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The dative experiencer predicate puzzle
Meadow Mari reflexive

Meadow Mari škenže is subject-oriented and must be bound within the first finite clause (Volkova 2014):

(1) Údər₁ rvezej de-č’ [∅ j ška-lan-že₁/j
girl boy near-EL PRO self-DAT-P.3SG
pört-əm əšt-aš] jod-ən.
house-ACC make-INF ask-PRT
The girl asked the boy to build her / himself a house.

(2) [Jəvanᵰ šken-ž-əmᵰ/*m jörat-a,] Mašaᵰ Ivan self-P.3SG-ACC like-PRS.3SG Masha
šona.
think-PRS.3SG
Masha thinks that Ivan likes himself / *her.
However, škenže allows very long-distance binding as an argument of a dative experiencer predicate in an embedded relative clause (both finite and reduced).


Peter said that the mother introduced Ivan to the girl that appealed to her/him.

*Peter said that the mother introduced Ivan to the girl that appealed to her/him.*
Finite relative clauses

(4)  a. Pet’a_i  imn’e-m  [kudo ška-lan-že_i/∗j
Petja  horse-ACC  which  self-DAT-P.3SG
please-PRT  Vanja-DAT  give.as.a.present-PRT
*Petja gave to Vanja as a present a horse, which
pleased him.

b. Petər_i  pört-əm  [kud-əm  Van’u_j
Peter  house-ACC  which-ACC  Ivan
ška-lan-že∗_i/j  č’oŋ-a]  už-ən.
self-DAT-P.3SG  build-PRS.3SG  see-PRT
Peter  saw  the  house,  that  Ivan  builds  for  himself.
Reduced relative clauses

(5)  

a. Pet’a_i [ška-lan-že_i/*j kelš-əše] imn’-əm  
Petja self-DAT-P.3SG please-PTCP.ACT horse-ACC  
Van’a-lan_j pölekl-en.  
Vanja-DAT give.as.a.present-PRT  

*Petja_i gave to Ivan a horse that appealed to him_i.*

b. Pet’a_i [Ø_j *šken-ž-əm_i / tud-əm_i  
Petja PRO self-P.3SG-ACC / he-ACC  
üž-še] üdər_j de-ne kušt-en.  
call-PTCP.ACT girl near-INESS dance-PRT  

*Peter danced with the girl that invited him.*
Discussion I

- The atypical behaviour of the semi-reflexive škenže has been observed with the dative experiencer predicates in Meadow Mari: kelšaš ‘appeal to’, and č’uč’aš ‘seem, appear to’.

- The psych predicates of the appeal to-type have an unaccusative derivation, assigning inherent case to the experiencer argument VP-internally. The experiencer projects into a higher VP-internal position than the theme, but the latter can undergo a subsequent NP-movement (Belletti and Rizzi 1988).

- The dative experiencer verb case-marks the experiencer but fails to case-mark the target, which therefore has to move to a subject position (Pesetsky 1995).
Discussion II

- I assume that in modifying relative clauses, the theme does not move into the T-domain, whereas in complement and root clauses it does.

- Hypothesis: the left periphery in relative clauses is ‘weaker’ than in complement clauses, hence T is weaker, thus, there is no movement due to EPP feature in the former, whereas in the latter there is.

- Binding restrictions on škenže are defined by the Agree-mediated relation between the unsaturated argument position of šken on the one hand and the SpecTP on the other (for details see Volkova forthcoming).
Discussion III

- Given that SpecTP is not filled, no such link between šken and the low theme argument is created, hence no privileged local binding relation mediated by Agree is established.
- Being in a syntactic environment that disallows binding via Agree, škenže as an argument of a dative experiencer predicate in an embedded relative clause behaves as an exempt anaphor in the sense of Pollard & Sag (1992).
- Its interpretation in this case is determined by further properties of the environment (including discourse) in which it occurs. The relation to a higher subject is established by variable binding in logical syntax.
Participial RCs vs. regular RCs
Participial RCs vs. regular RCs

- Meadow Mari reflexive škenže behaves the same way as an argument of a dative experiencer predicate both in participial RCs and in finite RCs.
- Yet, participial clauses are usually taken to have a less articulate structure that the regular relative clauses.
Participial relative clauses

- Participial RCs are often analyzed as VP-like structures (for some, embedded under a nominalizing node, Doron and Reintges 2005, Hazout 2001, Siloni 1995, a. o., but see Kayne 1993, 1994 who argues that participial clauses have a C, but crucially not a T).

- The typical characteristics of the participial clauses are the following:
  - they don’t license usual CP-material (wh-phrases, complementizers);
  - they do not have an independent temporal reference;
  - they do not have subjects
The architecture of participial RCs

- Doron & Reintges (2005) propose to distinguish three types of participial RCs based on their syntactic complexity:
  - lexical (V is directly dominated by the nominalizing PTCP node)
  - phrasal (PTCP node dominates VP, possibly with an extended projection including the TAM node; Spec,VP is not projected)
  - clausal (PTCP node dominates TAM; Spec,VP is projected)
The architecture of phrasal participial RCs

(6) from Doron & Reintges (2005)
The architecture of phrasal participial RCs

(7)

```
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<tr>
<th>DP</th>
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<tr>
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<tr>
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<tr>
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<tr>
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<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

N-features
The Accessibility Hierarchy

Keenan & Comrie 1977:
SU > DO > IO > OBL > GEN > OCOMP

- Any RC-forming strategy must apply to a continuous segment of the AH.
- Strategies that apply at one point of the AH may in principle cease to apply at any lower point.
Participles in Meadow Mari
Participles in Meadow Mari

- active participle derived with the suffix -še;
- passive participle derived with the suffix -me;
- future participle derived with -šaš; and
- negative participle derived with -dəme.
Active participle -šе

Active participle with -šе can relativize only the subject position (Brykina & Aralova 2012, B&A 2012 henceforth):

(8) [Čüč’kədən č’erlan-оšе] rveze šuko urok-əm often fall.ill-PTCP.ACT boy many class-ACC kod-a.
miss-PRS.3SG

_The boy who is often sick misses many classes._

(9) Me [korn-əm sajən pal-əšе] šoför we road-ACC good know-PTCP.ACT driver de-ne mutlan-ena.
near-INESS talk-PRS.1PL

_We talk with the driver who knows the road well._
Passive participle -me

- Can be derived from many verbs, not necessarily transitive (Pengitov 1951)
- Does not relativize subjects

(10) [Tə-lat pu-mo] kniga məlam kül-eš.
    you-DAT give-NZR book I.DAT need-PRS.3SG
    *I need the book that I gave you.* (B&A 2012)

(11) [Oza-ž-əm saj-ən pal-əme] pört vokte-č’
    owner-P.3SG good-ADV know-NZR house near-EL
    tudo č’üč’kədən ert-a.
    he often pass-PRS.3SG
    *He often passes the house the owner of which he knows.* (B&A 2012)
Future participle -šaš I

- Relativizes both subject and non-subject positions.

(12) [Kastene mur-əm mur-əšaš] üdər peš
  evening song-ACC sing-PTCP.FUT girl very
  motor.
  beautiful

The girl who will sing in the evening is very
beautiful. (B&A 2012)
Future participle -šaš II

For instance, oblique postpositional phrases:

(13) [Jūd-əm keč’ ik mašina kudal-šaš]
    night-ACC just one car drive-PTCP.FUT
    korn-əm mu-šaš ul-am.
    road-ACC find-PTCP.FUT be-PRS.1SG

I need to find a road along which at least one car drives at night. (B&A 2012)
Negative participle \textit{-dəme}

- Relativizes both subject and non-subject positions.

(14) \[\text{[Kok keč’e koč’-dəmo] pij-lan keč’ lu two days eat-NEG.PTCP dog-DAT just bone padəraš-əm pu. piece-ACC give.IMP}\]

\textit{Give at least a piece to the dog who hasn’t eaten for two days.} \textit{(B&A 2012)}

(15) \[\text{[Tud-ən il-ədəme] pört-šö petər-əme. he-GEN live-NEG.PTCP house-P.3SG close.down-NZR}\]

\textit{The house in which he no longer lives is closed.} \textit{(B&A 2012)}
Syntactic position

- Inside the pRC the participle always occupies the final position.
- The participial RC is usually in preposition to the head.
- Under certain conditions pRC can follow the head. In that case, the participle agrees in person and number with its head (B&A 2012):

\[(16)\] Memna-n č’odəra-šte, [ümbalne we.OBL-GEN forest-INESS on.INESS verlan-əš-əšte], šuko pondgo ul-o. lie-PTCP.AC-INESS a.lot mushroom be-PRS.3SG

*In our forest, which is situated further away, there is a lot of mushrooms.*
Encoding the subject 1

- possessive marker on the head
  - only in case of personal pronouns
- Genitive NP
  - all kinds of NPs (personal pronouns, non-personal pronouns, proper names, anates, inanimates)
- Nominative NP
  - NPs denoting animates
  - NPs denoting inanimate objects
- Postpositional phrase with *dene*
  - NPs denoting inanimate objects
Encoding the subject II

(17) [Milicione\(r(-ən)\) onč’-əkt-əmo] ajdeme policeman(-GEN) look-TR-NZR man jom-o.
disappear-NARR.3SG

*The person who was identified by the policeman disappeared.*
(B&A 2012)

humid be-PRT

*In the stable where the horse was standing, it was dark and humid.* (B&A 2012)
Discussion

- Whether Meadow Mari participials project a TAM node (and can have independent time reference) has to be established in further research.
- Meadow Mari doesn’t make use of resumptive pronouns.
- Active participle derived with the suffix -še is a phrasal pRC.
- Passive participle with -me, future participle with -šaš, and negative participle with -dəme are clausal pRC making use of an operator.
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