## **Complementizers and Interrogative Clauses in Avatime**

In this talk, we present the results of a preliminary examination of the complementizer system of Avatime (Sideme), an endangered Ghana-Togo Mountain (>Kwa) language of eastern Ghana. The talk is a contribution to the Clausal Complementation and Selection Project, an AFRANAPH sister project. Although there is some previous descriptive and analytical work on Avatime syntax (Ford 1971,1988; van Putten 2014), this is the first detailed study of clausal complementation and interrogation in the language.

Avatime is a particularly interesting language to investigate because it possesses a number of complementizer-like "particles" that indicate different question types (WH, Yes/No, emphatic, speaker uncertainty, etc.) and have a complex distribution. We use the morpho-syntactically distinct forms of interrogation in Avatime as a probe into structural aspects of complementation. Avatime has basic SVO word order and an active noun class system. Some particles occur on the right edge of questions (and non-questions):

| (1) a. εε-do<br>3SG.PROG-sleep.PRES<br>'Is he sleeping?.'  | srase<br>sleep    | ( <b>na)</b><br>Q | Yes/No             |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| b. ege wo-ji<br>what 2sg-buy.PAST<br>'What did you buy?'   | ( <b>na)</b><br>Q |                   | Wh                 |
| c. εε-do<br>3sg.prog-sleep.pres<br>'Is he sleeping(, I wo  |                   | ( <b>ũ</b> )<br>Q | (Wondering) Yes/No |
| d. ege wo-ji<br>what 2sg-buy.PAst<br>'What did you buy(, l |                   | )?'               | (Wondering) Wh     |

As the translations indicate, the particles have varied semantic/pragmatic functions. In addition, Avatime allows for wh-questions not marked by a segmental particle (although there are still tonal effects that manifest on the right when the particles are absent). Avatime allows for wh-in-situ and wh-movement (Devlin, Lehman, Major, Torrence 2019). Relative clauses involve activation of both the left and right peripheries. with the *gi* 

Relative clauses involve activation of both the left and right peripheries. with the gromplementizer on the left edge:

(2) mi-kpini odze-lo **gi** a-to ava-na \*(e) 1SG-insult.PAST woman-DEF REL 3SG-cook.PAST beans-DEF DET 'I insulted the woman who cooked the beans.'

The right edge has an obligatory clausal determiner, ([e] in (2), which harmonizes and/or coalesces with a preceding vowel). There is a related wh-construction, which has the relative clause complementizer gi:

(3) **nyawε gi** wo-da imwεε-nε (\*ε) who REL 2SG-sell.PAST oranges-DEF DET 'Who sold the oranges?'

Interestingly, (3) shows that in the relative wh-construction, the right edge clausal determiner cannot be present. Thus, this construction makes use of a subset of the "pieces" of the clausal periphery found in relative clauses, but not all of them. One conditional construction has the relative complementizer (gi) and a second compenentizer,  $x\varepsilon$ :

(4) ma-do srase [xe gi Kofi o-ji i] 1SG.FUT-sleep.FUT sleep COND REL kofi 3SG.FUT-arrive.FUT DET 'I will sleep if Kofi arrives.'

There is also a wh-interrogative construction where only the  $x\varepsilon$  complementizer is present:

(5) ktte **xe** wo-to ava-na how COND 2SG-cook.PAST beans-DEF 'How did you cook the beans?'

Embedded clauses reveal that Avatime allows for embedded peripheries, as in (3), where there are potentially two instances of the complementizer *si* (homophonous with a verb 'say'):

(6) wo-bu **si (si)** mi-kpini odze-lo 2SG-think COMP COMP 1SG-insult.PAST woman-DEF 'You think that I insulted the woman.'

Preliminary data suggest that the presence of the second complementizer indicates speaker uncertainty about the truth of the embedded clause. In addition, a possible nominal element (homophonous with a pronoun and a noun class suffix), le(e), can also intervene between the two complementizers:

(7) wo-bu **si** (**le(e)**,) (**si**) (\***le(e)**) mi-kpini odze-lo 2SG-think COMP DET? COMP DET? 1SG-insult.PAST woman-DEF 'You think that I insulted the woman.'

The le(e) cannot follow the second si. Interrogatives suggest that these complementizers are not simply lexical strings because a wh-item can undergo partial movement to some position between the two complementizers:

(8) a. wo-bu **si** (le(e)) odze woli si mi-kpini 2SG-think COMP DET? woman which COMP 1SG-insult.PAST woman-DEF 'Which woman do you think that I insulted?'

Returning to matrix clauses, there is a *right-edge* particle, *le*, that can occur in wh-questions:

(9) ege wo-mo le what 2SG-see.PAST Q 'What did you see?'

The interpretive import of using the right edge le is unclear. However, the fact that it is (for some speakers) homophonous with the left edge le(e) (found in 7/8), strongly suggests that cases like (9) involve elemnts of the left periphery that end up on the right periphery.

Overall, we present a description and initial analytical conclusions concerning the structural relations between the left and right peripheral complementizers and the predicates that select for them.