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1. Introduction

1.1 Language

- Tatar is a Turkic language predominantly spoken in the Republic of Tatarstan, Russia
- Tatarstan within Russia:\textsuperscript{2}

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{map.png}
\end{center}

- There are roughly 5 million speakers of Tatar (Simons & Fennig 2017)
- This work focuses on Kazan Tatar (sometimes called “middle Tatar”) (\textit{henceforth called 'Tatar'}

\textsuperscript{1} Data for this project was collected from one female speaker. A great thanks to Travis Major and Sofia Mazgarova for their advice and insight on this project.
\textsuperscript{2} Picture is from Wikipedia: by Stasyan117 - Own work, CC BY-SA 4.0, https://commons.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?curid=39697422
1.2 Proposal

- Tatar, like other Turkish languages, has a system of verbal suffixes which are reported to encode both tense and evidentiality
- Of these, an odd subset is allowed in certain embedded contexts
- In these contexts, no evidentiality is communicated, only tense
- Following an analysis of Korean embedded nominal clauses, I propose that these specific embedded clauses are licensed when the embedded proposition has been mentioned in the local discourse

2. Data

2.1 Basics of Tatar tense and evidentiality

- Tatar has a two-way distinction in evidentiality:
  - “direct” evidence – the speaker either saw the event or is in some other way absolutely certain about the event's occurrence
  - “indirect” evidence – the speaker does not have direct evidence, but has some sort of second-hand reason, such as hearsay
- Tatar has a three-way distinction in tense: past, present, and future
  - present tense does not distinguish between direct and indirect evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Past</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>-de</td>
<td>-V</td>
<td>-(j)ashaq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>-Ran</td>
<td></td>
<td>-er</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Examples of each of the five morphemes:

(2)  Direct Past
alsu kitap-ne uqu-de
A. book-ACC read-PAST.DIR
‘[The speaker has direct evidence that] Alsu read the book.’

(3)  Indirect Past
alsu kitap-ne uqu-Ran
A. book-ACC read-PAST.IND
‘[The speaker has indirect evidence that] Alsu read the book.’

(4)  Present
alsu kitap-ne uqu-i
A. book-ACC read-PRES
‘Alsu is reading the book.’
(5) **Direct Future**
alsu kitap-ne uqu-jaşaq
A. book-ACC read-FUT.DIR
‘[The speaker has direct evidence that] Alsu will read the book.’

(6) **Indirect Future**
alsu kitap-ne uq-er
A. book-ACC read-FUT.IND
‘[The speaker has indirect evidence that] Alsu will read the book.’

2.2 Unrestrained/normal embedding

- As in English, many Tatar verbs can take a CP complement. Any of the five tense/evidentiality suffixes can appear in an embedded CP:

(7) **Direct Past – in embedded CP**
timur alsu kitap-ne uqu-de dip eit-e
T. A. book-ACC read-PAST.DIR COMP say-PRES
‘Timur says that [he has direct evidence that] Alsu read the book.’

(8) **Indirect Past – in embedded CP**
timur alsu kitap-ne uqu-Ran dip eit-e
T. A. book-ACC read-PAST.IND COMP say-PRES
‘Timur says that [he has indirect evidence that] Alsu read the book.’

(9) **Present – in embedded CP**
timur alsu kitap-ne uqu-i dip eit-e
T. A. book-ACC read-PRES COMP say-PRES
‘Timur says that Alsu is reading the book.’

(10) **Direct Future – in embedded CP**
timur alsu kitap-ne uqu-jaşaq dip eit-e
T. A. book-ACC read-FUT.DIR COMP say-PRES
‘Timur says that [he has direct evidence that] Alsu will read the book.’

(11) **Indirect Future – in embedded CP**
timur alsu kitap-ne uq-er dip eit-e
T. A. book-ACC read-FUT.IND COMP say-PRES
‘Timur says that [he has indirect evidence that] Alsu will read the book.’

- Embedded tenses in Tatar interact with matrix tenses
  - Double access readings
  - Some matrix verbs license multiple past-under-past readings
2.3 Restricted embedding

- There are a number of constructions in Tatar where clauses restrict which tense/evidentiality morphemes can be in them.
- In (most of) these cases, only two of the five suffixes are allowed. The indirect past – *Ran* can be interpreted as either past or present, while the direct future – *ashaq* is the only available future morpheme.

**Relative clauses:**

(12) timur [alsu uqu-*Ran/*de/*i] kitap-ne urla-de
    T. A. read-PAST.IND/*PAST.DIR/*PRES book-ACC steal-PAST.DIR
    ‘Timur stole the book [Alsu read/is reading].’

(13) timur [alsu uq-u*ashaq/*er] kitap-ne urla-de
    T. A. read-FUT.DIR/*FUT.IND book-ACC steal-PAST.DIR
    ‘Timur stole the book [Alsu will read].’

**Nominalized clauses under clause embedding verbs:**

(14) timur alsu kitap-ne uqu-*Ran/*de/*i-en eit-e
    T. A. book-ACC read-PAST.IND/*PAST.DIR/*PRES-GEN say-PRES
    ‘Timur says that Alsu read/is reading the book.’

(15) timur alsu kitap-ne uqu-*ashaq/*er-en eit-e
    T. A. book-ACC read-FUT.DIR/*FUT.IND-GEN say-PRES
    ‘Timur says that Alsu will read the book.’

**Identificational Relative Clauses/Pseudo-pseudoclefts:**

(16) [juRal] aSkı’S-nV tab-qan/*te/*a] ki`SV midal
    lost key-ACC find-PAST.IND/*PAST.DIR/*PRES person medal
    al-ashaq
give-FUT.DIR
    ‘He who found/finds the lost key will be given a medal.’

(17) [juRal] aSkı’S-nV tab-*ashaq/*ar] ki`SV midal
    lost key-ACC find-FUT.DIR/*FUT.IND person medal
    al-ashaq
give-FUT.DIR
    ‘He who will find the lost key will be given a medal.’

- Note: In (17), the indirect future –*ar* is considered somewhat acceptable, but sounds archaic.
Questions:
  o What do these morphemes do/communicate?
    Some options:
      ▪ Nominalization
      ▪ Evidentiality
      ▪ Aspect
      ▪ Tense
  o Why are –Ran and –ashaq allowed in these environments, but the other three suffixes are not?
  o How can we account for all of this syntactically?

3. What do embedded –Ran and –ashaq do?

3.1 Nominalization?

  • Clauses under clause embedding verbs receive case, and are widely considered to be nominal

Nominalized clauses under clause embedding verbs:

(14') timur [alsu kitap-ne uqu-Ran/*de/*]-en eit-e
   T. A. book-ACC read-PAST.IND/*PAST.DIR/*PRES-GEN say-PRES
   ‘Timur says that Alsu read/is reading the book.’

(15') timur [alsu kitap-ne uqu-jashaq/*er]-en eit-e
   T. A. book-ACC read-FUT.DIR/*FUT.IND-GEN say-PRES
   ‘Timur says that Alsu will read the book.’

  • However, it is desirable to say that the morphemes in all of the restricted embedded contexts are the same, and it is unlikely that the other two cases (from (12)-(13), (16)-(17)), which modify nouns, are nominal.
  • Additionally, what appears to be a genitive case marker on these nominalized clauses appears even when the clause is marked with another case:

(18) timur alsu kitap-ne uq-ep biter-gen-en-ne ashan-a
   T. A. book-ACC read-SER finish-PAST.IND-GEN?-ACC believe-PRES
   ‘Timur believes Alsu finished reading the book.’

  • Therefore, I presume that these embedded clauses are nominalized by the morpheme which looks like the genitive agreement morpheme, instead of by –Ran or –ashaq
So... what do embedded –Ran and –ashaq encode?

- Nominalization \(X\)
- Evidentiality \(\_\)
- Aspect \(\_\)
- Tense \(\_\)

### 3.2 Evidentiality?

- In matrix clauses, –Ran tells us that the speaker has indirect evidence and –ashaq tells us that the speaker has direct evidence.
- In our restricted embedded clauses, they do not tell us anything about the speaker’s evidence for their claim.
- For instance, in relative clauses (which are formed with –Ran and –ashaq), we do not know anything about the source of the speaker’s information.

**Relative clauses:**

(12’) timur [alsu uqu-Ran] kitap-ne urla-dV
T. A. read-PAST.IND book-ACC steal-PAST.DIR
‘Timur stole the book [Alsu read/is reading].’

(13’) timur [alsu uqu-jashaq] kitap-ne urla-dV
T. A. read-FUT.DIR book-ACC steal-PAST.DIR
‘Timur stole the book [Alsu will read].’

So... what do embedded –Ran and –ashaq encode?

- Nominalization \(X\)
- Evidentiality \(X\)
- Aspect \(\_\)
- Tense \(\_\)

### 3.3 Aspect?

- In other Turkish languages, the relative clause markers are reported to encode aspect.
- For instance, Asarina (2011) claims that the equivalent relative clause marker in Uyghur (also “-RAN”) is ambiguous between a factative and a perfective reading.
- Factatives lack tense marking and receive a past interpretation with non-states and a present interpretation with statives:

(19) a. You sell your car?
b. You like my cat? \(\text{Fitzpatrick 2006: (26a,d)}\)
- Asarina (2011) claims that the Uyghur "-RAN" is ambiguous between a factative and a perfective reading
  - factative reading:
    - non-stative: past interpretation
    - stative: present interpretation
  - perfective reading:
    - stative or non-stative: past interpretation
  - options given that Uyghur "-RAN" is ambiguous:
    - non-stative: only past interpretation
    - stative: either past or present interpretation

(20) **Uyghur:**
Past non-stative:

[men ji-gen] tamaq jaχʃi
[I eat-RAN] food good
✓ ‘The food I ate is good.’
X ‘The food I’m eating is good.’

(21) **Uyghur:**
Past/present stative:

[Mehemmet (haazir/burun) jaχʃi kör-gen] qiz güzel
[Mehemmet (now/earlier) well see-RAN] girl pretty
✓ ‘The girl Mehemmet liked is pretty.’
✓ ‘The girl Mehemmet likes is pretty.’ (Asarina 2011: 80)

- Tatar -Ran, on the other hand, can be interpreted as past or present even with non-stative verbs, as in (22)-(24):

(22) [min asha-Ran] ashau bik temle
[I eat-RAN] food very tasty
✓ ‘The food [that I ate] was tasty.’
✓ ‘The food [that I am eating] is tasty.’

(23) [min sat-qan] mashina zenger
[I sell-RAN] car blue
✓ ‘The car [that I sold] is blue.’
✓ ‘The car [that I am selling] is blue.’ (i.e. that I have put up for sale)

(24) alsu [timur jiz-Ran] kitapne uqujashaq/uqer
✓ ‘Alsu will read the book that Timur wrote.’
✓ ‘Alsu will read the book that Timur is writing.’

- This suggest that an aspect account cannot cover the Tatar data
• So... what do embedded –Ran and –ashaq encode?
  ▪ Nominalization  ❌
  ▪ Evidentiality  ❌
  ▪ Aspect  ❌
  ▪ Tense  ✓

3.4 Tense?

• Given that –Ran and –ashaq lead the hearer to past, present, and future interpretations (see above data), but cannot be accounted for with aspect, I propose that they are likely tense morphemes, as they are at the matrix level
• So... what do embedded –Ran and –ashaq encode?
  ▪ Nominalization  ❌
  ▪ Evidentiality  ❌
  ▪ Aspect  ❌
  ▪ Tense  ✓

4. Why the restriction on suffixes?

• Why are –Ran and –ashaq allowed in these environments, but the other three matrix tense/aspect suffixes are not?
• As a very stark comparison, why are only –Ran and –ashaq allowed in nominal phrases under clause embedding verbs, while all of these tense/evidentiality suffixes are allowed in CPs under clause embedding verbs?

(25) timur alsu kitap-ne uqu-\textit{Ran/jashaq/}^\textit{de/i/er-en}
T. A. book-ACC read-\textit{PAST.IND/FUT.DIR/PAST.DIR/PRES/FUT.IND-GEN}
eit-e
say-PRES
‘Timur says that Alsu read/is reading/will read the book.’

(26) timur alsu kitap-ne uqu-Ran/de/i/jashaq/er
T. A. book-ACC read-\textit{PAST.IND/PAST.DIR/PRES/FUT.DIR/FUT.IND}
dip eit-e
COMP say-PRES
‘Timur says that Alsu will read the book.’
4.1 Data from Korean

- Like Tatar, Korean clause-embedding verbs can also take nominalized clauses:

(27)

K.-TOP D.-NOM this book-ACC read-PST-DEC-ADN kes-ACC believe-PST-DEC
‘Kibo believed (the claim) that Dana read this book.’ (Shim and Ihsane, 2015: 4b)

(28)

K.-TOP D.-NOM this book-ACC read-PST-ADN kes-ACC believe-PST-DEC
‘Kibo believed (the fact) that Dana read this book.’ (Shim and Ihsane, 2015: 4c)

- As seen above, Korean actually has two variants of the nominalized clause. The latter is factive, but the former is not (Shim and Ihsane 2015):

(29)

K.-TOP D.-NOM this book-ACC read-PST-DEC-ADN kes-ACC believe-PST-DEC
kulente sasil-un Dana-nun i chayk-ul ilk-ci anh-ass-ta.
but fact-TOP D.-TOP this book-ACC read-NEG-PST-DEC
‘Kibo believed (the claim) that Dana read this book, but D. didn’t read it.’
(Shim and Ihsane, 2015: 5b)

(30)

#Kibo-nun [Dana-ka i chayk-ul ilk-ess-nun kes-ul] mit-ess-ta,
K.-TOP D.-NOM this book-ACC read-PST-ADN kes-ACC believe-PST-DEC
kulente sasil-un Dana-nun i chayk-ul ilk-ci anh-ass-ta.
but fact-TOP D.-TOP this book-ACC read-NEG-PST-DEC
#‘Kibo believed (the fact) that Dana read this book, but D. didn’t read it.’
(Shim and Ihsane, 2015: 5c)

- So what separates the non-factive nominalized clause in (27) from its CP counterpart in (31)?

(31)

K.-TOP D.-NOM this book-ACC read-PST-DEC-ko believe-PST-DEC
‘Kibo believed that Dana read this book.’ (Shim and Ihsane, 2015: 4a)
• Like (27), the embedded CP version of the sentence (in (31)) is not factive:

(32)

Kibo-nun [Dana-ka i chayk-ul ilk-ess-ta-ko] mit-ess-ta,
K.-TOP  D.-NOM this book-ACC read-PST-DEC-ko believe-PST-DEC
kulente sasil-un Dana-nun i chayk-ul ilk-ci anh-ass-ta.
but fact-TOP D.-TOP this book-ACC read-NEG-PST-DEC
‘Kibo believed that Dana read this book, but D. didn’t read it.’

(Shim and Ihsane, 2015: (5a))

• Bogal-Allbritten & Moulton (2016) claim that the nominalized clause is only licensed if the claim it makes was previously asserted in local discourse.

• Therefore, if the embedded claim was made overtly, as in (33) below, both the nominalized clause (B2) and the CP (B1) are licensed:

(33)

A: Na-nun swukecey-lul ta ha-yess-e. Pakk-ey naka nola-to toy?
 I-TOP homework-ACC all do-PST-DEC outside-at go play-also can
‘I finished my homework. Can I go outside and play?’

B: An toy. A: Na-lul an mit-e?
not can I-ACC not believe-INT
‘No,’ ‘Don’t you believe me?’

Yes. I-TOP you-NOM homework-ACC all do-PST-DEC-ko believe-DEC
Haciman cikum-un cenyek siksa sikan-i-ya.
but now-TOP evening meal time-COP-DEC
‘Yes, I believe that you finished your homework. But it’s dinner time.’

Yes. I-TOP you-NOM homework-ACC all do-PST-DEC-ADN kes-ACC
mit-e. Haciman cikum-un cenyek siksa sikan-i-ya.
believe-DEC but now-TOP evening meal time-COP-DEC
‘Yes, I believe (the claim) that you finished your homework. But its dinner time.’
However, if the embedded claim was not mentioned in the local discourse, the nominal embedded clause (B2) is not licensed:

\[(34)\]

A:  
\text{Cyoni-nun pakk-ey naka nola-to toy?}  
J.-TOP outside-at go play-also can  
‘Can Johnny go outside and play?’

Yes. I-TOP he-NOM homework-ACC all do-PST-DEC-\textit{ko} believe-DEC  
‘Yes, I believe that he finished his homework.’

Yes. I-TOP he-NOM hmwrk-ACC all do-PST-DEC-\textit{ADN kes-ACC} believe-DEC  
# ‘Yes, I believe (the claim) that he finished his homework.’

4.2 Applied to Tatar

- In Tatar, neither embedded CPs nor embedded nominal phrases are factive.

\[(35)\]

\text{timur alsu kitap-ne uqu-Ran/de dip ujl-i}  
T. A. book-ACC read-PAST.IND/PAST.DIR COMP think-PRES  
lekin shun.bar.lukta alsu kitap-ne uqu-ma-Ran  
but in.reality A. book-ACC read-NEG-PAST.IND  
Timur thinks that Alsu read the book, but Alsu didn’t read the book.

\[(36)\]

\text{timur alsu kitap-ne uqu-Ran-en ujl-i}  
T. A. book-ACC read-PAST.IND-GEN think-PRES  
lekin shun.bar.lukta alsu kitap-ne uqu-ma-Ran  
but in.reality A. book-ACC read-NEG-PAST.IND  
Timur thinks that Alsu read the book, but Alsu didn’t read the book.
Like Korean, both CP and nominal clauses are licensed when the embedded proposition is mentioned in the local discourse:

(37) Timur: Alsu finished reading the book.\(^3\)

A: So do you think that she should get a good grade?

B: Definitely!...

B1: timur alsu kitap-ne uqup biter-gen/de dip eit-te
T. A. book-ACC read-PAST.IND/PAST.DIR COMP say-PAST.DIR
Timur said that Alsu finished reading the book.

B2: timur alsu kitap-ne uqup biter-gen-en eit-te
T. A. book-ACC read-PAST.IND GEN say-PAST.DIR
Timur said that Alsu finished reading the book.

Again like Korean, only the CP and not the nominal clause is licensed when the embedded proposition has not been mentioned in the local discourse:

(38) A: Can Alsu come out and play?

B: Yes...

B1: timur alsu kitap-ne uqup biter-gen/de dip eit-te
T. A. book-ACC read-PAST.IND/PAST.DIR COMP say-PAST.DIR
Timur said that Alsu finished reading the book.

B2: #timur alsu kitap-ne uqup biter-gen-en eit-te
T. A. book-ACC read-PAST.IND GEN say-PAST.DIR
Timur said that Alsu finished reading the book.

\(^3\) This licenses the nominal embedded clause no matter whether it is stated using the indirect or direct past tense morpheme.
4.3 Limitations

- Like Korean, the nominalized clause can be licensed if the proposition in it is entailed by the local discourse, rather than being overtly mentioned.

(39) A: I ate all of my peas. Can I have desert?
B: No.
A: Don't you believe me?
B: I believe you ate vegetables, but the dessert isn’t ready.
  ✓ CP
  ✓ nominal

- Like Korean, the nominalized clause cannot be licensed by a negated assertion of the embedded proposition:

(40) A: Timur didn’t eat his vegetables!
B: But Alsu said he ate his vegetables!
  ✓ CP
  X nominal

- Unlike Korean, the nominalized clause can be licensed by
  (This is like German; see Schwab et al (2016) and Sudhoff (2003).)

(41) A: Did Timur finish his vegetables?
B: Alsu said he finished his vegetables.
  ✓ CP
  ✓ nominal
5. Pulling it together

- I propose that all of the clauses which restrict their tense morphemes to –Ran and –ashaq require the propositional content of that clause to be entailed or in some other way mentioned in the local discourse.
- Thus, since (in most of these cases), the proposition will have been recently asserted with an evidential marker. Therefore, when the embedded proposition is repeated, there is no need for the second speaker to report the evidentiality.
- However, it makes sense to include tense information, even in the repeated (embedded) proposition, because embedded tenses interact with the matrix tenses.
- This fits with the information from section 3, where I suggested that the embedded –Ran and –ashaq communicate tense, but not evidentiality.
- A note on syntax:
  - This system would require that evidentiality scopes over tense in Tatar and that these embedded contexts require a TP and no higher.
- I propose that –Ran and –ashaq do not inherently carry evidential meaning, but that –Ran is the only past tense morpheme compatible with indirect evidential features and that –ashaq is the only future tense morpheme compatible with direct evidential features.
  - Thus, in full CPs, with both tense and evidentiality meanings, –Ran is used iff the proposition has past tense and indirect evidential features and –ashaq is used iff the proposition has future and direct evidential features.
  - However, in the restricted embedded clauses discussed in this talk, where there is only a tense head, and no higher evidentiality head, –Ran and –ashaq do not add any evidential information.

6. Remaining issues:

- If present tense doesn't encode evidentiality, why can't the present tense morpheme occur in restricted clauses?
- There are cases where the relative clause content has not been mentioned previously; for instance when the relative clause content answers a QUD. Why should the tense morphemes be limited in these cases? Has the system just been generalized over time?
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