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)


JAPANESE (Ohta 1997: 356)

(2) Keizi-wa sono otoko-ga hannin-da-to dantei-si-ta.

The detective thought that that man is a criminal.

Keizi-wa sono otoko-o hannin-da-to dantei-si-ta.

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

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) Ajas-tu / Ajas чеди-п кел-ген деп ава-зы бил-ир.

Aj as-ACC / Aj as come-NZR.PST COMPL mother-POSS3SG know-PART.FUT

Mother knows that Ajas has already arrived.

• -gan- nominalizations

(5) a. Ajas-tu дилги туду-п ал-ган-ън

Aj as-ACC fox catch-NZR.PST-ACC.POSS

(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' е.а., 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 чидир-п тур-ган-ын] эскар-ди-н?
    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-ны кошелек чидир-п тур-ган-ын]
      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:
   Ajas street-LAT go-CONV boy-ACC beat-CONV AUX-PART.PST-ACC.1SG i see-PST-1SG
   I saw Ajas beating the boy, after he (Ajas) has gone out.
   b. [купдүм-чүүжү үн-гөш] Аяс...
      street-LAT go-CONV Ajas...
      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 чидир-п тур-ган-ын азы-н-ны эскар-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.
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 кош-лар-га
father-mother-POSS1SG quarrel-CONV stand-NZR.PST-ACC.POSS.3 neighbour-PL-DAT
dынна-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 дынна-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-ганы кош-лар-га
father-mother-POSS1SG quarrel-CONV stand-NZR.PST-POSS.3 neighbour-PL-DAT
dынна-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
dынна-ды-м. — Мен база ону дынна-ды-м.
hear-PST-1SG I also it.ACC hear-PST-1SG
I’ve heard my parents quarrelling. — Yes, I’ve heard it, too.

(15) *Мен база ада-йе-м суг-лар-ны ону дынна-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) Чуну дынна-ды-ц? — Ада-йе-м суг-лар-ны кончужу-п
what hear-PST-2SG father-mother-POSS.1SG both-PL-ACC quarrel-CONV
тур-ган-ын.
AUX-NZR.PST-ACC.POSS.3

What have you heard? — lit. My parents quarrelling.

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:
I believe that Bill is intelligent. (Postal 1974: 132)

I didn’t expect Nixon to win, but I ended up wanting Nixon to win. →

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

* — Чүнү көр дүң Аяс-ты?
what see-PST-2SG Ajas-ACC

(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:

* — кошелек чидир-п түр-гап-ын мен алы-н-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:


Who, as you have seen, was beating the boy? (lit. Who did you see beating)

Cf.:

b. *Кым кор-ду-ң оол-ду эти-п каап-кан-ың?
who-ACC see-PST-2SG boy-ACC beat-CONV AUX-PART.PST-ACC

Cf.:

c. Кым оол-ду эти-п каап-кан-ың кор-ду-ң?
who boy-ACC beat-CONV AUX-PART.PST-ACC see-PST-2SG

3. Semantics of the quasi-‘Raising’ construction

3.1. Animacy requirement:

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) Петр-ңы хәнеме-ни аппар-гаш чөруп-кан-ың кор-ду-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:

Ajas-ACC wise-ACC.POSS.3 I notice-PST-1SG

b. (Мен) Аяс-ты 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.
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:**


