Name: Deborah N. A. Allotey
Affiliation: University of Western Ontario

Overt Pronoun Subjects of Infinitival Predicates in Gã

Crosslinguistically in infinitival clauses we expect a null pronoun, PRO (Chomsky 1981). In Gã however, (New Kwa group of the Niger-Congo languages), we see an overt pronoun in this position. The examples below demonstrate the overt pronoun:

(1)   Mi$_i$ tao   ni   **ma**$_i$ /*ø   na   bo
            1.SG   want   C   1.SG/*[PRO]   see.INF.   you
            'I want to see you'

(2)   Mary$_j$ na ni **e**$_{j/*k}$-ya paati le ni Pite$_i$ hu na [ni e$_{i/*j}$-ya paati le]

            Mary wish C 3-go party DET and Pite also wished C 3-go party DET

            'Mary wished to go to the party and Peter also (wished to go to the party).'

(3)   [Jojo$_i$ gbekebii   le]$_j$ hiekpano ni **ame**$_{*i/j}$ sha tsensii le

            Jojo   children DET forgot   C 3.PL wash utensils DET

            'Jojo's children forgot to wash the utensils.'

In sentence (1) the embedded pronoun *ma* is overt thereby making the sentence grammatical. However, the absence of the overt pronoun *ma* renders the sentence ungrammatical. In (2) there is obligatory co-reference of matrix subjects with embedded subjects. The elided CP containing the pronoun *e* must refer to Peter, not Mary or some other third person argument. In (3) non c-command coreference of the embedded pronominal is not possible. I argue that these embedded pronouns occupy the subject position.

There is little work in the previous literature on subject pronouns in Gã. Previous studies (Dakubu 2004; Korsah 2017) propose that the embedded clause pronoun is a subject agreement marker on the embedded verb. Campbell (2017) however proposes that the embedded pronoun is a subjunctive subject of an irrealis clause. In this paper, I propose that these pronouns are subjects of non-finite clauses. The absence of obviation effects as seen in (2) rules out the subjunctive subject analysis since the embedded subject must be coreferential with the matrix subject. My analysis gives evidence to show that the embedded clause pronoun in examples such as (1) and (2) are overt syntactic subjects of an infinitival control clause. I present critical arguments from the signature properties of obligatorily controlled PRO (Hornstein 1999; Landau 2013) showing that long-distance control of PRO is not possible, PRO must be de se, only a bound variable reading of PRO is possible, and PRO under ellipsis must be construed sloppily. I also show how the agreement marker hypothesis faces a number of challenges: first, that agreement marking is lacking in both finite and other non-finite clauses and therefore are not agreement markers. Second claiming that this pronominal is agreement suggests that it is not in Spec TP of the embedded clause. The data from Gã proves otherwise. From negation tests and adverbial tests for proving subjecthood, I show that these pronouns are indeed in Spec TP position.

I base my analysis on Landau (2004)'s approach to control infinitives as an Agree-based feature to show how the Gã data may raise questions for his calculus of control. I also adopt the Long-Distance Agreement hypothesis by Barbosa (2016) to account for the co-indexation of the embedded clause subject with the matrix clause subject. This hypothesis holds that the nominative DP, although located within the infinitival complement, agrees with a superordinate subject in case, person and number. The condition for this hypothesis is that the subjects in infinitival complements must be overt for the

relevant features of a superordinate finite subject inflection to be transmitted to them. My arguments of the pronoun will establish that the overt pronominal in the non-finite complement clause must be controlled and conclude that it is a lexical instance of PRO.

REFERENCES

Barbosa, Pilar. 2016. Overt subjects of raising and control infinitives and the mode of composition of subjects in the consistent null subject languages. Universidade do Minho/CEHUM https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/003077

Campbell, Akua Asantewaa. 2017. A Grammar of Gã. PhD Dissertation, Rice University. https://hdl.handle.net/1911/102269

Chomsky, Noam. 1981. Lectures on government and binding. Dordrecht: Foris

Dakubu, Mary Esther. 2004. Ga clauses without syntactic subjects. In *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics*, *25*(1), 1-40.

Hornstein, Norbert.1999. Movement and control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30: 69-96

Landau, Idan. 2004. The scale of finiteness and the calculus of control. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22:811–877.

Landau, Idan. 2013. *Control in Generative Grammar.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sampson, Korsah. 2017. Issues in Kwa Syntax: Pronouns and Clausal Determiners*,* Dissertation Doctor philosophiae (Dr. phil.) Universität Leipzig, Germany