

Accusative Subjects in Tuvian nominalizations: against Subject-to-Object Raising analysis

The phenomenon of Subject-to-Object raising (SOR) in Altaic languages has been documented for Japanese, Korean, and Turkish (see Kuno 1976, Lee 1992, Ohta 1997, Nharada 2002, Takano 2003, Yoon 2003). This paper considers a less discussed data from Tuvian. I consider the evidence for and against the SOR analysis of the Tuvian constructions, and argue for the non-raising interpretation.

1. Syntactic properties of the Tuvian SOR

SOR is possible in Tuvian both from finite embedded clauses (with the complementizer *dep*) and nominalizations. In this paper only raising from nominalizations is discussed.

The Tuvian SOR (both in finite embedded clauses or nominalizations) is optional, as in Japanese: when raised, the subject of the embedded clause is assigned the accusative (1a); when non-raised, it bears either nominative or genitive marking (1b). The SOR construction only occurs with a few matrix verbs, as *чугаала* ‘to tell’, *көр* ‘to see’, *дыңна* ‘to hear’ e.a., all of them assigning the accusative marking to the nominalized verb. If the embedded subject bears the accusative marker, the nominalized verb still keeps the accusative (1a).

Hence, the Tuvian construction in (1a) shows the syntactic features common with English and Japanese SOR construction. The question arises whether the raising analysis of (1a) is borne out.

2. Raising or Non-raising

The Raising analysis of (1a) bases on the following arguments: (i) passivization: when the matrix verb is passivized, the raised NP becomes the matrix clause subject (2); (ii) scope: the raised NP does not reconstruct to the gap in the embedded clause for the purpose of scope; (iii) linear position: no material (e.g., adverbials from the embedded clause) can intervene between the raised NP and the matrix clause.

However, (1a) does not show another properties characteristic for the raising constructions. First, the ‘raised’ NP in (1a) fails to license the matrix verb agreement in the passive, cf. (3). It contrasts in this respect with an NP, which occurs initially in the DO position of the same verb. Second, the ‘raised’ NP forms a constituent with the rest of the embedded clause. The whole phrase containing the accusative NP and the rest of the nominalized clause (a) can be pronominalized, (b) allows the Pied-Piping of the embedded verb, if the accusative NP is Wh-extracted and (c) can form an independent utterance (e.g., an answer to a question).

Thus, I show that the ‘raised’ NP does not occupy a DO position in the matrix clause. Hence, the raising analysis of (1a) is infelicitous.

The question then arises, (i) why the embedded subject in (1a) is assigned accusative case and (ii) why the embedded verb in the SOR keeps the accusative. I suggest that this could be accounted by co-Case marking approach proposed by Muysken, Lefebvre for Quechua (see Muysken, Lefebvre 1988: 141-165).

Examples:

- (1) **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 stand-NZR.PST
(My) father told (us) about Ajas’ catching of the fox.

б. 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	stand-NZR.PST		

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

- (2) **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-ттыр-ган.
 hear-PASS-NZR.PST

My parents have been heard quarrelling by the neighbours.

- (3) **Ада-йе-м** кончужу-п тур-ган-нар-ын кожа-лар-га
 father-mother-POSS1SG quarrel-CONV stand-NZR.PST-PL-ACC.POSS.3 neighbour-PL-DAT
 дыңна-ттыр-ган (?? дыңна-ттыр-ган-нар).
 hear-PASS-NZR.PST hear-PASS-NZR.PST-PL

My parents have been heard quarrelling by the neighbours.

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.
- Harada N. 2002. *Licensing PF-Visible Formal Features: A Linear Algorithm and Case-Related Phenomena in PF*. Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Irvine.
- Ohta K. 1997. Tense in the Subject Raising Construction // *Japanese / Korean Linguistics*, v. 6. CSLI Publications, pp. 353-369.
- 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 (WAFLL)*, MIT, Cambridge, MA.