

The syntax of complements with Subject and Subject-Object agreement of complement-taking predicates in Moksha Mordvin

Sentential complements are defined as clauses that function as arguments of a predicate (Noonan 1985: 52), “complement-taking predicate” (CTP). However, it has been claimed that in some languages some types of sentential complements do not demonstrate the morphosyntactic properties of nominal arguments of the CTP or do not have a DP-layer (cf. Dalrymple, Lødrup 2000, Kastner 2016). For example, in many languages with polypersonal agreement some types of sentential complements do not trigger agreement on CTPs, i.e. in Adyghe, Itelmen etc. We consider the syntactic properties of object agreement markers in Moksha-Mordvin and argue that complements that do trigger object agreement have a D-shell, while other complements do not have it.

Moksha-Mordvin distinguishes subject vs. subject-object agreement patterns (subject vs. subject-object conjugations in Kolyadyonkov 1954). The subject agreement pattern is used with intransitive verbs (1), while transitive verbs can take the markers of both agreement patterns, subject-object (SO) and subject (S), see (2ab). The choice of the agreement pattern is regulated by the definiteness and animacy of the direct object, aspectual properties of the verb etc. (Bartens 1999: 125).

Many CTPs can take both agreement patterns (3ab), cf. (Feoktistov 1993: 206). Moreover, one and the same CTP can take both agreement patterns with one and the same complement type (3ab).

We consider finite SO and S-complement clauses with three subordinators, *što* ‘that’, *koda* ‘how’ and *məz’ardə/məjardə* ‘when’ and test the criteria used in Dalrymple, Lødrup (2000) and Kastner (2016). We only consider transitive CTPs, since intransitive CTPs can only take S (with minor exceptions).

We show that the SO-complements differ from the S-complements in the following way. SO-complements can be coordinated with non-derived nouns, can be replaced with a pronominal element *tən*, by the quantifier *s’embə* (in the anaphoric function) and allow extraposition. S-complements do not show these properties.

Based on this data, we argue that SO-complements have a D-shell, unlike S-complements.

Examples

(1) son sa-s' kud-u
he come-PST.3SG house-ILL
'He came home.'

(2a) son s'uc'ə-s' c'ora-n'ε
he scold-PST.3SG boy-DIM
'He scolded a/the boy.'

2 б(b) son mon' s'uc'ə-ma-n'
he IOBL scold-PST.1.O-SG.O.3SG.S
'He scolded me.'

(3a) mon **iz'-in'ə** ars'-ə što son t'aftamə s'ir'ə,
I NEG.PST.3.O.1SG.S think-CN COMPL s/he so old
son pek octə n'eft'-i
s/he very new.EL look-NPST.3SG
{Context: 'Why did not you help Mariya Ivanovna with the heavy bags? She's already past 80! -} I didn't think she's that old, she looks young.'

(3b) **t'a-t** / ***t'a-k** ars'-ə što mon ton'
PROH-IMP.SG PROH-IMP.3SG.O.SG.S think-CN COMPL I you.OBL
mel'-gə-t šta-sa-jn'ə šava-n'ε-t'n'ə-n'
after-PROL-2SG.POSS wash-NPST-3.O.1SG.S[PL.O] dish-DIM-DEF.PL-GEN
'Don't think that I will wash the dishes after you.'

References

- Bartens 1999: Bartens R. Mordvalaiskielten rakenne ja kehitys. Suomalais-ugrilainen seura, 1999.
- Dalrymple M., Lødrup H. 2000. The grammatical functions of complement clauses. In M. Butt and T. H. King (eds.) Proceedings of the LFG00 Conference. CSLI Publications.
- Feoktistov 1993: Feoktistov A. P. Mordovskie jazyki // Jazyki mira: Uralsie jazyki. Moscow, 1993.
- Kastner, Itamar. 2015. Factivity mirrors interpretation: The selectional requirements of presuppositional verbs. *Lingua* 164. 156–188.
- Kolyadyonkov M. N. Grammatika mordovskix (erzyanskogo i mokshanskogo) jazykov. Part 2. Syntaksis. Saransk: Mordovskoe knizhnoe izdatelstvo, 1954.
- Noonan 1985: Noonan M. 1985. Complementation // Shopen T. (ed.). *Language Typology and Syntactic Description 2: Complex Constructions*, 42–140. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.