb *man-ân* say-CVB, and (ii) unlike ‘pure’ complementizers *što* and *štobâ*, borrowed from Russian, and similarly to predicates it always appears at the right edge of an embedded clause. On the other hand, embedded clauses with *manân* under consideration are complements, while converb clauses are usually adjuncts. The following facts support analysis of *manân* 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 not restricted to speech-related contexts and can be used embedded under a mental predicate, such as ‘think’.

4 Adopting Landau’s (2015) logophoric control analysis, which was developed for verbs of order and permission as attitude predicates and which accommodate partial control, the following (simplified) structure corresponds to sentences with a single DP_{DAT} (6).

- (6) [_{VP} DP_{DAT} [_V [_{CP} [_{GP} ... *pro_y*] [_C [_{FinP} PRO_i infinitive] C⁰ *manân*]]] V⁰]]

Here, the GP (concept generator phrase) component in the embedded 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 Goal argument (flexibility of the binding relation allows partial coreference), and it further values the PRO variable via predication (Landau 2015). The analysis for double dative sentences proposed in this paper is compatible with the structure in (6) under assumption that DP_{DAT2} – that is the Goal argument projected by C⁰ – is a ‘re-introduced’ overt ADDRESSEE coordinate (7).

- (7) [_{VP} DP_{DAT1} [_V [_{CP} DP_{DAT2i} [_C [_{FinP} PRO_i infinitive] C⁰ *manân*]]] *tell*]]]

Similarly to *pro_y* in (6), DP_{DAT2} in (7) and PRO in the non-finite clause are connected via predication; this explains why in ‘double dative’ sentences, unlike in ‘mono-dative’ ones, partial control is no longer acceptable (examples omitted due to the limitations of space).

5 It might be suggested that DP_{DAT2} is introduced by a silent modal / speech act verb selecting a non-finite clause as its argument; the full version of the paper argues against these options, based on the distribution of these lexical predicates and constructions with double dative.

- Landau, I.** 2015. *A two-tiered theory of control*. MIT Press.
- Savatkova, A.** 2002. *Gornoye narechiye mariyskogo yazyka*. [Hill Mari language]. Savariae.
- Toldova S. Ju. & N. V. Serdobolskaya.** 2014. Glagol reči manaš v marijskom jazyke: osobennosti grammatikalizacii. [The verb manaš in Mari: grammaticalization] *Voprosy Jazykoznanija*, 6. 66-91.
- Wurmbrand, S.** 2019. Cross-clausal A-dependencies. In *Proceedings of the Chicago Linguistic Society meeting 54*, 585–604. Chicago: University of Chicago.