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Carstens and Diercks (2009): Lubukusu Complementizers, AGR-li vs mbo

- AGR-li: Agreeing complementizer (agrees with matrix subject), High complementizer, is a phase head.
- mbo: Non-agreeing complementizer, Low complementizer, not a phase head.
- Can hyper-raise across mbo (1), but not across AGR-li (2)

(1) Mikaeli a-lolekhana mbo t_i a-si-kona
1.Michael C1-seem COMP C1-PRES-sleep
‘Michael seems to be still sleeping.’

(2) *Mikaeli a-lolekhana a-li t_i a-si-kona
1.Michael C1-seem C1-COMP C1-PRES-sleep
‘Michael seems to be still sleeping.’

Potential Problem:

- Raising to object across the agreeing complementizer is allowed:

(3) a. N-enya en-di Barack Obama a-khil-e.
1sg-want 1sg-that 1.Barack.Obama c1SM-win-SBJV
‘I want Barack Obama to succeed.’

1sg-want 1.Barack.Obama 1sg-that c1SM-win-SBJV
‘I want Barack Obama to succeed.’

- A-movement cannot cross phases
- Moving from subject position to object position via Spec-CP would constitute improper movement

Either:

- AGR-li is a phase head, and DP has not raised from subject to object position, or
- AGR-li is not a phase head, and DP has raised from subject to object position

*I owe a debt of gratitude to Justine Sikuku for providing the Lubukusu data discussed here
This talk:
I consider 4 possibilities:

1. Control: The pre-complementizer DP is generated in object position, and it controls a PRO in the subject position of the lower clause;
2. Prolepsis: The pre-complementizer DP is generated in the matrix clause, and is coindexed with a pro in the subject position of the lower clause (cf Davies 2005: Madurese);
3. The pre-complementizer DP is generated in subject position in the embedded clause, and then raises to Spec-CP of the embedded clause (cf Bruening 2001: Passamaquoddy & Japanese)
4. The pre-complementizer DP is generated in subject position in the embedded clause, and then raises to object position (cf Halpert and Zeller 2015: Zulu)

I Show:

• The DP must originate in lower clause, can’t be control or prolepsis
• Raising appears to feed some A-movement operations, suggesting the raising movement itself is A-movement (Raising to object, not Raising to Spec-CP)

The DP starts out in the lower clause

It’s not control
Control: Pre-Comp DP is generated in object position, and is assigned a θ-role by the matrix verb; the DP controls a PRO in the subject position of the lower clause.

The pre-complementizer DP in (3b) is not an argument of the matrix verb:

• The DP does not get a θ-role from the matrix verb.
• Subsequently, there is no difference in meaning between sentences where the DP appears before/after the verb, unlike in control constructions

Control example:

(4) a. N-a-reeba  en-di  Sammy  a-yet-e  Wafula
   1sg-pst-ask 1sg-that 1.Sammy c1SM-help-sbjv 1.Wafula
   ‘I asked that Sammy help Wafula’
   b. N-a-reeba  Sammy  en-di  a-yet-e  Wafula
      1sg-pst-ask 1.Sammy 1sg-that c1SM-help-sbjv 1.Wafula
      ‘I asked Sammy to help Wafula’

• In (4a) request can be directed at someone other than Sammy.
• In (4b) request must be directed at Sammy.

Raised DP example:

• No difference in meaning

(5) a. N-enya  en-di  Sammy  a-yet-e  Wafula
   1sg-want 1sg-that 1.Sammy c1SM-help-sbjv 1.Wafula
   ‘I want Sammy to help Wafula’
b. N-enya *Sammy en-di* a-yet-e Wafula
   1sg-want 1.Sammy 1sg-that c1SM-help-SBJV 1.Wafula
   ‘I want Sammy to help Wafula’

Passivization of the lower clause results in a difference of meaning in control constructions:
**Control Example**

(6) a. N-a-reeba *Sammy en-di* a-yet-e Wafula
   1sg-PAST-ask 1.Sammy 1sg-that c1SM-help-SBJV 1.Wafula
   ‘I asked Sammy to help Wafula’

   b. N-a-reeba *Wafula en-di* a-yet-w-e ne Sammy
   1sg-PAST-ask 1.Wafula 1sg-that c1SM-help-PASS-SBJV by 1.Sammy
   ‘I asked Wafula to be helped by Sammy’

Passivization of the lower clause does not result in a difference of meaning in raising constructions:

(7) a. N-enya *Sammy en-di* a-yet-e Wafula
   1sg-want 1.Sammy 1sg-that c1SM-help-SBJV 1.Wafula
   ‘I want Sammy to help Wafula’

   b. N-enya *Wafula en-di* a-yet-w-e ne Sammy
   1sg-want 1.Wafula 1sg-that c1SM-help-PASS-SBJV by 1.Sammy
   ‘I want Wafula to be helped by Sammy’

**Conclusion:** It’s not control

It’s not prolepsis

**Prolepsis:**

- A non-thematic DP anticipates the reference of a thematic argument in the embedded clause.
- English: “I believe of *Sarah* that *she* is intelligent”
- Proleptic DP is not always introduced by a preposition, and second argument is not always overt

**Madurese Prolepsis** (adapted from Davies 2005:649)

(8) Atin a-bala-agi *Hasan* i dha’ Siti *ja’ pro* , enter ka Sorbaja.
   Atin AV-say-BV Hasan to Siti COMP pro go to Sorbaja
   ‘Atin said to Siti that Hasan went to Sorbaja.’

   ‘Atin said to Siti about Hasan, that he went to Sorbaya.’

**Idiom chunks:** prolepsis vs raising

- **Raising** preserves the idiomatic meaning

(9) “*The cat* seems to be out of the bag”

- **Prolepsis** disallows idiomatic interpretation

(10) “I want for *the cat* that *it* be out of the bag”

**Lubukusu:** Idiomatic meaning retained when the DP precedes the complementizer

(11) a. Embwa ya-a-mu-khomb-a mu-bi-kele
   c9.dog c9SM-PAST-OM-lick-FV c18-c8-foot
   ‘He always moves from place to place’
   (Lit: ‘The dog licked him on the feet’)

3
b. N-enya en-di embwa e-mu-khomb-e mu-bi-kele
   1sg-want 1sg-that c9.dog c9sM-OM-lick-SBJ c18-c8-foot
   ‘I want him to always move from place to place’
   (Lit: ‘I want the dog to lick him on the feet’)

c. N-enya embwa en-di e-mu-khomb-e mu-bi-kele
   1sg-want c9.dog 1sg-that c9sM-OM-lick-SBJ c18-c8-foot
   ‘I want him to always move from place to place’
   (Lit: ‘I want the dog to lick him on the feet’)

Conclusion: It’s not prolepsis, the DP must originate in lower clause

Arguments for raising to object

Object marking:
Diercks and Sikuku (2013):

- Object marking in Lubukusu arises as a result of pronoun incorporation (object marker acts as a clitic), rather than agreement.

- Following Harizanov (2014) and Kramer (2014): object marking derived by movement of D from the VP to Spec-vP, followed by m-merger with the verb (12)

\[
(12)
\]

Lubukusu: Object Marker can be used in place of raised DP

(13) Na-mu-enya en-di a-khil-e
   1sg-OM-want 1sg-that c1SM-win-SBJV
   ‘I want him to win.’

This suggests that the pronoun had to raise to a VP-internal position before incorporating.

Diercks and Sikuku (2013): In certain contexts object marking can co-occur with a coreferential pronoun in object position; they analyse this as clitic doubling, where both copies of the pronoun are spelled out.

- This doubling is allowed when the DP is raised:

(14) Na-mu-i-enya niye en-di a-khil-e
   1sg-OM-i-want PRON_i 1sg-that c1SM-win-SBJV
   ‘I want him to win.’

Diercks and Sikuku (2013):

- In neutral contexts full DP objects may not co-occur in the VP with the object marker.

- A full coreferential DP may be present only if it has dislocated to a position outside of the VP.
When the raised DP is not a pronoun the use of an object marker becomes more marked (contrast with (14)); the fact that it is not ruled out altogether is possibly due to right dislocation of the DP in this instance.

(15) ?Na-

mu_i-enya papa_i en-di a-khil-e

1sg-OM_i-want father_i 1sg-that c1SM-win-SBJV

‘I want father to win.’

Importantly, Diercks and Sikuku (2013) note that object marking appears to be derived through A-movement, as it can license reverse binding (16).

(16) a. Mayi wewe-i/j a-siim-a Yohana_i

mother his 1SM-like-FV John

‘His_i/j mother likes John_i.’

b. Mayi weweci_i/j a-siim-a Yohana_i

mother his 1SM-1OM-like-FV John

‘His_i/j mother likes John_i.’ (Diercks and Sikuku 2013:20)

- The fact that raising can feed A-movement suggests that the raising movement must also be A-movement.

What about other A-movement?

Diercks (2013): Passivization of RtO constructions with an agreeing complementizer ruled out for separate reason:

- Complementizer Agreement with Matrix Subject is achieved through indirect agree
- C agrees with Null-subject oriented anaphor in Spec-CP
- Passive of RtO construction ruled out due to lethal ambiguity: null anaphor c-commands trace of its antecedent.

(17) Barack Obama k-enyi-bwa (*ali) a-khil-e

1Barack.Obama c1SM-want-PASS (C1-that) c1SM-win-SBJV

‘Barack Obama is wanted to succeed.’ (Diercks 2013:387)

(18) [TP Barack Obama, kenyibwa [VP kenyibwa Barack Obama, [CP OP, ali [TP Barack Obama, akhile]]]]

Thus lethal ambiguity rules out passivization of RtO verb when there is an agreeing complementizer

Conclusions

- The DP does start out in the lower clause
- Raising the DP from subject position can feed object marking, which appears to be derived through A-movement; this suggests that the raising is achieved by means of A-movement.
- This is a problem for the notion that the agreeing complementizer is a phase in Lubukusu.
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