



# Raising to Quirky Subject in Tatar

Nara Institute of Science and Technology (NAIST)

Chihiro Taguchi

`taguchi.chihiro.td0[at]is.naist.jp`

November 21, 2020



# Raising to Quirky Subject in Tatar

1. Introduction
  - a. Raising
  - b. Quirky subject
2. Discussion: Quirky Subject Hierarchy (Poole 2016)
3. Conclusion



# Raising to Quirky Subject in Tatar

1. Introduction
  - a. Raising
  - b. Quirky subject
2. Discussion: Quirky Subject Hierarchy (Poole 2016)
3. Conclusion



# Introduction: Objective

This study will empirically demonstrate that:

- Description:  
Tatar has raising constructions with “quirky” case-markings
- Theory:  
Quirky Subject Hierarchy (Poole 2016) is not language-specific



# Introduction: Tatar

- Typology: Turkic > Kipchak > Tatar
  - Spoken mainly in the Republic of Tatarstan, Russia
- Syntax: SOV, AN
- Morphology: case-marking, suffixation



## Introduction: Raising in Tatar

- (1) *Marat*      *kit-ärgä*      *tiješ.*  
Marat.**NOM** leave-INF      obligatory
- (2) *Marat-qa*      *kit-ärgä*      *kiräk.*      (1)-(3): “Marat must leave.”  
Marat-**DAT** leave-INF      necessary
- (3) *Marat-niñ*      *kit-äse*      *bar.*  
Marat-**GEN** leave-FP.3      exist

Problem: different case-markings on the subject

⇒ subject-to-subject raising (SSR) with quirky case-marking



# Raising to Quirky Subject in Tatar

1. Introduction
  - a. Raising
  - b. Quirky subject
2. Discussion: Quirky Subject Hierarchy (Poole 2016)
3. Conclusion



# Overview: Raising

- Raising  
syntactic movement of an argument from subordinate clause to matrix clause  
  
e.g., SSR in English  
Johni seemed [*ti* to leave.]  
... “John” is not a semantic argument of SEEM but of LEAVE.
- cf. control  
e.g., Johni tried [*PRO*<sub>i</sub> to leave].  
... “John” is a semantic argument of both TRY and LEAVE.



# Raising in Tatar

- Raising property of sentences (1)-(3) can be confirmed by **passivization test**.
- No change in semantic relationship

(12)	<i>Marat</i>	<i>xat-ni</i>	<i>jaz-arya</i>	<i>tiješ.</i>	
	Marat.NOM	letter-ACC	write-INF	obligatory	
	“Marat must write the letter.”			i.e., <b><i>write(Marat, letter)</i></b>	identical
(13)	<i>Xat</i>	<i>Marat tarafinnan</i>	<i>jaz-il-irya</i>	<i>tiješ.</i>	
	letter.NOM	Marat by	write-PASS-INF	obligatory	
	“The letter must be written by Marat.”			i.e., <b><i>write(Marat, letter)</i></b>	



# Raising in Tatar

Passivization of a control predicate causes semantic relationship alternation

- (14) *Marat xat-ni jaz-arya tiriš-ti.*  
Marat.NOM letter-ACC write-INF try-PST.3  
“Marat tried to write the letter.” i.e., *try(Marat, λx.write(x, letter))*
- (15) *Xat Marat tarafinnan jaz-il-irya tiriš-ti.*  
letter.NOM Marat by write-PASS-INF try-PST.3  
“The letter tried to be written by Marat.” i.e., *try(letter, λx.write(Marat, x))*
- } alternation



# Raising in Tatar

- The same test can be applied to (2) and (3)
  - ⇒ (1)-(3) are raising constructions
  - ⇒ Non-flat structure (also confirmed by anaphoric binding)



# Raising to Quirky Subject in Tatar

1. Introduction
  - a. Raising
  - b. Quirky subject
2. Discussion: Quirky Subject Hierarchy (Poole 2016)
3. Conclusion



## Overview: Quirky Subject

- Non-nominative subject
  - typically found in Icelandic (Sigurðsson 1992)
- Example (Icelandic):

(16) Þeir                    hjálpuðu            okkur.  
they.NOM      help.PST.3.PL   we.DAT  
“They helped us.”

(17) **Okkur**    var                    hjálpað.  
we.DAT   be.PST.3.SG   help.PP  
“We were helped.”



# Quirky Subject vs. Pseudo-Quirky Argument

- Quirky-like argument in German
  - *uns* is not a quirky subject but an object (Zaenen et al. 1985).

(18) Sie                    halfen                    uns.  
they.NOM    help.PST.3.PL    we.DAT  
“They helped us.”

(19) Uns            wurde                    geholfen.  
we.DAT    become.PST.3.SG    help.PP  
“We were helped.”

# Quirky Subject vs. Pseudo-Quirky Argument

PRO test: if an XP can control a PRO, the PRO is the subject.

(20) Við            vonuðumst            til    [PRO            að    verða            hjálpað]. (Icelandic)  
we.NOM        hope.MED.PST.1.PL    for    [PRO(DAT)    to    become.INF help.PP]

(21)\* Wir            hofften            [PRO            geholfen            zu    werden]. (German)  
we.NOM        hope.PST.1.PL    [PRO(DAT)    help.PP            to    become.INF]



German quirky-like argument cannot bind PRO with supposedly dative case-marking  
⇒ Not a subject



# Quirky Subject in Tatar Raising

- Are the raised arguments in Tatar really quirky subjects?  
⇒ Apply subjecthood tests (Sigurðsson 1992, Poole 2016)
- Anaphoric Binding test
- PRO test
- Reduced Relative test



## Anaphoric Binding test

(22) *Marat-qa* [berüz-e kit-ärgä] *kiräk.*  
Marat-DAT [oneself-3.NOM leave-INF] necessary

(23) *Marat-niñ* [berüz-e kit-äse] *bar.*  
Marat-GEN [oneself-3.NOM leave-FP.3] exist

“Marat must leave by himself.”

⇒ The raised quirky arguments can bind the reflexive pronoun



## PRO test

- (24) *Marati*      [[PRO<sub>i</sub>    *kit-ärgä*    *kiräk*]      *bul-u-ya*]    *künder-el-de*.  
Marat.NOM [[PRO(DAT) leave-INF    necessary]    be-VN-DAT] persuade-PASS-PST.3  
“Marat was persuaded that he had to leave.”
- (25) *Marati*            [PRO<sub>i</sub>      *kit-äse*      *bul-u-în-a*]      *künder-el-de*.  
Marat.NOM      [PRO(GEN) leave-FP    be-VN-3-DAT]    persuade-PASS-PST.3  
“Marat was persuaded that he would have to leave.”

⇒ The quirky arguments can be **PRO**



## Reduced Relative test (Overview)

Relative clauses without relative pronoun

“If XP can be relativized in reduced relatives, XP is a subject.” (Poole 2016)

e.g., “The man gives the cattle the hay.”

(26) The mani [\_\_i giving the cattle the hay] ⇒ “the man” is the subject

(27)# The cattlei [\_\_i giving the man the hay]

(28)# The hayi [\_\_i giving the man the cattle]



## Reduced Relative test

(29) ?? [\_\_i *kit-ärgä*      *kiräk*      *bul-yan*]      *kešei*  
                    leave-INF      necessary      be-ADJVZ      person

“The person who had to leave”

(30) [\_\_i *kit-ü*      *ixtimal-i*      *bul-yan*]      *kešei*  
                    leave-VN      possibility-3      be-ADJVZ      person

“The person who might leave”

⇒ Acceptability differs



## Suppl.: *-u ixtimal-ï bar* (“possible”)

*-u ixtimal-ï bar* syntactically behaves similarly to *-asï bar*

(3) *Marat-niñ kit-äse bar.*  
Marat-GEN leave-FP exist  
“Marat must leave.”

(3)' *Marat-niñ kit-ü ixtimal-ï bar.*  
Marat-GEN leave-VN possibility-3 exist  
“Marat might leave.”

(23) *Marat-niñ berüz-e kit-äse bar.*  
Marat-GEN oneself-3 leave-VN exist  
“Marat must leave by himself.”

(23)' *Marat-niñ berüz-e kit-ü ixtimal-ï bar.*  
Marat-GEN oneself-3 leave-VN possibility-3 exist  
“Marat might leave by himself.” (Anaphoric Binding)



## Suppl.: *-u ixtimal-ī bar* (“possible”)

(25) *Marati* [PRO<sub>i</sub> *kit-āse* *bul-u-īn-a*] *kūnder-el-de.*  
Marat.NOM [PRO(GEN) *leave-FP* *be-VN-3-DAT*] *persuade-PASS-PST.3*  
“Marat was persuaded that he would have to leave.”

(25)' *Marati* [PRO<sub>i</sub> *kit-ū* *ixtimal-ī* *bul-u-īn-a*] *kūnder-el-de.*  
Marat.NOM [PRO(GEN) *leave-VN* *possibility-3* *be-VN-3-DAT*]  
*persuade-PASS-PST.3*  
“Marat was persuaded that he would have to leave.” (PRO test)



# Genitive subject raising in Uyghur

Asarina (2011) reports genitive subject raising in Uyghur

- (31) Ötkür-*niñ*      *bu+ehtimalda*      *oqu-š-i*      *kérek.*  
Ötkür-GEN      probably      read-VN-3 necessary  
“Ötkür probably must read.”
- (32) \*Ötkür-*niñ*      *bu+ehtimalda*      *oqu-š-i*      *muhim.*  
Ötkür-GEN      probably      read-VN-3 important  
intended: “It is probably important for Ötkür to read.”

⇒ Raising construction **allows for insertion** of sentence-modifying adverbials



# Raising to Quirky Subject in Tatar

1. Introduction
  - a. Raising
  - b. Quirky subject
2. Discussion: Quirky Subject Hierarchy (Poole 2016)
3. Conclusion





## Quirky Subject Hierarchy (QSH) (Poole 2016)

(33) QSH: SOA Binding  $\gg$  PRO Binding  $\gg$  Reduced Relatives (cited from Poole (2016))

Hindi type                  Icelandic type          Laz type

For a hierarchy  $p_1 \gg p_2 \gg \dots \gg p_n$ , a DP has property  $p_{i+1}$  only if it has property  $p_i$

Table 1: QSH

	SOA Binding	PRO Binding	Reduced Relatives
Hindi type	✓	*	*
Icelandic type	✓	✓	*
Laz type	✓	✓	✓

# Quirky Subject Hierarchy

Table 2: Typology of QS (Poole 2016)

Hindi type	Hindi, German, Basque, Gujarati, Hungarian, Kannada, Korean, Malayalam, Russian, Spanish
Icelandic type	Icelandic, Faroese, Tamil, Telugu
Laz type	Laz, (Marathi, Tamil, Telugu)

Tatar (*kiräk*, dative raising)

Tatar (*-asī bar*, genitive raising)

- Languages in parentheses are not clear yet as to which they belong to.



# Raising to Quirky Subject in Tatar

1. Introduction
  - a. Raising
  - b. Quirky subject
2. Discussion: Quirky Subject Hierarchy (Poole 2016)
3. Conclusion



## Conclusion: QSH types are not language-specific

- Reduced Relative test in Tatar showed that the acceptability differed between dative SSR (*kiräk*) and genitive SSR (*ixtimal bar*).  
  
⇒ Tatar belongs to **two QSH types** (Icelandic and Laz) ???
- QSH types are not uniquely determined by each language
- Different predicates can have a different QSH type  
⇒ **lexically** (by each word) or **morphologically** (by case-marking) motivated



# References

- Asarina, A. A. (2011). Case in Uyghur and beyond. PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Halle, M. & A. Marantz. (1993). Distributed morphology and the pieces of inflection. In K. L. Hale & S. J. Keyser (eds.), *The view from Building 20: Essays in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger*. MIT Press, pp. 111-76.
- Marantz, A. (2000). Case and licensing. In E. Reuland (ed.), *Arguments and case: Explaining Burzio's generalization*. John Benjamins, pp. 11-30.
- Poole, E. (2016). Deconstructing subjecthood. Ms., University of Massachusetts Amherst.
- Sigurðsson, H. A. (1992). The case of quirky subjects. *Working papers in Scandinavian syntax*, 49. Department of Scandinavian Languages, Lund University.
- Zaenen, A., H. Thráinsson & J. Maling. (1985). Case and grammatical functions: the Icelandic passive. In *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 3(4). Springer Verlag. pp. 441-483.



# Raising to Quirky Subject in Tatar

Nara Institute of Science and Technology (NAIST)

Chihiro Taguchi

`taguchi.chihiro.td0[at]is.naist.jp`

November 21, 2020