Agreement versus Pronominal Incorporation in Eurasian Relative Clauses
Farrell Ackerman (UCSD) & Irina Nikolaeva (SOAS)

There is an externally headed prenominal non-subject relative clause type that has been largely neglected in both the typological and theoretical literature. Moreover, it is attested only in genetically related and unrelated languages of Eurasia. It has the following surprising property: *The subject's person/number and pronominal properties are expressed by markers from the nominal possessive paradigm which appear on the external head, i.e., the modified relativized nominal, of the relative clause.* That is, the person number markers (PNM) bear properties of the SUBJ, but these markers appear not within the local domain of the verb with which they are associated, but on the external head of the prenominal relative. This is illustrated schematically in Figure 1:

$$[[\; \{\text{lexical NP/pronoun/}\emptyset_{gap}\} \; ... \; V_{PARTICIPLE}]_{LOCAL\ DOMAIN} \; \text{HeadNoun-PNM} \;]_{EXTERNAL\ DOMAIN}$$

SUBJ   SUBJ

Figure 1

The parellelisms in marking between these relatives and nominal possessive clauses led Ackerman and Nikolaeva 1997, 1998 and Ackerman, Nikolaeva, Malouf 2008 to refer to them as Possessive Relatives.

Over the past few years several analyses from different theoretical traditions have been proposed to address possessive relatives. In this talk we focus on an empirical issue that has been ignored in this literature, but is consequential for any credible analysis. This concerns the status of the PNMs as SUBJ agreement markers versus (incorporated) SUBJ pronominals. Within the syntactocentric perspective of grammar analysis typified by Hale 2002, Kornfilt 2005, 2008, Baker and Vinokurova 2008, Baker 2009 have focused on languages where an independent lexical NP obligatorily co-occurs with a PNM on the relativized head. Consider the examples in (1) and (2) from Sakha (Turkic):

1. *[Masha cej ih-er] caakky.   *Absence of PNM
   Masha tea drink-AOR cup
   'a cup that Masha drinks tea from'

2. [**Masha**$_i$ cej ih-er] caakky**-ta**$_i$. Presence of PNM = Agreement
   Masha tea drink-AOR cup-3sg
   'a cup that Masha drinks tea from'

This contrast in grammaticality has led Baker 2009:13 to observe about Sakha that "a participial phrase with an overt subject in argument position is ungrammatical if it lacks possessive agreement. While this appears to be true for Sakha it not true for Tundra Nenets, where a lexical NP cannot co-occur with PNMs, unless the lexical NP functions as a TOPIC anaphorically bound to the PNM interpreted as a pronominal.[1] This can be seen in (3) and (4) below:

3. [Watah   ta-wi$_o$]   ti   Absence of PNM
   Watah-GEN give-PART deer
   `the deer Wata gave'

4. [**Watah**   ta-wi$_o$]   te-**da**   Presence of PNM = Anaphoric binding
   Watah-GEN give-PART deer-3SG
   `Wata$_i$, the deer he$_i$ gave'

The basic contrast between 3rd SG as an agreement marker versus pronominal should be evident from the contrast between (1) & (2) versus (3) & (4).

  With respect to pronominal subjects, it appears that there are three logical options: languages where (i) independent pronouns and PNMs are both obligatory, (ii) independent pronouns are obligatory, while PNMs are optional (Dagur, Yukaghir), and (iii) independent pronouns are optional, while PNMs are obligatory (Tundra Nenets, Ostyak, Evenki). In the domain of Possessive Relatives we are only aware of the existence of (ii) and (iii). On the other hand, glossing conventions can sometimes be misleading in languages for which we have no first-hand evidence. (Kornfilt on Uighur).

  Though the distributions and interpretation of PNMs in languages with Possessive Relatives clearly differs, it appears that within a given language their distribution and interpretation are consistent across nominal possessive and Possessive Relative constructions, i.e., whatever behavior is evident for lexical NP/pronoun in one construction, it is the same in the other.

  These varying interpretations of the function of PNMs as agreement markers or pronominals clearly recalls the functions of similar markers on predicates in matrix clauses, as observed in Bresnan and Mchombo 1987 and attested in numerous languages since. We argue that all of the principled cross-linguistic flexibility and empirical coverage derived from optional PRED = pro, extends to explain the varying values of PNMs in Possessive Relatives.

  We utilize PRED = pro in a constraint-based construction theoretic analysis of Possessive Relatives that accounts in a direct way for the parametric difference between the contrasting functional values of PNMs in Possessive Relatives. On this analysis, the entire Possessive Relative is interpreted formally as a "possessive" construction: this is 2-place relation which is semantically vague with respect to the relation between e.g., the SUBJ of the participle and the relativized head. The participle enters into a modification relation with the head and this has two relevant consequences: (i) the semantics of the verb serves as a restrictor on the interpetation of the otherwise vague semantics associated with the possessive construction, i.e., the relation between the SUBJ of the participle and the relativized is defined by the semantics of the participle and (2) the value of the PNM on the head is identified as the value of the SUBJ of the participle. If a language (or a construction in a language) has an agreement function for the PNM, then only the person/number values are identified (agree) with those of the expressed SUBJ in the relative. If, in contrast, the PNM has a pronominal function, the same mechanism that identifies person/number features with the SUBJ requirement in the former language, now also provides a pronominal value for that SUBJ. As in languages where this latter stategy entails an anaphoric relation between an overt element and a pronominal marker in matrix clauses, the same construal occurs with the co-occurrence of these two elements in Possessive Relatives. Given the pervasive parallelism between nominal possessive constructions and Possessive Relatives, this analysis also extends to the difference in the functional status of PNMs in these constructions as well, where the PNM is sometime a pronominal possesor and sometimes reflects agreement with a possesor. In sum, we provide a minimal parametric difference between the two behaviors of PNMS in Possessive Relatives that is consistent with what has been previously proposed for matrix clauses.

References: Ackerman and Nikolaeva 1997 *Identity in form, difference in function* LFG97; Ackerman 1998 *Construction and mixed categories* LFG98; Ackerman, Nikolaeva, Malouf 2004 *Possessive relatives and cooperating constructions*, HPSG 2004 Proceedings; Hale 2002 *On the Dagur object relative* Journal of East Asian Linguistics; Kornfilt 2005 *Agreement and it placement in nonsubject relative clauses,* Oxford Handbook of Comparative Syntax; Kornfilt 2008 *Subj case and agreement in two types of Turkic RCs,* Leipzig Spring on Language Diversity; Baker and Vinokurova 2008 *Two modalities of case assignment: case in Sakha,* Rutgers ms.; Baker 2009 *Degress of nominalization: Clause-like constituents in Sakha, Rutger ms.*