

Complements, relatives, and nominal properties

Anna Roussou (aroussou@upatras.gr)

University of Patras

In the present paper I consider clauses introduced by the element *pu* in Greek, as in (1). The complementizer *pu*, which originally derives from the relative adverb *opu*, is used to introduce relative clauses (a), as well as some complement clauses (b). The example in (c) is an instance of a pseudo-relative, i.e. a construction which shares properties with both relatives and complements attested with perception verbs.

- (1a) Sinandisa ton fititi *pu* pire to vravio.
met-1s the student that got-3s the prize “I met the student that got the prize.”
- (1b) Lipame *pu* efijes.
be.sorry-1s the left-2s “I’m sorry that you left.”
- (1c) (ton) Idha (ton fititi) *pu* efevje.
him saw-1s the student that was.leaving-3s “I saw the student leaving”

In most analyses, the C *pu* has been treated as the C-correlate of the definite article (Roussou 1994, 2010, Varlokosta 1994, after Christidis 1986). This has been based on the fact that *pu* is used to introduce ‘factive’ complements, mainly with emotive predicates and some mental state verbs, which share properties with definite expressions in terms of truth presupposition. This was empirically supported by the fact that *pu*, unlike the declarative complementizer *oti* or the interrogative *an*, cannot be nominalized, i.e. cannot be preceded the definite article *to* (literally *the that/the whether*). This approach further neutralizes the distinction between C and D in terms of the variable they bind: propositional in the former case vs. individual in the latter (see Manzini & Savoia 2003, Manzini 2010, Roberts & Roussou 2003).

In this paper I reconsider the definiteness property of *pu*, as an intrinsic feature. This view draws on the presence of *pu* in relative clauses (the context where it first originated before spreading to complementation) and on the availability of the stressed interrogative correlate *pu* (where). On this basis, the intrinsic property of *pu* is that of a locative with a nominal nature. This property is consistent with the presence of *pu* in relatives, independently of the definiteness of the modified head. With respect to the definite interpretation assigned to it with emotive predicates, it is argued that it is a by-product of *pu* with the lexico-semantic properties of the selecting predicates, which in most cases allow for a factive interpretation (see de Cuba and Ürögdi 2010). The next question is the role of *pu* in both relatives and complement clauses. In relatives, it typically binds a (constituent) variable inside the clause (mainly of arguments), which is expressed either as a gap or a resumptive pronoun in most non-restrictive relatives (see Alexopoulou 2006 for an elaborate discussion). In ‘factive’ complement clauses, *pu* assigns reference to the clause it embeds. Given the ‘presuppositional’ interpretation attributed to these contexts, *pu*, unlike *oti*, does not bind a propositional variable, since the clause is interpreted as true. In this respect, *pu* fixes the reference of the clause, in the same way as the definite article in DPs. Thus the correlation between definiteness (or referentiality, as in Haegeman and Ürögdi 2010) and *pu*, usually attributed to factive complements, is derived.

The similarities between relative and complement clauses (best exemplified in the pseudo-relative construction in (1c)) raise the question as to whether there is a common syntactic structure. In recent analyses, complements have been taken to correspond to hidden relatives (see Arsenijević 2009, partly Sportiche 2011, a.o.). On the other hand, relatives have also been treated as instances of complements to a D head along the lines of Kayne (1994). Based on the empirical data presented, I show that complementation is the basic structure that underlies both relatives and complement clauses