

**Accusative Subjects in Tuvinian nominalizations: against Subject-to-Object Raising analysis****0. The phenomenon of accusative subjects in Tuvinian nominalizations**

## 0.1. Subject-to-Object Raising

## ENGLISH

(1) I showed **him** to be stubborn. (Kuno 1976: 30)

Arguments for the raising analysis:

- case marking
- passivization with *him* becoming the matrix verb subject
- reflexives and reciprocals binding
- scope interaction
- linear position: interlacing with element of the matrix etc.
- e.a. (Postal 1974, Lasnik, Saito 1991)

0.2. Raising in Altaic languages: Japanese, Korean, Turkish (Kuno 1976, Lee 1992, Ohta 1997, Nharada 2002, Takano 2003, Yoon 2003)

## JAPANESE (Ohta 1997: 356)

(2) Keizi-wa        sono        otoko-**ga**        hannin-da-to        dantei-si-ta.  
detective-TOP    this        man-NOM        criminal-COP-CIT    believe-PST

The detective thought that that man is a criminal.

Keizi-wa        sono        otoko-**o**        hannin-da-to        dantei-si-ta.  
detective-TOP    this        man-ACC        criminal-COP-CIT    believe-PST

The detective thought that man to be a criminal.

Ohta 1997: tense effect in SOR

Tuvinian, Uzbekh, Xakass: raising from nominalizations

## UZBEKH

(3) (Olim-**ning** / Olim/)        Olim-**ni**        kel-gan-i  
Olim-GEN        Olim(NOM)        Olim-ACC        come-PART.PST-3SG  
men-ga        shubhali        ko'rinyapti.  
I-DAT        doubtful        seem

I'm not sure if Olim has already arrived.

## 0.3. Syntax of the Tuvinian Accusative subject constructions

Candidates for SOR in Tuvinian:

- complement clauses with *dep*

(4) Аяс-ты / Аяс        чеди-п        кел-ген        деп        ава-зы        бил-ир.  
Ajas-ACC / Ajas        come-CONV        come-PART.PST        COMPL        mother-POSS3SG        know-PART.FUT

Mother knows that Ajas has already arrived.

- *-gan-* nominalizations

(5) а. Аяс-ты        дилги        туду-п        ал-ган-ын  
Ajas-ACC        fox        catch-CONV        take-NZR.PST-ACC.POSS  
ача-м        чугаала-п        тур-ган.  
father-POSS.1SG        tell-CONV        AUX-NZR.PST

(My) father told (us) about Ajas' catching of the fox.

b. Аяс / Аяс-тың дилги туду-п ал-ган-ын  
 Ajas(NOM) Ajas-GEN fox catch-CONV take-NZR.PST-ACC.POSS  
 ача-м чугаала-п тур-ган.  
 father-POSS.1SG tell-CONV AUX-NZR.PST

(My) father told (us) about Ajas' catching of the fox.

Properties of the (5a) construction:

- SOR is optional, cf. (5b);
- matrix verbs allowing the (5a) construction are *чугаала-* 'to tell', *көр-* 'to see', *дыңна-* 'to hear' e.a., all of them assigning the accusative marking to the nominalized verb;
- the nominalized verb keeps the accusative marking.

→ Is the Raising analysis of Tuvinian construction in (5a) borne out?

### 1. Arguments in favour of the Raising analysis

#### 1.1. Case marking (5a).

1.2. Scope: the raised NP does not reconstruct to the gap in the embedded clause for the purpose of scope:

(6) a. [Кым-ны кошелек чидири-п тур-ган-ын] эскер-ди-ң?  
 кто-ACC wallet let.fall-CONV AUX-PART.PST-ACC.POSS.3 notice-PST-2SG

Who (of them) did you notice to lose his wallet?

Cf. narrow scope reading in (b):

b. [Кым-ның кошелек чидири-п тур-ган-ын] эскер-ди-ң?  
 кто-GEN wallet let.fall-CONV AUX-PART.PST-ACC.POSS.3 notice-PST-2SG

Did you notice anyone to have lost his wallet?

#### 1.3. Linear position:

1.3.1. No material (e.g., adverbials from the embedded clause) can intervene between the raised NP and the matrix clause:

(7) a. Аяс [кудум-чуже үн-геш] оол-ду эте-п каап-кан-ын мен көр-дү-м.  
 Ajas street-LAT go-CONV boy-ACC beat-CONV AUX-PART.PST-ACC I see-PST-1SG

b. [кудум-чуже үн-геш] Аяс...  
 street-LAT go-CONV Ajas...

I saw Ajas beating the boy, after he (Ajas) has gone out.

(8) Аяс-ты [кудум-чуже үн-геш] оол-ду эте-п каап-кан-ын мен көр-дү-м.  
 Ajas-ACC street-LAT go-CONV boy-ACC beat-CONV AUX-PART.PST-ACC I see-PST-1SG

?? [кудум-чуже үн-геш] Аяс-ты...  
 street-LAT go Ajas-ACC...

I saw Ajas beating the boy, after he (Ajas) has gone out.

1.3.2. The raised NP can either precede or follow the embedded VP (9), while the nominative and genitive subject occupy a fixed position within the embedded clause (10).

(9) ? кошелек чидири-п тур-ган-ын акы-ң-ны эскер-ди-м.  
 wallet let.fall-CONV AUX-PART.PST-ACC.POSS brother-POSS2SG-ACC notice-PST-1SG

I noticed that your brother had lost his wallet.

- (10) \* кошөлек чидири-п тур-ган-ын акы-ң-ның /  
 wallet let.fall-CONV AUX-PART.PST-ACC.POSS brother-POSS2SG-GEN
- акы-ң эскер-ди-м.  
 brother-POSS2SG notice-PST-1SG
- I noticed that your brother had lost his wallet.

## 2. Arguments against the Raising analysis

2.1. Passivization: it is impossible to passivize the matrix and make the 'raised' NP the matrix clause subject:

- (11) \*Ада-йе-м кончужу-п тур-ган-ын кожа-лар-га  
 father-mother-POSS1SG quarrel-CONV stand-NZR.PST-ACC.POSS.3 neighbour-PL-DAT
- дыңна-л-ган.  
 hear-PASS-NZR.PST
- (My parents have been heard quarrelling by the neighbours.)

Cf.:

- (12) Кожа-лар-га ада-йе-м суг-лар дыңна-л-ган-нар.  
 neighbour-PL-DAT father-mother-POSS1SG both-PL hear-PASS-NZR-PL
- My parents have been heard by the neighbours.

- (13) Ада-йе-м кончужу-п тур-ган-ы кожа-лар-га  
 father-mother-POSS1SG quarrel-CONV stand-NZR.PST-POSS.3 neighbour-PL-DAT
- дыңна-л-ган.  
 hear-PASS-NZR.PST
- The quarrel of my parents has been heard by the neighbours.

## 2.2. Pronominalization

- (14) [Ада-йе-м суг-лар-ны кончужу-п тур-ган-ын]  
 father-mother-POSS.1SG both-PL-ACC quarrel-CONV AUX-NZR.PST-ACC.POSS.3
- дыңна-ды-м. – Мен база ону дыңна-ды-м.  
 hear-PST-1SG I also it.ACC hear-PST-1SG
- I've heard my parents quarelling. — Yes, I've heard **it**, too.

- (15) \* Мен база ада-йе-м суг-лар-ны ону дыңна-ды-м.  
 I too mother-father both-PL-ACC it.ACC hear-PST-1SG

2.3. The embedded clause with the 'raised' NP can form an independent utterance (e.g., an answer to a question):

- (16) Чүнү дыңна-ды-ң? – Ада-йе-м суг-лар-ны кончужу-п  
 what hear-PST-2SG father-mother-POSS.1SG оба-PL-ACC quarrel-CONV
- тур-ган-ын.  
 AUX-NZR.PST-ACC.POSS.3
- What have you heard? — lit. My parents quarelling.

Cf. the English data from pseudoclefts (18) and coordinated structures (20): the raised NP does not form a constituent with the rest of the embedded clause:

- (17) What I believe is that Bill is intelligent.  
 (18) \* What I believe is Bill to be intelligent. (Postal 1974: 132)  
 (19) I didn't expect Nixon to win, but I ended up wanting Nixon to win. →  
 (20) \* I didn't expect to want — but I ended up wanting — Nixon to win. (ibid.: 168)

In contrast, the rest of the embedded clause (without the 'raised' NP) can not form an independent utterance:

- (21) \* – Чүнү көр-дүң Аяс-ты?  
 what see-PST-2SG Ajas-ACC

\* – оол-ду эте-п каап-кан-ын мен көр-дү-м.  
 boy-ACC beat-CONV AUX-PART.PST-ACC I see-PST-1SG

(What did you see Ajas to do? — lit. To beat the boy.)

2.4. The 'raised' NP does not allow interlacing with the material from the matrix clause:

- (22) \* кошелек чидири-п тур-ган-ын мен акы-ң-ны  
 wallet let.fall-CONV AUX-PART.PST-ACC.POSS I brother-POSS2SG-ACC  
 эскер-ди-м.  
 notice-PST-1SG

Cf.:

- (23) I have found **Bob** recently to be morose. (ibid.: 146)

2.5. Pied-Piping of the embedded verb, in case the accusative NP is Wh-extracted:

- (24) a. Кым-ны көр-дүң оол-ду эте-п каап-кан-ын?  
 who-ACC see-PST-2SG boy-ACC beat-CONV AUX-PART.PST-ACC  
 Who, as you have seen, was beating the boy? (lit. Who did you see beating)

Cf.:

b. \*Кым көр-дүң оол-ду эте-п каап-кан-ын?  
 who see-PST-2SG boy-ACC beat-CONV AUX-PART.PST-ACC  
 c. Кым оол-ду эте-п каап-кан-ын көр-дүң?  
 who boy-ACC beat-CONV AUX-PART.PST-ACC see-PST-2SG

**Примечание [U1]:** Это аргумент за подъем!!! аргумент против – в том, что такой Пайд-Пайпинг необязателен

### 3. Semantics of the quasi-'Raising' construction

3.1. Animacy requirement:

- (25) суг-нуң агымы-ның / агымы / \* агымы-ны хеме-ни апар-ган-ын көр-дү-м.  
 water-GEN river-GEN river river-ACC boat-ACC carry-NZR-ACC.3SG see-PST-1SG  
 I saw that the river carried the boat away.

- (26) Петя-ны хеме-ни апар-гаш чоруп-кан-ын көр-дү-м.  
 Peter-ACC boat-ACC carry-CONV go-NZR-ACC.3SG see-PST-1SG  
 I saw Peter carry the boat away.

3.2. States as embedded verbs do not allow the quasi-'Raising' construction:

- (27) a. \* Аяс-ты угаан-медерел-ин мен эскер-ди-м.  
 Ajas-ACC wise-ACC.POSS.3 I notice-PST-1SG  
 b. (Мен) Аяс-тың угаан-медерел-ин эскер-ди-м.  
 I Ajas-GEN wise-ACC.POSS.3 notice-PST-1SG  
 I've noticed that Ajas is a wise person.

- (28) a. \***Аяс-ты** аарып тур-ган-ын мөн эскер-ди-м.  
 Ajas-ACC be.ill-NZR-ACC.POSS.3 I notice-PST-1SG
- b. (Мөн) **Аяс-тың** аарып турганын эскер-ди-м.  
 I Ajas-GEN be.ill-NZR-ACC.POSS.3 notice-PST-1SG
- I've noticed that Ajas is sick.

3.3. The topicality of the 'raised' NP: see specificity requirement in (6a) and word order in the 'raising' examples.

#### Conclusion

Thus, the raising analysis of (1a) is infelicitous: the 'raised' NP does not occupy a DO position in the matrix clause. Hence, the questions:

- ✓ why accusative case assigning?
- ✓ why the nominalized verb bears the accusative marker?

? Co-Case marking approach proposed by Muysken, Lefebvre for Cuzko Quechua (see Muysken, Lefebvre 1988: 141-165).

#### References:

- Kuno S. 1976. Subject Raising // M. Shibatani (ed.). *Syntax and Semantics*, v. 5: *Japanese Generative Grammar*. New York: Academic Press, pp. 17-49.
- Lee J. 1992. *Case Alternations in Korean: Case Minimality*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut.
- Muysken P., Lefebvre C. 1988. *Mixed Categories. Nominalizations in Quechua*. (Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory). Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Nharada N. 2002. *Licensing PF-Visible Formal Features: A Linear Algorithm and Case-Related Phenomena in PF*. Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Irvine.
- Lasnik H., Saito M. 1991. On the Subject of Infinitives // *Chicago Linguistic Society* 27, pp. 324-343.
- Ohta K. 1997. Tense in the Subject Raising Construction // *Japanese / Korean Linguistics*, v. 6. CSLI Publications, pp. 353-369.
- Postal P. M. 1974. *On Raising*. MIT Press: Cambridge, Massachusetts — London.
- Takano, Y. 2003. Nominative objects in Japanese complex predicate constructions: a prolepsis analysis. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, v. 21, pp. 779-834.
- Yoon J. H. 2003. Raising Specifiers. A Macroparametric Account of Subject-to-Object Raising in some Altaic Languages. // *The proceedings of the Workshop on Formal Altaic Linguistics (WAFI)*, MIT, Cambridge, MA.