

# A Case-by-Agree account for ACC in Sakha adjunct clause constructions

**Christine Soh Yue**

University of Pennsylvania

*csohyue@sas.upenn.edu*

WAFL 16

September 30, 2022

# Handout and Slides



Scan for slides  
[bit.ly/YueWAFLSlides](https://bit.ly/YueWAFLSlides)



Scan for handout  
[bit.ly/YueWAFLHandout](https://bit.ly/YueWAFLHandout)

- Sakha adjunct clause constructions have been presented as striking data for uniquely Dependent Case Theory (Baker & Vinokurova 2010, henceforth B&V)
- ACC case can surface on what seems to be the subject of the embedded clause, in prima facie absence of a functional head

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

- (2) B&V case assignment for ACC and DAT case
- a. 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
  - b. 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

The B&V analysis of ACC case:

- (1) Masha [<sub>CP</sub>Misha-(ny) kel-ie        di-en] jie-ni        khomuy-da  
Masha [<sub>CP</sub>Misha-ACC come-FUT DIEN] house-ACC tidy-PST.3SG  
'Masha tidied up the house (thinking) Misha would come'

- (2) B&V case assignment for ACC and DAT case
- a. 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
  - b. 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

The B&V analysis of ACC case:

- (1) Masha [<sub>CP</sub>Misha-(ny) kel-ie      di-en] jie-ni      khomuy-da  
Masha [<sub>CP</sub>Misha-ACC come-FUT DIEN] house-ACC tidy-PST.3SG  
'Masha tidied up the house (thinking) Misha would come'

# Our claim

- The structure was analyzed incorrectly in B&V—the adjunct clause is an adjunct ConverbP rather than an adjunct CP
  - ▶ The CP is headed by the complementizer *dien*, which is historically derived from a converb form of *di-* “to say”
  - ▶ The ConverbP is headed by the converb of anteriority (CVANT) *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  
Masha Misha-ACC come-FUT say-CVANT house-ACC  
khomuy-da  
tidy-PST.3SG  
‘Masha tidied up the house (thinking) Misha would come’

# Our claim

- The structure was analyzed incorrectly in B&V—the adjunct clause is an adjunct ConverbP rather than an adjunct CP
  - ▶ The CP is headed by the complementizer *dien*, which is historically derived from a converb form of *di-* “to say”
  - ▶ The ConverbP is headed by the converb of anteriority (CVANT) *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  
Masha Misha-ACC come-FUT say-CVANT house-ACC  
khomuy-da  
tidy-PST.3SG  
‘Masha tidied up the house (thinking) Misha would come’

# Our claim

- The structure was analyzed incorrectly in B&V—the adjunct clause is an adjunct ConverbP rather than an adjunct CP
  - ▶ The CP is headed by the complementizer *dien*, which is historically derived from a converb form of *di-* “to say”
  - ▶ The ConverbP is headed by the converb of anteriority (CVANT) *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  
Masha Misha-ACC come-FUT say-CVANT house-ACC  
khomuy-da  
tidy-PST.3SG  
‘Masha tidied up the house (thinking) Misha would come’



# Our claim

- The structure was analyzed incorrectly in B&V—the adjunct clause is an adjunct ConverbP rather than an adjunct CP
  - ▶ The CP is headed by the complementizer *dien*, which is historically derived from a converb form of *di-* “to say”
  - ▶ The ConverbP is headed by the converb of anteriority (CVANT) *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  
Masha Misha-ACC come-FUT say-CVANT house-ACC  
khomuy-da  
tidy-PST.3SG  
‘Masha tidied up the house (thinking) Misha would come’

# Our claim

- The structure was analyzed incorrectly in B&V—the adjunct clause is an adjunct ConverbP rather than an adjunct CP
  - ▶ The CP is headed by the complementizer *dien*, which is historically derived from a converb form of *di-* “to say”
  - ▶ The ConverbP is headed by the converb of anteriority (CVANT) *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  
Masha Misha-ACC come-FUT say-CVANT house-ACC  
khomuy-da  
tidy-PST.3SG  
‘Masha tidied up the house (thinking) Misha would come’

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

§3 Analysis of ACC in adjunct (converb) clauses

§4 Analysis of ACC in complement clauses

§5 Conclusion

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

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

- (3)    Sahyl-lar kihi iher-in                    keor-eon-**ner**    kuot-an  
fox-PL    man come-3SP.ACC see-CVANT-3PL run-CVANT  
khaal-byt-tar  
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-CVANT-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.'

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

- (7) Itini büter-en       min sarsyn       bar-ya-m  
after finish-CVANT 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-pat-akh-khyt  
child/#horse 2PL-ACC yesterday gate-ACC close-NEG-PST-2PL  
di-en khahaa-ttan bar-byt  
say-CVANT 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-pat-akh-khyt  
child/horse 2PL-ACC yesterday gate-ACC close-NEG-PST-2PL  
die-bit  
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-pat-akh-khyt-yttan        ]  
         horse [ 2PL gate-ACC close-NEG-PST.NMLZ-3PL-ABL.3SP ]  
         khahaa-ttan bar-byt  
         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.’

## Semantic restriction on subjects: Passivization

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-bat-akh-khyt di-en sab-ylly-byt  
gate 2PL-ACC leave-NEG-PST-2PL say-CVANT 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

## Insertion of *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**  
Masha Misha-ACC come-FUT say-CVANT after  
jie-t-in khomuy-da  
house-3SP-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.

- *-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 *-At*, the converb of immediate precedence (CVIMM)

- (15) Masha Misha-(ny) kel-ie      **dii-dii**  
Masha Misha-ACC come-FUT say-CVSIM-say-CVSIM  
jie-t-in              khomuy-but  
house-3SP-ACC tidy-PST  
'Masha tidied the house (while) saying that Misha will come.'
- (16) Masha Misha-(ny) kel-ie      **di-et**              jie-t-in  
Masha Misha-ACC come-FUT say-CVIMM house-3SP-ACC  
khomuy-but  
clean-PST  
'Masha tidied the house right after 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-CVSIM-say-CVSIM hear-PST  
'Masha heard (something else) while saying that Misha will come.'
- (18) Masha Misha-(ny) kel-ie      **di-et**      isti-bit  
Masha Misha-ACC come-FUT say-CVIMM hear-PST  
'Masha heard (something else) right after saying that Misha will come.'

## Summary of Complementizer *dien* vs. Converb *di-en*

<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	*	✓



## Proposed analysis of accusative case

- 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.'

- More formal analysis of the mechanism coming soon

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

- (20) Masha Misha-(\*ny) kel-en            ih-er-itten  
Masha Misha-ACC come-CVANT come-AOR-ABL.3SP  
jie-t-in            suui-but  
house-3SP-ACC clean-PST  
'Masha cleaned the house from Misha's coming.'

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

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

- (22) Masha ehigi-(ni) kel-bikkit dien isti-bit  
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

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

- (22) Masha ehigi-(ni) kel-bikkit dien isti-bit  
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

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

- (22) Masha ehigi-(ni) kel-bikkit dien isti-bit  
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

# ACC in complement clauses

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

Unlike adjunct participial clauses, complement participial clauses 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.')

Difference between adjunct and complement clauses captured with proposed analysis



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

- (22) Masha ehigi-(ni) kel-bikkit dien isti-bit  
Masha 2PL-ACC come-2PL DIEN hear-PST  
'Masha heard that you came.'
- (25) ehigi-(\*ni) kel-bikkit dien ih-illi-bite  
2PL-ACC come-2PL DIEN hear-PASS-PST  
'It was heard that you came.'

While it is not possible for the NOM object to scramble to the left edge of the matrix clause, the ACC object can.

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

Leaving behind the embedded subject while scrambling the *dien* clause to the left is licit only with the ACC-marked case.

(27) a. \*ehiil          Boston'-n'a kel-ie          dien    Ayaana Masha  
         next.year Boston-DAT come-FUT COMP Ayaana Misha  
         isti-bite  
         hear-PST

         'Ayaana heard that Masha will come to Boston next year.'

b. ehiil          Boston'-n'a kel-ie          dien    Ayaana Masha-ny  
         next.year Boston-DAT come-FUT COMP Ayaana Misha-ACC  
         isti-bite  
         hear-PST-1SG

         'Ayaana heard that Masha will come to Boston next year.'

## Condition A

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

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

Note: Reciprocals are used rather than reflexives, which can be logophors

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

(29) (B&V 2010: 41)

- a. [Sarsyn min bar-a-byn dien] ihit-ti-m.  
tomorrow 1SG(NOM) leave-AOR-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-AOR-1SG DIEN hear-PST-1SG  
'I heard that I am leaving tomorrow.'

Turkish does not allow gapping of phrases in different clauses (Ince 2007)

- (30) Ali-Ø [Ahmet-in Ankara-ya gittiği]-ni sanıyor,  
Ali-NOM Ahmet-GEN Ankara-DAT went-ACC assuming-3SG,  
\*Mehmet-Ø de Özgür-ün.  
Mehmet-NOM also Özgür-GEN  
'Ali thinks that Ahmet went to Ankara, and \*Mehmet Özgür.'  
(Ince 2007: 24)

Gapping can be used as a test for clausemate-ness

- (31) Ali-Ø Ahmet-i Ankara-ya gitti sanıyor,  
Ali-NOM Ahmet-ACC Ankara-DAT went-3SG assuming-3SG,  
Mehmet-Ø de Özgür-ü.  
Mehmet-NOM also Özgür-ACC  
'Ali thinks that Ahmet went to Ankara, and Mehmet Özgür.' (Ince 2007: 25)

The gapping test can be applied in Sakha with the same results

- (32) a. \*Min Kesha kel-bit      dien    isti-bit-im,      onton en  
1SG Kesha come-PST COMP hear-PST-1SG, and    2SG  
Lyosha.  
Lyosha  
'I heard that Kesha came, and you Lyosha.'
- b. Min Kesha-ny kel-bit      dien isti-bit-im,      onton en  
1SG Kesha-ACC come-PST C      hear-PST-1SG, and    2SG  
Lyosha-ny.  
Lyosha-ACC  
'I heard that Kesha came, and you Lyosha.'



- Passivization test supports the fact that the case-assigning status of the matrix verb matters
- Scrambling, binding, and gapping tests indicate that the ACC object is in the matrix clause, while the NOM object is in the embedded clause
- Case assignment is reduced to a standard verbal object

- There are two distinct structures, each corresponding to 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

- 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.
- Ince, Atakan. 2006. "Direct complement clauses as object control structures in Turkish." *WECOL 2006*, 208.
- Ince, Atakan. 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, German Westphal, Benjamin Ao, Hee-Rahk Cae (eds.) 234–253.
- Pakendorf, Brigitte. 2015. A comparison of copied morphemes in Sakha (Yakut) and Evenki.
- 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.
- Petrova, Nyurguyana. 2010. "Syntax-Pragmatics interface in converbal constructions." In LSA Annual Meeting Extended Abstracts, 1:43–1.7

- (33) \*Aisen uonna Sardaana miigin/miekhe beie-beie-ler-iger  
Aisen and Sardaana self-self-3PP-DAT help  
keomeoleos die-bit-tere  
1SG-DAT help-PST-3PL say-PST-PL  
'Aisen and Sardaana told me to help each other.'  
\*miigitten  
but need context; strange without context