## TBD\*

## Ben Eischens & Andrew Hedding

June 6, 2018

## 1 Introduction

San Martín Peras Mixtec has a canonical VSO word order, as shown below. A post-verbal pronoun or R-expression specifies a third person subject:

- (1) shi<sup>3</sup>shi<sup>2</sup> Pe<sup>3</sup>bro<sup>2</sup> shi<sup>1</sup>ta<sup>1</sup> eat.CONT Pedro tortilla "Pedro eats tortillas"
- (2)  $\mathrm{shi^3shi^2}$   $\mathrm{ra^1}$   $\mathrm{shi^1ta^1}$   $\mathrm{eat.CONT}$  3.SG.MASC tortilla "He eats tortillas"

For first and second person subjects, an agreement clitic fuses with the verbal stem:

- (3)  $\mathrm{shi^3 sh \cdot i^{21}}$   $\mathrm{shi^1 ta^1}$ hit.COMPL-1SG Pedro "I eat tortillas"
- (4) shi<sup>3</sup>sh-ũ<sup>2</sup> shi<sup>1</sup>ta<sup>1</sup> hit.COMPL-2SG tortilla "You eat tortillas"

Embedded clauses generally follow the pattern below, which is  $_{\text{Matrix}}[V S (O)]_{\text{Embedded}}[(Comp) V S (O)]]$ :

(5) [
$$k\tilde{a}^3$$
' $\tilde{a}^2$   $\tilde{n}a^3$  [ $ke^3ba^2$ ' $a^2$   $\tilde{n}a^3$ ]] [think.CONT 3SG.FEM [win.CONT 3SG.FEM]] "She thinks that she is winning" (from Ostrove 2018)

In general, the matrix clause must have a subject (6), and this pattern is followed in most control constructions. Leaving the matrix verb without an overt subject is usually disallowed (7). In addition, there must be an overt subject in the embedded clause; null PRO is not allowed (8).

<sup>\*</sup>Authors are listed in alphabetical order. All remaining errors are each other's.

- (6) ko<sup>32</sup>ni<sup>1</sup> Pe<sup>3</sup>bro<sup>2</sup> ku<sup>2</sup>shi<sup>2</sup> ra<sup>2</sup> shi<sup>1</sup>ta<sup>1</sup> want.CONT Pedro eat.POT 3.SG.MASC tortilla "Pedro wants to eat tortillas"
- (7) \*ko<sup>32</sup>ni<sup>1</sup> ku<sup>2</sup>shi<sup>2</sup> Pe<sup>3</sup>bro<sup>2</sup> shi<sup>1</sup>ta<sup>1</sup> want.CONT eat.POT Pedro tortilla Intended: "Pedro wants to eat tortillas"
- (8) \*ko<sup>32</sup>ni<sup>1</sup> Pe<sup>3</sup>bro<sup>2</sup> ku<sup>2</sup>shi<sup>2</sup> shi<sup>1</sup>ta<sup>1</sup> want.CONT Pedro eat.POT tortilla Intended: "Pedro wants to eat tortillas"

However, there are certain constructions in SMPM that allow this exact pattern. Interestingly, the verb meaning 'to start' permits a construction in which the matrix clause does not contain a subject:

(9)  $ki^1sha^2$   $ka^3$ ' $\tilde{a}^2$   $ra^1$   $shi^3$ ' $\tilde{i}^2$   $\tilde{n}a^3$  begin.COMPL talk.CONT 3.SG.MASC with 3.SG.FEM "He began to talk to her"

As expected, a construction in which there is an overt subject in the matrix clause and a silent PRO in the embedded clause, is disallowed:

(10)  $*ki^1sha^2$  ra<sup>1</sup> ka<sup>3</sup>' $\tilde{a}^2$  shi<sup>3</sup>' $\tilde{i}^2$   $\tilde{n}a^3$  beginCOMPL 3.SG.MASC talk.CONT with 3.SG.FEM Intended: "He began to speak with her"

What is surprising about this pattern of data is that, in general, SMPM disallows null subjects like PRO. In fact, it is not possible for a locally bound PRO to serve as the subject of an embedded clause (8). However, it is possible for there to be a gap in matrix subject position in constructions with the verb 'begin.' This is the opposite pattern of control observed in languages like English, where PRO must be bound by a matrix subject, as in (11) below, where a dashed line represents binding:

- (11)  $_{\text{CP}}[\underbrace{I_k \text{ want }_{\text{CP}}[PRO_k \text{ to eat tortillas }]}_{}]$
- 2 Language Background
- 3 Polinsky and Potsdam
- 4 Application to Mixtec
- 5 Discussion and Implications
- 6 Conclusion