

Clausal complementation in Malagasy

Research on clausal complementation suggests there is a hierarchal correspondence between the semantics of the selecting verb and the syntax of the embedded clause (Givón 1980, Wurmbrand & Lohninger 2019). Lacking any morphological distinction between tensed and tenseless clauses, Malagasy is often seen as having only two types of complement clauses: full CPs headed by *fa* and smaller clauses, lacking the CP layer (Potsdam & Polinsky 2005). We argue that there are in fact four types of clausal complement in Malagasy. The first three are complements (to lexical verbs) of different sizes (CP, TP, VoiceP), while the fourth involves a functional element *te* ‘want’ and therefore implies functional restructuring (Cinque 2004).

- (1) a. Manantena i Soa [_{CP} fa hividy fiara] PROPOSITION
 AT.hope DET Soa COMP FUT.AT.buy car
 ‘Soa hopes to buy a car.’
- b. Mandà [_{TP} hihira] i Soa SITUATION
 AT.refuse FUT.AT.sing DET Soa
 ‘Soa refuses to sing.’
- c. Mila [_{VoiceP} mividy sira] ny mpahandro EVENT
 AT.need AT.buy salt DET cook
 ‘The cook needs to buy salt’
- d. Te hihira ny mpianatra FUNCTIONAL PREDICATE
 want FUT.AT.sing DET student
 ‘The student wants to sing.’

Syntactic tests distinguish between the four classes, as summarized in the table below.

		Comp	Free Tense	Partial Control	Extrapolation	V1 Adv V2
P	<i>milaza</i> ‘say’, <i>manantena</i> ‘hope’	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
S	<i>mandà</i> ‘refuse’, <i>mikasa</i> ‘intend’	no	no	yes	yes	yes
E	<i>mila</i> ‘need’, <i>manomboka</i> ‘start’	no	no	no	no	no
	<i>te</i> ‘want’	no	no	no	no	no

(For reasons of space, we set aside *te* ‘want’.) First, Proposition complements occur with the complementizer *fa* (1a), while *fa* is blocked from Situation and Event complements (2a). Second, the embedded verb always carries tense marking, but only the Proposition complements have free tense. Situation complements are marked with future/irrealis (1b) and Event complements must match in tense with the matrix predicate (1c). Third, Situation (and some Proposition) complements allow partial control (2a), while Event complements do not (2b).

- (2) a. Mandà (*fa) hiara-hiasa i Soa b. *Mila miara-miasa i Soa
 AT.refuse COMP FUT.together-work DET Soa AT.need together-work DET Soa
 ‘Soa refuses to work together.’ ‘Soa needs to work together.’

Fourth, Proposition (1a) and Situation (3a) complements can extrapose to the right of the subject, while Event complements resist extraposition (3b).

- (3) a. Mandà i Soa [hihira] b. *Mila i Soa [mividy sira]
 AT.refuse DET Soa FUT.AT.sing AT.need DET Soa AT.buy salt
 ‘Soa refuses to sing.’ ‘Soa needs to buy salt’

Fifth, Situation and Proposition complements allow for an adverb to appear between the matrix and the embedded clause (4a) while Event complements do not (4b).

- (4) a. Mandà **matetika** hihira i Soa b. *Mila **foana** mividy sira i Soa
 AT.refuse often FUT.AT.sing DET Soa AT.need always AT.buy salt DET Soa
 ‘Soa often refuses to sing.’ ‘Soa always needs to buy salt.’

The distribution of the complementizer *fa* indicates that Proposition complements are CPs, while the others lack the CP layer. We propose that Situation complements are TPs and can therefore host tense – which is irrealis, as is common for Situation complements across languages (Wurmbrand & Lohninger 2019). Event complements are VoiceP and the time of the embedded event is simultaneous with the time of the matrix event – hence the matching tense marking. Moreover, the VoiceP of Event complements is defective and lacks agent phi features (Wurmbrand & Shimamura 2017): the agent features of the matrix predicate are therefore inherited by the embedded predicate. This sharing captures the full identity between the matrix controller and the embedded subject, ruling out partial control with Event complements.

We also link extraposition and the distribution of adverbs to the syntactic size of the complement clause. Extraposition is relatively free in Malagasy and has been argued to be a PF phenomenon (Edmiston & Potsdam 2017). We propose that Event complements are syntactically too small to be visible to extraposition. The immobility of Event complements also explains the distribution of adverbs. Adverbs in Malagasy can appear to the left of definite DP complements (5a) but not indefinites (5b) (Rackowski 1998).

- (5) a. Manasa (foana) ny lamba (foana) Rakoto b. Manasa (*foana) lamba (foana) Rakoto.
 AT.wash always DET cloth always Rakoto AT.wash always cloth always Rakoto
 ‘Rakoto always does the laundry.’ ‘Rakoto always does laundry.’

This word order is the result of the definite object DP (optionally) moving out of the VP to a position above the adverb, with subsequent predicate fronting (remnant movement) placing the verb and adverb in front of the shifted object. Indefinite objects, however, cannot shift (à la pseudo noun incorporation) and are fronted together with the predicate. We suggest that Event complements are similarly frozen within the matrix VP and therefore undergo predicate fronting with the matrix verb to a position where they precede adverbs (6).

- (6) Mila mividy sira foana i Soa.
 AT.need AT.buy salt always DET Soa
 ‘Soa always needs to buy salt.’

Situation (and Proposition) complements, however, can move out of the VP, much like definite DP objects.

In sum, Malagasy provides evidence in favour of the Implicational Complementation Hierarchy (ICH) proposed by Wurmbrand and Lohninger (2019), despite lacking morphological cues for finiteness. Moreover, the language has a distinct class of functional predicates (e.g. *te* ‘want’), which indicates that ICH effects are independent of the lexical-functional distinction: Event complements pattern with functional restructuring, but the matrix verb is lexical.

References

- Edmiston, D.** & **E. Potsdam.** 2017. Linearization at PF: Evidence from Malagasy extraposition. In *Proceedings of NELS 47*, eds. A. Lamont & K. Tetzloff. Amherst, MA: GLSA. **Cinque, G.** 2004. “Restructuring” and functional structure. In *Structures and beyond: The cartography of syntactic structures. Volume 2*, ed. A. Belletti. Oxford: OUP. **Polinsky, M.** & **E. Potsdam.** 2005. Malagasy control and its theoretical implications. In *Proceedings of BLS 30*, eds. M. Ettliger et al. Berkeley: BLS. **Rackowski, A.** 1998. Malagasy adverbs. In *The structure of Malagasy, vol. II* (UCLA Occasional Papers in Linguistics 20), ed. I. Paul. Los Angeles: UCLA Department of Linguistics. **Wurmbrand, S.** & **M. Lohninger.** 2019. An implicational universal in complementation—Theoretical insights and empirical progress. In *Propositional arguments in cross-linguistic research: Theoretical and empirical issues*, eds. J. Hartmann & A. Wöllstein. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. **Wurmbrand, S.** & **K. Shimamura.** 2017. The features of the voice domain: actives, passives, and restructuring. In *The verbal domain*, eds. R. d’Alessandro et al. Oxford: OUP.