SUBORDINATION THROUGH NOMINALIZATION: *DET* AS *COMP* IN MALAGASY CONTROL COMPLEMENTS

Dimitrios NTELITHEOS
United Arab Emirates University

1.   Introduction.

The main functions of a determiner are to establish the referential properties of a nominal expression and to turn NPs (which have a predicative or propositional status) into arguments (see Longobardi 1990; Szabolcsi 1987, 1994:181; Stowell 1989). In this respect, determiners are similar to complementizers which subordinate a clause. This parallelism between Comp-elements and Det-elements of different types has also been shown to have historical sources. (Hopper and Traugott 2003: 190-4; Diessel (forthcoming)).

This paper provides a set of syntactic criteria for the identification of the morphosyntactic status of the marker *ny* in Malagasy (Austronesian). Traditionally, ny is assumed to be a definite determiner which appears selecting common noun phrases or nominalized strings of verbal or adjectival sources. Additionally, *ny* acts as a nominalizer of clausal strings and as a marker of subordination in control structures. The basic assumption in this paper is that *ny* is undergoing a process of reanalysis as a subordinating marker in this specific environment. We provide a series of arguments supporting this assumption: the determiner maintains some of the characteristics of its default function as a marker of definiteness in nominal contexts but it also acquires new properties in its new function as a marker of subordination.

2.   Malagasy Clause Structure and Nominalizations.

Malagasy is traditionally characterized as a VOS language. The clause-final noun phrase is considered a subject in traditional grammars and later approaches (Guilfoyle et al 1992; Paul 1999) or a left-dislocated topic (Pearson 2001, 2005; Ntelitheos 2006). The language has a complex voicing system that promotes verbal arguments (agent, theme, instrument, etc.) to the clause-final position. Following the terminology adopted in Pearson (2001; 2005) we will call this rightmost noun phrase the "trigger". The promotion of arguments to trigger is reflected in distinctive verb morphology (Keenan & Polinsky, 1998; Pearson, 2001; Paul, 1999; and others)[1]:

---

[1]   Transcription conventions follow the Leipzig Glossing Rules. Since a hyphen is an orthographic device in Malagasy, we opted for using the period as a morpheme-separator and a forward slash for fusion. Some

(1)   n.i.vídy   boky   ho an'   ny   mpianatra   ny   mpampianatra.
        PST.PFX.buy   books   for'   DET   student   DET   teacher
        'The teacher bought books for the student.'

(2)   no.vid.in'   ny   mpampianatra   ho an'ny   mpianatra   ny   boky.
        PST.buy.TT/LNK' DET   teacher   for ' DET   student   DET   books
        'The books were bought by the teacher for the student.'

(3)   n.i.vidi.ana.n'   ny   mpampianatra   boky   ny mpianatra.
        PST. PFX.buy.CT / LNK'   DET   teacher   books   DET student
        'The student was bought books by the teacher.'

In (1) the root *vidy* "buy" is prefixed by a verbalizing prefix *–i*, which in turn allows the prefixation of tense morphology. This is the so-called active form of the verb, termed here the actor-trigger (AT), because it licenses the actor argument of the verb to the trigger position. In (2) the root is suffixed by *–in*, while no overt verbalizing prefix appears. The rightmost element in this case is the theme of the verb *ny mpianatra* and the structure is called the theme-trigger (TT) voice. Finally, in (3) the root is once again prefixed by the verbalizing morpheme *–i*, and subsequently suffixed with the morpheme *–an*. In this case the benefactor role is promoted to trigger position and the structure is termed the circumstantial trigger (CT) voice.

Malagasy exhibits a wide range of nominalizations, from simple nominals that resemble common noun phrases in their behaviour, to full-fledged clausal nominalizations that contain tense morphology. Some examples are provided in (4)-(6):

(4)   n.a.hita   [f.an.ala.hidy]   aho
        PST.PFX.see   NML.PFX.remove.lock   1SG/NOM
        'I found a key.' (Lit. thing used to remove lock with)

(5)   ny   f.an.doah.an-dRabe   ny rindrina dia   ilay fantsika
        DET   NML.PFX.drill.CT/LNK -Rabe   DET wall   TOP   DEM nail
        'The (instrument for) Rabe's drilling the walls is this nail.'

(6)   ny n.an.doah.an-dRabe   rindrina   omaly   dia   ilay fantsika
        D PST.PFX.drill.CT/LNK -Rabe   wall   yesterday   TOP   DEM   nail
        'The (instrument for) Rabe's drilling walls yesterday is this nail.'

In (4) the nominal *fanalahidy* has the distribution and morphosyntactic behaviour of underived common nouns. Example (5) is an intermediate case where the instrumental nominal *fandoahana* (drill, instrument for drilling) has mixed verbal and nominal properties. Finally, example (6) corresponds to a headless relative clause. What all of these nominals have in common is that the derived nominalization can be selected by the definite determiner *ny*.

The marker *ny* mainly appears in contexts where the following nominal is interpreted as definite:

(7)   m.am.eno   ny   tavoahangy ny   lehilahy
        PRS.PFX.fill   DET   bottle   DET man
        'The man is filling the bottle.'

(8)   m.am.eno   tavoahangy   ny   lehilahy

---

additional abbreviations used here include: NML, nominalizer; PFX, the verbalizing prefixes an- and i-; TT, Theme Trigger voice morphology on the verb; CT, Circumstantial Trigger voice morphology on the verb; LNK, linker; ABIL, abilitive morpheme.

PRS.PFX.fill	bottle	DET	man

'The man is filling the bottle.'

In (7), the focus is on a specific bottle of which both speaker and addressee are aware. On the other hand, in (8) the nominal may refer to any bottle/bottles (Malagasy lacks plural marking morphology). The marker *ny* can also appear with generics, as in (9) (example from Domenichini-Ramiaramanana 1977):

(9)   biby   ny   alika.
            animal   DET   dog
            'The dog is an animal.'

Keenan (1976: 252-254) shows that the trigger position requires the nominal to appear with a definiteness marker (see also Paul 1999; Pearson 2001:19-20; and others):

(10)   lasa   ny   mpianatra.
            gone   DET   student
            'The student(s) left.'

(11)   * lasa mpianatra.
            gone student
            'Some/a student(s) left.'

Finally, while in most cases the object directly follows the verb with adverbs being placed after the verb phrase, in certain cases the adverb can appear immediately following the verb, with the object placed in a post-adverbial position. This scrambling operation is available only when the object is preceded by *ny*. As is usually the case for the more productive object scrambling Germanic languages, only definite objects can be scrambled (De Hoop, 1992):

(12)   m.a.handro   (ny)   sakafo   matetika   Rabe
            PRS.PFX.cook   DET   food   often   Rabe
            'Rabe cooks food often.'

(13)   m.a.handro   matetika *(ny)   sakafo   Rabe
            PRS.PFX.cook   often   DET   food   Rabe
            'Rabe cooks the (specific) food often.'

In (12), the definite or indefinite forms of the object *sakafo* appear immediately following the verb, and the adverb *matetika* follows the VP. In (13), on the other hand, only the definite form is allowed in a post-adverbial scrambled position. This restriction also carries on to the left-peripheral topic position of the clause, which is usually introduced with the topic particle *dia*:

(14)   * (ny)   bibilava   dia   m.i.kisaka.
              DET   snake   TOP   PRS.PFX.crawl
            'Snakes crawl.'

A nominal can be topicalized only when preceded by the definite determiner.

3.   Malagasy Control Structures.

The properties of different types of Malagasy control structures have been studied extensively in Keenan 1976, 1995; Law 1995; Paul and Ranaivoson 1998; Pearson 2001; Polinsky and Potsdam 2002, 2003, 2005; Potsdam 2004; and others.

Potsdam (2004) lists three different types of Malagasy control patterns[2]:

(15)   n.an.andrana   [n.am.ono   ny akoho   Δi]   Rabei   ACTIVE
         PST.PFX.try   PST.PFX.kill   DET chicken   Rabe
         'Rabe tried to kill the chicken'

(16)   n.andraman-dRabei   [no.vono.ina   Δi]   ny   akoho   PASSIVE
         PST.try.TT/LNK -Rabe   PST.kill.TT/LNK   DET   chicken
         (lit. 'The chicken was tried by Rabe to be killed') 'Rabe tried to kill the chicken'

(17)   n.aha.vita   [n.am.ono ny   akoho   Rabei]   Δi   BACKWARD
         PST.PFX.accomplish   PST.PFX.kill DET   chicken Rabe
         'Rabe finished killing the chicken'

Malagasy embedded clauses contain verbs that are marked obligatorily with tense morphology[3].The tense can be independent, dependent, or anaphoric (Ntelitheos 2006: ch. 4). In cases of finite clausal complements, introduced with the complementizer *fa*, the tense of the embedded clause is independent of the tense of the main clause:

(18)   m.i.hevitra   Rabe fa   m/n/h.i.vidy   fiara   (izy)
         PRS.PFX.think   Rabe COMP   PRS/PST/FUT.PFX.buy   car   3NOM
         'Rabe thinks that he is buying/has bought/will buy a car.'

Certain control verbs seem to take complement clauses that also present a distinct tense marking, independent of the tense of the matrix clause. Consider the following examples:

(19)   n.an.iry   [(ny)   h.an.deha   ho   any   Antsiranana]   Rabe
         PST.PFX.wish   DET   FUT.PFX.go   FUT   LOC   Antsiranana   Rabe
         'Rabe wished to go to Antsiranana'.

(20)   n.i.kasa   [(ny)   h.am.aky   ny   boky]   Rabe
         PST.PFX.intend   DET   FUT.PFX.read   DET   book   Rabe
         'Rabe intended to read the book.'

(21)   m.an.aiky   [(ny)   ho.sas.ana]   ny   zaza
         PRS.PFX.agree   DET   FUT.wash.TT   DET   child
         'The child agrees to be washed.'

In the above cases, the tense of the matrix clause can be of any possible type while the tense of the embedded clause is obligatorily marked with the future marker *h-/ho-*[4]. If we try to change the tense of the embedded clause the result is ungrammatical:

(22)   *   n.an.iry   [(ny)   n.an.deha   ho   any   Antsiranana]   Rabe
           PST.PFX.wish   DET   PST.PFX.go   FUT   LOC   Antsiranana   Rabe
           'Rabe wished to have gone to Antsiranana'.

(23)   *   n.i.kasa   [(ny)   m.am.aky   ny   boky]   Rabe

---

[2]   In fact Potsdam (2004) lists a fourth type exemplified below:

       m.i.hevitra   Rabei   [fa   hamono   ny akoho   Δi]   FINITE
       PRS.PFX.think   Rabe   that   FUT.PFX.kill   the chicken
       'Rabe thinks that (he) will kill the chicken'

       However, in later work (Polinsky and Potsdam 2005) this type is considered a case of topic-drop.

[3]   Present tense is unmarked in Malagasy, and therefore forms without a prefix are interpreted as present tense clauses.

[4]   Choice of allomorph is determined by the initial segment of the verbal stem: vowel-initial stems are prefixed with *h-* while consonant-initial stems are prefixed with *ho-*.

PST.PFX.intend   DET   PRS.PFX.read   DET   book   Rabe
'Rabe intended to read the book.'

This means that the tense of these clauses must be invariably future. However the flavour of future in the embedded clauses is different than that of matrix clauses. A quick survey of the relevant data shows that verbs that take clausal complements marked for future are so-called 'desiderative' (i.e. denoting desire) predicates (in Noonan 1985 verbs that belong to three classes – the 'wish-class', the 'hope-class', and the 'want-class'). Some examples include: *manaiky* 'agree', *mikasa* 'intend', *tia/te* 'want', *manantena* 'hope', *manapaka* 'decide, agree', and others.

The pattern that these verbs exhibit is not unique to Malagasy. In Balkan languages the same verbs select for free subjunctives clauses (Landau 2004), which allow for lexical subjects and for aspectual modifiers distinct from matrix aspectual modifiers. Landau (2004) shows use of future tense to denote irrealis mood in Hebrew, where commissive and desiderative verbs take complements marked with future tense. In addition, morphological future participates in sequence of tense phenomena, expressing both the irrealis *would* and the future *will*. Thus future morphology in Malagasy embedded clauses of the type exemplified above could be an irrealis marker like the subjunctive markers in Balkan languages or the future marker in Hebrew complements of commissive and desiderative verbs.

A number of control verbs impose a strict restriction on the tense morphology of their selected clauses. They include implicative verbs, such as *mahatsiaro* 'remember' and *manadino* 'forget'; achievement verbs such as *manandrana* 'try', *mianatra* 'learn'; aspectual verbs such as *manomboka* 'begin', *mitsahatra* 'cease', *mijanona* 'stop', *mahavita* 'finish'; and modal verbs like *mila* 'need', *mahay* 'know how to, can', as well as some verbalized modifiers such as *miaraka* 'together':

(24)   h.i.ezaka   [(ny)   h.a.handro   vary]   Rabe
            FUT.PFX.try   DET   FUT.PFX.cook   rice   Rabe
            'Rabe will try to cook rice.'

(25)   tsy   n.i.janona   [(ny)   n.i.tomany]   ilay   zaza
            NEG   PST.PFX.stop   [DET   PST.PFX.cry]   DEM   child
            'This child did not stop crying.'

(26)   m.a.hay   m.i.teny   Malagasy Rabe
            PRS.PFX.can   PRS.PFX.speak   Malagasy Rabe
            'Rabe can speak Malagasy.'

In all the above cases the tense morphology of the embedded clause obligatorily matches the tense morphology of the matrix clause:

(27)   * n.i.ezaka   [(ny)   m/h.a.handro   vary]   Rabe
            PST.PFX.try   DET   PRS/FUT.PFX.cook rice   Rabe
            'Rabe tried to cook rice.'

(28)   * m.an.omboka h.i.resaka   isika
            PRS.PFX.start   FUT.PFX.talk   1PL/NOM (inclusive)
            'We start talking.'

Furthermore, it is impossible to introduce distinct aspectual modifiers in both matrix and embedded clauses:

(29)	*	n.i.ezaka	omaly	[(ny)	h.a.handro	vary	rahampitso]	Rabe
		PST.PFX.try	yesterday	DET	PRS/FUT.PFX.cook	rice	tomorrow	Rabe

'Rabe tried yesterday to cook rice tomorrow.'

(30)	*	m.an.omboka	androany	h.i.resaka	rahampitso	isika
		PRS.PFX.start	today	FUT.PFX.talk	tomorrow	1PL/NOM (inclusive)

'We start today talking tomorrow.'

Summarizing, control complements appear with dependent or anaphoric tense. As can be seen in most of the examples examined in this section, a property of these control complements is that they can appear preceded by the definite determiner *ny*, but in the majority of the cases the presence of the determiner is optional. In the following section we will examine the properties of this marker in control contexts in more detail and try to determine more accurately its categorial status in these cases.

4. The Dual Character of *ny* in Malagasy Control Clauses

As we have seen in section 2 the particle *ny* in Malagasy acts as a definiteness marker. More accurately *ny* seems to carry discourse-related properties in that it juxtaposes the nominal to other possible members of the same group. Thus, *ny* is a marker of specificity, a device that encodes focusing and background information (see Paul 2009 for a detailed discussion of these properties).

The question that needs to be asked is whether *ny* is a definite determiner in control contexts or whether it is a type of subordinator. What is its semantic contribution (if any)? Does presence vs. absence of *ny* make any difference in the interpretation and syntactic distribution of the control complement? The relevant literature leaves these questions unanswered. In his treatment of causative verbs in Malagasy, Randriamasimanana, (1986, p. 501-503) terms *ny* a complementizer in these contexts, while in their account of control structures in Malagasy, Polinsky and Potsdam (2002, 2003, 2005) call it a determiner.

Assuming a grammaticalization process, as defined for example in Kurylowicz (1965:69), what needs to be detected is an increase of the range of a morpheme advancing from a less grammatical to a more grammatical status. This advance is detected by a unidirectional and gradual process of changes ranging from phonological reduction and semantic bleaching to distribution and structural changes. Let us consider the well-documented example of the English demonstrative and complementizer *that*, illustrated in the following examples:

(31)   John believes that rumour spread by Mary.
(32)   John believes (that) Mary has spread a rumour.

The complementizer *that* in (32) a) is no longer a referring term (semantic bleaching); b) it is pronounced with a reduced schwa instead of the full low front vowel of the demonstrative of (31) (phonological reduction); c) it is optional (as the brackets indicate), d) it cannot be replaced by other forms such as the plural demonstrative *those* or the proximal singular *this*; and e) it is syntactically restricted to the subordinate clause initial position, while the demonstrative can appear in elliptical contexts, can be contrastively focused, and so on.

Let us now consider some of the determiner-like properties of *ny*. As we have already seen the definiteness marker is obligatory in at least three contexts: when the noun phrase is in

the rightmost trigger position; when it is an object that has scrambled to the right of an adjacent adverb; and when it is topicalized (see examples (10)-(14)).

Control complements exhibit an identical distributional pattern. While in active contexts the definiteness marker is optional, when the control verb in a subject control structure appears in non-active form, the embedded clause can occupy the trigger position and the definite determiner becomes obligatory:

(33)   kasai.n-dRabe   *(ny)   h.an.oratra   taratasy
           intend.TT/LNK-Rabe   DET   FUT.PFX.write   letter
           'Rasoa intended to write a letter.'

(34)   n.eke.n'ny zaza   *(ny)   ho.sas.ana
           PST.agree.TT/LNK' DET child DET   FUT.wash.TT
           'The child agrees to be washed.'

Under a stricter requirement than that observed for common noun phrases, when the control predicate is modified by an adverb the complement clause obligatorily appears to the right of the adverb when preceded by the definite determiner:

(35)   m.an.iry   [h.i.sambotra   ny   mpangalatra]   matetika ny   polisy
           PST.PFX.wish   FUT.PFX.arrest   DET   thief   often   DET   police
           'The police often wish to arrest the thief'.

(36)   m.an.iry   matetika [*(ny) h.i.sambotra ny   mpangalatra]   ny   polisy
           PRS.PFX.wish   often   DET FUT.PFX.arrest DET thief   DET   police
           'The police often wish to arrest the thief'.

Finally, the control complement can be topicalized when it is a trigger. Thus, (33)-(34) can give rise to:

(37)   * (ny)   h.an.oratra   taratasy dia   kasain-dRabe
           DET   FUT.PFX.write   letter   TOP   intend.TT.LNK-Rabe
           '(As for) writing a letter, Rasoa intended (it).'

(38)   * (ny)   ho.sas.ana   dia   n.eken'ny zaza
           DET   FUT.wash.TT   TOP   PST.agree/TT/LNK'
           '(As for) washing, the child agrees to (it).'

A similar pattern is observed with the complementizer *that* in English. While it is optional in the unmarked complement position, the complementizer becomes obligatory when the sentence is passivized, or when the complement is topicalized or extraposed:

(39)   Her friends suspect [(that) Mary has spread this rumour].
(40)   [*(That) Mary has spread this rumour] is suspected by her friends[5].
(41)   It is surprising [that Mary spread this rumour].
(42)   [*(That) Mary spread this rumour] is surprising.

If coordination of XPs applies to phrases of similar categorial status (see Munn (1993, 2000), the nominal status of action nominals predicts that they should be able to coordinate with other noun phrases. Consider the following examples:

(43)   m.an.antena [ny h.ana.dio   ny trano] sy [ny f.a.handro.an-dRasoa   sakafo] Rabe
           PRS.PFX.hope DET FUT.PFX.clean DET house and DET NML.PFX.cook.CT/LNK-Rasoa food   Rabe
           'Rabe hopes to clean the house and that Rasoa (will) cook food.'

(44)   n.an.adino   ny   boki.ny   sy   ny   n.a.handro   sakafo   Rabe

---

[5] A star outside brackets indicates that the material in the brackets is obligatory.

PST.PFX.forget	DET	book.3GEN and	DET	PST.PFX.cook	food	Rabe

'Rabe forgot his book and to cook food.'

In (43) the control complement is coordinated with a nominalization, while in (44) it is coordinated with a common noun phrase, providing further support that complements of control predicates are nominal in nature.

While *ny* maintains the distributional properties of a determiner, it also exhibits characteristic properties of the English complementizer *that* and thus provides support to the assumption that the categorial status of *ny* has changed in these contexts. Abstracting away from phonological reduction, which is often also observed in the determiner *ny* and thus cannot be used as a diagnostic, first and foremost *ny* is optional in control contexts as has been illustrated in examples (19)-(21). In addition, it is not clear whether presence vs. absence of *ny* in the above contexts has a semantic contribution as no such contribution has been reported in the literature. Polinsky and Potsdam (2002, 2003, 2005) stress the fact that the definite determiner is truly optional in these cases and its presence or absence has no direct effect on the semantic interpretation of the control complements. In carefully constructed contexts some semantic differences seem to arise but these are not systematic and interpretations vary with different speakers. Consider the following examples:

(45)   n.i.kasa   (?ny)   h.an.asa   ny lamba Rasoa fa   n.a.rary   tampoka izy
        PST.PFX.intend   DET FUT.PFX.wash DET clothes Rasoa COMP   PST.PFX.ill suddenly 3SG/NOM
        'Rasoa intended to wash the clothes but she suddenly became ill.'

(46)   n.i.kasa   ?(ny)   hanasa   ny   lamba Rasoa fa   tsy   vita.ny
        PST.PFX.intend   DET   FUT.PFX.wash DET   clothes Rasoa COMP NEG   complete.3SG
        intsony   izany
        anymore   DEM
        'Rasoa intended to wash the clothes but they weren't finished by her.'

In (45) no event of washing was necessarily initiated because another event interfered (in this case Rasoa's suddenly becoming ill). Presence of a definite determiner would force a reading in which Rasoa started washing the clothes but stopped because she fell ill. In (46), on the other hand, an event of washing has started at some point in the past but for some reason it was interrupted as such, and was completed by a different agent. Some of my consultants do not accept the sentence as grammatical if the definite determiner is omitted, and thus a definite determiner in this case marks this as a specific event. We see therefore, that presence of *ny* could still have some sort of semantic contribution when preceding embedded clauses of control predicates by providing the structural context for the entailment of an event. But this contribution is only available in carefully constructed contexts and is not recognized by all speakers. *Ny* in control complements does not imply definiteness or specificity as in normal noun phrases, exhibiting semantic bleaching of the sort illustrated with the English complementizer *that* in (32).

In addition to semantic bleaching, a second argument that reinforces *ny*'s status as a complementizer in these contexts is the fact that it cannot be substituted by any of the rich series of demonstratives that Malagasy contains. In common noun phrases any demonstrative can appear in pre-nominal position (with a corresponding copy on the right boundary of the noun phrase (Keenan and Polinsky 1998 and references therein):

(47)   m.am.eno   ny/ilay   tavoahangy   ny   lehilahy
        PRS.PFX.fill   DET/DEM bottle   DET   man
        'The man is filling the/ this (aforementioned) bottle.'

(48)　　　　m.am.eno　　　ity　　　tavoahangy ity　　　　ny lehilahy
　　　　　　　PRS.PFX.fill　　DEM　　bottle　　　DEM　　　DET man
　　　　　　　'The man is filling this (near) bottle.'

However, this is not the case for clausal arguments of control:

(49)　　　* n.an.iry　　　[ilay　　h.an.deha　ho　any　　Antsiranana]　　Rabe
　　　　　　 PST.PFX.wish　　DEM　　FUT.PFX.go　FUT　LOC　　Antsiranana　　　Rabe
　　　　　　 'Rabe wished to go to Antsiranana'.

(50)　　　* n.i.kasa　　　[ity　　h.an.oratra　　　taratasy ity]　　Rabe
　　　　　　 PST.PFX.intend　DEM　　FUT.PFX.write　　letter　DEM　　Rabe
　　　　　　 'Rabe intended to write a letter.'

Summarizing, the context of control complements in Malagasy seems to provide a case of a grammatical morpheme which appears to have the same distribution as a homophonous determiner, but is optional, semantically bleached, and cannot be substituted by other DET-type elements such as demonstratives.

We could be witnessing an intermediate step of a grammaticalization process where the definite determiner becomes a subordination marker in this specific context while in other similar contexts, such as when introducing nominalized tensed clauses (c.f. (6)), it clearly remains a determiner in terms of categorial status. If this is on the right track then it is not a surprising process of change. A process in which a determiner of some sort (usually a demonstrative) becomes a complementizer is quite common (Hopper and Traugott 2003; Diessel (forthcoming) and references therein). The process is also observed in a number of other languages and language families where determiners have homophonous counterparts that act as complementizers. This is true for Germanic languages (Diessel (forthcoming)); Salish languages, (Kroeber, 1991); some Semitic languages (Ouhalla, 2004); and others.

Presumably, the process is analogue to a nominalization, whereas the verb complement is a nominalized string. This process is still active in Malagasy for control verbs:

(51)　　　　m.an.antena　　[ny　　f.a.handro.an-dRasoa　　　sakafo]　　Rabe
　　　　　　　PRS.PFX.hope　　DET　　NML.PFX.cook.CT/LNK-Rasoa food　　　Rabe
　　　　　　　'Rabe hopes that Rabe cooks food (lit. Rabe's cooking of food).'

In Section 2 it was shown that Malagasy allows also for clausal nominalizations of the type in (52):

(52)　　　　tsy　　tia.ko　　　ny　　ataon-dRabe
　　　　　　　NEG　　like.1SG/POSS　DET　　do/TT/LNK-Rabe
　　　　　　　"I don't like (what was) done by Rabe."

We can assume then that what happens with control verbs is a similar process of the verb selecting for a nominalized clause. This would explain the presence of the definite determiner. However, the structure has been partially reanalyzed as a verb selecting for a clausal complement. As a consequence, some of the nominal properties of the embedded clause have disappeared in a parallel fashion to the process observed for the English complementizer *that*, including emergence of optionality; non-replaceability; and semantic bleaching.

In this respect the determiner has been assigned a new categorial status: that of a subordinator, a COMP-element whose function is to allow for the clausal string to act as a verbal argument.

5.   Conclusion

We have discussed the distributional properties of control complements in Malagasy. We have shown that the definiteness marker *ny* acts as a nominalizer of clausal strings and as a subordinating marker in these structures. The marker seems to be undergoing a process of reanalysis as a subordinating marker in this specific environment. The analysis is supported by a series of arguments, including the fact that the determiner maintains some of the characteristics of its default function as a marker of definiteness allowing the clausal complement to appear in exclusively definite contexts, and acquires new properties in its new function as a marker of subordination, including semantic bleaching, optionality, and the exclusion of demonstratives.

References

DOMENICHINI-RAMIARAMANANA, B. (1977), *Le malgache. Essai de description sommaire*. Paris: SELAF.

DIESSEL, H. (Forthcoming), Where do grammatical morphemes come form? On the development of grammatical markers from lexical expressions, demonstratives, and question words. In Wischer, I. & Diewald, G. (eds.), *New Reflections on Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

GUILFOYLE, E. & HUNG, H. & TRAVIS, L. (1992), Spec of IP and Spec of VP: Two subjects in Austronesian languages, *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 10*, 375-414.

DE HOOP, H. (1992), *Case Configuration and NP Interpretation*. PhD dissertation, University of Groningen.

HOPPER, P.J. and TRAUGOTT, E.C. (2003), *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

KEENAN, E. L. (1976), Remarkable subjects in Malagasy. In Li, C. (ed.), *Subject and Topic*. New York, Academic Press, 247-301.

KEENAN, E. L. (1995), Predicate-argument structure in Malagasy. In Burgess, C. S., Dziwirek, K. & Gerdts, D. (eds.), *Grammatical Relations: Theoretical Approaches to Empirical Questions*. Stanford: CSLI, 171-216.

KEENAN, E. L. & POLINSKY, M. (1998), Malagasy (Austronesian). In Spencer, A. & Zwicky, A. (eds.) *The Handbook of Morphology*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 563-623.

KROEBER, P. (1991), *Comparative Syntax of Subordination in Salish*. Dissertation, University of Chicago.

KURYŁOWICZ, J. (1965), The evolution of grammatical categories. *Diogenes 51*, 55-71.

LAW, P. (1995), On grammatical relations in Malagasy control structures. In Burgess, C. S., Dziwirek, K. & Gerdts, D. (eds.), *Grammatical Relations: Theoretical Approaches to Empirical Questions*. Stanford: CSLI, 271-290.

LANDAU, I. (2004), The Scale of Finiteness and the Calculus of Control. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 22, 811–877.

LONGOBARDI, G. (1990), Evidence for the Structure of Determiner phrases and N-Movement in the Syntax and LF. Relazione Presentata al XIII GLOW, Cambridge, GB.

MUNN, A. (1993), *Topics in the Syntax and Semantics of Coordinate Structures*. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Maryland.

MUNN, A. (2000), Three types of coordination asymmetries. In: Schwabe, K. & Zhang, N. (eds.), *Ellipsis in Conjunction*. Max Niemeyer, Tubingen, 1–22.

NOONAN, M. (1985), Complementation. In Shopen, T. (ed.) *Language typology and syntactic description: Complex constructions. Volume 2*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 42–140.

NTELITHEOS, D. 2006. *The Morphosyntax of Nominalizations: A Case Study*. PhD Dissertation, Deprtment of Linguistics, UCLA.

OUHALLA, J. (2004), Semitic Relatives. *Linguistic Inquiry*, n° 35, 2, 288–300.

PAUL, I. (1999), *Malagasy Clause Structure*. PhD Dissertation, Department of Linguistics, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

PAUL, I. (2009), On the presence versus absence of determiners in Malagasy. In Ghomeshi, J., Paul, I. & Wiltschko, M. (eds.) *Determiners : universals and variation*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 215-240.

PAUL, I. & RANAIVOSON, J. F. (1998), Complex verbal constructions in Malagasy. In Paul, I. (ed.). *The structure of Malagasy II. UCLA Occasional Papers in Linguistics 20*, 111-125.

PEARSON, M. (2001), *The Clause Structure of Malagasy: A Minimalist Approach*, UCLA Dissertations in Linguistics 21, Department of Linguistics, UCLA.

POLINSKY, M. & POTSDAM, E. (2002), Backward control: Evidence from Malagasy. In *The Proceedings of the Eighth Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association, (MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 44.),* Cambridge, Ma., 257-272.

POLINSKY, M. & POTSDAM, E. (2003), Control in Malagasy. *Cornell Working Papers in Linguistics 19*: 173-187.

POLINSKY, M. & POTSDAM, E. (2005), Malagasy Control and its implications for linguistic theory. *BLS 30*.

POTSDAM, E. (2004), Patterns of Control in Malagasy and their Theoretical Implications, Ms., The University of Maryland, February 2004.

RANDRIAMASIMANANA, C. (1986), *Causatives of Malagasy*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

STOWELL, T. (1989), Subjects, Specifiers, and X-bar Theory. In Baltin, M. & Kroch A. (eds.) *Alternative Conceptions of Phrase Structure*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 232-262.

SZABOLCSI, A. (1987), Functional categories in the noun phrase. In Kenesei, I. (ed.) *Approaches to Hungarian*, Vol. 2, Jate Szeged, 167-189.

SZABOLCSI, A. (1994), The Noun Phrase. In Kiefer, F. & Kiss, É. K. (eds.) *The Syntactic Structure of Hungarian (Syntax and Semantics 27)*. San Diego, Academic Press, 179-274.