Relative clause(-like) constructions in East Caucasian

Yury Lander

Relative clause constructions

- Relative clause (roughly)
  - is a subordinate clause
  - which is used for the description of some participant of the situation / state-of-affairs denoted by the matrix clause
  - via its participation in some other situation / state-of-affairs (described by that relative clause)

- Examples of relative clause constructions (subordinate parts are in brackets)
  - *This is a clause [that is used for the description].*
  - *This is a situation [described by the clause].*

Relative clause constructions

- Naïve understanding:
  - Attributive clauses which modify nouns
- …does not cover all relative clause constructions

- "Headless"/Free relatives:
  - *Take [what you find].*
- Correlatives:
  - **Hindi** (Dayal, V. 1996. *Locality in WH Quantification*. Dordrecht):
    [jo   laRkiyaaN khaRii   haiN]   ve   lambii   haiN
    which girls   standing be.PRS   they   tall   be.PRS
     'The girls who are standing are tall.'

- Below:
  - mostly "headed" constructions
  - mostly non-correlatives

East Caucasian relatives at first glance

- Prenominal participial clauses
  - sometimes appear postnominally (presumably not in all languages)

Sanzhi Dargwa (Forker 2020)

il-tːi   [bahla-l   ag-ur]   durħ-ne
that-PL   slow-ADJ   go.PFV-PRET   boy-PL
'the boys who went slowly'

iž   maʕlʔuʕn-ni [ca kur-re   ka-b-iž-ib-il   dawla-či-w   Ismaʕʔil-li-cːella]
this snake-ERG   one pit-LOC DOWN-N-be.PFV-PRET-ATR wealth-ADJ-M Ismail-OBL-COM
'the snake that sat in a pit together with the rich Ismail'

Barylnikova, D.V. 2015. Pričastnaja strategija reljativizacii v naxsko-dagestanskix jazykax. BA Thesis. Moscow: HSE University.**Forker, D. 2020.** *A grammar of Sanzhi Dargwa*. Berlin.

East Caucasian relatives at first glance

- Correlatives

Tsakhur (Lyutikova 1999: 463)

[ne-n-Gʷ-ē-jē   jed-i-qa-jī   daḵ-i-qa   k'ɨr   g-idʲ-aq̄-ɨ]
which.1-ATR-OBL.1-ERG-Q mother-OBL-ALL-and father-OBL-ALL ear.4 NEG-direct-PF
ma-n-Gu-s   *jaIq'   deš-da*
this.1-ATR-OBL.1-DAT way.3   not.exist-ATR
Lit., 'Whoever has not listened to the parents, for this (person) there is no way forward.'

- Seemingly quite widespread but always peripheral.
    - See Belyaev & Haug 2020: 18-21 for a brief survey.

Lyutikova, E. A. 1999. Otnositel'noe predloženie. In A. E. Kibrik & Ya. G. Testelets (eds.), *Élementy caxurskogo jazyka v tipologičeskom osvesčenii*. Moscow. **Belyaev, O. & D. Haug. 2020.** The genesis and typology of correlatives: Supplementary materials. *Language* 96.

East Caucasian relatives at first glance

- Finite relative clauses

Vartashen Udi

*tːe žürä **adamar=te**   [ma-tː-in=te   ič-in   bul=e   zap-e*
that kind   person=PTCL   which-OBL-ERG=COMP   self-ERG   head=3SG   pull-PERF

insan-a]   e=ne=čer-e   udi-ʁo-χ   güržistːan-a
people-DAT   bring=3SG=ST-PERF   Udi-PL-DAT   Georgia-DAT

'…that person who himself guided people brought Udis to Georgia.'

- originate from correlatives?
- probably a contact-induced feature

Gippert, J. 2011. Relative clauses in Vartashen Udi. Preliminary remarks. *Iran & the Caucasus* 15.

NB

- Below we discuss only participial constructions.

- Please do not forget about other possibilities.

Participles?

General participles vs. special participles

- General participles vs "special participles"
  (cf. distinction between general converbs and special converbs)
- Special participles: forms which function similarly to participles but involve peculiar semantics which does not easily fit into the paradigmatic system.
  - Examples: "locative participles", "resultative participles", "potential participles"

Tanti Dargwa

[beˤʔ.la=ra waˤ-te   d-irq'-an]   maˤmmu

most=ADD bad-PL.ATR NPL-do-POT   Mammu

'Mammu, who could do the worst things'

NB: In some other Dargwa languages, the *an*-participle became a general participle.

Sumbatova, N. R. & Yu. A. Lander (with M. Kh. Mamaev). 2014. *Darginskij govor selenija Tanty: Grammatičeskij očerk. Voprosy sintaksisa.* Moscow.

General participles vs. special participles

- General participles vs "special participles"
  (cf. distinction between general converbs and special converbs)
- Special participles: forms which function similarly to participles but involve peculiar semantics which does not easily fit into the paradigmatic system.
  - Examples: optative participles in Agul (< infinitive + COP.PTCP)

Agul (Maisak 2020)
[raħmat   x.a-ʒe]   ħamid   add.a   p.u-ne (…)
requiescence   become.PF-PT:OPT   Hamid   uncle   say.PF-AOR
'The late (lit., to whom let peace be) uncle Hamid said then that…'

Maisak, T. 2020. Relative clauses in Agul from a corpus-based perspective. *STUF* 73(1): 113-158.

Participles?

- In some languages
  - dedicated forms
  - sometimes verbal stems with the attributive morphology

Godoberi (Tatevosov 1996)

a. *ima*   ***w-aʔa***   'The father came.'

   father   M-come.PST

b. *den*   *razi-da*   ***[w-aʔa-bu]***   *im-u-č'u*

   I   be.content-COP   M-come.PST-PTCP   father-OBL-CONT

   'I am content with the father who came.'

Tatevosov, S. G. 1996. Relative clauses. In A. E. Kibrik et al. (eds), *Godoberi*, 210-217. München/Newcastle.

Participles?

- In some languages such "dedicated forms" nonetheless can be used as predicates of independent clauses in narrow focus constructions

Lak (Kazenin 2003)

a. *[muHamad-lul   d-u-r-ša]   ḡatri*

   Mohammed-ERG 4CL-build.PST-4CL-PTCP   house

   'the house built by Mohammed'

b. *uIrč-lul=li   ḡatri   d-u-r-ša*

   boy-ERG=3SG   house   4CL-build.PST-4CL-PTCP

   'THE BOY has built the house.'

Kazenin, K. 2003. Focus in Daghestanian and word order typology. *Linguistic Typology* 6: 289-316. **Kalinina, E. & N. Sumbatova. 2007.** Clause structure and verbal forms in Nakh-Daghestanian languages. In: I. Nikolaeva (ed.), *Finiteness. Theoretical and empirical foundations*. Oxford.

Participles?

- In other languages, the same forms are found in clearly finite clauses

Udi

a. *qːonaʁ-χo   har-i=tːun*

   guest-PL   come-AOR=3PL

   'The guests came.' (written text)

b. *[kiravabad-aχun   har-i]*   *joldaš-χo-n=al*

   Kirovobad-ABL   come-AOR   friend-PL-ERG=ADD

   'and (my) friends that came from Kirovabad'

- Probably resulted from the extension of the use of non-finite forms

Cresseils, D. 2009. Participles and finiteness: the case of Akhvakh. *Linguistic Discovery* 7(1): 106-130. **Lander, Yu. A. 2008.** Pričastnye konstrukcii ili nekategorial'noe podčinenie? In M. E. Alekseev, T. Maisak et al. (eds), *Udinskij sbornik: grammatika, leksika, istorija jazyka*. Moscow.

Participles?

- Occasionally we find non-participial forms as predicates of relative clauses
  - Infinitives

Ingush (Nichols 2011)

aaz   cynna   [diesha]   kinashjka iicar

1SG.ERG   3SG.DAT   D.read.INF book   bought

'I bought him a book to read.'

Tanti Dargwa (Sumbatova & Lander 2014)

[dikʼ-d-arqʼ-isːe]   musːa   b-aˁku   wabšːe

divide-NPL-LV.PF-INF+ATR   place   N-NEG.EXST at.all

'There is no place (for us) to divide them at all.'

Nichols, J. 2011. *Ingush grammar*. Berkeley. **Sumbatova, N. R. & Yu. A. Lander (with M. Kh. Mamaev). 2014.** *Darginskij govor selenija Tanty: Grammatičeskij očerk. Voprosy sintaksisa.* Moscow.

Non-finiteness

- Relative clauses may lack other properties of finite clauses

    - **Udi**: the absence of personal agreement, non-finite negation, etc.

a. *za   udi-n   muz-in   žavab   **te=ne**   tad-i   siftä*

   I:DAT Udi-GEN language-INS answer   NEG=3SG   give-AOR first

   'First, she didn't give me an answer in Udi.'

b. *[šo-tː-in   **nu**=akː-i]   qːonaχ*

   that-OBL-ERG   NEG=see-AOR guest

   'the guest who he did not see'

Lander, Yu. A. 2008. Pričastnye konstrukcii ili nekategorial'noe podčinenie? In M. E. Alekseev, T. Maisak et al. (eds), *Udinskij sbornik: grammatika, leksika, istorija jazyka*. Moscow.

Non-finiteness

- In some East Caucasian languages of Azerbaijan, apparent arguments of relative clauses may take genitive case

Kryz (Authier 2009: 354)

*Allahǯi-r [**va**   i-ka-j]   vu-tir*

God-ERG you(SG):GEN   PV-want-PTCP give-JUSS

'Let God give you what you want'

Udi

*[**bez** / zu   šlum   käj]   kːož   šahat=e*

I:GEN   I   bread eat+AOR house nice=3SG

'The house where I lunched is nice'

Authier, G. 2009. *La langue Kryz (langue caucasique d'Azerbaïdjan, dialecte d'Alik).* Leuven/Paris. **Lander, Yu. 2011.** The adrelative genitive in Udi: Syntactic borrowing plus reanalysis. In: V. S. Tomelleri et al. (eds), *Languages and cultures in the Caucasus*. München/Berlin.

Non-finiteness

- In some East Caucasian languages of Azerbaijan, apparent arguments of relative clauses may take genitive case

  - Presumably the result of Azeri influence

Azeri

[Isa-nın   sev-diy-i]   *qız*   'Isa's beloved girl'
Isa-GEN   love-PTCP-3SG.PR   girl

  - At least in Udi, such genitives are possibly not parts of relative clauses but adnominal possessors

Udi

bez   bütüm   [baj]   šähär-χo   'all cities where I have been'
I:GEN   all   be+AOR   city-PL

Lander, Yu. 2011. The adrelative genitive in Udi: Syntactic borrowing plus reanalysis. In: V. S. Tomelleri et al. (eds), *Languages and cultures in the Caucasus*. München/Berlin.

Take-home message

- The use of the term "participle" for East Caucasian is a matter of tradition.

- The morphological and syntactic status of East Caucasian participles may vary.

- East Caucasian participial constructions are (sometimes?) very different from Standard Average European ones.

Relativized argument?

Relativized argument

- …is the syntactic (or semantic?) role in the subordinate clause which corresponds to the described participant

  - *I met a tiger [**whose** head was covered by a tremendous hat]*
  - Relativization of the possessor of the subject

  - *I met a tiger [**which** was wearing a tremendous hat]*
  - Relativization of the subject

- Important:

  We are not interested in the corresponding role within the matrix clause

Syntactic constraints on relativized arguments

- Keenan & Comrie (1977):
- Hierarchy of NP accessibility: S > DO > IO > OO > POSS > OCOMP

- Roughly and inaccurately:
  - The higher a position is, the easier it is to relativize it.
  - Languages may restrict relativization to the highest positions.

- There are some correlations between the type of the relative clause construction and the position in the hierarchy (see also Maxwell 1979 inter alia)

- Well-known problem: What happens in ergative languages (like East Caucasian)?

Keenan, E.L. & B. Comrie. 1977. Noun phrase accessibility and universal grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8(1): 63-99. **Maxwell, D.N. 1979.** Strategies of relativization and NP accessibility. *Language* 55(2): 352-371.

Syntactic constraints on relativized arguments

- Ross (1967)
- Some constituents (=syntactic islands) cannot contain relativized arguments.

Examples:

No relativization out of a relative clause

The man [who I read a statement [which was about __]] is sick.

No relativization out of a coordinate construction

The madrigals [which Henry [plays the lute and sings __]] sound lousy.

Ross, J.R. 1967. *Constraints on variables in syntax*. Cambridge (Mass.): MIT dissertation.

East Caucasian relativized arguments

- Normally, relativized arguments are absent in the relative clause

Tabassaran (Babaliyeva 2013)

[uzu   kitab   tuv-u]   bay
[1SG   book   give-PTCP.AOR]   boy
'the boy whom I gave the book'

- But any arguments can be omitted, so this is not enough for recognizing what is relativized

Khwarshi (Khalilova 2009: 357)

Pat'imat‡l   iyeq'   [os   b-ešut't'-u]   uže.
Patimat.LAT CL1.know.GNT money(CL3) CL3-let-PST.PTCP   boy(CL1)
'Patimat knows the boy who sent the money.' /
'Patimat knows the boy to whom the money was sent.'

Babaliyeva, A. 2013. *Études sur la morphosyntaxe du tabasaran littéraire*. Paris: l'École Pratique des Hautes Études diss. **Khalilova, Z. 2009.** *A grammar of Khwarshi*. Utrecht.

23

East Caucasian relativized arguments

- Sometimes relativized arguments are expressed by "resumptive pronouns"
  - most often reflexive pronouns

Hunzib (van den Berg 1995: 132)

*[(**žu**) ut'-ur.u]   suk'u-u   mαλu   n-acə-r*

self   CL1.sleep-PST.PTCP man-DAT   dream CL5-see-PRET

'the man who slept saw a dream'

- NB: The use of reflexive pronouns as resumptive is widespread in Turkic, Japanese, Korean…
- This may correlate with a broader use of reflexives as compared to typical European languages

van den Berg, H. 1995. *A grammar of Hunzib (with text and lexicon)*. Leiden.

East Caucasian relativized arguments

- Sometimes relativized arguments are expressed by "resumptive pronouns"
  - Demonstrative pronouns (also used as simple 3rd person pronouns) – more rarely

Khwarshi (Khalilova 2009: 356)

[kand-i   isu-l   heⁿše   tiλλ-u]   žik'o

girl.OBL-ERG that.OBL-LAT   book   give-PST.PTCP   man

'the man that the girl gave a book to'

  - Bagvalal uses both reflexives and demonstratives as resumptive pronouns (Lyutikova 2001).

Khalilova, Z. 2009. *A grammar of Khwarshi*. Utrecht. **Lyutikova, E.A. 2001.** Otnositel'noe predloženie. In A.E. Kibrik et al. (eds), *Bagvalinskij jazyk. Grammatika. Teksty. Slovari*. Moscow.

East Caucasian relativized arguments?

- Terribly:
- Sometimes it is impossible to postulate a syntactic position that is relativized

Archi (Kibrik et al. 1977: 303)

[ħawan   bu-ʟ'u-ƫu-t]   *aʟ'*   *ʟo-t'u*

ram   CL3-slaughter.PFV-ATR-CL4 meat   CL4.give.PFV-NEG

'They would not give (us) the meat of the slaughtered ram'

Akhvakh (Denis Creissels, p.c. with Michael Daniel, from field notes)

[c̄'a   qēda]   *c̄'aba*

rain   ask.PTCP.IPF   stone

lit. 'a rain-asking stone',

(not 'a stone asking for a rain' or 'a stone to ask for a rain with')

'a stone such as if it would be once lifted up, there would be no need to ask for the rain ever again'

Kibrik, A.E. et al. 1977. *Opyt strukturnogo opisanija arčinskogo jazyka*. Vol. 2. Moscow.

Semantics above all?

- Kibrik (1980: 333):
  - East Caucasian relativization is not based on the syntactic characteristics of any argument

Kibrik, A.E. 1980. Predikatno-argumentnye otnošenija v semantičeski ergativnyx jazykax. *Izvestija AN SSSR, Ser. literatury i jazyka* 39(4): 324-335.

Semantics above all?

- Comrie & Polinsky (1999):

  "The hearer has to assign a plausible interpretation to the association between the head NP and an unexpressed constituent in the attributive clause. (…) If a plausible interpretation can be assigned (…) then the resulting relative clause construction is judged acceptable".

- Comrie et al. (2017):

  - East Caucasian "relative clauses" represent "general noun-modifying clause constructions" (GNMCCs), which are not based on syntactic mechanisms.

Comrie, B. & M. Polinsky. 1999. Form and function in syntax: Relative clauses in Tsez. In M. Darnell et al. (eds), *Functionalism and formalism in linguistics*. Vol. 2: *Case studies*, 77–92. Amsterdam/Philadelphia. **Comrie, B., D. Forker & Z. Khalilova. 2017.** General noun-modifying clause constructions in Hinuq and Bezhta, with a note on other Daghestanian languages. In Y. Matsumoto et al. (eds), *Noun-modifying clause constructions in languages of Eurasia: Rethinking theoretical and geographical boundaries*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia.

GNMCCs: For

- For many languages, it is reported that everything is relativizable and there are no effects of NP accessibility.

Lezgian (Haspelmath 1993: 342)

Relativization of an (inalienable) possessor

[ğül.ü-n	*mašin*	*čünüx-aj]*		*pab*
husband-GEN	car	steal-PST:PTCP		wife

'the wife whose husband's car was stolen'

Relativization of an object of comparison

[wiče-laj	*šahdağ*	*q'aq'an*	*tir]*	*dağ*	*hina*	*awa?*
self-SUPEREL	Šahdağ	high	COP:PTCP	mountain	where	be.in

'Where is the mountain that Šahdağ (4243 m) is taller than?'

Haspelmath, M. 1993. *A grammar of Lezgian*. Berlin/New York.

GNMCCs: For

- Some languages even allow relativization out of canonical syntactic islands.

Relativization out of a relative clause

Tanti Dargwa (Sumbatova & Lander 2014: 196)
a. *hi.t-i-li*   *[č-ib-se]*   *kːata* *b-ibšː-ib*
   that-OBL-ERG   bring:PF-PRET-ATR cat   N-run:PF-PRET
   'The cat which she brought ran away.'
b. *[[(sun-ni-li)*   *dam*   *č-ib-se]*   *kːata* *b-ibšː-ib]*   *xːunul*
   self-OBL-ERG I:DAT   bring:PF-PRET-ATR   cat   N-run:PF-PRET woman
   lit., 'the woman who the cat which she brought me ran away'

Sumbatova, N. R. & Yu. A. Lander (with M. Kh. Mamaev). 2014. *Darginskij govor selenija Tanty: Grammatičeskij očerk. Voprosy sintaksisa.* Moscow.

GNMCCs: For

- Some languages even allow relativization out of canonical syntactic islands.

Relativization out of a coordinate construction

Tanti Dargwa (Sumbatova & Lander 2014: 195-196)

a. *ʔaʕħmad-li=ra   musa-li=ra   mura   d-ertː-ib*

Ahmad-ERG=ADD Musa-ERG=ADD hay   NPL-mow:PF-PRET

'Ahmad and Musa mowed the hay.'

b. *[ʔaʕħmad-li=ra   sun-ni=ra   mura   d-ertː-ib]*   *admi*

Ahmad-ERG=ADD   self-ERG=ADD   hay   NPL-mow:PF-PRET   man

lit., 'the man Ahmed and who mowed the hay'

Sumbatova, N. R. & Yu. A. Lander (with M. Kh. Mamaev). 2014. *Darginskij govor selenija Tanty: Grammatičeskij očerk. Voprosy sintaksisa.* Moscow.

GNMCCs: For

- East Caucasian languages are regularly reported "to relativize unrelativizable"

Agul (Maisak 2020: 115)

[jakː   ug.a-je]   niʔ

meat   burn.IPF-PRS.PTCP   smell

'a smell of burning meat'

Bezhta (Comrie et al. 2017: 135)

[do   Maskola-ʔ   eⁿλ'e-cas]   hädürɬi

me   Moscow-IN   CL1.go-PRS.PTCP   preparation

'the preparations for my (male) travel to Moscow'

Comrie, B., D. Forker & Z. Khalilova. 2017. General noun-modifying clause constructions in Hinuq and Bezhta, with a note on other Daghestanian languages. In Y. Matsumoto et al. (eds), *Noun-modifying clause constructions in languages of Eurasia: Rethinking theoretical and geographical boundaries*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia. **Maisak, T. 2020.** Relative clauses in Agul from a corpus-based perspective. *STUF* 73(1): 113-158.

GNMCCs: For

- Polinsky et al. (2012):
  - For Avar no processing differences between the relativization of the ergative argument and the relativization of the absolutive argument of the transitive verb.

- Possible interpretation:
  - Avar "relativization" does not depend on syntactic mechanisms which could motivate such processing difficulties.
  - NB: Polinsky et al. provide a different interpretation.

Polinsky, M., C. Gómez Gallo, P. Graff, E. Kravtchenko. 2012. Subject preference and ergativity. *Lingua* 122(3): 267-277.

GNMCCs: For

- East Caucasian languages sometimes can relativize several (coindexed) participants at the same time
  - an apparent violation of Keenan's (1972) ban on multiple coreferent relative pronouns
  - possibly due to the fact that these constructions are not based on syntactic mechanisms

Tanti Dargwa (Lander & Daniel 2019)

[***sun-na*** *durħaˤ-li* ***sun-na*** *xːunul* *r-učː-ib-se*] *admi* *w-ačʼ-ib*

self-GEN boy-ERG self-GEN woman F-carry.PFV-PRET-ATR man M-come.PFV-PRET

'There came a man(i) whose(i) son carried his(i) wife away.'

Keenan, E. 1972. On semantically based grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 3: 413-461. **Lander, Yu. & M. Daniel. 2019.** West Caucasian relative pronouns as resumptives. *Linguistics* 57(6): 1239-1270.

GNMCCs: For

- Cross-linguistically, resumptive pronouns usually appear as a means of support when a given position is not easily relativizable, i.e. lower on Keenan & Comrie's hierarchy.
- For several East Caucasian languages, it is reported that resumptive pronouns can appear even where the highest positions are relativized
  - although they clearly do not constitute the default construction, possibly because of the topicality of the highest positions.
  - In these languages resumptive pronouns apparently need not make distinctions between different syntactic positions.

Chechen (Komen 2008)

[(Shaa)	*cynga*	*xi*	*maliitina*	*jolu]*	*Rebiqa*
self.ERG	that.ALL	water	let.drink-PSTN	AUX.PTCP	Rebecca

'Rebecca, who had made him drink water'

Komen, E. W. 2008. An introduction into Chechen relative clauses. Unpublished ms. Nijmegen.

GNMCC: Against

- There are certain asymmetries between different syntactic positions concerning the frequency of their relativization.

- In many languages we have data that transitive absolutive arguments are relativized much more frequently than ergative arguments.

- In Udi, ergative arguments are relativized more frequently than transitive patients.
  - This is in harmony with the fact that East Caucasian languages occasionally show other traces of syntactic ergativity, but
  - while being affected by accusative languages (Armenian and Azerbaijani), Udi shows more traces of the S/A pivot than many other East Caucasian languages.

- Syntactic accusativity/ergativity matters?

GNMCC: Against

Language	S	A	P	Source
Avar	68	41	49	Polinsky et al. 2013
Agul	268	62	112	Maisak 2020a
Archi	97	11	35	Daniel & Lander 2013
Lezgian	787	296	637	Ganenkov 2016
Udi – 1	137	55	47	Daniel & Lander 2013
Udi - 2	463	234	129	Maisak 2020b

Daniel, M.A. & Yu.A. Lander. 2013. Neravnopravie rolej v otnositel´nyx konstrukcijax: materialy po častotnosti reljativizacii v arčinskom i udinskom jazykax. *Semantika jazykovyx edinic raznyx urovnej*, vyp. 15, 59–78. Makhachkala. **Ganenkov, D. 2016.** Relativization in a morphologically ergative language: A corpus study. Paper presented at 38. Jahrestagung der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Sprachwissenschaft. 24.–26. February 2016. Universität Konstanz. **Maisak, T. 2020a.** Relative clauses in Agul from a corpus-based perspective. *STUF* 73(1): 113-158. Maisak, T. 2020b. Pričastnye otnositel'nye konstrukcii v udinskom jazyke po korpusnym dannym. Tomsk Journal of Linguistics and Anthropology, vyp. 2(28): 46-65. **Polinsky, M., C. Gómez Gallo, P. Graff, E. Kravtchenko. 2012.** Subject preference and ergativity. *Lingua* 122(3): 267-277.

GNMCC: Against

- East Caucasian languages are not all alike with respect to their relative clause (-like) constructions.

- Some languages are reported to prohibit relativization of certain positions. Examples:
  - Avar: No relativization out of some converbial and masdar (action nominal) clauses (Rudnev 2015)
  - Bezhta, Hinuq do not relativize the object of comparison? (Comrie et al. 2017)
  - Many languages: Only inalienable possessors can be relativized (Nichols 2017 inter alia) – but this may be a semantic factor.

Comrie, B., D. Forker & Z. Khalilova. 2017. General noun-modifying clause constructions in Hinuq and Bezhta, with a note on other Daghestanian languages. In Y. Matsumoto et al. (eds), *Noun-modifying clause constructions in languages of Eurasia: Rethinking theoretical and geographical boundaries*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia. **Nichols, J. 2017.** Noun-modifying constructions and relativization in the central and western Caucasus. In Y. Matsumoto et al. (eds), *Noun-modifying clause constructions in languages of Eurasia: Rethinking theoretical and geographical boundaries*, 179–202. Amsterdam/Philadelphia. **Rudnev, P. 2015.** *Dependency and discourse-configurationalty: A study of Avar*. Rijksuniversiteit Groningen dissertation.

GNMCC: Against

- East Caucasian languages are not all alike with respect to their relative clause (-like) constructions.

- East Caucasian languages differ in the distribution of resumptive pronouns.
  - Itsari Dargwa: "Pronominal support is typical for Icari", but "[t]he only case when a resumptive pronoun would be ungrammatical is a relativized intransitive subject" (Sumbatova & Mutalov 2003)
  - Sanzhi Dargwa: "Examples in which the nominal head itself is expressed by a reflexive in the relative clause were judged as not very well-formed sentences" (Forker 2020: 443)
  - Tanti Dargwa: resumptive pronouns are easily allowed in all positions (Sumbatova & Lander 2014)
  - Mehweb Dargwa: resumptive pronouns are sometimes prohibited for the highest positions of Keenan & Comrie's hierarchy (Lander & Kozhukhar 2019)

Forker, D. 2020. *A grammar of Sanzhi Dargwa*. Berlin. **Lander, Yu. & A. Kozhukhar. 2019.** Relative clause and resumptive pronouns in Mehweb. In M. Daniel et al. (eds), *The Mehweb language: Selected essays on phonology, morphology and syntax*. Berlin. **Sumbatova, N.R. & R.O. Mutalov. 2003.** *A grammar of Icari Dargwa*. München. **Sumbatova, N. R. & Yu. A. Lander (with M. Kh. Mamaev). 2014.** *Darginskij govor selenija Tanty: Grammatičeskij očerk. Voprosy sintaksisa.* Moscow.

GNMCC: Against

- East Caucasian languages are not all alike with respect to their relative clause (-like) constructions.

- Different languages may grammaticalize different rules restricting the use of resumptive pronouns.
  - Mehweb Dargwa: Resumptives are only possible when an animate argument is relativized (Lander & Kozhukhar 2019)
  - Bagvalal: Both reflexive and demonstrative resumptives are possible in relativization out of complement clauses but only demonstrative resumptives are reported in relativization out of adjunct clauses (Lyutikova 2001)
  - …

Lander, Yu. & A. Kozhukhar. 2019. Relative clause and resumptive pronouns in Mehweb. In M. Daniel et al. (eds), *The Mehweb language: Selected essays on phonology, morphology and syntax*. Berlin. **Lyutikova, E.A. 2001.** Otnositel'noe predloženie. In A.E. Kibrik et al. (eds), *Bagvalinskij jazyk. Grammatika. Teksty. Slovari*. Moscow.

Take-home message

- East Caucasian relative clause constructions can be used when the association between the subordinate clause and the matrix clause is not based on any syntactic mechanisms.
  - Hence they may represent a subtype of general noun-modifying clause construction rather than relative clause constructions proper.
- Still, East Caucasian languages show considerable variation in the degree to which formal (not purely semantic) factors play a role in relativization.

Other stories

- Adjective phrases as a subtype of relative clause constructions in East Caucasian
  - See, for instance, Sumbatova & Lander 2014 on Tanti Dargwa and Daniel 2018 on Archi)
- Predicates of relative clauses which simultaneously agree in class & number both with their absolutive arguments and with their heads
  - See, for instance, Boguslavskaya 1989
- Formal differences related to restrictivity and contrast
  - Boguslavskaya 1989 inter alia

Boguslavskaya, O.Y. 1989. *Struktura imennoj gruppy: opredelitel'nye konstrukcii v dagestanskix jazykax*. Moscow: Lomonosov MSU dissertation. **Daniel, M.A. 2019.** K utočneniju časterečnogo statusa priznakovyx leksem v arčinskom jazyke. *Voprosy jazykoznanija*, No. 4: 114-132. **Sumbatova, N. R. & Yu. A. Lander (with M. Kh. Mamaev). 2014.** *Darginskij govor selenija Tanty: Grammatičeskij očerk. Voprosy sintaksisa.* Moscow.

And many open questions

for

the next year

2021

See you in the field!