

Deriving two types of applicatives: The case of Persian psych predicates
Sahar Taghipour, University of Toronto

Introduction. Persian always shows obligatory subject agreement with verbal suffixes, illustrated in (1-2). However, there is a class of unaccusative psych complex predicates showing a different pattern. These predicates consist of a nominal psych element and an unconjugated (3sg) light verb. The nominal element obligatorily hosts the clitics in Table 1, illustrated in (3-4).

Table 1. Personal clitics

1sg	2sg	3sg	1pl	2pl	3pl
=em	=et	=eš	=emun	=etun	=ešun

(3) unā_i xoš=*(ešun_i) mi-yād.
 they pleasure=3PL DUR-come.PRS-3SG
 ‘They feel pleased.’

(4) man_i del=*(am_i) mi-gir-e.
 I heart=1SG DUR-get.PRS-3SG
 ‘I feel bored.’

(1) man fardā emtehān dār-*(am).
 I tomorrow exam have.PRS-1SG
 ‘I have an exam tomorrow.’

(2) mā ali-o did-*(im).
 we Ali-OBJ see.PST-1PL ‘We saw Ali.’

The prevailing insight of the previous research (Ghomeshi 1996; Sedighi 2005; Karimi 2005; Karimi 2013; a.o.) is twofold: 1. The sentence-initial DPs in (3-4), have been characterized as the possessor of the psych element; 2. Homophonous

with oblique pronouns, the clitics have been unifiedly analyzed as non-agreement elements; e.g., possessor pronoun, dative case doubling, etc. **Puzzle.** Some psych predicates do not resemble possessive constructions in one important way. Possessive constructions (5a) can have a genitive counterpart in which the sentence-initial possessor (topic) is linked to the possessum with a nominal linker (aka. *ezafe*), while the clitic is omitted (5b).

(5a) man dust=am umad.
 I friend=1SG come.PST.3SG
 ‘My friend came.’

(5b) dust-e man umad.
 friend-EZ I come.PST.3SG
 ‘My friend came.’

Crucially, while the example in (4) has the genitive counterpart (6), the one in (3) does not (7). The fact in (6) provides support for the possessive nature of the sentence-initial DP in (4).

(6) del-e man mi-gir-e.
 heart-EZ I DUR-get.PRS-3SG

(7) *xoš-e unā mi-yād.
 pleasure-EZ they DUR-come.PRS-3SG

Meanwhile it is worth noting that in the presence of the sentence-initial possessor, the possessor in the low position cannot remain as a full DP, as shown in (8a&8b); cf. (5a&4) respectively.

(8a) *(man) dust-e man umad.
 I friend-EZ I come.PST.3SG

(8b) *(man) del-e man mi-gir-e.
 I heart-EZ I DUR-get.PRS-3SG

Analysis. I argue that Persian psych predicates have a dichotomous nature. Predicates such as the one in (3) are derived through a high applicative phrase. In such constructions, the sentence-initial DP is an experiencer merged in Spec,ApplP. I posit that the high Appl^o is a ϕ -probe, resulting in an Agree relation between the experiencer and the high Appl^o (via Spec-Head relation). Given this Agreement, the phi-features on Appl^o are realized as a dative clitic (Table 1) on the psych element. Since there is no active goal valuing the phi-features on T, the agreement on T is realized as default (3sg). By contrast, the predicates such as the one in (4) are argued to be derived through a low applicative phrase (Pylkkänen 2002; Cuervo 2003), involving a genitive construction in which the psych element forms a PossP (e.g., *del-e man* ‘my heart’). With such predicates, the sentence-initial DP first enters the derivation as the possessor of the psych element and then raises to the specifier of the (low) ApplP to function as an applied argument for the predicate. As a result of the possessor raising, the possessor’s ϕ -features are expressed as a pronominal clitic in its base-generation position, leading to clitic doubling (cf. Karimi 2013). I posit that the PossP enters the derivation with an interpretable [3sg] feature, accessible for T. As such, T establishes Agreement with the PossP. Given the [3sg] feature on the PossP, the agreement on T is realized as [3sg].

Conclusion. The present study provides a novel perspective on Persian psych predicates, thereby capturing the dichotomous nature of such predicates. Considering Appl^o as a ϕ -probe suggests a new locus of Agreement for Persian that is typically known with a single locus of ϕ -Agreement–T.

References

Cuervo, Cristina. (2003). Datives at Large. PhD thesis. MIT. Cambridge, MA.

Ghameshi, Jila. (1996). Projection and Inection: A Study of Persian Phrase Structure. PhD thesis, University of Toronto.

Karimi, Simin (2005). A Minimalist Approach to Scrambling; Evidence from Persian. Mouton de Gruyter.

Karimi, Yadgar (2013). Possessor raising and the structure of impersonal complex predicates in Persian. *Lingua* 135: 112-131.

Pylkkänen, Liina. (2002). *Introducing arguments*. PhD thesis. MIT. Cambridge, MA.

Sedighi, Anousha (2005). Subject-predicate agreement restrictions in Persian. PhD thesis. University of Ottawa.