When embedded $C^0$ projects an argument
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1 Overview

Spec,CP is not always an A-bar position $\leftarrow$ embedded $C^0$ can be involved in agreement and case-assignment (see Wurmbrand 2019).

However, Chomsky (2000:102): “$a = [\text{XP } | \text{ H YP } ]$ ... If H is C, XP is not introduced by pure Merge.”

Our claim: A particular type of $C^0$ can thematically license an argument merged externally in Spec,CP.

Novel data: Object control in Meadow Mari (Uralic; nominative, head final, SOV).¹

In particular, double dative constructions.

Mari speech act verbs can serve as mandative predicates when they embed an infinitival or subjunctive clause.

1. Speech act verb + a finite indicative clause = an utterance
2. Speech act verb + a finite subjunctive / infinitival clause = an order

Speech act verb: No mandative interpretation

(1) [Rveze-vlak kniɡa-m už-an-ot manən], Maša ma-lan-na kalas-en.
boy-PL book-ACC see-PST-3PL COMP Maša we-DAT-POSS.1PL tell-PST
‘Mary told us that the boys had seen the book.’

DP$_{\text{DAT}}$ – Addressee (the Goal of communication).

Speech act verb: Mandative interpretation

(2) Maša ma-lan-na$_i$ [PRO$_i$ tol-aš (manən)] kalas-en.
Maša we-DAT-POSS.1PL come-INF COMP tell-PST
‘Maša told us to come.’

DP$_{\text{DAT}}$ – simultaneously Addressee (the Goal of communication) and mandee.

¹Unless explicitly specified otherwise, the data presented here come from the Morkinsko-Sernur dialect of Meadow Mari (otherwise known as Eastern Mari) spoken in Mari El republic. Several examples marked “Hill Mari” come from the Kuznetsovo variety of Hill Mari (Western Mari) spoken in Mari El. The data have been collected during my field work in 2019 – 2020. The double dative constructions under consideration are attested in both languages and, so far, I have found no difference in their properties and distribution.
In object control constructions with a mandative interpretation two non-coordinated dative nominal phrases can appear.\(^2\)

Double dative sentences

(3) Maša mo-la-m to-lan-et tol-aš (manən) kalas-en.
Maša I-DAT-POSS.1SG you-DAT-POSS.2SG come-INF COMP tell-PST

‘Maša told me for you to come.’ (OR: ‘While talking to me Maša told you to come’, ‘Maša told you via me to come’)

Schema: \([\text{DP}_{\text{DAT1}} + \text{DP}_{\text{DAT2}} + \text{infinitive} + \text{verb}]\).

\(\text{DP}_{\text{DAT1}}\) – immediate Addressee – an Intermediary that receives the message.

\(\text{DP}_{\text{DAT2}}\) – the obligation holder/Addressee.

It is usually implied that the Intermediary must pass the message to the Obligation holder; but it does not matter whether the message has actually been passed on.

Outline of the analysis: \(\text{DP}_{\text{DAT2}}\) is base-generated in Spec,CP and is licensed by the embedded \(C^0\) manifested as the complementizer \(\text{manən}\). This exceptional property of \(\text{manən}\) follows from its semi-grammaticalized status: it is derived from the verb of communication \(\text{manaš}\) ‘say, tell’ and retains some of its lexical properties.

(4) \([V_P \text{DP}_{\text{DAT1}} \text{[VP}_C \text{DP}_{\text{DAT2}} \text{[\text{C[FINP} \text{PRO}_i \text{[FIN} \text{TP} \text{t}_i \text{infinitive} \text{]} \text{FIN}^0 \text{]} \text{C}^0 \text{manən} \text{]} \text{V}^0 \text{]}\]

2 Examining the two dative DPs

2.1 Properties of the dative DP1

\(\text{DP}_{\text{DAT1}}\) is the Addressee argument selected by the matrix predicate.

(5) a. Maša Petja-lan no-lan-na, [\text{PRO}_i \text{tol-aš (manan) kalas-en.}]
Maša Petja-DAT we-DAT-POSS.1PL come-INF COMP tell-PST

‘Maša told Petja for us to come.’

b. Maša Petja-lan, [\text{PRO}_i \text{tol-aš (manan) kalas-en.}]
Maša Petja-DAT come-INF COMP tell-PST

‘Maša told Petja to come.’

\(^2\)Not attested, for instance, in Russian (a contact language) or Hungarian (a Uralic language). In Mari, in double datives are regularly prohibited in monoclausal constructions.
DP\textsubscript{DAT1} is restricted to [+Animate] (regularly [+Human]) intermediaries.

   ‘In a letter, Maša told me to come.’

DP\textsubscript{DAT1} does not have to be dative.

   ‘Maša begged God to come.’

   ‘Maša begged God to make us come.’

2.2 Properties of the dative DP2

DP\textsubscript{DAT2} is interpreted as a combination Addressee/mandee.

Scenario: The children are asleep. They should sleep until the evening. The doctor talked to me and asked me to check on them.

   ‘The doctor told me that the children should sleep until the evening.’

   Intended: ‘The doctor told me that the children should sleep until the evening.’

c. #Vrač joča-vlak-lan kas marte mal-aš (manon) kalas-en. doctor child-PL-DAT evening until sleep-INF COMP tell-PST
   ‘The doctor told me that the children should sleep until the evening.’

DP\textsubscript{DAT2} forms a constituent with the embedded non-finite clause.

(9) *Taj ma-lan-na [Petja-lan tače kapka-m erla ačal-ašt (manon)] kalas-aš-ač. you we-DAT-POSS.1PL Petja-DAT today fence-ACC tomorrow fix-INF COMP tell-PST-2SG
   Intended: ‘Today you told us that tomorrow Petja should fix the fence.’

DP\textsubscript{DAT2} and the infinitival clause cannot be separated by a matrix adverb.

   ‘You told us that Petja should fix the fence.’

   ‘You told us that Petja should fix the fence.’
DP_{DAT2} is **not** an overt embedded subject (cf. Russian or Hungarian, where overt embedded subjects of non-finite clauses are attested):

✓ DP_{DAT2} obeys the [+Human] restriction regardless of the embedded predicate. → same restriction as for the addressee!

\[(11)\]
a. #Maša mə́län-em [äškal-lan ške-ok tol-aš] keles-en. [Hill Mari]
   Maša I-DAT-POSS.1SG cow-DAT REFLECT-PTCL come-INF tell-PST
   Only: ‘Maša told me to go for the cow myself.’
   Not available: ‘Maša told me that the cow should come herself.’
   Maša I-DAT-POSS.1SG cow self-PTCL come-JUST COMP tell-PST
   ‘Maša told me that the cow should come herself.’

✓ Double dative sentences do not pass the idiom chunk test.

\[(12)\]
*Maša (Petja-lan) [koti-lan mä loškô-na vanž-aš] keles-en. [Hill Mari]
   Maša Petja-DAT cat-DAT we between-POSS.1PL run-INF tell-PST
   Intended: ‘Maša told (Peter) that we should quarrel.’

✓ Double dative constructions are restricted to speech act verbs.

\[(13)\]
   father-DAT [we-DAT-POSS.1PL here-EL go-INF hard
   ‘For his/her father it is hard to leave.’

3 Double dative constructions: the role of *manən*

### 3.1 The second dative DP is projected by the C head

- DP_{DAT1} is a matrix Addressee.
- DP_{DAT2} is related to the non-finite clause but cannot be analyzed as an argument of the embedded predicate. No raising analysis.

\[(14)\]
[ ... DP_{DAT1} ... \[XP \text{DP}_{DAT2} \text{[XP [PRO_{i} infinitive ] X⁰] ... SAY ]}\]

I argue that X here is a C head of a particular type: it is manifested as the complementizer *manən* or its null allomorph.

\[(15)\]
Maša ma-lan-na [CP Petja-lan, [IP PRO_{i} tol-aš] (manən)] kalas-en.
   Maša we-DAT-POSS.1PL Petja-DAT come-INF COMP tell-PST
   ‘Maša told us that Petja should come.’

**The complementizer *manən*:**

- selects a non-finite FinP as its complement,
- projects an argument in Spec,CP – the DP_{DAT2} – and assigns it the Addressee role together with licensing dative Case.
Cf. the correlation: only those predicates that can embed a non-finite complement clause with the complementizer *manən* allow double dative.

father-DAT we-DAT-POSS.1PL go-INF COMP hard

‘For his/her father it is hard to leave.’

3.2 The complementizer *manən*

The exceptional status of *manən* as a complementizer
← it is a semi-grammaticalized element diachronically derived from the speech act verb *manaš* ‘say, tell’. Morphologically *manən* is identical to the non-agreeing converb/past.3sg form *man-ən*.

COND virus tell-PST surgeon

‘And a virus?’ – said the surgeon.

Similarly to lexical predicates and unlike, for instance, ‘proper’ complementizers, such as *što* ‘that’ and *štobə* ‘so that’ borrowed from Russian to Hill Mari, *manən* always appears at the right edge.


‘The mother told her son to take/buy bread.’

b. Āvä ergō-ž-lān keles-en [tōdō sōkər-ōm nāl-žō (*manən)]. mother son-POSS.3SG-DAT tell-PST he bread-ACC take-JUS COMP

‘The mother told her son to take/buy bread.’

In the double-dative sentences *manən* is a C⁰, not a lexical verb (the converb form):

✓ Converb clauses are usually adjuncts, the embedded clauses with *manən* under consideration are complements:

1. They cannot co-occur with an internal DP argument, such as ‘fact’ or ‘joke’ (19).
2. They allow sub-extraction (20, 21).

we Petja-DAT this joke-ACC tell-PST-1PL

‘We told Petja this joke.’

we Petja-DAT this joke-ACC he-DAT come-INF say-CVB tell-PST-1PL

Intended: ‘We told Petja this joke, saying to him to come.’

(20) a. Nunə ma-lan-na [(kō-m šel-aš (*manən))] kalas-en-ət?
they we-DAT-POSS.1PL who-ACC hit-INF COMP tell-PST-3PL

‘Who did they tell us to hit?’

b. Kō-m, nunə ma-lan-na [(tī šel-aš (*manən))] kalas-en-ət?
who-ACC they we-DAT-POSS.1PL hit-INF COMP tell-PST-3PL

‘Who did they tell us to hit?’
The morphological form of \textit{manən} as a complementizer is fixed. For instance, a negative converb form derived with the suffix -\textit{de} cannot be used.

\begin{itemize}
\item[(22)]
a. Maša salam-əm kalas-\textit{ade} / man-\textit{de} pur-əş.
Maša hello-ACC tell-CVB.NEG tell-CVB.NEG enter-PST
\end{itemize}

Maša entered without saying hello.

\begin{itemize}
\item[(23)]
\begin{itemize}
\item *Maša t-lat [təšeč kaj-aš / kaj-Ø man-\textit{de}] kalas-\textit{en}.
\end{itemize}
Masa you-DAT.2SG here.EL go-INF go-IMP tell-CVB.NEG tell-PST
\end{itemize}

Intended: ‘Maša told you not to leave.’

Maša did not tell you to leave.

\\textit{manən} as a complementizer cannot be substituted by a converb form of a synonymous speech act verb.

\begin{itemize}
\item[(24)]
Iza üšan-a [süžar-že ok šojašt \textit{manən}].
brother believe-NPST.3SG sister-POSS.3SG NEG.3SG lie COMP
\end{itemize}

‘The brother believes that his sister will not lie to him.’ [T&S:120 (25)]

Following Toldova and Serdobolskaya (2014): In modern Mari \textit{manən} is being grammaticalized as a functional element, a complementizer.

Its grammaticalization has not been complete yet:

it may retain some properties of the lexical speech act verb \textit{manaš}, such as the ability to combine with a non-finite clausal complement and to license the Addressee argument.

\begin{itemize}
\item[(25)] \[ [V_P \textit{DP}_{DAT1} \mid [V_t [CP \textit{DP}_{DAT2i} \mid [C [F_{inP} \textit{PRO}_{i} [F_{inO} [T_{i} \textit{infinitive} \mid F_{inO} ] ] C^{0} \textit{manən} ] ] V^{0} ] ] ] \]
\end{itemize}

4 Deriving double dative constructions: Logophoric control

Mari \textit{mono-dative} object control constructions

← Landau’s (2015) logophoric control analysis for attitude predicates.
(26)

GP – the concept generator phrase; it introduces the AUTHOR, ADDRESSEE, TIME, and WORLD coordinates for the embedded proposition.

Mari double-dative object control constructions

(27)

DP_{DAT2} and PRO are connected via predication.
5 Additional support for the analysis

5.1 No double datives with finite clauses

Maša we-DAT-POSS.1PL Petja-DAT boy-PL book-ACC see-JUS COMP tell-PST
Intended: ‘Maša told us to tell Petja that the boys should see the book.’
or ‘Maša told Petja to tell us that the boys should see the book.’

Maša we-DAT-POSS.1PL Petja-DAT come-INF COMP tell-PST
‘Maša told us that Petja should come.’
Maša we-DAT-POSS.1PL Petja-DAT Petja come-JUS COMP tell-PST
‘Maša told us that Petja should come.’

← DP\textsubscript{DAT2} is the subject of predication, while FinP is the predicate (hence, cannot be fully saturated).

5.2 Partial vs. exhaustive control

In sentences with a single dative DP and an embedded non-finite clause, the DPDAT and the understood embedded subject must be co-indexed. However, the coreference can be partial.

← pro\textsubscript{y} is bound by the controller, DP\textsubscript{DAT}; binding is more flexible.

(30) a. Maša t-lat tašč parl’a kaj-ašt kalas-en.
Maša you-DAT.2SG here.EL together go-INF tell-PST
‘Maša told you to leave together.’ (= you and Maša should leave together)
b. Me tašč parl’a ka-en-na.
we here.EL together go-PST-1PL
‘We left together.’
c. Maj tašč (*parl’a) ka-en-am.
I here.EL together go-PST-1SG
‘I left.’

In sentences with two dative DPs, DP\textsubscript{DAT2} obligatorily controls the embedded subject. Partial coreference examples with two dative DPs are evaluated as degraded.

← DP\textsubscript{DAT2} is the subject of predication

(31) *Maša ma-la-m t-lat tašč parl’a kaj-ašt kalas-en.
Maša I-DAT-POSS.1SG you-DAT.2SG here.EL together go-INF tell-PST
Intended: ‘Maša told me to tell you to leave together.’

6 Implications

• Spec,CP is not restricted to having A-bar properties. For the future research: to look at other languages where speech act verbs are being grammaticalized into complementizers. Cf. Sinitic languages (Chappell 2008); see also Heine & Kuteva (2002) on grammaticalization of ‘say’, Matić & Pakendorf (2013) on non-canonical uses of ‘say’.
• (Tentative) proposal: $\text{DP}_{\text{DAT}2}$ argument is an overt ADDRESSSEE coordinate, in the spirit of Baker 2008.

Baker 2008:125: “All matrix clauses and certain embedded clauses have two special null arguments generated within the CP projection, one designated S (for speaker) and the other A (for addressee).” I suggest that, based on the Mari data, this proposal can be elaborated to include exceptional cases when a ‘discourse-oriented’ argument (an Addressee in the cases under consideration) is overtly realized as an independent DP, being projected by the complementizer.
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A Alternative analysis: a silent modal

\[
\text{(32)}
\]

```
\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
    \node (X) at (0,0) {XP};
    \node (X') at (1,1) {X'};
    \node (CP) at (1,2) {CP};
    \node (GP) at (-1,2) {GP};
    \node (C') at (1,3) {C'};
    \node (PRO) at (-2,4) {\ldots \text{pro}_{y}};
    \node (TP) at (0,4) {TP};
    \node (C') at (0,3) {C'};
    \node (manən) at (2,2) {manən};

    \draw (X) -- (X') -- (CP) -- (GP) -- (PRO) -- (TP) -- (C') -- (C') -- (manən);
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}
```

where $X^0$ is a silent modal.

**Challenges:**

Ideally, we would like this silent modal to fit in with overt deontic modals found in Mari, such as $\text{kūlaš}$ ‘be necessary’. $\text{kūlaš}$ is a transitive control predicate that selects a dative obligation holder and a non-finite clause.

\begin{itemize}
    \item $\text{kūlaš}$ ‘be necessary’ has [+ Animate] restriction on the $\text{DP}_{\text{DAT}}$;
    \item $\text{kūlaš}$ can embed a finite subjunctive clause (33);
\end{itemize}
• külaš cannot embed non-finite clauses with manən;
• Partial control is not allowed with double datives.

\[(33)\] Ma-lan-na [PRO, kogol’o vaškerak kiij-žo manən] kül-eš.
we-DAT-POSS.1PL pie quickly cook-JUS COMP be.necessary-NPST.3SG

‘It is necessary for us for the pie to cook quickly.’

\[B\] Double dative and the left periphery of the embedded clause

Wh-movement out of the embedded CP is allowed in Mari → A/A-bar properties of the same C\(^0\). However, the mechanism of this movement is understudied; more data should be collected.

they we-DAT-POSS.1SG you-DAT.2SG Petja-ACC hit-INF COMP tell-PST-3PL

‘They told us for you to hit Petja.’

b. Kō-m₁ nuno ma-lan-na [tə-lat [t₁ šel-aš (manən)]] kalas-en-ət?
who-ACC they we-DAT-POSS.1SG you-DAT.2SG hit-INF COMP tell-PST-3PL

‘Who did they tell us for you to hit?’

c. Nuno ma-lan-na [kō-m₂ tə-lat [t₁ šel-aš (manən)]] kalas-en-ət?
they we-DAT-POSS.1SG who-ACC you-DAT.2SG hit-INF COMP tell-PST-3PL

‘Who did they tell us for you to hit?’

d. Nuno ma-lan-na [tə-lat [kō-m šel-aš (manən)]] kalas-en-ət?
they we-DAT-POSS.1SG you-DAT.2SG who-ACC hit-INF COMP tell-PST-3PL

‘Who did they tell us for you to hit?’

\[C\] Dative case assignment

In infinitival purpose clauses with the complementizer manən:

• overt dative subjects can appear;\(^3\)
• the infinitive is accompanied by a possessive marker corresponding to the embedded subject: optionally if the subject is overt, obligatorily if the subject is covert and distinct from the matrix subject;
• manən is optional but preferable.

\[(35)\] a. Rveze-vlak(-*lan) pur-aš manən me kapka-m poč-en-na.
boy-PL-DAT enter-JUS.PL COMP we gate-ACC open-PST.1PL

‘We opened the gate so that the boys could enter.’

b. ?Rveze-vlak-lan pur-aš manən me kapka-m poč-en-na. – obsolete
boy-PL-DAT enter-INF COMP we gate-ACC open-PST.1PL

‘We opened the gate so that the boys could enter.’

boy-PL-DAT enter-INF-POSS.3PL COMP we gate-ACC open-PST.1PL

‘We opened the gate so that the boys could enter.’

\(^3\)See also Landau (2008), i.a., on dative case being assigned by the embedded C\(^0\) in Russian.
    enter-INF-POSS.1PL COMP we gate-ACC open-PST-1PL
    ‘We opened the gate to enter.’
b. Mə-lan-na pur-aš(-na) manon me kapka-m poč-en-na.
    we-DAT-POSS.1PL enter-INF-POSS.1PL COMP we gate-ACC open-PST-1PL
    ‘We opened the gate to enter.’
c. Pur-aš#(-na) manon Petja kapka-m poč-en.
    enter-INF-POSS.1PL COMP Petja gate-ACC open-PST
    ‘Petja opened the gate for us to enter.’
    Without "-na": ‘Petja opened the gate to enter.’

(37)  a. Kogəl'-lan küj-aš(-əžə) manon me duxovka-m čükt-əš-na.
    pie-DAT cook-INF-POSS.3SG COMP we oven-ACC turn.on-PST-1PL
    ‘We turned on the oven for the pie to cook.’

In the double dative constructions under consideration in this paper, possessive marking on embedded infinitives is prohibited:

    Maša we-DAT-POSS.1PL come-INF-POSS.1PL tell-PST
    Intended: ‘Maša told us to come.’
    Maša boy-PL-DAT we-DAT-POSS.1PL here.EL go-INF-POSS.1PL COMP tell-PST
    Intended: ‘Maša told the boys for us to come.’