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Carstens and Diercks (2009): Lubukusu Complementizers, $\text{AGR-}li$ vs $mbo$

- $\text{AGR-}li$: 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 $\text{AGR-}li$ (2)

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

(2) *Mikaeli; a-lolekhana $\textbf{a-li}$ $t_i$ 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.’ (Diercks 2013:387)
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.’

   b. N-enya **Barack Obama en-di** a-khil-e.
   1sg-want 1.Barack.Obama 1sg-that c1SM-win-SBJV
   ‘I want Barack Obama to succeed.’ (Diercks 2013:387)

- 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,
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
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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
Control: Pre-Comp DP is generated in object position, and is assigned a $\theta$-role by the matrix verb; the DP controls a PRO in the subject position of the lower clause.
Control: Pre-Comp DP is generated in object position, and is assigned a $\theta$-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 $\theta$-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’
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 \textit{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 \textit{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
    1sg-PAST-ask  1.Wafula  1sg-that  c1SM-help-pass-sbjv  by
    Sammy
    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  
1sg-want 1.Wafula 1sg-that c1SM-help-PASS-SBJV by Sammy  
1.Sammy  
‘I want 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*  
   1sg-want 1.Wafula 1sg-that c1SM-help-PASS-SBJV by Sammy  
   1.Sammy  
   ‘I want Wafula to be helped by Sammy’

**Conclusion:** It’s not control
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- 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;* dha’ Siti *ja’ pro;* entar ka Sorbaja.
Atin AV-say-BV Hasan to Siti COMP pro; go to Surbaya
‘Atin said to Siti that Hasan went to Surbaya.’
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)
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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’)

b. N-enya 1sg-want 1sg-that  embwa 1sg-that  e-mu-khomb-e
     c9.dog  c9SM-PAST-OM-lick-FV 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 1sg-want  embwa 1sg-that  e-mu-khomb-e
     1sg-want  c9.dog  c9SM-PAST-OM-lick-FV 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
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Arguments for raising to object
Object marking:
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(12)
Lubukusu: Object Marker can be used in place of raised DP

(13) Na-\textit{mu}-enya \textbf{en-di} \_ a-khil-e
    1sg-OM-want 1sg-that  c1SM-win-SBJV

‘I want him to win.’
Lubukusu: Object Marker can be used in place of raised DP

(13) Na-\textit{mu}\text{-enya} \textit{en-di} \_ a-khil-e

1sg-OM-want 1sg-that clSM-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-\textit{mu}-eny\textit{a} \textit{niye}; \textbf{en-di} a-khil-e
1sg-OM\textit{;} want PRON\textit{;} 1sg-that c1SM-win-SBJV

‘I want him to win.’
Diercks and Sikuku (2013):

- In neutral contexts full DP objects may not cooccur 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.
Diercks and Sikuku (2013):

- In neutral contexts full DP objects may not cooccur 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

(15) ? Na-\textit{mu}i-enya \textit{papa}; \textit{en-di} a-khil-e
1sg-OM\textit{i}-want father; 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\textsubscript{\textit{i/j}} a-siim-a Yohana\textsubscript{i}  
mother his 1SM-like-FV John  
‘His\textsubscript{\textit{i/j}} mother likes John\textsubscript{i}.’

b. Mayi wewe\textsubscript{i/j} a-siim-a Yohana\textsubscript{i}  
mother his 1SM-1OM-like-FV John  
‘His\textsubscript{i/j} mother likes John\textsubscript{i}.’

(Diercks and Sikuku 2013:20)
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.’

b. Mayi wewe_{i/j} a-siim-a Yohana_i
   mother his 1SM-1OM-like-FV John
   ‘His_{i/j} mother likes John.’

   (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:

(17)
Barack Obama
\[\text{k-enyi-bwa}\]
\(c_1\text{sm}\)
\(-\text{want-}\)
\((\*\text{ali})\)
\((c_1-\text{that})\)
\(\text{a-khil-e}\)
\(c_1\text{sm}\)
\(-\text{win-}\)
\(\text{sbjv}\)

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

(18)
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- 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)
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]]]]
Conclusion

- The DP does start out in the lower clause
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Conclusion

- 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.
Thank You
Bibliography I


(19)  
  a.  N-enya  \underline{bwangu}  \textbf{en-di}  \textit{Sammy}  a-khil-e  
      1sg-want  fast  1sg-that  Sammy  c1SM-win-SBJV  
      ‘I want [Sammy to win] fast.’  
  
  b. * N-enya  \underline{bwangu}  \textit{Sammy}  \textbf{en-di}  a-khil-e  
      1sg-want  fast  Sammy  1sg-that  c1SM-win-SBJV  
      Int: ‘I want [Sammy to win] fast.’  
  
  c. * N-enya  \textit{Sammy}  \underline{bwangu}  \textbf{en-di}  a-khil-e  
      1sg-want  Sammy  fast  1sg-that  c1SM-win-SBJV  
      Int: ‘I want [Sammy to win] fast.’
(20) a. Na-mu-eny-ile likolooba niye en-di
    1sg-OM$_i$-want-PST yesterday him$_i$ 1sg-that
    a-khil-e
    c1SM-win-SBJV
    ‘Yesterday I wanted him to win’

b. ? Na-mu-eny-ile niye likolooba en-di
    1sg-OM$_i$-want-PST him$_i$ yesterday 1sg-that
    a-khil-e
    c1SM-win-SBJV
    ‘Yesterday I wanted him to win’
(21)  

a. N-enya lukali **en-di** *Sammy* a-khil-e  
1sg-want really 1sg-that Sammy c1SM-win-SBJV  
‘I really want Sammy to win.’

b. N-enya *lukali Sammy* **en-di** a-khil-e  
1sg-want really Sammy 1sg-that c1SM-win-SBJV  
‘I really want Sammy to win.’

c. *N-enya *Sammy* lukali **en-di** akhile  
1sg-want Sammy really 1sg-that c1SM-win-SBJV  
‘I really want Sammy to win.’