CLIPP

Christiani Lehmanni inedita, publicanda, publicata

titulus
Review of : Comrie, Bernard & Estrada-Fernández, Zarina (eds.) 2012, *Relative clauses in languages of the Americas. A typological overview.* Amsterdam & Philadelphia: J. Benjamins (Typological Studies in Language, 102).
huius textus situs retis mundialis
http://www.christianlehmann.eu/publ/lehmann_rev_comrie_estrada_long_version.pdf
dies manuscripti postremum modificati
24.02.2014
occasio orationis habitae
–
volumen publicationem continens
(versio deminuta:) *Language* 90
annus publicationis
2014
paginae
534-536

Comrie, Bernard & Estrada-Fernández, Zarina (eds.) 2012, *Relative clauses in languages of the Americas. A typological overview.* Amsterdam & Philadelphia: J. Benjamins (Typological Studies in Language, 102).

Reviewed by Christian Lehmann

1   Introduction

More often than not, somebody is asked for a review because he has published on the subject matter of the work to be reviewed. If it is an anonymous review, the reviewer finds himself in the clumsy situation of being prevented from quoting the fund of his knowledge. If it is a signed review, his situation is no more comfortable, since he is constantly tempted to refer to his own work to demonstrate that the truth could long be known. In the following, I will boldly face this uncomfortability.

A few facts about relative clauses must be recalled at the outset which are basic to the following discussion and about which some contributions to the volume betray uncertainty. The first thing to be clarified is the distinction between a nominal and a noun phrase: A **nominal** is a construction with a nominal head devoid of determination. A **noun phrase** (or determiner phrase)[1] is a nominal which is equipped by overt or zero determiners, is therefore capable of reference and of serving as a governed dependent. A nominal is susceptible to (attributive) modification; a noun phrase is not. The distinction is therefore of relevance to relative clause formation. The head of a relative clause is aptly called "domain nominal" in Andrews 2007:214. Most of the contributors to this volume do without accurate terminology here, speaking either of a "head noun" (see below) or of a "noun phrase" (e.g. p. 192).

The main division in the typology of relative clauses is between embedded and adjoined relative clauses. An **embedded relative clause** forms, together with its head nominal, a constituent of the matrix clause. It is prenominal, as in (1), postnominal, as in (2), or circumnominal, as in (3). An **adjoined relative clause** is subordinate to the main clause without being a constituent of it. It is, consequently, peripheral to the main clause, either preposed, as in (4), or postposed, as in (5). (In the examples, the relative clause is bracketed.)

(1)   tɨh   wæd-ě-p   parátu, wáb-an   pɨ̈d=mah   cak=w'ob-yɨ̈ʔ-pɨ̈d-ɨ̈h
HUP   [3.SG eat-PERF-SR] plate   shelf-ALL DISTR=REP   climb-set-TEL-DISTR-DECL
       'the plate he had eaten from, she set (it) back up on the shelf' (p. 195)

(2)   Joan uka   chu'u-ta enchi   ke'e-ka-m-ta   me'a-k
YAQUI John   DET:OBL   dog-OBL [2.SG.OBL bite-PERF-SBJ.NR]-OBL   kill-PERF
       'John killed the dog that bit you' (p. 87)

(3)   María quih   cafee oo-si   cop   c-matj   iha.
SERI   [Maria DET.FL coffee   POSS.3:OBJ.NR-drink] DEF.VTCL SBJ.NR-hot DECL
       'The coffee that Maria is drinking / drank is/was hot.' (p. 227)

(4)   KASKAL-z-a   kwi-t   assu   utahhun
HITT   [campaign-ABL-however REL-N.SG   good(N.SG) bring.home:PST.1.SG]

---

[1] Marlett (p. 233 and elsewhere) calls NP what is here called a nominal, and calls DP what is here called an NP.

    n-at   ape-danda halissiyanun.
    CONN-N that-INSTR.SG adorn:PST.1.SG
    'With the booty, however, which I brought from the campaign, I adorned them.' (KBo III 22
    Rs. 58)

(5)   natta apū-n   GEŠTINa-n piēr
Hɪᴛᴛ   NEG   that-ACC.SG   wine-ACC.SG give:PST.3.PL

    LUGALu-s   kwi-n   austa.
    [king-NOM.SG   REL-ACC.SG see:PST.2.SG]
    'That wine they did not give which you, oh king, had seen.' (KBo III 34 Vs. II 5d//KBO III
    36 Vs.)

The head nominal and the relative clause form a **relative construction**. Exx. (4)f illustrate the particular variety of the adjoined relative construction which was aptly called "correlative diptych" in Haudry 1973: the relative clause contains a relative pronoun, while the main clause contains a ("correlative") demonstrative. The default order has a preposed relative clause, as in (4); (5) illustrates the inverted diptych, with a postposed relative clause. Whichever the order, the head nominal is always in the first clause, producing, thus, an internal-head relative clause in the default case. There are, consequently, two entirely different kinds of **internal-head** RCs: the circumnominal RC is embedded, while the preposed RC is adjoined.

    The relative clauses described in the present volume belong to the following positional types: The Hup relative clause is prenominal; Yaqui, Pima Bajo, Northern Paiute, Toba, Yucatec and Tuscarora have a postnominal RC; the Seri and Gavião RCs are circumnominal. No adjoined RC is reported on in this volume.

    In the case of an embedded relative clause, the relative construction is a nominal, which will, provided by an overt or zero determiner, constitute an NP. Depending on the language, this constituency may be evidenced by different structural facts like position of the determiner (p. 217, 256f), constraints on sequential order, agreement, as in (2), or dependency on an adposition (p. 194f), as in (6).

(6)   inepo   kari-ta   nim   tomte-ka-'apo   betchi'ibo chu'u-ta jinu-k
Yᴀǫᴜɪ   1.SG.NOM   house-OBL [1.SG.GEN be.born-PERF-LOC.NR] for   dog-OBL buy-PERF
    'I bought a dog for the house where I was born' (p. 79)

This shows that the talk of a syntactic function of the "head noun" of an adnominal relative clause in the matrix, which recurs in the volume (pp. 48, 69f, 98, 110), is sloppy: It is an entire noun phrase, not just its head, which has a syntactic function in a clause. Likewise, any definite determiners accompanying the head of a restrictive embedded relative clause determine the relative construction as a whole. Such a determiner can neither determine the head (as supposed on p. 178) nor be itself the head (as supposed on p. 86), as that would render restrictive modification impossible. By the same token, it is the noun phrase headed by the restrictive relative construction, not just its head noun (as supposed on p. 154), which may constitute a referring expression.

    The major semantic difference between a complement clause and a relative clause consists in the fact that the former designates a state of affairs, while the latter designates a kind of entity participating in a state of affairs, more precisely, the kind of entity occupying the open position in the proposition corresponding to the clause. To this end, the relative clause is **oriented** towards that position. In (2) and (6), this is achieved by the nominalizing suffixes. Thus, the dependent clause in (2) does not designate the state of affairs "that it bit you", but "one that bit you"; and likewise the dependent clause in (6) does not mean "that I was born (in some place)", but "(place) where I was

born". In (4)f, it is the interplay between the correlative pronouns which affords the orientation. If the operation is not marked explicitly on an embedded RC, it may be indistinguishable from a complement clause. Toba and Gavião exemplify this state of affairs.

The traditional notion of noun comprises both substantives and adjectives, so a **nominal** may be a substantival or an adjectival. If a language lacks adjectives, as does Toba, then the nominal character of relative clauses implies that they are substantivals, which may or may not be combined with another noun as their head. If a language possesses adjectives, these may be minimally distinct from substantives, as they are in Quechua. Then if a clause is nominalized with orientation, the result may be more noun-like or more adjective-like. In the former case, its primary use will be as a headless relative-clause; in the latter case, it will be as a headed relative clause. However, since in such cases substantive/substantival and adjective/adjectival are but subcategories of the category noun/nominal, mutual conversion between them commonly boils down to combining or not combining them with a head nominal. In such cases, the question of whether a relative clause is primarily substantival or adjectival may not find an answer.

Most of the articles talk about "the syntactic function of the head noun within the relative clause" (e.g. p. 180). While such negligent talk is conventionally understood, it should be clear that the head has a syntactic function in the relative clause only if the latter is head-internal. Otherwise, the head nominal could, in many languages including English, not even be inserted in the relativized position to form a full clause because it lacks determination. Thus, what is meant by such formulations is the syntactic function of the relativized position.

In principle, a full clause may be oriented towards any of the syntactic functions born by an NP. The set of functions actually available for relativization in a language depends on a variety of factors. Quite in general, it follows the **hierarchy of syntactic functions** (first proposed as the Noun Phrase Accessibility Hierarchy in Keenan & Comrie 1977, elaborated in Lehmann 1984, ch. 3 and 1986) whose (simplified) top is: subject > direct object > indirect object > other complement > adjunct / complement of adposition > possessive attribute … In systems where the orientation is effectuated by a diathetic less-than-finite verb form – a participle in active, passive and possibly further voices, as in (2) and (6) – it is often confined to the highest functions, precisely those for which there are voices. This may explain why most of the authors refer, in this connection, to "arguments" of the relative clause (e.g. p. 180), although the lower positions of the hierarchy are occupied by non-arguments.

Traditional lore has it that a **restrictive** adnominal relative clause is an attribute while a **non-restrictive** relative clause is an apposition. The present volume questions this simple picture. The restrictiveness opposition is a semantic one; and as usual, there is no biunique mapping between function and form. Specifically, what is structurally an apposition – a noun phrase consisting of two (or more) juxtaposed noun phrases targeting the same referent – may semantically amount to a restrictive relation. Constructions of the type 'the student, the one we met' are frequent both in the languages of this volume and elsewhere; and although the construction is appositive, the second noun phrase serves to pin down the reference of the first instead of making an independent comment on an already-identified referent, as is definitional for a non-restrictive clause. Several of the authors argue that the (restrictive) relative construction of their language originates from such an apposition. While the diachronic pathway is everything but new, no contribution to this volume offers historical data for empirical proof. Nor is any of the authors concerned about the theoretical problem of how such an appositive nominalized clause may become restrictive, given that its head is, at least initially, a noun phrase. There appear to be two pathways by which this can happen. First, a semantic locus of transition between non-restrictive and restrictive attribute is provided by non-

definite and non-generic head NPs, as in *we met a student, the best one in her class*. This is synonymous with the restrictive construction *we met the best student in her class*. Such constructions therefore provide the basis for the reanalysis of the scope of determiners from determiner of the head nominal to determiner of the relative construction. Finally, that reanalysis may extend to definite and generic determination (s. Lehmann 1984, ch. VI.1.1.2). The second bridge is provided by grammaticalization: If the appositive construction coalesces, any determiner accompanying the relative clause may forfeit its referential function and become some kind of linker, as in the notorious Ancient Greek *ho ánthrōpos ho agathós* (Dᴇꜰ man Dᴇꜰ good) 'the good man'. At the same time, the scope of the first determiner becomes the entire complex NP, and the relative clause becomes restrictive. The two pathways are mutually independent, but may strengthen each other.

The concepts under discussion may now be defined as follows:[2] A **relative construction** is a syntactic construction consisting of a nominal N and a dependent clause RC which is oriented towards one of its NP positions. N is the **head nominal**, RC is the **relative clause**.

   (a) N may be zero, in which case the RC is headless.
   (b) The position towards which the RC is oriented is actually or phorically occupied by N.
   (c) Let N designate H and the RC including H designate S. Then the RC modifies N in such a way that H is specified as occupying the participant position in S.

2   Critical discussion

Bernard Comrie and Zarina Estrada-Fernández are well-known specialists in matters of relative clauses and Uto-Aztecan languages, resp., thus qualifying excellently for the task of editing such a volume. Their introduction provides short abstracts of the contributions, concentrating on the problems of the headedness of relative clauses and their relationship to nominalizations. The rest of the volume divides into three parts. The first part comprises articles on theoretical and diachronic aspects of relative clause formation. The remaining articles are descriptive studies, each devoted to one language and subdivided into part two, focusing on Uto-Aztecan languages, and part three, dealing with other American languages. Several among the contributions fruitfully combine the synchronic and the diachronic perspectives, which is - as is aptly remarked by Thornes (p. 148), almost a century after Saussure's verdict against such a combination, the state of the art in our discipline.

The initial observation on the first contribution, by Talmy Givón on diachronic typology, is that the final editing of this text was so sloppy that one cannot even be sure that the author intended to say everything that the text says. He hypothesizes that there are two diachronic pathways by which relative constructions originate, both of them reductive in nature. The first condenses a sequence of two erstwhile independent clauses into a complex sentence of the clause-chaining type; the second presupposes a nominalized clause and combines this in apposition with a nominal group. In both cases, an original intonation break is smoothed out so that the relative clause may become restrictive. The genesis of a relative clause by expansion of an original participle (s. Lehmann 1984,

---

[2] The definition provided in Andrews 2007:206, "A relative clause (RC) is a subordinate clause which delimits the reference of an NP by specifying the role of the referent of that NP in the situation described by the RC." differs substantially from my definition only by requiring "delimitation" instead of "specification" of the reference, which condition only applies to restrictive relative clauses.

ch. VI.1.2.1) is not considered here, although Givón's own Tibetan examples (p. 17f) might well be a case in point.

A major shortcoming in Givón's account of the first process lies in his apparent ignorance of the correlative construction. His point on the condensation of parataxis into a relative construction could be much stronger if the facts were all correct. In the analysis of Bambara, he repeatedly (pp. 5f) declares the relative particle to stem from a demonstrative meaning 'that'. However, it is actually identical with the interrogative pronoun 'where' (as in so many other languages). Given that, the biclausal construction is of the correlative type. Likewise, Givón suspects that Hittite *kwis* (s. (4)f) "was probably a demonstrative determiner" (p. 9). It is, however, identical with the interrogative and indefinite pronoun of this language and of cognate Indo-European languages, and the examples adduced are, again, correlative constructions, like (4)f above. These are categorically different from clause chaining. And after discussing for five pages combinations of two clauses the first of which develops into a (preposed) relative clause, Givón claims this to be a common pattern in informal discourse, illustrating with an example from English child language (p. 11) in which the s e c o n d clause is equivalent to a relative clause in more formal style (see Lehmann 2008 on the relevance of sequential order here). In section 3, Givón postulates a genesis of the "new" (p. 11) Modern German postnominal relative clause out of a "non-restrictive (parenthetical)" relative clause. Actually, the modern construction appears in Old High German texts; its genesis out of a set of Germanic constructions is described, on the basis of corpus data, in Lehmann 1984, ch. VI.1.2.2.

Bernard Comrie and Tania Kuteva study the use of markers of relative clauses whose subject is relativized in a large sample of creole languages. On the background of cross-linguistic variation which comprises a gamut from zero to five markers in general, creole languages are special in showing, in the far majority, exactly one marker. i.e., they do not partake in the cross-linguistic variation, and their position on the gamut is close to the lower end of structural complexity. Again, relative constructions developed in language contact generally show the more formal complexity the more intense the contact, conforming thus to general expectations on complexification in contact situations. If creole language arise out of language contact, their one-marker principle requires an explanation. The explanation offered by the authors is that, unlike other languages getting into contact, creole languages arise out of pidgins which employ no marker at all. They have just had the time to do the first step to pair a function with a form.

In the presentation of evidence from the sample, there is much discussion on whether something should count as a relative marker. The subject pronoun appearing in the Bislama and Tayo relative clauses (p. 32-34) is not considered as one, but the subject pronoun appearing in the non-restrictive Negerhollands relative clause (34-36) is. Likewise, in Ngemba - the record-holder with five markers -, the verb of the relative clause contains the well-known Bantu class prefix for the subject. Since that is a finite construction and finite verbs always bear that prefix, it is not clear why it should be considered as a relative clause marker, as it is without comment (p. 30). What we miss here is an introductory clarification of what counts as a marker of relative clause formation.

Robert Van Valin intends to show that Role and Reference grammar can account with equal simplicity for both externally and internally headed relative clauses without the need to assume null elements or movement processes. He formulates rules that link the syntactic to a semantic representation, exemplifying with one externally and one internally headed relative clause. The formalism proposed does not distinguish between attribution and predication (p. 55), so that it does not become clear how the semantic representations for *I saw the tall man* and *I saw that the man was tall* would differ. Like Givón, Van Valin ignores the correlative construction, claiming that the Bambara relative clause (which is actually part of a correlative diptych) is shifted to the left "to

avoid a center embedding" (p. 59) and that "internally headed relative clauses never contain relative pronouns" (p. 60), which they regularly do in the correlative diptych; see (4).

The second part of the volume starts with two articles on the Yaqui (northwest Mexico) relative clause, covering essentially the same ground, obviously with a great deal of overlap, but also with contradictions. For instance, we get two versions of the paradigm of personal pronouns (pp. 71, 101). And while the author of the first article, Albert Álvarez González, insists that the suffixes appearing on the relative clause are nominalizers, the author of the second article, Lilián Guerrero, calls them clause linkage markers.

Álvarez starts his contribution by a survey of typologies of the relative clause. His typology of positional types considers only embedded relative clauses, ignoring, thus, the adjoined relative clause. This makes one wonder which positional type the correlative construction would be assigned to, which is mentioned one page later. He then proceeds to a detailed description of the Yaqui relative clause, showing convincingly that it is essentially an oriented nominalized clause (cf. (2) and (6)) which may equally function as an NP or as an adjectival attribute. Although some of the nominalizing suffixes are also used in derivation, the relative clause retains a relatively high degree of sententiality ("finiteness"), the virtually only internal symptom of nominalization being the genitive on the subject of the relative clause. The distribution of such a nominalized clause, however, is essentially the same of a noun or NP. Since its combination with a head nominal is a mere juxtaposition, Álvarez argues that it is not necessary to posit relative clause formation as a grammatical operation of Yaqui.

While Álvarez's empirical basis are essentially concocted linguist's examples, Guerrero works mostly on corpus data. One of the consequences is that she brings up quite a few examples that do not fit in Álvarez's neat and regular framework. Having no ax to grind, she describes a rather heterogeneous set of data. The bulk of the article is devoted to a comparison of relative clauses with complement clauses, emphasizing the similarity between a relative clause and the complement of a verb of direct perception. The author distinguishes "true relative clauses", which essentially comes down to restrictive relative clauses, from "non-modifying relative-like structures", subsuming under the latter headless and non-restrictive relative clauses and complement clauses. About the former, she says: "Functionally, true Rel-clauses introduce or further establish new information into discourse" (p. 100). This is not so. On the one hand, that is the typical function of non-restrictive relative clauses. On the other, the information status of a (restrictive) relative clause is subservient to the information status of the NP that it is a constituent of. There are also quite a few errors in the analysis: On p. 103, the relative-clause internal syntactic function of the head noun of (6)b is mis-identified. In (7)b, the last clause cannot be a relative clause, as its subject is not in the genitive. On p. 104, analytical comments on exx. (6)b and c are apparently swapped. The relative clause of (6)b is wrongly analyzed as head-external, while the ones of (10)b and (14)c are wrongly analyzed as head-internal. The dependent clause in (8) – allegedly a head-internal relative clause – must be a non-oriented nominalized clause, witness its suffix. "Theme/patient oriented" nominalizations are diagnosed in ex. (11)b, which contains none.

The contribution by Estrada-Fernández pursues the fate of the single Pima-Bajo (northwest Mexico) relativizer *-kɨg* – a clause-final suffix – from its pre-historical origin to its most recent expansion. For the reconstruction, the author elaborates on a hypothesis due to Ken Hale which assumes a combination of a participial clause ended by a participle suffix with a main clause starting with a resumptive demonstrative (misleadingly called "determiner" on p. 137). *-kɨg* would then originate from the univerbation and contraction of the suffix with the demonstrative. The details of the hypothesis, however, remain to be clarified: What is an "attributive clause"? In

Estrada's discussion (p. 137f), it is alternately the first or the second of the two clauses involved. What is the syntactic status of the participial construction? Ex. (16) (whose translations are not in order) appears to assume that it can be a sentence; but the comparison with (15) suggests that it is rather a left-dislocated topic for the following clause. Why does the demonstrative have to be the subject of a nominal predication? The assumed constellation and subsequent development would be the same with a verbal predicate. All in all, while such a genesis of a relativizer seems possible in principle, one would like to see corpus evidence to show that the combination presupposed did at all occur in the language. The review of relative markers in neighboring Uto-Aztecan languages offered in §4 certainly lends no comparative support to the hypothesis. It is introduced by the sentence "The diachronic origin of the relative marker *-kɨg* is traceable in Névome, an historical variety of Pima Bajo now extinct" (p. 138); but the demonstration relies on a set of examples that show that the relativization patterns and suffixes of this language were entirely unrelated to the Pima Bajo construction. In (4), the relationship between the glossed text and the translation is not transparent; nor is it clear how a morpheme suffixed to a particle of a subordinate clause can be an imperative marker. Ex. (13) is said to contain a correlative clause, where neither a relative nor a correlative pronoun is to be seen. In (15)a, a "perfective participial suffix" (p. 137) combines with a verb stem marked and translated as imperfective. The introductory passage of §5 purportedly deals with the (im-)possibility of relativizing on syntactic functions lower than the direct object. However, in none of the examples (25) – (27) does the relativized element have such a function. The remainder of the section shows the suffix *-kɨg* not on relative clauses, but on the preceding head noun or even an interrogative pronoun functioning as a relative pronoun. Estrada postulates a reanalysis here (p. 143); however, the syntactic contexts providing the bridge for the reinterpretation remain to be shown.

Tim Thornes's treatment of Northern Paiute (western U.S.A.) relative clauses is one of the more careful expositions. Like in Álvarez's Yaqui, the relative clause here is essentially an oriented nominalization, the syntactic function of the open argument position being primarily coded by the nominalizing suffix. In addition, the language has what appears to be a clitic relative pronoun if that syntactic function is lower than direct object in the hierarchy. If it is lower than subject (i.e. it is oblique in the traditional sense), the subject of the relative clause is marked by a possessive proclitic on the (nominalized) verb. If this is third person, the clitic may be the anaphoric third person clitic or a special "logophoric (reflexive) possessor proclitic *tɨ*=" which refers to an "ongoing topic" (p. 152f). This morpheme is homonymous with the antipassive prefix. Section 3 is devoted to the combinations of voice prefixes with relativizing suffixes on the relative-clause verb. For the combination of the antipassive prefix with the non-subject relativizer, things get complicated. This form of a verb V would have to mean "entity Oʙʟ-which Subject Vs intransitively", where 'intransitively' excludes a direct object and Oʙʟ represents any relation coded by an English preposition – direct object being excluded because of the antipassive voice. However, the verbs of (30)f are apparently used transitively and the function of the open argument position is direct object, which one should think to be incompatible with the presence of an antipassive prefix. In two of the examples ([28] first occurrence and [31]), the problem may be solved by glossing preverbal *tɨ* as the "logophoric/reflexive" clitic instead of antipassive; but in (30), the two morphemes appear to co-occur. The solution to the puzzle may be to discard the analysis as antipassive voice and to assume, instead, that the prefix means "unspecified patient" without affecting the valency. In headless non-subject-oriented relative clauses, the prefix may then take the stead of the missing head.

M.ª Belén Carpio and Marisa Censabella start their description of relativization in Toba (Gran Chaco) with a sizeable set of definitions. In this language, the introductory pronoun is a pure

attributor; it occupies no syntactic position in the relative clause, and there is, in fact, nothing to mark the relativized position. In the slot of the introductory pronoun, there is a primary opposition between a dedicated relative pronoun and the full paradigm of demonstratives, which latter may bear a topicalizing suffix. The distinctions being marked by this staggered opposition have to do with the functions of the head and the relative clause in information structure. Furthermore, the authors distinguish relative clauses from complement clauses (p. 179, 192) as defined above in §1.[3] Since the open position of the relative clause is not marked, the subordinate clauses themselves look the same. There is, however, a difference in the syntactic relation between the head nominal and the subordinate clause: the relative clause is a modifier, while the adnominal complement clause is a possessive attribute of the head. The latter (possibly a Spanish calque) can be seen in exx. (10) and (12). By this criterion, the dependent clause in (11) – 'the day that P.'s parents leave' – is a relative clause; contrary to what the authors assume, the head nominal here may well have a role in the dependent clause. Similar observations apply to (21): the dependent clause is not a "noun complement" but either a relative clause or the extrafocal clause of a cleft-sentence. In (1) and (6), it is unclear why the syntactic function of the subject of an applicative verb should be S (conventionally, intransitive subject) rather than A (transitive subject); no relevant difference is to be discerned between (6) and (7), the subject of which latter is analyzed as A. Allegedly, the function of the possessed nominal in a possessive construction is relativizable in Toba. However, ex. (5) does not show that. In fact, a relative construction of the type 'the house which of John's I bought was cheap' (to mean something like "the house of John's that I bought was cheap") is not possible in any language, since the occupant of the relativized position, whether overt (a relative or resumptive pronoun) or zero, is of the category NP and consequently does not take attributes. Finally, the authors claim repeatedly that "the P argument … must be overtly expressed by a noun phrase" (p. 175). While such a constraint would be peculiar enough in a typological perspective, ex. (17) appears to falsify it, as it contains an applicative verb without a trace of a "P argument" (a direct object).

   In a carefully argued paper, Patience Epps describes relative clauses in Hup (Vaupés region) and postulates a gradual rather than categorical distinction between headed, light-headed and headless relative clauses, ascribing the latter distinction to Citko 2004. The distinction as well as its graduality are first proposed in Lehmann 1984, ch. V.4.1.2, as observed by Rodríguez Bravo (p. 266 of the present volume). Epps discusses the gradience in the head position from full lexical noun via bound noun, classificatory noun and plural suffix to zero, betraying (p. 202) some uncertainty on the grammatical status of the elements in question. As this is a case of grammaticalization, the changes involved comprise, *inter alia*, desemanticization and increase of bondedness. Especially on account of the latter process, the morphemes in question forfeit their status as nouns. This, however, only affects their autonomy, viz. their status as words. It does not affect their category, which remains N throughout. As is typical for grammaticalization, desemanticization gradually strips a *significatum* of its semantic features, leaving, in the end, only its categorial grammatical feature. And that is precisely what is used to confer nominal status to the construction equipped with such a grammatical formative. Since it determines the category of the construction, it remains its head

---

[3] On p. 174, however, they want to base the distinction on the criterion of "presence or absence of co-referentiality between the noun modified and the modifying clause". That does not work: in a construction like *the fact that Linda left*, the complement clause targets the same referent as the head noun, viz. a particular state of affairs.

throughout the grammaticalization process, just like the suffix *-ness* is the head of the word *darkness*.

Stephen A. Marlett offers a systematic and comprehensive description of the Seri (northwest Mexico) relative clause. It is based on oriented nominal verb forms (with the exception of a finite irrealis form) which are derived by a rather large set of nominalizing prefixes. Although the head is internal to the RC without being specially marked, its head status is unambiguous since the verb prefix identifies its syntactic function. Determiners are NP-final and consequently follow the relative construction. The head nominal is generally not determined. According to the hypothesis (put forward in Lehmann 1984, ch. V.2.2f and by others) presented as a principle of relative clause formation in §1, the head of a restrictive relative clause cannot be determined as definite or generic; in other words, if it is provided by any determiners at all (which it is commonly not), these may only be indefinite or specific. Marlett claims (p. 228) that Seri falsifies this hypothesis.[4] The evidence adduced, however, confirms rather than falsifies it. On the one hand, the head may be followed by an indefinite article (exx. (48)f), which is in full consonance with the hypothesis. On the other hand, the only other determiner that may follow the head is one claimed to be definite. However, firstly, that one is a kind of default determiner that also functions as an NP-internal linker, as in the Greek case mentioned before. The relative clauses in which it appears are all of that structure, featuring a subject-oriented stative intransitive verb (or adjective) attributed to the preceding head nominal via that determiner. Secondly and in consonance with this, the semantic determination of the relative constructions in two of the relevant examples ((40) and (41)) is obviously indefinite rather than definite. The conclusion is, thus, safe that this determiner has lost its definiteness feature and is beginning to assume a purely structural function.

In the last section, Marlett wishes to argue that relative clauses are rare in the language and, for that purpose, minimizes the set by discounting certain constructions. In Seri, adjectives, quantifiers and numerals do not constitute separate word classes but are verbs. Since these are often used as noun modifiers, they would increase the number of relative clauses. Marlett invokes semantic criteria to exclude them from the set of relative clauses. Also, after having argued in §2 (appropriately, as it seems) that relative clauses are based on nominalized verb forms, he finally discounts such headless relatives, again on semantic grounds.

The Gavião language (Rondônia) is described by Denny Moore as lacking a dedicated relative construction. Clauses are nominalized by a postposed demonstrative ("discourse pronoun"). If nothing else happens, they may function as complement or even as adverbial clauses. Alternatively, they may be implicitly oriented, either on a position occupied by a nominal, in which case they are circumnominal, or on an empty position, in which case they are headless. Such a clause may also modify a following nominal, which may result in a prenominal relative construction or even one with repeated head nominal. It is clear that relative clause formation in the traditional sense is not grammaticalized in the language.

Rodrigo Gutiérrez-Bravo focuses his description of the Yucatec Maya (Yucatán) relative clause on the headless variety. The relative clause does not differ essentially from an independent clause. In its headed variety, it is postnominal, neither introduced by anything nor containing a resumptive pronoun, although the presence of obligatory cross-reference markers for most of the relativized functions should not be forgotten. Headless relative clauses come in two variants. One simply lacks a head nominal. The other one has a relative pronoun introducing the clause which is identical with

---

[4] On p. 239, he even construes the hypothesis to claim that an internal head must be "formally indefinite", which is indeed an absurd version of the hypothesis.

the interrogative (and the indefinite) pronoun. Since the relative pronoun is not combinable with an overt head,[5] this looks as if it is itself the head. Gutiérrez-Bravo concentrates on the former variant, provides an insightful analysis for it and shows that it does not correspond to Citko's concept of a "light head". This in itself does not appear to contribute much to a clarification, and one wonders whether it is not rather the pronominal variant, if any, that should be measured against this concept. The author postulates fine conceptual distinctions between headless, light-head, null nominal domain and free relatives which are based on certain theoretical assumptions while occasionally lacking in clear structural correlates. Thus, the argument that a *bona fide* headless relative is, instead, "a relative structure in which the head of a noun phrase happens to be phonetically null" (p. 261) seems a bit scholastic.

Marianne Mithun uses the concept of a pathway for "grammatical replication" developed by Heine & Kuteva 2006:209-226 according to which a language may introduce interrogative pronouns into relative constructions by contact with a (typically European) language that does so. The stages are roughly: independent pronominal interrogative, dependent pronominal interrogative, headless relative clause, headed relative clause. She applies this schema to Tuscarora (eastern U.S.A.). By a longitudinal study through a historical corpus, she shows that the spread of interrogative pronouns in Tuscarora relative clauses followed exactly the pathway outlined by Heine & Kuteva and proceeded in step with the spread of bilingualism in English. While the pathway is certainly one of the possibilities for a language to acquire relative pronouns based on interrogative/indefinite pronouns, one should not apply it Indo-European languages, as Mithun does on p. 285, because they acquired such relative pronouns on the basis of the correlative construction illustrated in (4)f above. Moreover, she assumes a "substitution of an interrogative pronoun for a demonstrative in an existing relative construction" (p. 289 *et pass.*) for English and German, while the two pronouns actually originate in different, but converging constructions.

3   Conclusion

Some more work might have been invested in editing the volume. The English of some of the Non-Anglophones was not revised. Certain general abbreviations such as *e.g.* and *i.e.* are employed with unknown meaning in their articles. In several articles, the interlinear glosses contain undefined abbreviations. Nor was there an attempt to harmonize such abbreviations; even the two articles on Yaqui use different labels for the same categories. There are numerous mismatches between example texts, their interlinear glosses and their translations. Bibliographical references have apparently not been verified. Because of the absurd Benjamins rule to put all examples in italics, the convention explained by Marlett (p. 220) according to which deverbal nouns in the examples would be marked by underscore came to nothing without anybody noticing.

The contributions to this volume are not meant to provide exhaustive descriptions of the relative clauses of the languages in question. All of them concentrate on some selected aspects, mostly the subordination and nominalization of the relative clause, the nature of the head nominal and the syntactic function of the relativized position. Topics like the determination of the relative construction, indifferent relative clauses (introduced by 'who/whichever'), the relationship of relative clauses to cleft-sentences are not treated at all; non-restrictive and adverbial relative

---

[5] There is one example ([11]) which is analyzed as containing an overt head followed by a relative pronoun; but the noun in question is not the head.

clauses, stacking of relative clauses, the combination of a relative clause with other attributes and their relationship with indirect interrogatives are treated in one or another article.

Two general conclusions concerning the nature of relative clauses may be drawn from the set of descriptions. First, a relative clause is, in any case, a subordinate clause. In order to specify an entity by the role it plays in the situation designated by the clause, it must, in addition, be oriented. This operation, however, is often not marked grammatically, but left to the semantics (p. 251). If there is no grammatical operation of orientation, the embedded relative clause may be indistinguishable from a complement clause (just as the adjoined relative clause may then be indistinguishable from a generic subordinate clause; s. Lehmann 1984, ch. III.2.2.4). Several authors of the volume argue, with justification, that such a subordinate clause should not be called a relative clause. Second, as already mentioned in §1, even in a language that does have adjectives, the orientation of a subordinate clause does not need to produce an adjectival clause. It may be a substantival clause whose primary function it is to be the core of an NP and which may only secondarily be combined with another nominal to modify it. Such a clause does not correspond to the traditional idea of a relative clause, either, because it does not by itself bear a phoric relation to a nominal expression (which is the original meaning of 'relative'). Apparently, 'relative clause' is a derived concept, based on the more fundamental concept of 'oriented clause'.

References

Andrews, Avery D. 2007, "Relative clauses." Shopen, Timothy (ed.), *Language typology and linguistic description*. Cambridge etc.: Cambridge University Press; 2:206-236.

Citko, Barbara 2004, "On headed, headless, and light-headed relatives." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22:95-126.

Haudry, Jean 1973, "Parataxe, hypotaxe et corrélation dans la phrase latine". *BSL* 68(1): 147-186 .

Heine, Bernd & Kuteva, Tania 2006, *The changing languages of Europe*. Oxford etc.: Oxford University Press.

Keenan, Edward L. & Comrie, Bernard 1977, "Noun phrase accessibility and universal grammar." *Linguistic Inquiry* 8(1):63-99.

Lehmann, Christian 1984, *Der Relativsatz. Typologie seiner Strukturen - Theorie seiner Funktionen - Kompendium seiner Grammatik.* Tübingen: G. Narr (Language Universals Series, 2).

Lehmann, Christian 1986, "On the typology of relative clauses". *Linguistics* 24:663-680.

Lehmann, Christian 2008, „Information structure and grammaticalization." Seoane, Elena & López Couso, María José (eds.), *Theoretical and empirical issues in grammaticalization.* Amsterdam & Philadelphia: J. Benjamins (Typological Studies in Language, 77); 207-229.