Sentential and VP-nominalizations: syntax and semantics

1. Intro: nominalizations in Finno-Ugric and Turkic languages

Most of the Finno-Ugric and Turkic languages possess two types of nominalized constructions: the sentential type (all the arguments retain the same morphological marking as in the corresponding independent clause) (1) and VP-nominalizations (2) (the subject is marked with genitive/possessive, while all the other arguments retain the same marking as in a corresponding independent clause: the POSS-ACC type, see Koptjevskaja-Tamm 1993).

MARI (EASTERN)

(1) ača-m-əŋ tide pört-əm čon-əm-əž-əm me pal-ena.
father-POSS.1SG-GEN this house-ACC build-NZR-POSS.3SG-ACC we know-PRS.1PL
We know that (my) father has built this house.

(2) majə lum lum-m-əm už-əm.
I snow(NOM) to.snow-NZR-ACC see-PRS.1SG
I see it snow.

KOMI (PECHORA)

(4) me təd-a [soš’ed-lən məsk-əs guš’al-əm] jiliš’.
I know-PRS1SG [neighbour-GEN cow-ACC steal-NZR] about
I know that the neighbour has stolen a/the cow.

(5) [pet’a s’il-əm] menim kažitč-ə.
Peter sing-NZR I.DAT like-PRS3SG
I like Peter’s singing.

TUVINIAN

(7) Čarlə-p tur-a Ajana-nəŋ øgla-vət-paan-ə...
part-CONV stay-CONV Ajana-GEN weep-ASP-NEG+NZR.PST-ACC
The fact that Ajana has not even wept by parting… (Shamina 1999: 72)

(8) le kor-been-in kəsəko-er.
mother(NOM) see-NEG+NZR.PST-ACC.3SG girl see-NZR.FUT
What the mother hasn’t seen, her daughter will see. (Isxakov, Pal’mbax 1961: 301)

There is also evidence that genitive can be assigned not only to modifiers of DPs. In both the languages in question, genitive is used in independent clauses to mark possessors by nominal predicates in possessive clauses:
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MARI

(10) matra kuva-n peš šuko omarta-že ulo.
Matrena grandmother-GEN very many hive-POSS.3SG COP
Grandmother Matrena has lots of hives.

KOMI-ZYRJAN

(11) e-z-ə jual-əj tenad pə kaga-id em?
NEG.PST-3-PL ask-PL you.GEN CIT child-POSS.2 COP
They did not ask: «Do you have children?»

TUVINIAN

(12) Inek-tiŋ bəazaa-zə bar.
cow-GEN calf-POSS.3 COP
The cow has a calf. (Kunaa 1970: 44)

The data discussed in the talk are collected during the fieldwork in the villages of Staryj Torjal (Eastern variant of Mari) and Erenej (Pechora dialect of Komi). Tuvinian and Uzbekh data were collected from the native speakers of Standard Tuvinian and reference grammars.

2. Background on nominalizations

Nominalizations are described as DPs with the complement VP or IP (Abney 1987), mixed categories

(1) John sings the Marseillaise. –

a. John’s singing the Marseillaise
b. John singing the Marseillaise (Abney 1987: 141-2)

? How do we decide upon the syntactic structure of nominalizations?

Most syntactitians base on the following criteria: case marking of the arguments of the nominalized verb, verbal agreement (if any), and word order in nominalizations (see e.g. Hoekstra 1986, Pires 2001, Bresnan 1997, Malouf 1997 e.a.):

Case marking, agreement, and word order in nominalizations are compared to:

→ case marking, agreement, and basic word order in a simple sentence,
→ case marking of the possessor, marking of the possessee, and the word order in an NP.

However, in the case of Finno-Ugric and Turkic languages, these criteria do not give any satisfying results. Both nominative and genitive cases can be assigned in DPs and in independent clauses.
That means that the pattern of case marking (and agreement) alone does not give any evidence to make a decision about the syntactic structure of GenS and NomS nominalizations in Mari and Tuvinian. Unmarked word order does not serve this purpose, either. Basic word order in the analyzed languages follows the SOV pattern, both in nominalizations and in independent clauses. In DP, modifiers precede the head. Hence, it is unclear, whether the subject in nominalizations follows the SOV pattern observed in independent sentences, or the head-final principle observed in DPs. Hence, 2 questions arise:

- do simple sentences and NPs have the same syntactic structure in such languages?
- if not, what criteria can be used to test the syntactic properties of nominalizations in those languages?
- what is the functional difference between the two constructions?

3. Syntax of Mari and Tuvinian nominalizations

[Hoekstra 1986], [Pires 2001] analyze the following criteria: allowance of passive, raising and dative shift in nominalizations. However, these transformations do not exist in Finno-Ugric and Turkic languages (as for passive, the construction at issue is different from the English one).

The following syntactic tests have been used in the existing works on nominalizations: possibility to express negation in nominalizations (Wasow, Roeper 1972), allowance of aspectual and valency-decreasing / increasing suffixes on the nominalized verb (Kishimoto 2005), linear position and marking of adjuncts, as adverbs or as adjectives (Abney 1987), allowance of light verbs (Chomsky 1970), depictives (Safir 1987), subordinate that-complements and infinitives (Grimshaw 1990) in a nominalized construction, and possibility of reflexive pronouns that refer to the subject of the nominalization (Giorgi, Longobardi 1991).

I also suggest to consider the following syntactic criteria:

- Scope of topical and focus particles in nominalizations;
- Allowance of converbs and adverbial clauses embedded in nominalizations;
- Allowance of nominalized nominal predicates;
- Allowance of floating quantifiers in nominalizations;
- Tests on constituency structure, restrictions on word order: whether they work differently in independent clause, nominalizations, and DPs.

(A) Subject properties (see Keenan 1976)

**KOMI-ZYRJAN**

- GENITIVE subject can be the antecedent of the reflexive pronoun:

(13) a. mením kažitč-ǝ nilis-lǝn as jılsı̈ viš’tal-øm-ı̈s.
   I.DAT like-PRS.3 girl-GEN1 REFL about tell-NZR-POSS.3
   I like the way the girl tells about herself.

- GENITIVE subject can control the subject of infinitives:

(13) b. mením kažitč-ǝ nilis-lǝn jakt-ǝnı̈ zavodı̈-øm-ı̈s.
   I.DAT like-PRS.3 girl-GEN1 dance-INF begin-NZR-POSS.3
   I like the way the girl begins to dance.

- GENITIVE subject can control the subject of gerunds:

(13) c. mením kažitč-ǝ nilis-lǝn ʃ’il-g-as jakt-øm-ı̈s.
   I.DAT like-PRS.3 girl-GEN1 sing-CONV-POSS.3 dance-NZR-POSS.3
   I like the way the girl sings and dances (lit. dances singing).

- NOMINATIVE subject can NOT be the antecedent of the reflexive pronoun:
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(14) a. me əx'ıl-i əlbač / lebač-liš’ asl-a-s poz
dorin pukal-əm.
in sit-NZR
I saw the bird sitting in its nest.

- NOMINATIVE subject can NOT control the subject of infinitives:
b. me əx'ıl-i əšin’ / əšin’-liš’ vošš’i-ni zavodit-č-əm.
I saw the window begin to open.
- NOMINATIVE subject can NOT control the subject of gerunds:
c. me əx'ıl-i əšin’ / əšin’-liš’ vošš’-ig-as žugal-əm.
I saw the window sweeping open and breaking.

TUVINIAN
- both GENITIVE and NOMINATIVE subject can control the subject of gerunds:

(15) [ajas / ajas-təŋ [kudum-čuže vn-geš] ool-du
ete-p kaap-kan-əŋ] men kör-dy-m.
beat-CONV AUX-NZR.PST-ACC я видеть-PST-1SG
I saw Ajas beat the boy when he (Ajas) went out of the house.

Mari, Komi-Zyrjan reflexives infinitives gerunds
(a) (b) (c)
Type 1 constructions + + +
Type 2 constructions - - -

Tuvinian
Type 1 constructions + + +
Type 2 constructions + + +

(B) ALLOWANCE OF EMBEDDED DEPENDENT CLAUSES IN NOMINALIZATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mari, Komi-Zyrjan type 2 constructions</th>
<th>Tuvinian type 2 constructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject’s case</td>
<td>Adverbial clauses</td>
<td>Relative clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>genitive</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nominative</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(C) ALLOWANCE OF NOUN PREDICATES, SECONDARY PREDICATES, OR LIGHT VERBS IN NOMINALIZATIONS
- light verbs:

(16) a. aca-m-əŋ tide pört-əm čoŋ-en pətar-m-əz-əm me pal-ena.
father-POSS.1SG-GEN this house-ACC build-CONV finish-NZR-POSS.3SG-ACC…
We know that our father had build this house.

b. * okna poč-əlt-əŋ pətar-m-əm už-əm.
window(NOM) open-DETR-CONV finish-NZR-ACC see-PST1.1SG
I saw the window open.
- nominal predicates:
Predicate nominals:

(17) a. jwam-ثن student ul-m-اذ-ام pal-em
Ivan.GEN student be-NZR-POSS.3SG-ACC know-PRS.1SG

b. * jwam student ul-m-اذ-ام pal-em.
Ivan student be-NZR-ACC know-PRS.1SG

I know that Ivan is a student.

Floating quantifiers:

(18) a. * údor जुसो tol-m-اذ-ام už-اذ-am.
girl drunk come-NZR-ACC see-PST2-1SG

b. údor- ثن jwam tol-m-اذ-ام už-اذ-am.
girl-GEN drunk come-NZR-POSS.3SG-ACC see-PST2-1SG

I saw the girl came home drunk.

Light verbs:

(21) seeŋ ak-اذ-نى / ak-اذ košelek
your brother-POSS2SG-GEN / brother-POSS2SG(NOM) wallet

I noticed that your brother has lost his wallet.

Nominal predicates:

(22) deer jgas bol-gan-اذ-dan...
sky(NOM) clear be-PART.PST-POSS.3-EL

(It was hot) because the sky was clear. (Sat 1980: 41)

(D) Restrictions on the word order in independent and nominalized clauses, and in DPs

- Linear position of NOMINATIVE in nominalizations vs. independent clauses and DPs:

(23) a. pet’a ści-l-اذ-ام børš’a...
Peter sing-NZR after / sing-NZR Peter after
After Peter’s singing...

b. pu kerka / *kerka pu
wood house / house wood

wooden house

c. झमसा drɔbit-i-s-nĩ e-z čel’ad, a soš’ed.
window-ACC.POSS.3 break-PST-3-PL NEG-3 children but neighbour

It weren’t the children who broke the window, but the neighbour.

- Linear position of adverbs
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MARI

(24) \{urem-ošte lum || lum ured-m-om už-am.\}
\text{street-ESS snow snow street-ESS to.snow-NZR-ACC see-PRS.1SG}
I saw it snow in the street.

\text{tomorrow you-GEN city-LAT go-NZR-POSS.2SG about forget-PST.2-1SG}
I forgot that you are going to the city tomorrow.

Cf. independent clauses:

(26) peče šengelne pij-vlak opt-a-t.
\text{fence beh td dog-PL bark-PRS-3PL}
The dogs are barking behind the fence.

(27) memnan jeva ţk ţap-ošte irga-m kočk-eš ale.
\text{we-GEN Eva one time-INESS serviceberry-ACC eat-PRS.3SG PST}
Our Eva (the dog) ate serviceberry once.

Interpretation: Mari and Komi-Zyrjan type 2 vs. Tuvinian type 2 constructions
Nominalizations with NOM subjects in Finno-Ugric and Tuvinian behave in a different way:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Subject properties (A)</th>
<th>Embedded clauses in nominalizations (B)</th>
<th>Noun predicates, light verbs etc. (C)</th>
<th>Restrictions on the word order (D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Komi-Zyrjan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>as in DPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mari</td>
<td>-(+)/</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>as in DPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuvinian</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>as in independ. clauses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(A) Nominative subjects in Mari and Komi-Zyrjan nominalizations do not show subject properties: it is not possible to put a reflexive pronoun, a converb, or an infinitive in a type 2 construction. On the contrary, all of these are possible in Tuvinian nominalizations. Moreover, on the contrary to the Tuvinian nominalizations, Mari and Komi-Zyrjan constructions do not allow (B) any dependent clauses embedded in the nominalization, (C) noun predicates, secondary predicates, or light verbs in the nominalization. (D) In Mari and Komi-Zyrjan, type 1 constructions are subject to the same restrictions on the word order as independent clauses, while type 2 constructions follow the restrictions on word order imposed in DPs.

I argue that the type 2 constructions in Mari and Komi-Zyrjan do not belong to the “sentential” type. As (A) shows, this type does not preserve the subject position. Moreover, (B)-(D) show that these constructions do not have the same syntactic structure as independent clauses. Hence, they do not preserve the clausal syntactic structure. On the contrary, Tuvinian nominalizations with nominative subject demonstrate the properties of an independent sentence.

Generalization of the syntactic properties of GenS and NomS nominalizations in minimalist terms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of construction</th>
<th>GenS</th>
<th>NomS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Tuvinian</td>
<td>Mari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agr O: accusative Dos</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: time adverbial clauses</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: modal verbs</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vP: light verbs</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vP: floating quantifiers</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vP: negation</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-/+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP: manner adverbs</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP: depictives</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP: infinitives</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hence, it can be concluded that Mari and Tuvinian nominalized constructions are to be analyzed in a different way. Namely, Tuvinian NomS constructions are nominalizations at IP-level. They can host all the categories that adjoin to lower projections. The GenS constructions, both in Tuvinian and in Mari, host the TP node, whereas the genitive case is assigned in the higher DP. The NomS nominalizations belong to the complex event type: first, they can take aspectual and valency increasing / decreasing suffixes, second, they do inherit the verb’s argument structure, since they take the DO and other arguments of the verb, and third, they take adverbials of time. They also can host manner adverbs and embedded infinitives. Hence, I propose to analyze this type of constructions as nominalizations at VP-level.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{D'} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{VP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{IP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{I'}
\end{array}
\]

Figure 1. Syntactic structure of GenS and NomS in Mari.

4. Semantics: factors that regulate the choice between genitive and nominative

In many languages, the pattern of arguments’ encoding in nominalizations is determined by the following factors:

- **Transitivity** of the nominalized verb:
  
  **KOMI-ZYRJAN**
  
  (28) \text{mam\text{-}l\text{\-}n} / *\text{mam} \text{\-}s\text{\-} \text{m\text{-}s\text{-}s\text{-}} \text{li\text{\-}s\text{\-}t\text{\-}l\text{\-}m\text{-}...} \\
  \text{mother-GEN1 mother(NOM) cow-ACC.POSS.3 milk-NZR}
  
  mother’s milking of the cow

  (29) \text{kaga\text{-}(l\text{\-}s\text{\-}t\text{-}m)} \text{u\text{\-}z\text{\-}l\text{\-}m} \\
  \text{child-GEN2 sleep-NZR}
  
  the child’s sleeping.

- **Semantic roles** of the arguments:
  
  **MARI**
  
  (30) \text{[mland\text{-}m lum pet\text{\-}m\text{\-}e]} \text{ok\text{\-}n\text{\-} g\text{\-}d\text{\-} k\text{\-}d\text{\-}e\text{\-}s\text{\-}}. \\
  \text{earth-ACC snow(NOM) cover-NZR window out.of be.seen-PRS.3SG}
  
  It can be seen from the window that the snow has covered the earth.

  Unlike Komi-Zyrjan, it is not the transitivity of the verb that matters, but exactly the semantic role factor: the verb in (i) is not agentive, hence, nominative marking is possible.

  (31) \text{ava\text{-}z\text{\-}e} [\text{jo\text{\-}c\text{\-}n} / *\text{jo\text{\-}c\text{\-}a} \text{pe\text{\-}l\text{\-}d\text{\-}s\text{\-} \text{k\text{\-}r\text{\-}s\text{\-}t\text{-}m\text{-}m\text{-}m\text{-}m}] \text{on\text{\-}a}. \\
  \text{mother-POSESS.3SG child-GEN / *child flower pick-NZR-ACC watch-PRS.3SG}
  
  The mother watches the child picking flowers.

The semantic role hypothesis is proven on the basis of statistics (1200 sentences for Mari, 300 sentences for Komi-Zyrjan):

**Mari:** Semantic role of the subject

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject’s case</th>
<th>Agent</th>
<th>Experiencer</th>
<th>Effector</th>
<th>Patient</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>genitive</td>
<td>88.05%</td>
<td>87.76%</td>
<td>81.40%</td>
<td>54.10%</td>
<td>61.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nominative</td>
<td>11.95%</td>
<td>11.22%</td>
<td>18.60%</td>
<td>45.90%</td>
<td>38.02%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mari:** Agentivity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject’s case</th>
<th>Agentive</th>
<th>Patientive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>genitive</td>
<td>87.64%</td>
<td>68.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nominative</td>
<td>12.36%</td>
<td>31.29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Komi-Zyrjan:** Agentivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject’s case</th>
<th>Agentive</th>
<th>Patientive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>genitive</td>
<td>94.36%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nominative</td>
<td>5.64%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Animacy:**

**Mari**

(32) ača-m [məjən/ *məj lüd-m-əm] ogeš jőrate.
father-POSS.1SG I-GEN I fear-NZR-ACC NEG.PRS.3SG like

My father doesn’t like it when I’m afraid.

(33) məj [avtobus tol-m-əm] vuč-em.
bus come-NZR-ACC wait-PRS.1SG

I’m waiting for the bus to come.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject’s case</th>
<th>Pronouns, proper names</th>
<th>Humans</th>
<th>Animals</th>
<th>Inanimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>genitive</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nominative</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Komi-Zyrjan**

(34) me až’ill-i [vaš’a-liš’ ivlata kořart-əm].
I see-PST Vas’a-GEN2 street.on run-NZR

I saw Vasja running down the street.

(35) me až’a [š’už’ lebž-əm].
I see-NPST owl fly-NZR

I saw an owl flying above.

Statistics:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>91%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>36%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>genitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nominative</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Referential and discourse properties**

**MARI**

(36) a. \[rvez-\textit{om} \ türvöč-m-əž-\textit{om} \] \[kol'-\textit{om}\].

```
boy-GEN cough-NZR-POSS.3SG-ACC hear-PST.1SG
```

b. \[r\textit{veze} \ türvöč-m-\textit{om}\] \[kol'-\textit{om}\].

```
boy cough-NZR-ACC hear-PST.1SG
```

(a) I heard this boy cough. (b) I heard one of the boys cough.

(37) \[južgunam \ [u\textit{łani} \ kol-m-\textit{olan}]\ldots \] \[nočko lum lum-\textit{on}\].

```
some times Uljana die-NZR-DAT wet snow to.snow-PST.3SG
```

(Context: We wore bast shoes, we didn’t have felt boots. That’s why we had wet feet all the time. And it was cold.) Sometimes, after Uljana’s death, it snowed…

I suppose that the case marking of the nominalization’s subject depends on its relevance in the discourse: genitive is used if the participant (denoted by the subject) is a protagonist, else it is nominative case that is preferred. Such an interpretation embraces all the factors enumerated above: usually, agentive, animate and definite participant appear as discourse protagonists. Hence, they are interpreted as such in isolated examples. On the contrary, non-definite, non-agentive and inanimate participants are more likely to be analyzed as non-protagonists. Hence, they are marked with nominative.

In Turkic languages, the subject’s encoding seems to be regulated by the following factors (see also Ljutikova, Graschenkov 2008):

- referential properties
- semantics of the normalized clause

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referential properties of the subject</th>
<th>fact</th>
<th>proposition</th>
<th>manner</th>
<th>event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>definite</td>
<td>GEN/</td>
<td>GEN/</td>
<td>GEN/</td>
<td>NOM/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*NOM</td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>*NOM</td>
<td>*GEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indefinite</td>
<td>GEN/</td>
<td>GEN/</td>
<td>GEN/</td>
<td>NOM/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>*GEN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UZBEKH**

(38) Ruslan (*Ruslan-\textit{ning}) uylan-gan-da \[biz boshqa\]

Ruslan(NOM) (Ruslan-GEN) get.married-PART.PST-LOC we another

```text
kvartira-ga ko’ch-gan e-di-k.
flat-DAT move-PART.PST COP-PST-1PL
```

When Ruslan got married, we moved to another flat.

(39) Turk-lar (*turk-lar-\textit{ning}) Konstantinopol-ni \[bos-ib\]

Turk-PL(NOM) Turk-PL-GEN Constantinople-ACC push-CONV

```text
ol-gan-lar-ida, qo’zg’olon boshlan-ib ket-gan e-di.
be-PART.PST-PL-2PL+DAT revolt begin-CONV go-PART.PST COP-PST
```

When the Turks have taken Constantinople, the revolt began.

(40) Men Olim-\textit{ning} (‘Olim) kel-gan-i-ni \[allaqachon bila-man.\]

1 Olim-GEN Olim(NOM) go-PART.PST-3SG-ACC already know-1SG

I already know that Olim has arrived.

If the matrix verb is factive (see Kiparsky, Kiparsky 1971), and the dependent clause belongs to the presupposition, genitive case is preferred. The sentential construction is chosen with the matrix verbs that
take dependent clauses introducing an asserted proposition (like believe, think, e.a.). In other words, nominative subjects are more likely to appear in the assertion, while genitive subjects are preferred in presupposed dependent clauses. This correlates with the syntactic properties of these constructions: the sentential constructions preserve more clausal properties that the GEN-ACC constructions. Hence, they are more likely to appear in the assertion.

5. Conclusions

Nominalizations with nominative subjects in Mari and Tuvinian behave in a different way. In Tuvinian, both types of constructions are nominalizations at a higher level of derivation. I propose to analyze the NomS constructions as IP-nominalizations (cf. the analysis of Tatar nominalizations in Lyutikova, Graschenkov 2005), and GenS as TP-nominalizations. Finno-Ugric languages show a different pattern. Nominalized forms in Finno-Ugric languages can head two different types of constructions. The GenS type is an example of the IP nominalization, while NomS nominalizations are nominalized at VP level. The nominative case in this type of constructions is acquired in the higher DP, as DPs can assign nominative to their modifiers in these languages.

Semantically, Finno-Ugric and Turkic constructions also differ. In both Mari and Komi-Zyrjan, the choice of the NOM-ACC / GEN-ACC construction is regulated by the following:

- animacy of the subject: if it is animate, it is more likely to be marked with genitive;
- semantic role of the subject: the more it is closer to the agent, the more it is likely to be marked with genitive;
- referential properties of the subject: definite subjects are more likely to acquire genitive, while indefinite and non-specific subjects are more likely to be assigned nominative.

In Turkic languages (however, not tested for Tuvinian), the choice of the construction depends on the semantics of the dependent clause and the matrix verb: if the matrix verb is factive (see Kiparsky, Kiparsky 1971), and the dependent clause belongs to the presupposition, genitive case is preferred.
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