

Case on embedded subjects in Sakha*

Christine Soh
csohyue@sas.upenn.edu
University of Pennsylvania

WAFL
September 30, 2022

1 Introduction

1.1 The puzzle

In Sakha adjunct clause constructions, accusative case can surface on what seems to be the subject of the embedded clause, even where we might not expect case

- (1) Masha Misha-(**ny**) kel-ie dien jie-ni khomuy-da
Masha Misha-ACC come-FUT DIEN house-ACC tidy-PST.3SG
'Masha tidied up the house (thinking) Misha would come' (Vinokurova 2005: 368)

Central question: What is the source of accusative case?

Given the prima facie absence of a functional head to assign case, this has been used as evidence for uniquely Dependent Case Theory (Baker & Vinokurova 2010, henceforth B&V)

- (2) B&V case assignment for ACC and DAT case
- If there are two distinct argumental NPs in the same VP-phase such that NP1 c-commands NP2, then value the case feature of NP1 as dative unless NP2 has already been marked for case
 - If there are two distinct argumental NPs in the same phase such that NP1 c-commands NP2, then value the case feature of NP2 as accusative unless NP1 has already been marked for case
- (1) Masha [_{CP}Misha-(ny) kel-ie di-en] jie-ni khomuy-da
Masha [_{CP}Misha-ACC come-FUT DIEN] house-ACC tidy-PST.3SG
'Masha tidied up the house (thinking) Misha would come'

1.2 The claim

The key is in *dien*

- Complementizer *dien*, which is historically derived from a converb form of *di* "to say," looks identical to the converb of anteriority *di-en* say-CVANT 'after saying'
- Both elements are present synchronically
- This exceptional ACC on embedded subjects is assigned by converb *di-en* (see also Major, submitted)

- (1) Masha Misha-(ny) kel-ie **di-en** jie-ni khomuy-da
Masha Misha-ACC come-FUT say- house-ACC tidy-PST.3SG
'Masha tidied up the house (thinking) Misha would come'

*Thank you to Julie Anne Legate and Martin Salzmann for guidance and discussion. Thank you also to my consultants: Aiyyna Sleptsova, Maria Menkyarova, and their families. All errors are my own.

1.3 Roadmap

2. Complementizer *dien* vs. Converb *di-en*
3. ACC in adjunct clauses
4. ACC in complement clauses
5. Conclusion

2 Complementizer *dien* vs. Converb *di-en*

Four tests to resolve lexical ambiguity:

1. Subject agreement morphology
2. Semantic restriction on subjects
3. Insertion of the word *baran* ‘after’
4. Replacement with other converbal forms

2.1 Subject agreement morphology

Converbs can have subject agreement morphology (Pakendorf, 2007)...

- (3) Sahyl-lar kihi iher-in keor-eon-**ner** kuot-an khaal-byt-tar
fox-PL man come-3SP.ACC see-CVB-3PL run-CVB stay-PST-3PL
‘After seeing the man coming, the foxes ran away.’

... but complementizers cannot

- (4) o5o-lor jie-ge kel-bit-ter dien-(***ner**) surakh-tar
child-PL home-DAT come-PST-3PL COMP-3PL rumor-PL
‘The rumors that the children came home’

di-en in adjunct clauses can have subject agreement morphology...

- (5) Misha-(ny) kel-ie di-em-**min** jie-ni khomuy-d-um
Misha-ACC come-FUT say-CVB-1SG house-ACC tidy-PST-1SG
‘I, (saying) Misha would come, tidied the house.’

... while *dien* in complement clauses cannot

- (6) a. min ehigi-(ni) kel-be-tekh-khit dien isti-bit-im
1SG 2PL-ACC come-NEG-PST-2PL COMP hear-PST-1SG
‘I heard that you did not come.’
b. min ehigi-(ni) kel-be-tekh-khit diem-**min** isti-bit-im
1SG 2PL-ACC come-NEG-PST-2PL COMP-1SG hear-PST-1SG
‘I heard (something else) after saying that you did not come.’
NOT: ‘I heard that you did not come.’
c. *min ehigi-(ni) kel-be-tekh-khit dien’-**n’it** isti-bit-im
1SG 2PL-ACC come-NEG-PST-2PL COMP-2PL hear-PST-1SG
‘I heard that you did not come.’

2.2 Semantic restriction on subjects

Converbs exhibit subject control; that is, the subject of the converb event is controlled by the subject of the matrix event

- (7) Itini бүтєр-єn min sarsyn bar-ya-m
 after finish-CVB 1SG tomorrow leav-FUT-1SG
 ‘After finishing that, I will leave tomorrow.’ (Petrova 2011, 294a)

The matrix subject of an adjunct clause construction is restricted to entities that can speak, just like matrix verb ‘say’

- (8) **o5o/#sylgy** ehigi-(ni) be5ehee aan-y sap-patakh-khyt di-en khahaa-ttan bar-byt
 child/#horse 2PL-ACC yesterday gate-ACC close-NEG-2PL say-CVB stable-ABL leave-PST
 ‘The child/The horse, (saying) that you didn’t close the gate yesterday, left the stable.’
- (9) **o5o/#sylgy** ehigi-(ni) be5ehee aan-y sap-patakh-khyt die-bit
 child/horse 2PL-ACC yesterday gate-ACC close-NEG-2PL say-PST.3SG
 ‘The child/#horse said you didn’t close the gate yesterday.’

The restriction goes away when the *di-en* clause is replaced with a nominalized participial clause

- (10) sylgy [ehigi aan-y sap-patakh-khyt-yttan] khahaa-ttan bar-byt
 horse [2PL gate-ACC close-NEG-3PL-ABL.] stable-ABL leave-PST
 ‘The horse left the stable that you didn’t close the gate.’
 (lit: ‘from you not closing the gate.’)

The matrix subject of the complement clause construction does not have such a restriction

- (11) o5o/sylgy ehigi-(ni) kel-bik-kit dien isti-bit
 child/horse 2PL-ACC come-PST-2PL COMP say-PST
 ‘The child/horse heard that you came.’

When the matrix verb is passivized, the sentence becomes illicit, as the grammatical subject is inanimate and unable to speak

- (12) **#aan** ehigi-ni takhsy-batakh-khyt di-en sab-ylly-byt
 gate 2PL-ACC leave-PST.NEG-2PL say-CVB close-PASS-PST
 ‘The gate was closed (saying) that you wouldn’t leave’

In a storybook setting where gates can talk, this sentence becomes licit

2.3 Insertion of the word *baran* ‘after’

The word *baran* ‘after’ acts as a postposition when preceded by a converb, making explicit the event order interpretation (Petrova 2008)

- *baran* is available in adjunct clauses

- (13) Masha Misha-(ny) kel-ie di-en **baran** jie-t-in khomuy-da
 Masha Misha-ACC come-FUT say-CVB after house--ACC tidy-PST
 ‘Masha, after saying that Misha would come, tidied the house.’

- but in a complement clause, we get two different interpretations

- (14) Keskil Aisen-(ny) kel-bet dien (**baran**) isti-bit
 Keskil Aisen-ACC come-NEG.PST DIEN after hear-PST

with *baran*: Keskil, after saying that Aisen is not coming, heard (something else)
without *baran*: Keskil heard that Aisen is not coming.

2.4 Replacement with other converbal forms

- *-An* marks the converb of anteriority (CVANT) (Petrova 2011)
- There is a rich system of converbs in Sakha, including *-A/I*, the converb of simultaneity (CVSIM), and *-BAkka*, the converb of negation (CVNEG)

- (15) Masha Misha-(ny) kel-ie **dii-dii** jie-t-in khomuy-but
Masha Misha-ACC come-FUT say--say- house--ACC tidy-PST
‘Masha tidied the house (while) saying that Misha will come.’
- (16) Masha Misha-(ny) kel-ie **die-bekke** jie-t-in khomuy-but
Masha Misha-ACC come-FUT say- house--ACC clean-PST
‘Masha tidied the house without saying that Misha will come.’

Replacing complementizer *dien* with other converb forms results in a different interpretation

- (17) Masha Misha-(ny) kel-ie **dii-dii** isti-bit
Masha Misha-ACC come-FUT say--say- hear-PST
‘Masha heard (something else) while saying that Misha will come.’
- (18) Masha Misha-(ny) kel-ie **die-bekke** isti-bit
Masha Misha-ACC come-FUT say- hear-PST
‘Masha heard (something else) without saying that Misha will come.’

2.5 Summary

<i>Test</i>	Complementizer <i>dien</i>	Converb <i>di-en</i>
Subject agreement	*	✓
Semantic restriction	No restriction	Restricted to speaking entities
<i>baran</i> ‘after’	*	✓
Other converbs	*	✓

3 ACC in converb phrases

- Proposal: Source of ACC case on the embedded subject of adjunct *di-en* clauses is *di-en* ‘say-CVANT’
- Matrix *die-* ‘say’ optionally assigns ACC to the embedded subject of its CP complement

- (19) Masha Misha-(**ny**) kel-ie **die-bit**
Masha Misha-ACC come-FUT say-PST.3SG
‘Masha said Misha will come.’

3.1 Predictions borne out: Participial constructions

The embedded subject cannot be ACC-marked in adjunct participials, which lack converb *di-en*.

- (20) Masha Misha-(***ny**) kel-en ih-er-itten jie-t-in suui-but
Masha Misha-ACC come- come--ABL. house--ACC clean-PST
‘Masha cleaned the house from Masha’s coming.’

3.2 Predictions borne out: Nominal complements

The embedded subject cannot be ACC-marked in complement clauses of nouns

- (21) Misha-(*ny) kel-ie dien surakh
 Misha-ACC come-FUT COMP rumor
 ‘the rumor that Misha would come’
 NOT: #the rumor, saying that Misha would come

4 ACC in complement clauses

Unlike embedded subjects of nominal complements, embedded subjects of verbal complement clauses can bear ACC

- (22) Masha ehigi-(ni) kel-bikkit dien ihi-tte
 Masha 2PL-ACC come-2PL DIEN hear-PST
 ‘Masha heard that you came.’

What is the source of ACC here?

Claim: ACC is assigned by the matrix verb

- Participial clause
- Passivization
- Scrambling
- Binding (Conditions A & B)
- Gapping

4.1 Participial clause

Unlike adjunct participial clauses, complement participial clauses (which bear ACC on the nominalized verb) can have ACC on their embedded subjects

- (23) Masha ehigi-(**ni**) kel-bik-kit-in isti-bit
 Masha 2PL-ACC come-NMLZ-2PL-ACC hear-PST
 ‘Masha heard that you came’
 (lit. ‘Masha heard your coming.’)

4.2 Passivization

For our consultants (unlike B&V), matrix passive results in a loss of ACC

- (24) a. En chaasky-ny alja-p-pyt-yn
 2SG cup-ACC break-CAUS-PST-2SG
 ‘You broke the cup.’
 b. chaasky-(*ny) aljat-ylyn-na
 cup-ACC break-PASS-PST
 ‘The cup was broken.’

When the matrix verb is passivized, the embedded subject cannot have ACC

- (24) Masha ehigi-(ni) kel-bikkit dien isti-bit
 Masha 2PL-ACC come-2PL DIEN hear-PST
 ‘Masha heard that you came.’
- (27) ehigi-(*ni) kel-bikkit dien ih-illi-bite
 2PL-ACC come-2PL DIEN hear-PASS-PST
 ‘It was heard that you came.’

4.3 Scrambling

- (28) a. Ayaana Masha-ny ehiil Boston'-n'a kel-ie dien isti-bite
 Ayaana Masha-ACC next.year Boston-DAT come-FUT COMP hear-PST
 ‘Ayaana heard that Masha will come to Boston next year.’
 b. Masha-*(ny) Ayaana ehiil Boston'-n'a kel-ie dien isti-bite
 Misha-ACC Ayaana next.year Boston-DAT come-FUT COMP hear-PST
 ‘As for Masha, Ayaana heard that she will come to Boston next year.’
- (29) a. *ehiil Boston'-n'a kel-ie dien Ayaana Masha isti-bite
 next.year Boston-DAT come-FUT COMP Ayaana Misha hear-PST
 ‘I heard that Misha will come to Boston next year.’
 b. ehiil Boston'-n'a kel-ie dien Ayaana Masha-ny isti-bite
 next.year Boston-DAT come-FUT COMP Ayaana Misha-ACC hear-PST-1SG
 ‘I heard that Misha will come to Boston next year.’

4.4 Binding (Conditions A & B)

The NOM-marked reciprocal yields a Condition A violation, while the ACC-marked does not, suggesting that the ACC-marked embedded subject is indeed in the matrix clause

- (30) a. *Aisen uonna Sayaana beie-beie-ler-e jie-5e kel-lel-ler dien isti-bit-tere
 Aisen and Sayaana self-self-PL-NOM home-DAT come-FUT-3PL COMP hear-PST-3PL
 ‘Aisen and Sayaana heard that each other would come home.’
 b. Aisen uonna Sayaana beie-beie-ler-in jie-5e kel-lel-ler dien isti-bit-tere
 Aisen and Sayaana self-self-PL-ACC home-DAT come-FUT-3PL COMP hear-PST-3PL
 ‘Aisen and Sayaana heard that each other would come home.’

The NOM embedded subject can be coreferential with the matrix subject, while the ACC-marked one cannot, suggesting that under Condition B of binding, that the ACC-marked subject is in the matrix clause

- (31) (B&V 2010: 41)
- a. [Sarsyn min bar-a-byn dien] ihit-ti-m.
 tomorrow 1SG(NOM) leave--1SG DIEN hear-PST-1SG
 ‘I heard that I am leaving tomorrow.’
- b. *[miigin [sarsyn bar-a-byn dien]] ihit-ti-m.
 1SG(ACC) tomorrow leave--1SG DIEN hear-PST-1SG
 ‘I heard that I am leaving tomorrow.’

4.5 Gapping

- (32) a. *Min Kesha kel-bit dien isti-bit-im, onton en Lyosha.
 1SG Kesha come-PST COMP hear-PST-1SG, and 2SG Lyosha
 ‘I heard that Kesha came, and you Lyosha.’

- b. Min Kesha-ny kel-bit dien isti-bit-im, onton en Lyosha-ny.
 1SG Kesha-ACC come-PST C hear-PST-1SG, and 2SG Lyosha-ACC
 ‘I heard that Kesha came, and you Lyosha.’

5 Conclusion

- There are two distinct *dien*: converb *di-en* ‘say-CVANT’ in adjunct clauses and complementizer *dien* in complement clauses
- Source of ACC in adjunct clauses is converb *di-en* ‘say-CVANT’
- Source of ACC in complement clauses is matrix verb
- Thus, the Sakha data is fully compatible with a Case-by-Agree approach

References

- Baker, Mark C. 2011. “Degrees of nominalization: Clause-like constituents in Sakha.” *Lingua* 121 (7): 1164–1193.
- Baker, Mark C, and Nadya Vinokurova. 2010. “Two modalities of case assignment: Case in Sakha.” *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 28 (3): 593–642.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1999. “Derivation by phase.” Edited by Michael Kenstowicz. *An Annotated Syntax Reader*, 482.
- . 2000. “Minimalist inquiries: The framework (MITOPL 15).” *Step by step: Essays on minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*, 89–155.
- Davies, William D. 2005. “Madurese prolepsis and its implications for a typology of raising.” *Language*, 645–665.
- Ince, Atakan. 2006. “Direct complement clauses as object control structures in Turkish.” *WECOL 2006*, 208.
- . 2009. “Gapping in turkish.” In *Proceedings of thirty-eighth annual meeting of the North East Linguistic Society*, 425–438.
- Johanson, Lars. 1995. “On Turkic converb clauses.” *Haspelmath & König (eds.)* 1995:313–48.
- Legate, Julie Anne. 2008. “Morphological and abstract case.” *Linguistic inquiry* 39 (1): 55–101.
- Lord, Carol. 1993. *Historical change in serial verb constructions*. Vol. 26. John Benjamins Publishing.
- Major, Travis. Submitted. “What Uyghur “says” about Dependent Case Theory.”
- Marantz, Alec. 1991. “Case and licensing.” In *ESCOL’91: Proceedings of the Eighth Eastern States Conference on Linguistics*, Germán Westphal, Benjamin Ao, Hee-Rahk Cae (eds.) 234–253.
- Pakendorf, Brigitte. 2015. *A comparison of copied morphemes in Sakha (Yakut) and Even*.
- Pakendorf, Brigitte, and Eugenie Stapert. 2020. *Sakha and Dolgan, the North Siberian Turkic languages*.
- Petrova, Nyurguyana. 2008. “A Corpus Study of Sakha (Yakut) Converbs: A Case of Baran.” *Working Papers in Linguistics* 27:1.
- . 2010. “Syntax-Pragmatics interface in converbal constructions.” In *LSA Annual Meeting Extended Abstracts*, 1:43–1.

- Petrova, Nyurguyana. 2011. *Lexical and clause-linkage properties of the converbal constructions in Sakha (Yakut)*. State University of New York at Buffalo.
- Predolac, Esra. 2017. “The Syntax of sentential complementation in Turkish.” PhD diss., Cornell University.
- Shimamura, Koji. 2018. “The theory of quotative complementation in Japanese semantiosyntax.” PhD diss., University of Connecticut.
- Vinokurova, Nadezhda. 2005. “Lexical categories and argument structure: a study with reference to Sakha, University of Utrecht.” PhD diss., Ph. D dissertation.
- Wang, Yu-Fang, Aya Katz, and Chih-Hua Chen. 2003. “Thinking as saying: shuo (‘say’) in Taiwan Mandarin conversation and BBS talk.” *Language Sciences* 25 (5): 457–488.