Complementizer Concord in Western Armenian

Hrayr Khanjian   Massachusetts Institute of Technology

This paper accounts for the typologically unique double headed CP structure found in Western Armenian (WA), as an instance of concord. Certain CPs in WA can have two heads, where one is head-initial and the other is head-final. For these phrases, it is possible to omit one of the heads, and end up with either a head-initial or head-final phrase. These double headed CPs present two major challenges which I present solutions for. First, how to account for the phonological and syntactic differences between the head-initial and the head-final CPs. Second, how to compositionally derive the desired semantics of the doubly headed CPs.

As seen in (1), the CP adjunct "if i go home" has two C heads, the head-initial free morpheme *jete* "if" and the head-final bound clitic *-ne* which can mean {if, when, ever, or} depending on its environment. It's possible to omit either of the heads, as in (2) and (3), and get the same interpretation as in (1).

(1)   **jete** [dun jertam]-**ne**, bydem
       if   home go.1S-NE,   will.eat.1S
       "If I go home, I will eat."

(2)   jete [**dun** jertam], bydem

(3)   [dun jer**tam**]-ne, bydem

Besides the morphosyntactic difference of the C heads of (2) and (3), there is a difference in prosody, indicated in bold. The clausal focus in (2) is on the pre-verbal syllable *dun* 'home', whereas in (3) it is on the pre-C syllable *tam*, the second syllable of 'go'. The default clausal focus position in WA is assigned to the item immediately preceding the verb, similar to for example Hungarian (Horvath 1986) and Basque (Arregi 2002). Therefore the prosody in (2) is expected while the pattern in (3) is not.

Following Richards (2011), the prosody difference between (2) and (3) is accounted for given *Affix Support* (Richards 2011:30), which states that "If any head is an affix, there must be a metrical boundary in the direction in which it attaches." In the case of WA, the head-inital CP structure is headed by a free standing morpheme and therefore no prosodic change is seen for the TP. However the head-final CP, headed by the enclitic *-ne*, creates a metrical boundary immediately to the left of it. Since WA is a language with right edge stress for phrases (Vaux 1998), this pattern obeys Richards' (2011) theory. WA's unique double headed CP structure becomes a good test for Richard's theory in the same language for the same phrase.

The second puzzle that I account for is that of compositionality. I claim that a CP like in (1) presents an instance of concord, similar to other concord phenomena found in WA like that of negation. Zeijlstra (2004, 2008, ...) account for the phenomenon of negative concord cross-linguistically with a Last Resort covert negative operator, $Op_\neg$ which Zeijlstra (2004) following Giannakidou (1997) and Heim (1982) claims that this operator introduces negation at LF and binds all open variables under existential closure. Therefore the semantic meaning of negation comes from this operator when no other element in the overt syntax provides an interpretable negation. This is the case for certain WA phrases as in (4).

(4) $[_{vP}\ Op_{\neg[iNEG]}$ no-one$_{[uNEG]}$ no-where$_{[uNEG]}$ went] "No one went anywhere"

The two negative morpheme bearing phrases in (4) do not have any interpretable negative force, therefore a c-commanding $Op_\neg$ is introduced resulting in only one semantic negation. I extend this analysis to CPs. The head-initial conditional morpheme *jete* and the head-final enclitic *-ne* yield only one conditional meaning. I claim that both these morphemes carry uninterpretable features that trigger a single covert operator as in (5). This operator carries an interpretable feature that checks the uninterpretable features of one of the two or both C-heads.

(5) $[_{CP}\ Op_{[iIF]}\ [_C\ \text{jete}_{[uIF]}]\ [_{TP}\ \text{dun jertam}]\ [_C\ \text{-ne}_{[uIF]}]]$

Other environments where two heads appear in the same clause are with free relative constructions as in (6), which can be accounted for using the same mechanism. In the case of (6), the covert operator will carry universal force.

(6)   ur   **vor** [Aramə Hagop-in   desne]-**ne**...
        where that Aram   Hagop-DAT see.3S-NE...
        "Wherever Aram sees Hagop..."

The extension of Zeijlstra's (2004) account of negative concord via a covert operator can be applied to other languages other than WA for CPs where double headedness is present.