

Passivization of matrix predicates in the light of constructions with accusative subjects: the case of Barguzin Buryat¹

1. Introduction

In this paper I discuss the relation between two constructions with a finite sentential argument that are attested in the Barguzin dialect of Buryat spoken in Baraghan village (Republic of Buryatia, Russia)²:

- (1) *badmā namejā xoto ošo-xo gžžā ši:d-3*
 Badma.NOM 1SG.ACC city go-POT COMP decide-PST1
 ‘Badma decided that I will go to the city.’
- (2) *bi badm-ar xoto ošo-xo-(b) gžžā ši:dā-gd-3-b*
 1SG.NOM Badma-INSTR city go-POT-(1SG) COMP decide-PASS-PST1-1SG
 Lit. ‘I was decided by Badma that (I) will go to the city.’

In both (1) and (2) we see sentences that involve embedded finite clauses (Complementizer Phrases, henceforth CPs) with a complementizer *gžžā*, which is a grammaticalized converb form of the verb *gžxā* (‘say’)³. Sentences with verbs of saying functioning as complementizers have been widely attested and described both in Mongolic languages (see [Ulanova 1980; Knyazev 2009; Skribnik, Darzhaeva 2016], among others) and in languages of other families (see [Matić, Pakendorf 2013] for discussion of areal and genealogical patterns of non-canonical functions of verbs of saying).

In this paper I concern myself with the question of whether (1) and (2) are derivationally related. The sentence in (1) represents a structure with Exceptional Case Marking (ECM): the subject of the embedded clause is marked accusative, which is a non-canonical subject marking in a finite clause in Barguzin Buryat (finite clauses usually have nominative subjects). It seems that ECM configurations in Barguzin Buryat differ significantly from Standard Literary Buryat. For example, [Skribnik, Darzhaeva 2016] claim that in Standard Literary Buryat there is no connection between the ability of a matrix verb to assign the accusative case and the availability of an accusative subject in the embedded clause. Thus, the matrix verb *bajārlāxā* (‘be happy’), which usually assigns the dative case, can take an embedded clause with an accusative subject:

- (3) *namejā zzmā abā-bā gžžā bajārlā-bā gy-š?*
 1SG.ACC blame take-PST2 COMP be.happy-PST2 Q-2SG
 ‘Were you happy that I took the blame?’ (adapted from [Skribnik, Darzhaeva 2016: 132])

This is different from what we observe in Barguzin Buryat: verbs that assign lexical cases such as dative or instrumental cannot take sentential arguments with accusative subjects in Barguzin Buryat. This is illustrated below with the verb *atārxāxā* (‘to envy’), which assigns the dative case. In (4) we see that this verb assigns the dative case when it takes an object as its complement; in (5) we see that it also assigns the dative case to a nominalization that it takes as its argument. Sentences in (5)–(6) show for a nominalization and a CP respectively that when *atārxāxā* (‘envy’) is used as a matrix verb, the embedded subject cannot take accusative marking.

- (4) *xūbūn badma-da atārxā-nā*
 boy Badma-DAT envy-PRS
 ‘The boy envies Badma.’
- (5) *xūbūn badm-in / *badm-ijā nom unšā-xā-da atārxā-nā*
 boy Badma-GEN Badma-ACC book read-POT-DAT envy-PRS
 ‘The boy envies Badma’s reading the book.’
- (6) *xūbūn badmā / *badm-ijā na:dānxē abā-xā gžžā atārxā-nā*
 boy Badma.NOM / Badma-ACC toy buy-POT COMP envy-PRS
 ‘The boy envies that Badma will buy a toy.’

¹ The study has been supported by Russian Science Foundation (grant №16-18-02081).

² All the data presented in this paper has been collected during fieldwork trips of Lomonosov Moscow State University to Baraghan village in 2014–2016.

³ In this paper I cite verbs in their dictionary form, which is potential tense (with suffix *-xā*).

Another difference concerns the availability of inanimate accusative subjects. According to [Skribnik, Darzhaeva 2016] inanimate embedded subjects in Standard Literary Buryat cannot take the accusative case:

- (7) **šulu-jə un-a gžə Han-a-bdi*
stone-ACC fall-PST1 COMP think-PST1-1PL

Expected: 'We thought that the stone fell' (adapted from [Skribnik, Darzhaeva 2016: 132]).

In Barguzin Buryat accusative marking on embedded subjects is possible, as (8)–(9) illustrate.

- (8) *bi 3nə mod-ijə urge-hən-ijə xar-a-b*
1SG.NOM this apple.tree-ACC grow-PFCT-ACC see-PST1-1SG

'I saw how this apple tree grew.'

- (9) *sajənə 3nə xan-ijə badm-ar šərdə-gdə-hən gžə məda-nə*
Sajana.NOM this wall-ACC Badma-INSTR paint-PASS-PFCT COMP know-PRS

'Sajana knows that this wall has been painted by Badma.'

The fact that in Barguzin Buryat, unlike in Standard Literary Buryat [Skribnik, Darzhaeva 2016] and Mongolian [Heusinger et al. 2011], the availability of the accusative case on the embedded subject depends on the structural configuration (namely, on the transitivity of the matrix verb) rather than on semantic properties of the subject allows us to ask new interesting questions about the relation between ECM constructions (1) and constructions with passivized matrix predicates and promoted embedded subjects as in (2). Henceforth we will limit our discussion to the data from Barguzin Buryat, leaving the comparison between it and the literary language for the future research.

Constructions with Exceptional Case Marking have received a lot of attention in the theoretical literature ([Postal 1974; Kuno 1976; Kornfilt 1977; Hoji 1991; Tanaka 1992; Zidani-Eroğlu 1997; Bruening 2001; Kawai 2006; Serdobolskaya 2006; Yoon 2007; Şener 2008; Baker, Vinokurova 2010; Takeuchi 2010], among others). One of the standard analyses of ECM constructions, first proposed by [Postal 1974] for English, is the raising analysis ([Postal 1974; Kuno 1976; Tanaka 1992; Kawai 2006; Yoon 2007], among others), which assumes that an embedded subject raises in the constructions under consideration into the matrix clause where it receives accusative case from the matrix verb. One of the arguments for the raising analysis of ECM has been the ability of accusative subjects of embedded predicates to be promoted to the matrix subject position in cases where the matrix verb undergoes passivization. In languages like English this property is restricted to non-finite clauses: unlike subjects of infinitives ((10)–(11)), subjects of finite CPs cannot be promoted to the matrix subject position when the matrix predicate is passivized ((12)–(13)).

- | | | |
|--|-------------------|--|
| (10) <i>Jack believed Joan to be famous.</i> | [Postal 1974: 40] | infinitive |
| (11) <i>Joan was believed to have been famous by Jack.</i> | [Postal 1974: 40] | infinitive + V_{matrix} .PASS |
| (12) <i>Jack believed (that) Joan was famous.</i> | [Postal 1974: 40] | CP |
| (13) <i>*Joan was believed (that) was famous by Jack.</i> | [Postal 1974: 40] | CP + V_{matrix} .PASS |

Barguzin Buryat represents an interesting case of a language that allows not only promotion of subjects of embedded non-finite clauses (which in Barguzin Buryat are clausal nominalizations, (14)–(15)), but also promotion of subjects of finite CPs into the matrix subject position (15)–(16):

- (14) *badmə namejə tərgə 3bdəl-h-ijə-mni məd-3*
Badma.NOM 1SG.ACC cart break-PFCT-ACC-1SG know-PST1
'Badma found out that I broke the cart.'
bi badm-ar tərgə 3bdəl-hən-3 mədə-gd-3-b
1SG.NOM Badma-INSTR cart break-PFCT-REFL know-PASS-PST1-1SG
Lit.: 'I was found out by Badma to have broken a cart.'

- (15) *badmə namejə sajən-ijə zürə-xə gžə xəl-3*
Badma 1SG.ACC Sajana-ACC draw-POT COMP say-PST1
'Badma said that I will draw Sajana.'

- (16) *bi badm-ar sajən-ijə zürə-xə-(b) gžə xəl-gd-3-b*
1SG.NOM Badma-INSTR Sajana-ACC draw-POT-(1SG) COMP say-PASS-PST1-1SG
Lit.: 'I was said by Badma that (I) will draw Sajana.'

In this paper I am going to address the question of how structures like (16), which are impossible in many languages (for example, in English (13)), are related to sentences like (15). There are several possible deriva-

tions that a sentence like (16) could have. First, this structure could be the result of the long-distance passivization. Under this view accusative subjects would be claimed to have undergone promotion to the matrix subject position without prior raising into the matrix clause. Second, this structure could have a derivation that involves raising of an accusative subject into the direct object position of the matrix predicate followed by the further movement into the subject position. Another possible hypothesis would be that the structure in (16) is not derivationally connected to the sentence in (15) and represents a distinct structure involving control. This hypothesis assumes that the matrix subject of (16) has never been a subject of the embedded clause throughout the derivation. The fact that we understand the subjects of the two clauses to be identical then would have to be due to the existence of a null pronoun in the embedded clause that is coreferent to the matrix subject.

Another puzzle that arises with sentences like (16) is the optionality of agreement on the embedded predicate. A natural question is: do the sentences with and without agreement, as in (16), represent one syntactic derivation or to two distinct syntactic derivations?

This paper is structured as follows. In section 2 I am going to discuss long-distance passivization in Barguzin Buryat and show that the predicates that can take ECM complements disallow long-distance passivization (unlike some other predicates that involve restructuring). In section 3 I will provide independent evidence that accusative subjects in Barguzin Buryat are able to raise into the matrix clause. In section 4 I will suggest that the presence of agreement on the embedded predicate is a crucial diagnostic that can distinguish between the raising structure and the control structure, both of which exist in Barguzin Buryat. In section 5 another puzzle involving passivization of matrix predicates that take nominalizations with accusative subjects is presented. Section 6 summarizes the obtained results and discusses their consequences for analyses of ECM structures.

2. Long-distance passivization and restructuring in Barguzin Buryat

In this section I discuss the availability of long-distance passivization in Barguzin Buryat. Long-distance passivization is a process of valency alternation that involves demotion of a matrix subject and promotion of an argument of an embedded clause into the matrix subject position. Note that if the predicates that can take finite CPs with accusative subjects as their complements allowed long-distance movement of some material into argument positions of matrix clauses, then the obligatory raising of accusative subjects into a position higher than the position in which they are generated would not be necessary. However, I would like to argue that although Barguzin Buryat has some predicates that allow long-distance passivization, all of them are restructuring predicates and cannot take ECM complements.

The class of matrix predicates that allow long-distance passivization in Barguzin Buryat is restricted to the following verbs: *ɜxilxə* ‘begin’, *dü:rgəxə* ‘finish’, *turšəxə* ‘try’, *ürdixə* ‘manage’, *šadəxə* ‘can’. All these verbs take a converb as their complement. The direct object of this converb can be promoted to the matrix subject position, as illustrated in (17)–(18) for the verb *ɜxilxə* ‘begin’ and in (19)–(20) for the verb *turšəxə* ‘try’.

- (17) *badmə namejə zurə-žə ɜxil-3*
Badma.NOM 1SG.ACC draw-CONV begin-PST1
‘Badma began to draw me.’
- (18) *bi badm-ar zurə-žə ɜxilə-gd-3-b*
1SG.NOM Badma-INSTR draw-CONV begin-PASS-PST1-1SG
‘Badma began to draw me.’ (lit. ‘I was begun to draw by Badma.’)
- (19) *badmə namejə zurə-žə turš-a*
Badma.NOM 1SG.ACC draw-CONV try-PST1
‘Badma tried to draw me.’
- (20) *bi badm-ar zurə-žə turšə-gd-a-b*
1SG.NOM Badma-INSTR draw-CONV try-PASS-PST1-1SG
‘Badma tried to draw me.’ (lit. ‘I was tried to draw by Badma.’)

A substantial property of these verbs is illustrated in (21): an external argument of ‘manage’ is identical to the external argument of ‘tell’. An attempt to project a subject for each of the verbs, (22), leads to ungrammaticality.

- (21) *bagšə honin ju:mə xö:rə-žə ürd-jə*
teacher interesting thing tell-CONV manage-PST1
‘The teacher managed to tell an interesting story.’

- (22) **bagšə badm-in / badm-ijə / badma honin ju:mə xö:rə-žə ürd-jə*
 teacher Badma-GEN / Badma-ACC / Badma.NOM interesting thing tell-CONV manage-PST1
 Expected: ‘Teacher managed to do so that Badma told an interesting story.’ (for example, the teacher asked Badma to speak)

Verbs of this class cannot take CP clauses as their complements regardless of the agreement on the embedded verb:

- (23) **bagšə honin tü:xə xö:rə-bə-(b)⁴ gəžə ürd-jə*
 teacher interesting thing tell-PST2-(1SG) COMP manage-PST1
 Expected: ‘The teacher managed to tell an interesting story.’

The observed facts suggest that the verbs that allow long-distance passivization (*axilxə* ‘begin’, *dü:rgəxə* ‘finish’, *turšəxə* ‘try’, *ürdixə* ‘manage’, *šadəxə* ‘can’) exhibit clause union formation or voice restructuring ([Wurmbrand 2015; Wurmbrand 2016]): the matrix and the embedded verbs form a single predicate (either by the complex head formation ([Saito, Hoshi 1998; Williams 2003] among others) or by VP complementation [Wurmbrand 2001]) and share most of the functional verbal projections of the clausal make-up. Voice restructuring offers a simple explanation for the ability of promotion of direct objects into the matrix subject position: if direct objects are not objects of the embedded converbs, but are arguments of a single complex predicate, there is nothing surprising in their ability to become matrix subjects. The ungrammaticality of overt embedded subjects in sentences like (22) is also predicted under such approach: if there is only one functional verbal projection that introduces an external argument in this clause (VoiceP or its equivalent), it is expected that the insertion of a second external subject would lead to ungrammaticality.

In contrast to the voice restructuring verbs, verbs that take CP clauses do not allow long-distance passivization. Direct objects of embedded CP clauses cannot be promoted to the matrix subject position when the passivization of a matrix predicate takes place:

- (24) *sajənə badmə namejə xar-a gəžə məd-ə*
 Sajana Badma.NOM 1SG.ACC see-PST1 COMP know-PST1
 ‘Sajana found out that Badma had seen me’
- (25) **bi sajən-ar badmə xar-a gəžə mədə-gd-ə-b*
 1SG.NOM Sajana-INSTR Badma see-PST1 COMP know-PASS-PST1-1SG
 Expected: ‘Sajana found out that Badma had seen me’ (lit.: ‘I was known by Sajana that Badma had seen (me)’)

Note that case marking of the subject of an embedded predicate does not play a role in the availability of long-distance passivization: irrespective of whether the subject of CP is marked nominative or accusative, direct objects cannot undergo long-distance movement (26—27).

- (26) *badmə sajənə / sajən-ijə namejə zurə-xə gəžə xəl-ə*
 Badma Sajana.NOM / Sajana-ACC 1SG.ACC draw-POT COMP say-PST1
 ‘Badma said that Sajana would draw me’
- (27) **bi badm-ar sajənə / sajən-ijə zurə-xə gəžə xələ-gd-ə-b*
 1SG.NOM Badma-INSTR Sajana.NOM / Sajana-ACC draw-POT COMP say-PASS-PST1-1SG
 Expected: ‘Badma said that Sajana would draw me’ (lit.: ‘I was said by Badma that Sajana would draw (me)’).

Whether the subject of an embedded clause is overt or null also has no effect on the availability of long-distance passivization: the direct object of a CP cannot be promoted to the matrix subject position even if the subject of this CP is null (28—29).

- (28) *badmə namejə zurə-xə-b gəžə xələ-ə*
 Badma 1SG.ACC draw-POT-1SG COMP say-PST1
 ‘Badma_i said that he_i would draw me.’
- (29) **bi badm-ar zurə-xə-(b) gəžə xələ-gd-ə-b*
 1SG.NOM Badma-INSTR draw-POT-(1SG) COMP say-PASS-PST1-1SG
 Expected: ‘Badma_i said that he_i would draw me’ (lit.: ‘I was said by Badma_i that (he_i) would draw (me)’).

⁴ The agreement on embedded verbs in Barguzin Buryat will be discussed below.

To sum up, matrix predicates that take CP clauses as their complements cannot exhibit long-distance passivization. Although Barguzin Buryat has a small class of verbs that seem to show long-distance passivization, all these verbs undergo voice restructuring and form a single predicate with the embedded verb. In other words, what looks like a long-distance passivization is actually just a case of garden-variety passivization. Matrix predicates that take CP clauses do not undergo voice restructuring, hence the direct objects of these CPs cannot be promoted to the matrix subject position. Since long-distance passivization is generally unavailable in Barguzin Buryat, we can infer that sentences like (16) are not derived through this process: it cannot be the case that accusative subjects are promoted to the matrix subject position directly from the embedded clause.

3. ECM-clauses in Barguzin Buryat and the possibility of raising

In this section I show that accusative subjects in Barguzin Buryat are able to move into the matrix clause. Thus, the precondition for the analysis that assumes that sentences like (16) involve raising of accusative subjects prior to the promotion into the matrix subject position is satisfied.

Accusative subjects in Barguzin Buryat CP clauses alternate with nominative subjects (30)—(31):

- (30) *bi sajəna du: du:lə-žə bε:-ga g3žə du:l-a-b*
 1SG.NOM **Sajana.NOM** song sing-CONV be-PST1 COMP hear-PST1-1SG
 ‘I heard that Sajana sang a song.’
- (31) *bi sajən-ijə du: du:lə-žə bε:-ga g3žə du:l-a-b*
 1SG.NOM **Sajana-ACC** song sing-CONV be-PST1 COMP hear-PST1-1SG
 ‘I heard that Sajana sang a song.’

There are several facts that point to the conclusion that only accusative subjects, and not nominative ones, can raise into the matrix clause. One piece of evidence comes from possessive anaphor binding. The possessive anaphor *ō:ringō*, which has to be bound in the same clause that contains it (32), cannot modify nominative subjects of embedded CP clauses due to the absence of a potential binder inside the embedded clause (33)—(34):

- (32) *badma sajəna / sajən-ijə ō:r-in-gö nom unš-a g3žə m3d-3*
 Badma Sajana.NOM / Sajana-ACC self-GEN-REFL book read-PST1 COMP know-PST1
 a. ‘Badma found out that Sajana_i read her_i book.’
 b. *‘Badma_i found out that Sajana read his_i book.’
- (33) **badmə ōr-in-gö hamgən zurəg zur-a g3žə m3d-3*
 Badma self-GEN-REFL wife.NOM picture paint-PST1 COMP know-PST1
 Expected: ‘Badma_i found out that his_i wife painted the picture.’
- (34) **badmə ōrin-gö hamgən nom unš-a g3žə xar-a*
 Badma self-GEN-REFL wife.NOM book read-PST1 COMP see-PST1
 Expected: ‘Badma_i saw that his_i wife was reading a book.’

If the anaphor occurs within an accusative subject DP, that does not lead to ungrammaticality: the anaphor is able to get bound by the matrix subject (35)—(36).

- (35) *badmə ōr-in-gö hamg-ijə zurəg zur-a g3žə m3d-3*
 Badma self-GEN-REFL wife-ACC picture paint-PST1 COMP know-PST1
 ‘Badma_i found out that his_i wife painted the picture.’
- (36) *badma ōrin-gö hamg-ijə nom unš-a g3žə xar-a*
 Badma self-GEN-REFL wife-ACC book read-PST1 COMP see-PST1
 ‘Badma_i saw that his_i wife was reading a book.’

These binding facts can be explained if accusative subjects raise into the matrix clause. After the raising the local domain where the possessive anaphor must be bound becomes a matrix Tense Phrase (henceforth, TP), where the anaphor can be bound by the matrix subject.

Further evidence for the ability of accusative subjects to undergo raising comes from scrambling. While accusative subjects can be scrambled to the left periphery of the matrix clause, nominative subjects cannot. Sentences in (37)—(40) show that accusative subjects of CPs can scramble into the matrix clause, while nominative subjects cannot.

- (37) *sajəna badm-ijə tɜrgə ʒmdəl-ʒ gʒʒə mʒdə-nə*
 Sajana **Badma-ACC** cart break-PST1 COMP know-PRS
 ‘Sajana knows that Badma broke a cart.’
- (38) *badm-ijə_i sajəna t_i tɜrgə ʒmdəl-ʒ gʒʒə mʒdə-nə*
Badma-ACC Sajana cart break-PST1 COMP know-PRS
 ‘Sajana knows that Badma broke a cart.’
- (39) *sajəna badmə tɜrgə ʒmdəl-ʒ gʒʒə mʒdə-nə*
 Sajana **Badma.NOM** cart break-PST1 COMP know-PRS
 ‘Sajana knows that Badma broke a cart.’
- (40) **badmə_i sajəna t_i tɜrgə ʒmdəl-ʒ gʒʒə mʒdə-nə*
Badma.NOM Sajana cart break-PST1 COMP know-PRS
 Expected: ‘Sajana knows that Badma broke a cart.’

Other arguments for the raising of accusative subjects involve adverb placement and NPI licensing (see [Bondarenko 2016] for discussion). Note that the observed facts on their own do not necessarily argue for the obligatory raising analysis (proposed in [Postal 1974; Kuno 1976; Tanaka 1992; Kawai 2006; Yoon 2007] among others), but they do show that accusative subjects can become part of the matrix clause and participate in clause-mate relations with matrix elements. This suggests that the precondition for the raising analysis of (16) is satisfied: since accusative subjects can generally raise into the matrix clause, it is plausible that in (16) the former subject of the embedded clause underwent raising and became the direct object of the matrix clause, gaining the ability to undergo further promotion.

4. Passivization of matrix predicates that take ECM-clauses

In the previous sections I have shown that Barguzin Buryat has no genuine long-distance passivization and that accusative subjects are in principle able to raise into the matrix. This leaves two possible structures for sentences like (16), repeated here as (41): a structure involving raising (42) or a structure involving control (43). In what follows I am going to argue that both structures are present in Barguzin Buryat and that they can be distinguished by the presence / absence of agreement on the embedded predicate.

- (41) *bi badm-ar sajən-ijə zurə-xə-(b) gʒʒə xʒlə-gd-ʒ-b*
1SG.NOM Badma-INSTR Sajana-ACC draw-POT-(1SG) COMP say-PASS-PST1-1SG
 Lit.: ‘I was said by Badma that (I) will draw Sajana.’
- (42) The raising analysis of (41) (= 16):
Sub_i.NOM SubINSTR **Sub_i.ACC**-[CP **Sub_i.ACC** DO V_e COMP] V_m-PASS
- (43) The control analysis of (41) (= 16):
Sub_i.NOM SubINSTR [CP **PRO_i** DO V_e COMP] V_m-PASS

First person agreement on predicates of embedded CPs appears due to the process of indexical shifting and signals that the subject of a CP is coreferent with the matrix subject [Podobryaev, ms]:

- (44) *sajəna (bi) tɜrgə ʒmdəl-ʒ-b gʒʒə mʒd-ʒ*
 Sajana.NOM (**1SG.NOM**) cart break-PST1-1SG COMP know-PST1
 *‘Sajana knows that I (= the speaker) broke the cart.’
 OK ‘Sajana_i found out that she_i broke the cart.’

Crucially, accusative subjects do not undergo indexical shifting and cannot agree with the embedded predicate:

- (45) *sajəna namejə tɜrgə ʒmdəl-ʒ-(*b) gʒʒə mʒd-ʒ*
 Sajana.NOM **1SG.ACC** cart break-PST1-(1SG) COMP know-PST1
 OK ‘Sajana knows that I (= the speaker) broke the cart.’
 *‘Sajana_i found out that she_i broke the cart.’

Following previous research on indexical shifting ([Anand, Nevins 2004; Sudo 2012; Podobryaev 2014; Shklovsky, Sudo 2014] among others), I assume that there is a monster operator in CPs, denoted as “ ω ”, that shifts the interpretation of indexicals in its c-commanding domain. Accusative subjects obligatorily move to the left periphery of their embedded clause to a position above the operator (see [Bondarenko 2016]) for an exten-

sive discussion of the nature of this movement), and thus, cannot receive a shifted interpretation (46). Having moved higher than the tensed verb (presumably, higher than the TP), they do not exhibit agreement with the embedded predicate. Nominative subjects, on the other hand, do not undergo movement to the left periphery and remain in the c-commanding domain of the monster operator (47). Hence, they receive shifted interpretation and show obligatory agreement with the embedded verb.

(46) Sub_m [CP SubACC [...  ... [SubACC DO_e V_e]]] V_m

(47) Sub_m [CP [...  ... [SubNOM DO_e V_e]]] V_m

Taking into the consideration the agreement phenomena discussed above, we can now see how the two analyses of (41) can be set apart. Under the raising analysis of (41) we would expect the embedded predicate not to show agreement with the subject: if the surface matrix subject has moved to its position from the embedded clause where it had been an accusative subject, then it should not show agreement with the embedded verb, just like all accusative subjects do not agree with their embedded verbs (45). Under the control analysis of (41) we would expect the embedded predicate to show agreement: if the embedded clause contains a PRO subject in its normal subject position (presumably, in the specifier of TP) that is bound by the matrix subject, it should trigger agreement with the embedded verb just like nominative subjects that are coreferent to matrix subjects do. In other words, the presence of agreement on embedded predicates in sentences like (41) indicates that the derivation involving control (43) is at hand, while the absence of agreement shows that the derivation included raising of an accusative subject into the matrix clause followed by its further promotion (42).

Additional support for this suggestion comes from idiomatic expressions. Accusative subjects of CPs (just like nominative ones) can constitute idiomatic expressions with embedded predicates. In (48) a sentence with an idiomatic expression ‘one’s heart goes out of his mouth’ (‘be greatly frightened’) is presented. The example in (49) shows that both nominative and accusative subjects allow the idiomatic interpretation with the embedded predicate.

(48) *badm-in zürxən am-ar-a garə-nə*
Badma-GEN heart.NOM mouth-INSTR-REFL go.out-PRS
‘Badma gets greatly frightened.’ (lit.: ‘Badma’s heart goes out of his mouth.’)

(49) *sajənə badm-in zürxən / zürx-ijə am-ar-a gar-a gəžə xar-a*
Sajana Badma-GEN heart-NOM / heart-ACC mouth-INSTR-REFL go.out-PST1 COMP see-PST1
1) Literal: ^{OK} ‘Sajana saw, that Badma’s heart went out of the mouth.’
2) Idiomatic: ^{OK} ‘Sajana saw that Badma got greatly frightened.’

The availability of the idiomatic interpretation in (49) suggests that accusative subjects of CPs originate in embedded clauses. The same diagnostic can help us determine whether subjects of structures like (41) originate in embedded clauses (as accusative subjects) or are base-generated in matrix clauses. The sentences in (50)–(51) provide the relevant contrast between the presence and the absence of agreement on the embedded predicate:

(50) *badm-in zürxən sajən-ar am-ar-a gar-a gəžə mədə-gd-ə*
Badma-GEN heart.NOM Sajana-INSTR mouth-INSTR-REFL go.out-PST1 COMP know-PASS-PST1
Idiomatic: ‘Sajana saw that Badma got greatly frightened.’ (lit. ‘Badma’s heart was known by Sajana that (it) went out of his mouth.’)

(51) **badm-in zürxən sajən-ar am-ar-a gar-a-b gəžə mədə-gd-ə*
Badma-GEN heart.NOM Sajana-INSTR mouth-INSTR-REFL go.out-PST1-1SG COMP know-PASS-PST1
Expected idiomatic interpretation: ‘Sajana saw that Badma got greatly frightened.’ (lit. ‘Badma’s heart was known by Sajana that (it) went out of his mouth.’)

We see that the presence of agreement in (51) leads to ungrammaticality: in a control structure the surface subject is base-generated and cannot form an idiom with an embedded verb, in contrast to the raising structure, where the idiomatic interpretation is possible (50). This corroborates our hypothesis: when the matrix subject of a passivized verb is generated inside the embedded clause and goes through a stage in the derivation when it is an accusative subject, there is no agreement on the embedded verb. When, however, the agreement is present, the matrix subject is base-generated, and the embedded CP involves a controlled null subject.

5. Passivization of matrix predicates that take nominalizations

Another interesting question concerns passivization of matrix predicates that take nominalizations as their complements ((52)–(53)): do the resulting sentences involve control or raising? We can see that accusative subjects of nominalizations can trigger nominal possessive agreement with the embedded predicate:

- (52) *badmə namejə sajən-ijə zurə-x-ijə-mni* / **zurə-x-a* *x3lə-3*
 Badma 1SG.ACC Sajana-ACC draw-POT-ACC-1SG / draw-POT-REFL say-PST1
 ‘Badma said that I would draw Sajana.’
- (53) *bi badm-ar sajən-ijə zurə-x-ijə-mni* / *zurə-x-a* *x3lə-gd-3-b*
 1SG.NOM Badma-INSTR Sajana-ACC draw-POT-ACC-1SG / draw-POT-REFL say-PASS-PST1-1SG
 ‘Badma said that I would draw Sajana.’ (lit.: ‘I was said by Badma that (I) will draw Sajana.’)

When the matrix verb is passivized, as in (53), the availability of possessive agreement on nominalization is retained. But in this configuration nominalizations can also show up with the reflexive marking which usually marks coreference between matrix and embedded subjects. The question then is as follows do possessive marking vs. reflexive marking on the nominalization in (53) correspond to different syntactic structures, one involving raising and the other — control? I leave this issue for the further research.

6. Conclusions

In this paper I have discussed sentences involving passivization of matrix predicates that can take ECM-clauses (16 = 41). I have argued that such sentences cannot result from long-distance passivization, since all the apparent instances of long-distance passivization are in fact instances of voice restructuring (a process by which certain matrix verbs select a reduced embedded clause with a deficient functional domain); and verbs that take ECM-clauses never form a single clause with an embedded verb. I have also shown that accusative subjects in Barguzin Buryat are able to undergo raising into the matrix clause (based on the evidence from scrambling and possessive anaphor binding), and the precondition for the raising analysis of (16)=(41) is thus satisfied. Furthermore, I have argued that both raising and control structures are possible for (16)=(41) and that they can be distinguished by the presence of agreement on the embedded verb: the presence of agreement indicates the control structure, while its absence points to the derivation involving raising. Thus, agreement on embedded predicates can serve as a diagnostic distinguishing between raising and control environments in languages that have indexical shifting.

There are several other issues that require further investigation with respect to the passivization of matrix verbs that take ECM-clauses. One question that arises concerns the existence of improper movement [Fukui 1993]. It is not obvious how accusative subjects can become subjects of passivized matrix verbs if their movement into the matrix clause is an instance of scrambling (as argued for Barguzin Buryat in [Bondarenko 2016]), which is A'-movement in Barguzin Buryat. The passivization (A-movement) cannot follow scrambling (A'-movement) because of the ban on improper movement [Fukui 1993]. A possible solution to this problem might be to assume that a single position can simultaneously have both A- and A'-properties [Wurmbrand 2016]. This was in fact claimed for Dinka: in [Urk 2015] it is argued that A- and A'-properties are derived not from syntactic positions, but from the properties of the head's features.

My analysis of Barguzin Buryat sentences like (16)=(41) suggests that both raising from finite CPs and control into finite CPs are among possible syntactic structures that human languages are in principle able to derive. The fact that languages like English do not allow such structures and show raising and control phenomena only in sentences with non-finite clauses poses an interesting challenge to the typology of raising and control environments: why do some languages but not others allow finite raising and finite control? What properties does a language need to have in order to have such structures? I leave these questions open for now.

Abbreviations

☹ — monster operator	INSTR — instrumental	PST2 — past tense 2
1, 2 — first, second person	m — matrix	Q — question particle
ACC — accusative	NOM — nominative	REFL — reflexive
COMP — complementizer	PASS — passive	self — reflexive pronoun
CONV — converb	PFCT — perfect	SG — singular
CP — complementizer phrase	PL — plural	Sub — subject
DAT — dative	POT — potential	t — trace
DO — direct object	PRO — null obligatory control pronoun	TP — tense phrase
e — embedded	PRS — present tense	V — verb
ECM — exceptional case marking	PST1 — past tense 1	VoiceP — Voice Phrase
GEN — genitive		

References

- Anand, Nevins 2004 — *Anand P., Nevins A.* Shifty operators in changing contexts // *Proceedings from Semantics and Linguistic Theory XIV* / Ed. *R. Young*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University, CLC Publications. 2004. P. 20—37.
- Baker, Vinokurova 2010 — *Baker M., Vinokurova N.* Two modalities of case assignment: Case in Sakha // *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*. Vol. 28. 2010. P. 593—642.
- Bondarenko 2016 — *Bondarenko T.* ECM in Buryat and the optionality of movement // To appear in *Proceedings from the 12th Workshop on Altaic Formal Linguistics (WAFL 12)*, CCSU, New Britain, CT. 2016.
- Bruening 2001 — *Bruening B.* Raising to Object and Proper Movement. unpublished ms., University of Delaware. 2001.
- Fukui 1993 — *Fukui N.* A note on improper movement // *The Linguistic Review*. Vol. 10. 1993. P. 111—126.
- Heusinger et al. 2011 — *Heusinger K. von, Klein U., Guntsetseg D.* The case of accusative embedded subjects in Mongolian // *Lingua*. Vol. 1 (121). 2011.
- Hoji 1991 — *Hoji H.* Raising-to-object, ECM, and the major object in Japanese. Paper presented at the Japanese Syntax Workshop. University of Rochester. 1991.
- Kawai 2006 — *Kawai M.* Raising to object in Japanese: A small clause analysis // *Linguistic Inquiry*. Vol. 37. 2006. P. 329—339.
- Knyazev 2009 — *Knyazev M.* Participial sentential complements in Kalmyk // *Issledovaniya po grammatike kalmyskogo yazyka* [Studies of the Kalmyk grammar]. Ed. *N. N. Kazansky*. Acta Linguistica Petropolitana. Transactions of the Institute for Linguistic Studies. St. Petersburg: Nauka. Vol. 5. Part 2. 2009. P.525—581.
- Kornfilt 1977 — *Kornfilt J.* A note on subject raising. // *Linguistic Inquiry*. Vol. 8. 1977. P. 736—742.
- Kuno 1976 — *Kuno S.* Subject Raising. // *Syntax and Semantics: Japanese Generative Grammar* / Ed. *M. Shibatani*. Academic Press. 1976. P. 17—41.
- Matić, Pakendorf 2013 — *Matić D., Pakendorf B.* Non-canonical SAY in Siberia: Areal and Genealogical Patterns // *Studies in Language*. 2013. Vol. 37 (2). P. 356—412.
- Podobryaev 2014 — *Podobryaev A.* Persons, Imposters, and Monsters // Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, MA. 2014.
- Podobryaev, ms. — *Podobryaev A.* Indexical Shifting in Buryat, manuscript.
- Postal 1974 — *Postal P. M.* On raising: One rule of English grammar and its theoretical implications // MIT, Cambridge, MA. 1974.
- Saito, Hoshi 1998 — *Saito M., Hoshi H.* Control in complex predicates // Report of the special research project for the typological investigation of languages and cultures of the East and West, 15—46: University of Tsukuba. 1998.
- Şener 2008 — *Şener S.* Non-canonical Case Licensing is Canonical: Accusative subjects of CPs in Turkish. Unpublished ms., University of Connecticut. 2008.
- Serdobolskaya 2006 — *Serdobolskaya N.* Accusative Subjects in Tuvian nominalizations: against Subject-to-Object Raising analysis. // Paper presented at the 3rd Workshop on Altaic Formal Linguistics, Moscow State University. 2006.
- Shklovsky, Sudo 2014 — *Shklovsky K., Sudo Y.* The syntax of monsters // *Linguistic Inquiry*. Vol. 45 (3). 2014. P. 381—402.
- Skribnik, Darzhaeva 2016 — *Skribnik E. K., Darzhaeva N. B.* Grammar of the Buryat language. Syntax of the compound (polypredicative) sentence. Ulan-Ude: Publishing House of BSC SB RAS. Vol. 1. 2016.
- Sudo 2012 — *Sudo Y.* On the semantics of phi features on pronouns // MIT, Cambridge, MA. 2012.
- Takeuchi 2010 — *Takeuchi H.* Exceptional case marking in Japanese and optional feature transmission // *Nanzan Linguistics*. 2010. Vol. 6. P. 101—128.
- Tanaka 1992 — *Tanaka H.* Raising-to-object in English, French and Japanese // *English Linguistics*. Vol. 9. 1992. P. 39—60.
- Ulanova 1980 — *Ulanova A.* K probleme funkciy glagola gex v sovremennom mongolskom yazyke [On the problem of functions of the verb ‘gex’ in Modern Mongolian] // *Analiticheskije sredstva svyazi v polipredikativnykh konstrukciyax*. Siberian branch of AS USSR, Institute of history, philology and philosophy. Novosibirsk, 1980. P. 91—102.
- Urk 2015 — *van Urk C.* A uniform syntax for phrasal movement: A Dinka Bor case study // MIT Dissertation on the syntax of phrasal movement and Dinka. 2015.
- Williams 2003 — *Williams E.* Representation theory. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. 2003.
- Wurmbrand 2001 — *Wurmbrand S.* Infinitives: Restructuring and clause structure. Mouton de Gruyter. 2001.
- Wurmbrand 2015 — *Wurmbrand S.* Complex predicate formation via voice incorporation // *Approaches to complex predicates* / Ed. *Léa Nash, Pollet Samvelian*. Leiden: Brill. 2015. P. 248—290.
- Wurmbrand 2016 — *Wurmbrand S.* Restructuring as the Regulator of Clause Size. Talk given at the Workshop on Shrinking Trees, Universität Leipzig Institut für Linguistik, Leipzig, Germany. 2016.

Yoon 2007 — *Yoon J. H.* Raising of major arguments in Korean (and Japanese) // *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*. Vol. 25, Issue 3. 2007. P. 615—653.

Zidani-Eroğlu 1997 — *Zidani-Eroğlu L.* Exceptionally case-marked NPs as matrix objects. // *Linguistic Inquiry*. Vol. 28, 1997. P. 219—230.

SUMMARY

This paper discusses sentences involving passivization of matrix predicates that take finite CPs with accusative subjects in Buryat. It examines several potential derivations of such sentences, including long-distance passivization, raising and control structures. I argue that long-distance movement in Buryat is limited to restructuring verbs that do not take ECM-clauses. Therefore, the long-distance passivization analysis is excluded for the predicates under consideration. Two other potential derivations — the raising structure and the control structure are both attested in Buryat and can be distinguished by different agreement patterns on embedded verbs.

РЕЗЮМЕ

В данной статье рассматривается феномен пассивизации матричных глаголов, которые присоединяют финитные клаузы с аккузативными подлежащими, в бурятском языке. Рассматриваются несколько потенциально возможных дериваций таких предложений: длиннодистантная пассивизация, структуры с подъёмом и с контролем. В статье утверждается, что длиннодистантное передвижение в бурятском языке встречается только с такими матричными глаголами, которые образуют сложный предикат со своим комплементом и не могут присоединять клаузы с аккузативными подлежащими. Таким образом, анализ с длиннодистантной пассивизацией для рассматриваемых глаголов оказывается невозможным. Две другие потенциально возможные деривации — деривация с подъёмом и деривация с контролем — обе существуют в бурятском языке и могут быть идентифицированы с помощью наличия согласования между подлежащим и предикатом зависимой клаузы.

Ключевые слова: пассивизация матричных предикатов, бурятский язык, аккузативные подлежащие, подъём, контроль

Keywords: matrix passivization, ECM, Buryat, accusative subjects, raising, control

Татьяна Игоревна Бондаренко, Московский государственный университет им. М. В. Ломоносова; t.i.bond@yandex.ru
Tatiana I. Bondarenko, Lomonosov Moscow State University; t.i.bond@yandex.ru