

## Dative subjects and possessive markers in infinitival clauses in Mari

Irina Burukina

Hungarian Research Centre for Linguistics & Eötvös Loránd University

[irina.burukina@btk.elte.hu](mailto:irina.burukina@btk.elte.hu)

1. The paper focuses on the infinitival clauses in Meadow Mari that allow overt subjects and/or possessive marking on the infinitive. First, we approach the data by trying out well-known analyses developed for the similar phenomena in Russian (a contact language) and Hungarian (also Uralic) and we suggest that, although these approaches appear to match the data, they fail to make valid predictions. Second, we outline a novel analysis whereby embedded dative subjects are exceptionally licensed from the main clause and POSS becomes available due to the unique properties of the dative case, which in Mari was originally an adposition.

2. In Mari, overt dative subjects ( $S_{\text{DAT}}$ ) and possessive marking (POSS) are allowed in some but not all infinitival clauses. The correlation between the two phenomena is quite complex and is outlined in the table below; for comparison, we also consider infinitival clauses embedded under deontic modals and direct object control verbs such as *jodaš* ‘force’. In general, POSS appears only when there is either a dative matrix controller or a dative embedded subject; however, the presence of a  $DP_{\text{DAT}}$  does not automatically entail the presence of POSS.

	controller	embedded $S_{\text{DAT}}$	POSS on INF
Subject-oriented purpose clauses	NOM	✓	✓
Dependent of an evaluative adjective and ‘help’	DAT	–	✓
Dependent of a deontic modal	DAT	–	–
Dependent of <i>jodaš</i> ‘force’	ACC	–	–

In purpose clauses (1a), POSS is present when the embedded subject is overt. If the embedded subject is covert and not coreferent with the matrix one, POSS is obligatory; if both an overt embedded subject and POSS are absent, obligatory control is established. In clauses under evaluative adjectives and *polšaš* ‘help’, POSS always cross-references the controller (1b, 1c). Finally, in clausal complements of deontic modals and *jodaš* neither an overt  $S_{\text{DAT}}$  nor POSS can appear; the covert embedded subject is obligatorily controlled by the matrix DAT/ACC object. In the full version of the paper we will demonstrate that, aside from the purpose clauses, the  $DP_{\text{DAT}}$  in such contexts is a indeed a matrix controller and not a raised embedded subject.

(1) a. (Tə-lat) kudəveče-š pur-aš(-et), peče-m sümər-enna.  
 you-DAT yard-ILL go-INF-POSS2S fence-ACC break-PST1P

‘We broke the fence for you to get into the yard.’

Without *təlat* and *-et*: ‘We broke the fence to get into the yard.’

b. Mə-lan-na kudəveče-š pur-aš(na/\*et) nele/ saǰ.  
 we-DAT-POSS1P yard-ILL go-INF-POSS1P/2S hard good

‘For us it is difficult/good (\*for you) to get into the yard.’

c. Təǰ mə-lan-na ikte-vese-m už-aš(na/\*əšt) polš-enat.  
 you we-DAT-POSS1P each.other-ACC see-INF-POSS1P/3P help-PST2S

‘You helped us to see each other.’

3. Following the extensive discussion of Russian (a contact language; Moore & Perlmutter 1999, i.a.) and Hungarian (a Uralic language; Tóth 2002), it might be proposed that DAT is assigned to overt/covert embedded subjects by non-finite Infl/C. However, as we show, no independent support for this claim can be found in the case of Mari. In Russian crucial evidence comes from (i) the behavior of embedded subject-oriented case-concord items, such as ‘himself’ and ‘alone’, that can be DAT even when the matrix controller is NOM/ACC, and (ii) the availability of an overt  $S_{\text{DAT}}$  in a broad range of adjunct clauses: *if* clauses, temporal anteriority clauses, etc. This line of argumentation does not work for Mari: embedded subject-oriented items bear the same case as the controller, and  $S_{\text{DAT}}$  are not attested in other adjunct clauses except for purpose infinitives.

(2) Məǰ tud-əm peče-m šken-žə-m / #ška-lan-že tōrlat-aš jod-ənam.  
 I he-ACC fence-ACC self-POSS3S-ACC/DAT-POSS3S fix-INF force-PST1S

‘I forced him to fix the fence himself.’ #: ‘I forced him to fix the fence for himself.’

4. Infinitival clauses with S<sub>DAT</sub> and POSS are also found in Hungarian; as proposed by Landau (2004), they can be analyzed in terms of the Agree theory of control. The main idea behind this approach is that the embedded I and C are specified for ±T(ense) and ±Agr features. If the time specification of the embedded event is identical to that of the main event (i.e. anaphoric), I and C are [-T]; if the embedded event merely depends on the main one (cf. irrealis), I and C are [+T]. [+Agr] on I corresponds to overt agreement, [-Agr] to abstract agreement; C is assumed to be [+Agr] if it is tensed, and if not the feature is absent. Referential embedded subjects are allowed only when I or C (or both) is [+T, +Agr]; otherwise, the subject position can only be occupied by PRO. The approach is adopted to the Mari data as shown below.

	C	I	embedded S
Evaluative adj, <i>polšaš</i> ‘help’ (anaphoric tense)	[-T]	[-T, ±Agr]	PRO
Purpose adjuncts (dependent tense)	[+T, +Agr]	[+T, ±Agr]	DP/PRO
Deontic modals (dependent tense)	[+T, -Agr]	[+T, -Agr]	PRO
<i>jodaš</i> ‘force’ (anaphoric tense)	[-T]	[-T, -Agr]	PRO

At first glance, the analysis correctly predicts the distribution of overt v. PRO subjects and their correlation with POSS. A disadvantage of the Agree approach, however, is that it provides no explanation for the presence of POSS; for instance, having POSS on infinitives embedded under *jodaš* (hence, [+Agr] on the embedded I) would still result in only PRO subjects being acceptable. In addition to this, the “abstract agreement”, i.e. agreement that is present but morphologically always invisible, remains a stipulation; other general problems with the Agree theory of control are discussed in Landau (2015).

5. To develop a novel analysis, we adopt Landau’s (2015) predicative v. logophoric distinction for control constructions, according to which a non-finite clause is either predicated directly of the controller or contains an additional logophoric projection. In the first case control is exhaustive, while in the second case partial coreference between the controller and PRO is allowed. The distinction applies to Mari as follows:

exhaustive control → predicative	partial control → logophoric
evaluative adjectives, <i>polšaš</i> ‘help’, <i>jodaš</i> ‘force’	modals, purpose adjuncts

We argue that, for the embedded clause to function as a predicate, it must contain a variable, either a PRO or a bound personal pronoun (Williams 1980, Den Dikken 2017); hence, independent S<sub>DAT</sub> are only allowed in the logophoric configuration. Furthermore, the DP subject must be case-licensed. For the reasons presented in #3, we argue against DAT being analyzed as a structural case available within a non-finite IP/CP. Instead we propose that it is exceptionally assigned from the main clause. On the one hand, we propose that purpose adjuncts were originally embedded under the dative adposition, which was later reanalyzed as a case marker; hence, the P head is now silent but DAT is available: [PP [FinP ... infinitive ] P<sub>Ø</sub>] (cf. Den Dikken & Dékány 2018 on Estonian). Note that some speakers still allow DAT to combine with a purpose infinitive ((1a) = *kudəvečēš puraš-lan, pečem sümər-enna*). On the other hand, we will demonstrate that infinitival clauses embedded under evaluative adjectives and ‘help’ are adjuncts (in contrast to the clausal arguments of *jodaš* and modals). We argue that they are akin to depictive secondary predicates dependent on the DAT controller. In Mari, depictives exhibit obligatory concord with the antecedent; hence, the DAT PP is present on top of the clause and DAT can be assigned to the embedded subject (cf. case assignment by the *for* complementizer in English). Finally, we observe that, as indicative of postpositive constructions, all DAT pronouns contain a POSS: *mə-lan-na* we-DAT-POSS1P, *ška-lan-et* self-DAT-POSS2S ‘yourself’, etc. We suggest that the POSS here is the result of agreement of the silent P with the (pronominal) head. Drawing a parallel between such forms and the infinitival clauses under discussion, it is plausible to assume that in the latter case a similar Agree relation is established between the P and the embedded subject (usually a (silent) pronoun), therefore a POSS appears.

**Selected references:** Landau, I. 2004. The scale of finiteness and the calculus of control. *NLLT* 22(4):811–877. Landau, I. 2015. *A two-tiered theory of control*. Tóth, I. 2002. *Inflected infinitives in Hungarian*.