Maria Baltajs (mbaltajs.95@gmail.com)
Department of General Linguistics, St. Petersburg State University

Factivity and complementation strategies of mental predicates in Bashkir

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

"By complementation, we mean the syntactic situation that arises when a notional sentence or predication is an argument of a predicate" [Noonan 2007: 52]. Mental matrix predicates: 'think', 'know', 'understand' etc.

Factivity: "The speaker presupposes that the embedded clause expresses a true proposition, and makes some assertion about that proposition. All predicates which behave syntactically as factives have this semantic property, and almost none of those which behave syntactically as non-factives have it" [Kiparsky & Kiparsky 1971: 147].

(1) *Mary knows that it is raining* (factive)
(2) *John thinks that it is raining* (non-factive)

(3) *I regret having agreed to the proposal* (factive)[1]
(4) **I believe having agreed to the proposal* (non-factive)
(5) **I resent Mary to have been the one who did it* (factive)
(6) *I believe Mary to have been the one who did it* (non-factive)

1.2 GOALS

o What complementation strategies can be used with mental predicates in Bashkir?[2]
o What factors determine the choice of a strategy?

1.3 DATA

o about 165 examples
o elicitation method

2. STRATEGIES

2.1 STRATEGY 1

o GEN/NOM of the subject of the dependent clause
o one of the nominalizations (PC.PST, NMLZ, PC.PST-NMLZ, FUT, POT[3]) that has a possessive marker (according to the person and number of the subject) and a case marker required by the matrix predicate (ACC/DAT)

---

[1] The examples (3)-(6) are taken from [Kiparsky & Kiparsky 1971: 147].
[2] In this research indirect questions weren't taken into consideration.

(7) *malaj-ə*　　*äsä-he-**neŋ**　　maɣazin-ɣa　　kit-**kän-e-n***
　　boy-P.3　　mother-P.3-GEN　shop-DAT　　go.away-PC.PST-P.3-ACC
　　bel-ä
　　know-PRS
'The son knows that his mother has gone to the shop.'

(8) *min　žəraf-tar　japraq　aša-**w-ə-na**　　əšan-a-m*
　　I　　giraffe-PL　leaf　　eat-NMLZ-P.3-DAT　believe-PRS-1SG
'I know for sure that giraffes eat leaves.'

2.2　STRATEGY 2

o ACC/NOM of the subject of the dependent clause
o a finite verbal form that has one of the temporal markers (among the examples PST, PRS, POT and PC.PST are found)
o the predicate of the dependent clause can have no personal marker (10), although it is necessary in independent clauses
o the dependent clause is attached by a complementizer *tip*, which takes its origin from the converb of the verb *tiew* 'say'

(9) *uqə-t-əw-sə **hine**　　jaŋələš-**qan-həŋ**　　**tip**　　ujla-j*
　　teacher　　thou.ACC　wrong-PC.PST-2SG　　say.CV　　think-PRS
'The teacher thinks that you have made a mistake.'

(10) *uqə-t-əw-sə min　öj-gö　　eš-te　　ešlä-**ne**　**tip**　　ujla-j*
　　teacher　　I　　house-ADJ　work-ACC　work-PST　say.CV　　think-PRS
'The teacher supposes that I did the homework yesterday.'

Grammaticalization of the verb 'say' into a complementizer is common to many languages [Hopper, Traugott 1993, Hanina 2001]. Usually this complementizer can be used only with certain semantic groups of matrix predicates: first of all,
　- with predicates of speech;
　- with predicates the meaning of which includes a "speaking component"
　(e.g. 'think') [Hanina 2001].
➢ Bashkir [Yuldashev 1981: 358], Kalmyk [Knyazev 2009: 532-534]: a converb of the verb 'say' introduces direct and indirect speech (the initial stage of grammaticalization, when the connection to the lexical meaning of the verb is still very strong).

---

[3] There are no examples of this nominalization in the sample, but its usage within this construction is possible (cf. [Generalova 2013]).

3. FACTIVITY

In Bashkir, there seems to be a distribution between Strategies 1 and 2: e.g. *ujla-* 'think' cannot be used with Strategy 1 (11), while *bel-* 'know' in combination with Strategy 2 changes its meaning to 'think' (12).

(11) *[*]uqə-t-əw-sə*   *hineŋ*   *jaŋələš-**qan-əŋ-də***   ***ujla**-j*

teacher   you.GEN   be.mistaken-PC.PST-P.2SG-ACC   think-PRS

'The teacher thinks that you have made a mistake.'

(12) *Gölnara*   *üð-em*   *matur*   *jərla-**j-əm***   ***tip***   ***bel**-ä*

Gulnara   self-P.1SG   beautiful   sing-PRS-1SG   say.CV   know-PRS

'Gulnara thinks that she sings well.'

<u>Hypothesis</u>: Strategy 1 in Bashkir is used with factive matrix predicates, while Strategy 2 is mostly applied to non-factive predicates; factive predicates in combination with Strategy 2 can change their meaning to non-factive.

A similar assumption is made in [Knyazev 2009: 536] for Kalmyk language: indicative complements attached by a grammaticalized converb of the verb 'say' cannot be used, if the proposition expressed in the complement is presupposed to be true. In this case, a participle complement should be applied.

The hypothesis can be justified by the following data (cf. Table). Predicates that are factive in English are boldfaced, examples that are impossible in Bashkir are indicated by *, the figures represent the number of examples where a predicate is combined with one of the strategies (82 in total[4]).

	Basic meaning	Strategy 1		Strategy 2	
		OK	*	OK	*
bel-	***know***	**20**		**3**	**2**
aŋla-	***understand***	**8**	**1**	**3**	**1**
hið-	***know***	5			
hiðen-	***guess***	3			
iθlä-	***remember***	1		1	
əšan-	*believe*	4			
ujla-	*think*		**2**	**27**	

---

[4] For the sake of representativeness, only those examples where the action of the dependent clause takes place before the action of the main clause were analyzed. The examples with *ikän* (be.PC.PST) and its forms were also excluded from the sample due to the undetermined status of such constructions.

iθäplä-	*suppose*				1		

The predicate *əšan-* 'believe' is used with Strategy 1. This verb can also mean 'hope' [Dmitriev 2008]. In English neither *believe* nor *hope* is factive, but in the meaning 'believe' *əšan-* cannot govern a predication that doesn't express a true proposition (13). The only example where *əšan-* is combined with Strategy 2 is (14), but with the meaning 'hope' Strategy 1 seems to be preferred too (15). These observations lead to the following assumption: the Bashkir *əšan-*, at least in the meaning 'believe', is factive.

(13) **äsäj   beð   butqa-nə   aša-p   böt-kän-ebeð-gä*
     mother   we   porridge-ACC   eat-CV   end-PC.PST-P.1PL-DAT
     əšan-a
     believe-PRS
'The mother believes that we have eaten all the porridge [but we haven't].'

(14) *ul   jəw-əl-**ər**   **tip**   əšan-a*[5]
     that   wash-PASS-POT   say.CV   believe-PRS
'He **hopes** that he will be able to wash them [the boots].'

(15) *äsäj   bəl   həw-ðəŋ   etä-**w**-e-nä   əšan-a*
     mother   this   water-GEN be.enough-NMLZ-P.3-DAT   believe-PRS
'The mother **hopes** that this water will be enough.'

4. CONCLUSIONS

o   In Bashkir there are two basic complementation strategies of mental matrix predicates: 1) a strategy with a nominalization; 2) a strategy with a finite verbal form and the complementizer *tip*.
o   Factivity can be one of the factors determining the choice of the strategy: Strategy 1 is combined only with factive matrix predicates.

ABBREVIATIONS

ACC – accusative case; ADJ – adjective; AG – agent; CAUS – causative; CV – converb; DAT – dative case; FUT – future tense; GEN – genitive case; NMLZ – nominalization; P – possessive marker; PC – participle; POT – potential mood; PRS – present tense; PST – past tense; SG – singular.

---

[5] Examples (14) and (15) belong to V. A. Generalova.

References

Dmitriev 2008 – Н. К. Дмитриев. Грамматика башкирского языка. М.: Наука, 2008.

Generalova 2013 – В. А. Генералова. Выбор стратегии оформления сентенциальных актантов в башкирском языке // Acta linguistica petropolitana. Труды Института лингвистических исследований РАН, в печати.

Hanina 2001 – О. В. Ханина. Грамматикализация глагола речи в «подчинительный союз» при конструкциях с сентенциальными актантами // Русская филология. Вып. 12. Тарту, 2001. С. 125–129.

Knyazev 2009 – М. Ю. Князев. Сентенциальные дополнения в калмыцком языке // Acta Linguistica Petropolitana. Труды Института лингвистических исследований РАН V, 2 [С. С. Сай, В. В. Баранова, Н. В. Сердобольская (ред.). Исследования по грамматике калмыцкого языка]. 2009. С. 525–581.

Yuldashev 1981 – А. А. Юлдашев (ред.). Грамматика современного башкирского литературного языка. М.: Наука, 1981.

Hopper, Traugott 1993 – P. Hopper, E. Traugott. Grammaticalization. Cambridge: CUP, 1993.

Kiparsky, Kiparsky 1971 – P. Kiparsky, C. Kiparsky. Fact // D. Steinberg, L. Jakobovits (eds.). Semantics: An Interdisciplinary Reader. Cambridge: CUP, 1971. P. 143–173.

Noonan 2007 – Noonan M. Complementation // (Shopen T.) Language typology and syntactic description, Vol. 2. Cambridge University Press, 2007.