

Infinite and finite control in Mam

Marie-Luise Popp

University of Leipzig

marie_luise.popp@uni-leipzig.de

In this talk, I will outline two different types of control in the Mayan language Mam. I suggest that the two constructions exploit two different routes of control, which Landau (2008) introduced as *PRO-Control* and *C-Control*.

In the first construction, the matrix predicate selects an infinitival complement, as seen in (1). The lack of agreement in the selected complement indicates that this construction is an instance of *PRO-Control*.

(1)	<i>Ma-tz'-ok-n-q'o-yn-a</i>	[PRO _{i,j}	<i>tx'eema-l</i>	<i>siij</i>].
	ASP-2SG.ABS-DIR-1SG.ERG-give-DIR-2SG		cut-INF	firewood
	'I made you cut firewood'			

With the predicates *aj* – 'to want' and *ky'iy* – 'not to want', a different control construction has to be chosen as the infinitival control construction is ungrammatical, as seen in (2).

(2)	<i>*Ø-w_i-aj(b'el)-a</i>	[PRO _{i,j}	<i>aq'na-a</i>].
	3SG.ABS-1SG.ERG-want-1SG		work-INF
	intended: 'I want to work.'		

Instead, the matrix predicate chooses a complement with an inflected verb form. In contrast to the construction in (1), the selected complement in (3) shows overt agreement. This suggests that the control relation is mediated via C thus exhibiting an instance of *C-Control*.

(3)	<i>Ø-w_i-aj(b'el)-a</i>	[PRO _{i,j}	<i>chin-aq'naa-n-a</i>].
	3SG.ABS-1SG.ERG-want-1SG		1SG.ABS-work-ANTIPASS-1SG
	roughly: 'I want that I work.'		

In this talk, I will discuss the empirical patterns of both constructions and potential consequences for theoretical approaches to control.

References: • England, N. 1983. *A grammar of Mam, a Mayan language*. University of Texas Press.
• Landau, I. 2008. Two routes of control: Evidence from case transmission in Russian. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 26(4). 877–924.