

# Control the sentence, subordinate the pronoun: on the status of controlled versus non-controlled complement clauses in O'dam

[Michael Everdell,<sup>1</sup> Paul B. Melchin<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Linguistics, The University of Texas at Austin, <sup>2</sup>School of Linguistics and Language Studies, Carleton University



The University of Texas at Austin  
Department of Linguistics  
College of Liberal Arts



## Preverbal Quantifiers in O'dam

O'dam is a Uto-Aztecan language spoken primarily in the Mezquital municipality of Durango, MX by ~36,000 people (INEGI 2015).

When quantifiers appear in the preverbal position, as in (1), they may quantify any argument of their associated verb but no adjuncts.

1. *ji'k pix ja-ai-chdha-'-am mu chi-chiop*  
some MIR 3PL.PO-arrive-APPL-IRR-3PL.SBJ DIST.LOWER PL~church  
a. 'They brought **some of them** to churches'  
b. '**Some of them** brought them to churches'  
c. \*They brought my friends **to some churches**

## Two types of complement clauses in O'dam

**Controlled:** have an initial subordinator *na* followed by a finite clause that shows obligatory co-reference marking between the matrix object and subordinate subject. Shown in (3).

**Uncontrolled:** have an initial subordinator *na* followed by a finite clause, the OBJ of the matrix clause is co-referent with the subordinate clause, this means that the object prefix is always 3SG. Shown in (4).

## The syntactic shape of uncontrolled complement clauses

Uncontrolled complement clauses take on one of two shapes depending on whether they refer to a participant, as in (4), or an event, as in (2).

2. *Jix=bhai' jix=maat na=Ø cham ji'xkat jugio-ka' gu tu'*  
COP=good COP=know SUB=3SG.SBJ NEG never eat-EST DET something  
'Because it is good for him to know that he could not eat it.'  
(García Salido 2014: 288)

When they refer to a participant they obligatorily have a head, a nominal that occurs in the preverbal position of the subordinate clause. In contrast, when they refer to an event, they do not have an obligatory head, as in (2), where a demonstrative (*dhi* or *gui*) or indefinite pronoun (*jaroí* 'someone') is used for pronominal heads.

Thus, a non-controlled complement clause's shape matches that of an adjunct relative clause. Our argument is that this is because the complement clause's exponent is an adjunct relative clause.

PRED	'cause'	
	[PRED 'pro']	
SUBJ	PERS	2
	NUM	SG
OBJ	[PRED 'pro']	
	PERS	1
	NUM	SG
	i	
COMP	[PRED 'make']	
	[SUBJ [PRED 'pro']	
	PERS	1
	NUM	SG
	i	
	[OBJ [PRED 'tacos']	
	PERS	3
	NUM	SG
	QUANT TWO	

3. *Gok jiñ-chia-pi=ch na=ñi jup duñi-a' gu tacos*  
two 1SG.PO-send.PFV-2SG.SBJ-PFV SUB=1SG.SBJ IT do-IRR DET tacos  
'You had me make *two* tacos'

PRED	'know'	
	[PRED 'pro']	
SUBJ	PERS	1
	NUM	SG
OBJ	[PRED 'pro']	
	PERS	3
	NUM	SG
	i	
	QUANR ALL	
ADJ	[PRED 'burn']	
	[SUBJ [PRED 'someone']	
	PERS	3
	NUM	SG
	i	
	[OBJ [PRED 'firewood']	
	PERS	3
	NUM	SG

4. *Bix jix=Ø-mat-iñ na=m jaroí' mii-'ñ gu ku'a'*  
all COP=3SG.PO-know-1SG.SBJ SUB=3PL.SBJ someone burn-APPL DET firewood  
'I know who.PL *completely* burned the firewood' (Lit. I know that some people completely burned the firewood)  
\*I know who.PL burned *all* of the firewood.  
\*I know *all* of them who burned the firewood.

## Quantification and argument structure

When a quantifier appears in the preverbal position of a matrix clause, as in *gok* 'two' in (3) and *bix* 'all' in (4), it can quantify the eventuality (generally the scale) of any complement clause. However, it can only quantify the arguments of a controlled complement clause.

We handle this by proposing the **QUANT Assignment function**:

(↑ AF\* QUANT) = ALL

The QUANT feature is a syntactic feature which, through the correspondence function  $\sigma$  (Findlay 2016), indicates a certain relationship in s-structure determined by the meaning of the quantifier (this study concerns the lexical category of quantifiers in O'dam, some of which are also semantic quantifiers).

An AF is a syntactic element within the set of arguments (SUBJ, OBJ, COMP) and not in the set of adjuncts (ADJ).

The QUANT Assignment Function rules out quantification of the arguments of a non-controlled complement clause, because they are in the ADJ set, while arguments of controlled clauses are quantifiable, because they are in the COMP set.

This means that a controlled clause in O'dam is a true clausal dependent, the argument structure of the subordinate clause is a dependent of the matrix clause. However, for a non-controlled complement clause, only the eventuality is an argument of the matrix clause, it's participants are not.

## Acknowledgments

This project was in part funded by NSF-DDRIG BCS-1946625. The data here comes from our consultants Eli Soto Gurrola, Yamileth Gurrola, Wendy Gurrola, and Mauro Aguilar who continue to help us understand the O'dam language. Thank you for the invaluable feedback from Dan Siddiqi, Ash Asudeh, Gabriela García Salido, John Beavers, Stephen Wechsler, and the entire Syntax and Semantics Research Seminar at UT.

## References

- Findlay, Jamie Y. 2016. Mapping theory without argument structure. *Journal of Language Modeling*. 4(2): 293-338.  
García Salido, Gabriela. 2014. Clause in Southeastern Tepehuan, a Uto-Aztecan language of Northern Mexico. Ph.D. dissertation. The University of Texas at Austin.  
Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía (INEGI). 2015. <http://www.inegi.org.mx/default.aspx>. Mexico.  
Willett, Thomas L. 1991. *A reference grammar of Southeastern Tepehuan*. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.