On the subject "agreement" in infinitival clauses in Mari

Irina Burukina irina.burukina@btk.elte.hu
HUN-REN Hungarian Research Centre for Linguistics & Eötvös Loránd University

1. The paper focuses on infinitives in Meadow Mari that show apparent subject agreement (INFL). The data are from the Morkinsko-Sernur variety and were collected during elicitation sessions with two native speakers in 2022-2024 (primarily in acceptability and translation tasks). Inflected infinitives are exemplified in (1); the standard raising vs control tests show that in (1a) the DP$_{DAT}$ is in the embedded clause, while in (1b) it is a dependent of the matrix predicate.

(1) a. [(Tôlat)   kudôβeč'ô-š   pur-aš(-et)   (manôn)],   peč'ô-m   sümôr-enna.
    you.DAT   yard-ILL   go-INF-2SG   COMP   fence-ACC   break-PST1PL
    either *tôlat* **or** INFL:'We broke the fence for you to get into the yard.' (neutral)
    with **both** *tôlat* and INFL: 'We broke the fence FOR YOU^{EMPH} to get into the yard.'
    without *tôlat* and INFL: 'We broke the fence to get into the yard.'

   b. (Môlanna) [kudôβeč'ô-š pur-aš(-na)   (*manôn)] nele/   saj/   küleš.
    we.DAT   yard-ILL   go-INF-1PL   COMP   hard   good   necessary
    either *môlanna* **or** INFL: 'For us it is hard/good/necessary to get into the yard.' (neutral)
    with **both** *môlanna* and INFL: 'FOR US^{EMPH} it is hard/good/necessary to get into the yard.'
    without *môlanna* and INFL: '(In general) it is hard/good/necessary to get into the yard.'

2. The types of infinitival clauses available in Mari are presented in Table 1.

matrix predicate	controller	embedded Subj	INFL
'decide', phasal verbs	DP$_{NOM}$	ObligControl	--
emotive verbs ('love', 'hate')	DP$_{NOM}$	ObligControl	--
'ask', 'beg'	DP$_{ACC}$	ObligControl	--
verbs of order	DP$_{DAT}$	ObligControl	--
Dependents of evaluative adjectives	**DP$_{DAT}$**	ObligControl	✓
Dependents of deontic modals	**DP$_{DAT}$**	ObligControl	✓
Rationale clauses (adjuncts)	DP$_{NOM}$ or no control	ObligControl or **DP$_{DAT}$**	✓

3. The following <u>pattern</u> emerges from the data above. First, INFL appears only when there is either a dative matrix controller or a **dative** embedded subject; however, the presence of a DP$_{DAT}$ does not automatically entail the presence of INFL (see the verbs of order below in (3)). Second, INFL is **optional** and its presence correlates with information structure-related properties of the sentence. As shown in (1), when both INFL and the DP that it cross-references are present, the DP receives an emphatic/contrastive interpretation. Aside from this, sentences with and without INFL have the same structure, contra the analyses that assume that INFL is present in raising infinitives and that it is absent in controlled infinitives (e.g., É. Kiss 2002, Szécsényi 2017).

4. Examining the peculiar distribution of INFL, I show that (i) INFL depends on a predication relation and is only allowed when the embedded FinP/TP is directly predicated of the DP that INFL matches, and (ii) its presence correlates with the information-structure properties. I propose that INFL is an instance of cliticization/clitic doubling that is linked to pro-drop.

5. I argue that the following generalization captures the availability of INFL in infinitival clauses:

(2)   INFL may appear on the infinitive only when the latter is **predicated** of a **non-NOM** DP.

First, INFL is allowed with a **DP$_{DAT}$**, but only in some contexts. As I will show, the presence of INFL correlates with the size of the non-finite clause and the availability of partial control. INFL is <u>allowed</u> in the dependents of evaluative adjectives and modals (1b): these are smaller than CPs (they cannot contain a complementizer) and require exhaustive control, the signature characteristic of predicative control (Landau 2015). INFL is also <u>allowed</u> in rationale clauses, where the embedded TP is predicated of the embedded dative subject. INFL is <u>banned</u> in the dependents of verbs of order (3): these are full CPs (with a complementizer) and allow partial control; the latter

property implies a more complex structure where the infinitival clause is not predicated of the controller directly (Landau 2015).

(3) Nuno (məlanna) [üškə̂ž-ə̂m   šüškə̂l-aš(-*na)   manə̂n] kalas-enə̂t.
    they   we.DAT   bull-ACC   slaughter-INF-1PL   COMP   say-PST3PL
    'They told us to slaughter a/the bull.' (INFL is prohibited with or without *məlanna*)

Second, INFL is prohibited with a **DP_ACC** controller (4). In the direct object control contexts the infinitival clause is a full CP; partial control is allowed. Hence, such sentences instantiate non-predicative control and match the generalization in (2).

(4) Mə̂j   rveze-βlak-ə̂m   [peč'ə̂-m   pudə̂rt-aš(-*ə̂št)   manə̂n]   jod-ə̂nam.
    I   boy-PL-ACC   fence-ACC   break-INF-3PL   COMP   ask-PST1SG
    'I asked the boys to break the fence.' (INFL is prohibited with or without *rβezevlakə̂m*)

Finally, INFL is prohibited with a **DP_NOM** controller (5). However, in the subject control contexts the infinitival clause is smaller than a CP and no partial control is allowed. Hence, the "non-NOM" part of the generalization in (2), to be accounted for below.

(5) [Peč'ə̂-m   pudə̂rt-aš(-*na)   (*manə̂n)]   (me)   jörat-ena.
    fence-ACC   break-INF-1PL   COMP   we   love-NPST1PL
    'We love to break fences.' (INFL is prohibited with or without *me*)

6. As we saw above, INFL has a restricted distribution that depends on a predication relation. At the same time, when INFL is possible it is always optional and its presence correlates with pro-drop and emphasis. This suggests that INFL does not manifest a standard subject-agreement relation established between the non-finite T and the embedded subject. (Contra analyses in terms of T-probing, e.g., Tóth 2000; Sheehan 2014, 2018.) Compare it to the subject agreement in finite clauses, which is obligatory regardless of the presence of an overt subject and the information structure. As an alternative, I propose that INFL is an instance of cliticization/clitic-doubling; cf. the well-known tendency of clitic-doubling to interact with the information structure. Whenever a DP is dropped its φ-features must be spelled out on a related predicate, to facilitate the interpretation. In sentences with a matrix evaluative adjective or a modal and in rationale clauses the embedded FinP/TP is directly predicated of the DP_DAT. When the latter is dropped, its features are realized as a clitic on the infinitive (i.e. INFL). In the presence of INFL the DP itself can only be overt if that is independently motivated by the need to pronounce it with an emphasis (since the clitic cannot be stressed). This account explains the ungrammaticality of (4): the embedded CP is not predicated of the DP_ACC. It also explains the ungrammaticality of (5): the DP_NOM obligatorily establishes an agreement relation with the matrix predicate and its φ-features are always spelled out; the DP can always be dropped and an additional INFL on the embedded infinitive would be redundant.

7. The paper aimed at drawing attention to the understudied inflected infinitives in Mari. Treating INFL as a clitic whose presence is linked to pro-drop allows us to capture all the relevant data. The Mari data show that inflected infinitives cross-linguistically do not form a homogenous class (cf. the work on Hungarian and Portuguese referenced above) and emphasizes the importance of distinguishing between the run-of-the-mill TP-internal subject agreement and clitic-doubling.

Bradley, J. & J. Hirvonen. 2022. 10 Null subjects in Mari. *Null subjects in Slavic and Finno-Ugric: Licensing, structure and typology*, 281–306.

É. Kiss, K. 2002. *The syntax of Hungarian*. Cambridge University Press.

Landau, I. 2015. *A two-tiered theory of control*. MIT Press.

Sheehan, M. 2014. Portuguese, Russian and the theory of control. *Proceedings of NELS43*, v. 2, 115-126.

Sheehan, M. 2018. Control of inflected infinitives in European Portuguese. *Complement clauses in Portuguese: Syntax and acquisition*, 29–58.

Szécsényi, K. 2017. Overt and covert subjects in Hungarian infinitival clauses and their implications for restructuring. *Linguistica Brunensia* 65(2): 35–52.

Tóth, I. 2000. Inflected infinitives in Hungarian. Tilburg University PhD diss.