

Complementation in Newari

In this paper, I examine the CP headness in Newari, a dialect of Nepali mainly spoken in the Kathmandu Valley. While most phrases in Newari are head-final, CPs can be both head final, ‘d^hajɑ’ and ‘d^hɔkɑ’, and head initial ‘ki’, occurring in (1) to (3). But different possible word orders seem to require different C heads. Only the head final CPs may appear in pre-verbal position. Data in (2) and (3) show that KI cannot occur in pre-verbal CPs, whereas CPs that are headed by either DAYA or DOKA can.

(1) Newari CP in S-V-CP order

- a. (*sita-nɔ) d^hɑ-lɔ [CP (ki) ram-o bɔl t^wɑ-lɔ].
Sita-ERG say-PERF (KI) Ram-ERG ball.ABS kick-PERF
- b. (*sita-nɔ) d^hɑ-lɔ [CP ram-o bɔl t^wɑ-lɔ (d^hajɑ/d^hɔkɑ)].
Sita-ERG say-PERF Ram-ERG ball.ABS kick-PERF (DAYA/DOKA)
‘Sita said that Ram kicked the ball.’

(2) Newari CP in S-CP-V order

- a. * sita-nɔ [CP ki ram-o bɔl t^wɑ-lɔ] d^hɑ-lɔ.
Sita-ERG KI Ram-ERG ball.ABS kick-PERF say-PERF
- b. (sita-nɔ) [CP ram-o bɔl t^wɑ-lɔ (d^hajɑ/d^hɔkɑ)] d^hɑ-lɔ.
Sita-ERG Ram-ERG ball.ABS kick-PERF DAYA/DOKA say-PERF
‘Sita said that Ram kicked the ball.’

(3) Newari CP in CP-S-V order

- a. * [CP ki ram-o bɔl t^wɑ-lɔ] sita-nɔ d^hɑ-lɔ.
KI Ram-ERG ball.ABS kick-PERF Sita-ERG say-PERF
- b. [CP ram-o bɔl t^wɑ-lɔ d^hajɑ/d^hɔkɑ] (sita-nɔ) d^hɑ-lɔ.
Ram-ERG ball.ABS kick-PERF DAYA/DOKA Sita-ERG say-PERF
‘Sita said that Ram kicked the ball.’

Unlike KI CPs, the head-final CPs can appear in preverbal positions. Interestingly, C heads are optional in the sequence [S CP V] in (2), but obligatory in the sequence [CP S V] in (3). Another interesting pattern is the optionality of the main verb subject that seems to correlate with preverbal CPs. The table below summarizes what we know so far about the puzzle.

Word Order Pattern	KI	DAYA/DOKA	Main Subject
S V [CP ...]	Optional	Optional	Obligatory
S [CP ...] V	*	Optional	Optional
[CP ...] S V	*	Obligatory	Optional

Two puzzles raised by these facts:

1. Why does Newari have both head initial and head final CPs? 2. Why does the head initial CP strictly appear in post verbal position, while the head final CPs are more flexible?

My solution: I propose that in Newari, [S V [CP...]] where the CP headed by KI is the underlying structure, and the other structures [S [CP...] V] and [[CP...] S V] are derived from the underlying structure. Even though Newari seems to be SOV language on the surface, that does not necessarily imply that [S [CP...] V] must be the underlying structure (Simpson & Bhattacharya 2003).

The Evidence that wh-movement questions cannot be derived from [S [CP...] V] construction supports this idea. From the surface linear order, Newari looks like a wh-in-situ language, where

wh-phrases stay in situ to scope over a sentence and form a wh-question. However, in an embedded wh-question, the word order and optionality of the C heads become more restricted. First, the data in (4) and (5) show that all three heads are obligatory in any position in wh-constructions. Additionally, (6) shows [S [_{CP}...] V] is not available to form a wh-question at all. The following table summarizes the new restricted CP situations in wh-question sentences.

- (4) a. sita-nə d^hɑ-lə [_{CP} *(ki) t_ε^hu-nə bəl t^wɑ-lə] ?
 Sita-ERG say-PERF **KI** who-ERG ball.ABS kick-PERF
- b. sita-nə d^hɑ-lə [_{CP} t_ε^hu-nə bəl t^wɑ-lə *(d^hɑjɑ/d^həkɑ)] ?
 Sita-ERG say-PERF who-ERG ball.ABS kick-PERF **DAYA/DOKA**
 ‘Who did Sita say kicked the ball?’
- (5) a. [_{CP} t_ε^hu-nə bəl t^wɑ-lə *(d^hɑjɑ/d^həkɑ)] *(sita-nə) d^hɑ-lə ?
 who-ERG ball.ABS kick-PERF **DAYA/DOKA** Sita-ERG say-PERF
 ‘Who did Sita say kicked the ball?’
- (6) a. * sita-nə [_{CP} ki t_ε^hu-nə bəl t^wɑ-lə] d^hɑ-lə ?
 Sita-ERG **KI** who-ERG ball.ABS kick-PERF say-PERF
- b. * sita-nə [_{CP} t_ε^hu-nə bəl t^wɑ-lə d^hɑjɑ/d^həkɑ] d^hɑ-lə ?
 Sita-ERG who-ERG ball.ABS kick-PERF **DAYA/DOKA** say-PERF
 Intended: ‘Who did Sita say kicked the ball?’

Word Order Pattern	KI	DAYA/DOKA
S V [_{CP} wh- ...]	Obligatory	*
[_{CP} wh- ...] S V	*	Obligatory
S [_{CP} wh- ...] V	Not a possible word order	

The impossibility of [S [_{CP} wh-...] V] shows that [S CP V] should not be the underlying structure, and the non-wh-sentence [S CP V] may be derived from another structure, but the moved phrase creates an island, which does not allow any further wh-movements at the position it landed. CPs headed by different heads appearing post-verbally and pre-verbally have been observed in many languages as Turkish (Kesici 2013), Bangla (Simpson & Bhattacharya 2003), North Azeri (Halpert & Griffith 2014), and Hindi (Mahajan 1997). Some related hypotheses are raised: 1.the CP is not a complement to the matrix clause, but instead it is as high as the matrix clause(extraposition). 2.CP is a complement of V generated in the post verbal position, and moved to a higher position (Mahajan 1997). 3.CP can be a complement, depending on the position of the verb which licenses the CP, it can be generalized pre-verbally or post-verbally (Biberauer et al. 2009). While the North Azeri (Halpert & Griffith 2014) and Turkish (Kesici 2013) work conclude that only some CPs are generated as complement to V, which draw the opposite conclusion from what I find in Newari, namely the preverbal CPs are the lowest ones. Hypothesis 2 is able to explain the puzzle in Newari without violating the FOFC constraint.

Selected references: Biberauer, T., Newton, G. and Sheehan, M., 2009. Limiting synchronic and diachronic variation and change: The Final-over-Final Constraint. *Language and Linguistics*, 10(4), pp.699-741. Halpert, C. and Griffith, C., 2014. CPs in North Azeri: New evidence for extraposition. *In Proceedings of WAFL 10. MITWPL, Cambridge, MA.* Kesici, E., 2013. Ki-clauses in Turkish: A paratactic analysis. *Coyote Papers: Working Papers in Linguistics, Linguistic Theory at the University of Arizona.* Mahajan, A., 1997. Rightward scrambling. *Rightward movement*, pp.185-213. Simpson, A. and Bhattacharya, T., 2003. Obligatory overt wh-movement in a wh-in-situ language. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 34(1), pp.127-142.