

Thursday 10 December

Salle de la BULAC RJ23 (matin) et RJ24 (après-midi)

Relative clauses and areal typology: American Indian Languages

10h00 **Eric CAMPBELL** (University of California at San Barbara)
What's /nu?/: Relative prolixity in Zenzontepec Chatino (Otomanguan)

11h00 **Claudine CHAMOREAU** (CNRS – CEMCA-SeDyL)
Relative clauses in Pesh (Chibchan)

12h00 Lunch

13h30 **Stavros SKOPETEAS** (Universität Bielefeld) & **Elisabeth VERHOEVEN**
(Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin)
Relative clauses and focus constructions: The case of Yucatec Maya

14h30 **Enrique PALANCAR** (CNRS – SeDyL)
Focus and relative constructions in Otomi

15h30 **Marc-Antoine MAHIEU** (INALCO – LACITO)
Relativization in Inuktitut (Eskimo)

Wednesday 11 December

Salle du Conseil 4.24

Relative clauses in the West Asian area

9h30 **Eleanor COGHILL** (University of Konstanz)
Relative Clauses in the Neo-Aramaic dialect of Telkepe

10h15 **Metin BAGRIACIK** (Gent University)
Relative Clauses in Phrasiot Greek

11h00 Coffee break

11h30 **Steven KAYE** (University of Oxford)
Relativization in Northern Talyshi

12h15 **Jost GIPPERT** (University of Frankfurt)
Competing strategies in the historical development of relatives in Georgian

13h00 Lunch

14h30 **Pollet SAMVELIAN & Ophélie GANDON**
(Sorbonne-Nouvelle University, Labex EFL)
Convergence and divergence areas with respect to relative clause strategies in Caucasus-Iran-Anatolia area: Preliminary observations involving three parameters

15h15 **Anaïd DONABEDIAN** (Inalco-Labex EFL-IRD)
Syntax of prenominal non-finite relative clause in Modern Armenian: the limits of contact

16h00 Coffee break

16h30 **Katherine HODGSON** (Inalco, Labex EFL)
An experimental study of relativization in Armenian dialects

17h15 - 18h00 **Closing round table**

Abstracts

Thursday 10 December

What's /nu/: Relative prolixity in Zenzontepec Chatino (Otomanguan)

Eric Campbell

The Zenzontepec Chatino language of Oaxaca, Mexico, is typical of Otomanguan languages in exhibiting great formal complexity in the encoding of morphological categories, but formal simplicity for expressing a wide range of syntactic and discourse functions. The language has several particles that serve as nominalizers, complementizers and relativizers, the most frequent and flexible of which is the particle /nu/. It is a head initial language, and relative clauses follow their heads. Nouns of any grammatical function (subject, object, indirect object, instrument, locative, adverbial, and alienable or inalienable possessor) can be relativized. A common discourse strategy is to avoid lexically dense expression by spreading information across multiple relative clauses, which may be iteratively embedded or placed in apposition, leading to prolix sentences. The profusion of relativization is also exhibited in the lexicon, which helps offset the language's relatively small inventory of lexical roots. After demonstrating these facts, I turn to a brief comparison with relativization strategies in other Chatino varieties.

Relative clauses and case marking in Pesh

Claudine Chamoreau

Pesh, the northernmost of the Chibchan languages, has two types of strategies for restrictive relative clauses: 1) an externally headed relative construction using gap, which is the unmarked construction as it is used for all positions (subject, object, indirect object, instrument, locative, genitive); and 2) an internally headed relative construction, coherent with Pesh OV constituent order, but restricted to subject, object and locative. Independently of the type of construction, Pesh uses various enclitics to mark relative clauses. In most cases in which the nominal head is not the subject, the relative clause is marked by using the case enclitic that would normally mark the case of the noun phrase, but given the SOV order of Pesh, this enclitic appears at the end of the relative clause. Relative clauses modifying subjects are marked with the pragmatic enclitic =mà. The selection of the case enclitic

depends on the type of strategy and on the grammatical function of the head nominal in the relative clause.

The goal of this paper is to present the first analysis of relative clauses in Pesh, by introducing the main properties of each of the two strategies and by showing the patterns that allow for the selection of the case enclitic. I will then discuss an interesting construction in which the enclitic appears doubled: on the nominal head and at the end of the relative clause. This morphosyntactic feature and the fact that the relative clause gives additional information about the referent (but is not a restricting clause) support the analysis that this construction corresponds to a non-restrictive relative clause. Pesh is thus a language that formally distinguishes between restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses.

Relative clauses and focus constructions: The case of Yucatec Maya

Stavros Skopeteas & Elisabeth Verhoeven

Relative clauses in Yucatec Maya are formed with a special form of the verb: if the head noun is the subject of a transitive verb, the aspectual/modal auxiliary and the agent cross-reference clitic (that otherwise obligatorily accompany finite verbs) are dropped, such that the lexical verb is immediately adjacent to the head noun; see (1).

- (1) *T=in w-il-ah hun-túul pèk' hàant-ik lu'm.*
PFV=A.1.SG Ø-see-CMPL(B.3.SG) one-CL.AN dog eat:TRR-INCMPL(B.3.SG) earth
'I saw a dog eating earth.'

Focus constructions (and *wh*- questions) are formed with preposing the focus phrase or the *wh*- element, such that it appears immediately left-adjacent to the verb. Crucially, the verb form in this construction shows the same inflectional properties with relative clauses; compare (1) and (2).

- (2) *Pèk' hàant-ik lu'm.*
dog eat:TRR-INCMPL(B.3.SG) earth
'The / a DOG is eating earth.'

The similarity between focus constructions and relative clauses gives rise to two accounts of the syntax of focus constructions in Yucatec Maya:

CLEFT ACCOUNT. The focus construction is a covert cleft construction, i.e., the presupposed information is a relative clause and the focused constituent is a predicate – with a zero copula (Bricker 1979: 111; Bohnemeyer 1998: 192; Tonhauser 2003: 212-214).

EXTRACTION ACCOUNT. The focus construction is a simple clause in which the focused constituent is extracted out of the core clausal domain. The similarity to relative clauses is due to the fact that focus-movement and relativization are instances of the same syntactic operation (Lehmann 2003: 29; Gutiérrez Bravo 2011).

The aim of this talk is to discuss the relevant evidence for the decision between these two accounts. In particular, we are going to present evidence from (a) the possibilities in discontinuous noun phrases, (b) the binding properties, (c) the placement of enclitics that define prosodic phrases, and (d) the placement of interrogative particles. These facts support the view of the extraction account and leads to a syntactic analysis that closely reflects the facts of the overt syntax – without the stipulation of covert elements.

References

- Bohnemeyer, Jürgen. 1998. Time Relations in Discourse: Evidence from a Comparative Approach to Yucatec Maya. PhD Dissertation, Tilburg University.
- Bricker, Victoria Reifler. 1979. Wh-questions, relativization, and clefting in Yucatec Maya. Papers in Mayan linguistics, vol. 3, ed. Laura Martin, pp. 107-136. Columbia, MO: Lucas Brothers.
- Gutiérrez Bravo, Rodrigo. 2011. External and internal topics in Yucatec Maya. Representing Language: Linguistics essays in honour of Judith Aissen, eds. Rodrigo Gutiérrez Bravo, Line Mikkelsen, and Eric. Potsdam, pp. 105-119. Santa Cruz: University of California.
- Lehmann, Christian. 2003. Possession in Yucatec Maya (second, revised edition). ASSIDUE, Nr. 10. Erfurt: Seminar für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität.
- Tonhauser, Judith. 2003. F-constructions in Yucatec Maya. The Proceedings of SULA 2, eds. Jan Anderssen, Paula Menéndez-Benito, and Adam Werle, pp. 203-223. Vancouver, BC: GLSA, Amherst: University of Massachusetts.

Focus and relative constructions in Otomi

Enrique L. Palancar

Aspects of relative constructions are known to have a role in the makeup of other constructions whose function is directly related to aspects of information structure such as focus, i.e. cleft constructions. Similarly, relative constructions involve headed and headless subtypes, and the latter are commonly linked with wh-constructions, which in turn also involve focus. At a higher level then, there is a family of constructions having to do with the discourse management of nominal referentiality at both clausal and textual levels. Although

the phenomenon is widely studied in better-known language, we still know relatively little about the shape of such families in lesser-known languages, let alone of a possible typology.

Inspired by the proposal in Schachter (1973), in this paper I take a step in this direction by studying the relation of cleft constructions to relative constructions in Otomi; a small family of Amerindian languages from Mexico. In Otomi, cleft constructions involve the functional words *ko and *ke. Such words are also found in the making of a number of relative and wh-constructions. Interestingly, the words posit a challenge as to what should be their best syntactic characterization, because the link between their various functions is far from obvious, as I try to show, and they have divergent functions in the different languages. In the talk, I first present a taxonomy of relevant cleft constructions in two Otomi languages. I then investigate the role the elements *ko and *ke have in other realms of the grammar, particularly in relative constructions. The goal is to obtain a constructional map of the phenomenon to help us increase our understanding of the bigger picture about the relation of relative constructions and focus.

Relativization in Inuktitut (Eskimo)

Marc-Antoine Mahieu

This talk aims to provide an overview of how relative expressions are formed in Inuktitut, an Inuit language of the Canadian Arctic. Inuktitut, as all Eskimo languages, has a polysynthetic structure of the recursive suffixing type. One can speak about relativization in Inuktitut only if one adopts a very broad definition of what a relative expression is, namely: any clausal expression that serves to modify (and generally to narrow the potential reference of) a noun phrase. Relative expressions are always nominal in Inuktitut. They are headed either by a purely nominal predicate or by a deverbal predicate. There is no specific marker of relativization. Any nominal constituent in a main clause may be followed by a relative expression, agreeing as to number and case. But the only syntactic role that may be relativized into is the absolutive subject. (Eskimo languages are morphologically ergative.) Several processes allow to convert non-absolutive noun phrases into absolutive subjects. Relative expressions are commonly used as independent arguments within the main clause and can thus be considered as headless relative expressions.

Wednesday 11 December

Relative Clauses in the Neo-Aramaic dialect of Telkepe Eleanor Coghill

The North-Eastern Neo-Aramaic (NENA) dialects are spoken by Christian and Jewish communities indigenous to Northern Iraq and the surrounding countries. The dialect in this study is spoken by Christians from the village of Telkepe located north of Mosul. Until recently a community remained in situ, although there is also a long-standing diaspora, especially in Detroit. In 2014, however, the whole population was forced to flee as a consequence of an attack by ISIS and the village remains under occupation.

In earlier varieties of Aramaic relative clauses could be introduced by a particle *d-*, which also served to mark the possessor in genitive constructions: thus X *d*-Y.NP expressed 'X of Y', while X *d*-Y.CLAUSE expressed 'X who/which ...'. In most NENA dialects the main reflex of this morpheme appears as a suffix on the modified noun: *-əd*, but a prefixed *d-* also occurs in certain circumstances (depending on the particular variety). In Telkepe both are possible, whether the noun is being modified by another noun or by a clause, as in the following examples:

- (1) *'ar-əd* *g-zar-i-lə* *kəm-zar-i-lə*.
land-REL IND-SOW-3PL-OBJ.3FS PST.PFV-SOW-3PL-OBJ.3FS
'The land which is sowed (lit. they sow it), they sowed.'
- (2) *maʕamiθə* *āwə – bə'ə u* *ħalib d-iwan* *ʔrəqt-áy*,
spoon(f.) DEM.M eggs and milk REL-COP.1FS beat.RES.FS-POSS/OBJ.3PL
'a spoonful of that – eggs and milk that I've beaten'

When the head NP is not coreferential with the subject of the clause, it is generally resumed with a pronoun, as in the examples above. This is not always the case, however, especially when it is coreferential with the direct object.

The precise strategies used to introduce relative clauses varies according to the following factors: definite/indefinite head and restrictive/unrestrictive relative clause. Broadly speaking all relative clauses with a definite head are introduced by *d-*; those with an indefinite head, only when restrictive:

- (3) *məndi t-āwə* *'atiqə*.
thing REL-be.3MS old.MS
'Something (which is) old.'

Unrestrictive relative clauses after an indefinite head are simply juxtaposed:

- (4) *'əttan xənná= 'axonə* *'ilə b-beθə*
we.have other.MS-brother COP.3MS in-house
'We have another brother who is at home'
(lit. 'We have another brother, he is at home')

Restrictive relative clauses with a definite head are distinguished from their unrestrictive counterparts by the presence of a demonstrative:

- (5) *'an=nāšə* *d-muħke-lan* *'əll-áy*,| *pləʔ-la* *surāyə*.|
DEM.PL=people REL-spoke-1PL about-3PL came.out-3PL Christians
'Those/the people who we spoke about turned out to be Christians.'

NENA dialects vary with respect to relative clauses as they do in all other areas of the language.¹ The Aramaic morpheme *d-* has moreover developed different functions and syntax in different dialects (see Gutman, forthcoming). Language contact has also played a role, with the borrowing of morphemes with relativizing functions from other languages (see Coghill, forthcoming).

COGHILL, Eleanor. Forthcoming. 'Language contact in Neo-Aramaic: an overview', in A. Grant (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Language Contact*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

GUTMAN, Ariel. Forthcoming. *Attributive Constructions in North-Eastern Neo-Aramaic: Areal, Typological and Historical Perspectives*. PhD Thesis, University of Konstanz.

KHAN, Geoffrey. 2009. 'The Genitive and Relative Clauses in the North-Eastern Neo-Aramaic Dialects', in Janet C.E. Watson and Jan Retsö (eds.), *Relative Clauses and Genitive Constructions in Semitic*. (Journal of Semitic Studies Supplement 25.) 69–87.

¹ There are, nevertheless, strong similarities between the syntax of relative clauses in Telkepe and in the Christian dialect of Barwar, as described in Khan (2009).

Relative Clauses in Phrasiot Greek Metin Bağrıaçık

Phrasiot Greek, along with Cappadocian Greek and Pontic Greek, is an Asia Minor Greek dialect spoken by around 800 Orthodox people in few southeastern villages of modern-day Kayseri province, Turkey before the population exchange that took place between Greece and Turkey in 1923. The dialect is spoken today in few villages in Northern Greece by about 25 first and second generation refugees. It had been heavily influenced by (Anatolian/Ottoman) Turkish (and Armenian, though mostly at lexical level by the latter) and it preserves some archaic retentions that are absent in Modern Greek.

Relative clauses in Phrasiot Greek are finite clauses which are introduced by an overt morpheme *tu*. In the texts written prior to the population exchange and immediately afterwards, relative clauses are dominantly prenominal (left-branching) (cf. 99,2% : (1), 0.8% : (2)), whereas today, both prenominal and postnominal (right-branching) relative clauses ((1)-(2)) are readily available to the speakers (the synchronic data is abstracted from eleven-hour natural recordings and by three consecutive questionnaires distributed to 16 speakers in sum):

- (1) [[*tu*-relative clause] head] : prenominal
- (2) [head [*tu*-relative clause]] : postnominal

In the absence of an overt head, the structure(s) (1)/(2) obtain(s) free relative clause reading. Moreover, the *tu* morpheme introduces complements to factive predicates, finite subject clauses or PP complements.

In this talk, I will focus only on headed and free relative clauses in modern-day Phrasiot Greek as (1) and (2). I will reveal that the difference between (1) and (2) is not only in their surface word orders, but the difference in the word orders is an epiphenomenon on distinct syntactic structures. I will also argue that these distinct syntactic structures are the outcomes of restructuring/reanalysis of certain functional elements, which has taken place under long-term language contact with Turkish and Modern Greek, in this order. I will finally show how such a micro-level account renders Phrasiot Greek different from the other two Asia Minor Greek dialects.

By presenting exhaustive data, I will first reveal that (1) and (2) behave distinctly under certain syntactic tests (reconstruction and scope interaction) and that the structure in (1) extends much lower down the Accessibility Hierarchy (including obliques and adjuncts) than (2). This suggests that the word order difference between (1) and (2) should be attributed to

distinct syntactic structures. Second, I will provide evidence for the existence of a covert head in free relatives, more specifically of a *pro*, hence they are in a way headed relative clauses, much like Turkish free relative clauses. Finally, by providing evidence from the NP hierarchy in Phrasiot Greek, and by providing comparative evidence from Pontic and Cappadocian, I will argue that *tu* in Phrasiot Greek is actually bimorphemic, and it involves an archaic complementizer *u* which has been morphologically incorporated into an external determiner *to* (3) possibly under influence by Turkish yielding the order (1):

- (3) [to + u_i [t_i relative clause] head]

Under recent Modern Greek influence, however, the *to+u* amalgam has been reanalyzed as a monomorphemic complementizer by analogy to the Modern Greek complementizer *pu*, which has yielded the order in (2) for headed relative clauses and the respective syntactic restrictions therein.

This presentation traces the changes in relative clause formation in the history of Phrasiot Greek, which are intricate outcomes of language contact with Turkish and Modern Greek. Such account also reveals a sharp distinction between Phrasiot Greek on one hand and Cappadocian Greek and Pontic Greek on the other in terms of relative clause formation.

Relativization in Northern Talyshi Steven Kaye

Talyshi (NW Iranian) is the cover term used to refer to a continuum of closely related varieties spoken by the Talysh people of the south-eastern Caucasus. Within this continuum, three rough dialect groupings can be picked out: Central and Southern Talyshi are found only in Iran, while most speakers of Northern Talyshi (NT) live across the border in the Republic of Azerbaijan. On the basis of fieldwork data (both elicited and naturalistic) and textual evidence, I present the three principal types of relative construction found in the NT of Azerbaijan, which I label *pronominal*, *participial* and *ki* constructions, and discuss their place in the grammar more generally. The extreme breadth of function entrusted to a single, unaligned participle in NT relativization, which has not been fully appreciated up to this point, is highly unusual in the Iranian context – and even within the Talyshi group in particular. Meanwhile, however, I provide evidence that the details of relativization by means of the complementizer *ki* are also more distinctive in NT than has previously been recognized: here, unlike elsewhere in Talyshi and in corresponding constructions in the superstrate languages of Persian and Azeri, the head noun may be marked not for its syntactic function in the matrix clause, but for its role within the relative clause itself.

Competing strategies in the historical development of relatives in Georgian Jost Gippert

Throughout its written history, Georgian has possessed relative clauses of the "European" type, with finite verbal predicates and relative pronouns based upon interrogatives. However, the language underwent remarkable changes even within the first centuries of its literacy, i.e., in the second half of the first millennium of our era, with relative pronouns being extended by either resumptive demonstratives or an additive focus particle or both. In later times, the fully declinable relative pronouns tended to be substituted by an undeclinable all-purpose subordinator, which is the preferred relativizer of present-day Georgian. On the basis of recent research and corpus analysis, the paper tries to examine the functional differences between the extended and unextended relative pronouns within Old Georgian and to determine the origin and emergence of the undeclinable subordinator.

Convergence and divergence areas with respect to relative clause strategies in Caucasus-Iran-Anatolia area: Preliminary observations involving three parameters Pollet Samvelian & Ophélie Gandon

Caucasus-Iran-Anatolia area displays an important genetic and typological linguistic diversity, gathering more than 50 languages belonging to six distinct genetic families (Nakho-Dagestanian, Abkhazo-Adyghean, Kartvelian, Turkic, Indo-European and Semitic). The population of the area being most often bilingual, trilingual or even more, languages are in continuous contact. When focusing on three main variation parameters of relativization strategies- i) the position of the relative clause, ii) the finiteness of the verb, and iii) the nature of the relativizer in case there is one, three convergence areas are identified in Caucasus-Iran area: genetically unrelated languages spoken in a same area tend to converge regarding their relativization strategies, and may thus diverge from their respective genetic families (Gandon, To appear). However, no such linguistic convergence area is identifiable in North-West Caucasus, nor in Eastern Anatolia (Gandon 2015), where each language keeps its own strategy which generally seems to be the one inherited from their respective genetic families.

We will provide a preliminary explanation in terms of sociological, cognitive and language-based parameters to account for the areal convergence or not with respect to the three above-mentioned parameters between languages displaying genetic divergence.

Syntax of prenominal non-finite relative clause in Modern Armenian: the limits of contact Anaïd Donabédian

Pre-nominal non-finite relative clauses are strongly predominant in colloquial Modern Armenian. Their broadening and generalization is attested since Middle Armenian, and most likely enhanced by the contact, namely with Turkish. In this paper we will show which features are convergent with Turkish, and which are divergent, aiming to explain them by the typological properties of each of the languages. In this paper we will emphasize two main points of convergence and divergence.

1. Relativizing participles in Armenian : - **oy**, usually called 'present' or 'agentive' participle (impf. stem except for inchoative and causative verbs), - **ac**, usually called 'past', 'resultative', 'perfect' participle also used in analytical perfect form (default perfect in WA, stative-resultative perfect in EA) (pft stem), - **elik'** usually called 'future' or 'prospective' participle. Labelling those participles is as problematic as it is in Turkish (see Haig 1998 and others), even if Turkish and Armenian participles don't fully correspond between them².

	Turkish	Armenian
Subject relativization, imperfective	-An	- oy
subject relativization, perfective	-mİş ³	-ac
other than subject (unmarked aspect)	-dik	
future (with some constraints)	-AcAk (dial. -malik, -maklik)	-elik'

As shown in the table, the main questions raised by the description of these participles in Armenian, as well as in Turkish, are 1) tense/aspect meaning and 2) the case meaning of each of the participles, since there is clearly not one-to-one correlations between a participle and one of these meanings, however there is an obvious affinity between them, that is difficult to deny. Both affinity and discrepancy can be explained by the history of the markers, and by the set of available categories (tense/aspect inventory, case inventory) in each of the languages. Some explanations can also rely on cross-linguistic properties of some categories (future does not operate symmetrically with past).

2. Case recovery: Apart from the prototypical meaning attached to each of the participles, there are clear discrepancies regarding the case marking parameter. Function marking is much richer in Turkish than in Armenian, and consequently, functions that can be relativized are much more varied in Turkish than in Armenian. For the same reason, complex relatives with embedded complements are difficult to translate from Turkish to Armenian because there is no sufficient case marking to disambiguate such phrases. One of the interesting differences concerns the scope of possessive: in Turkish, the possessive as agent of the participle is beard by the participle himself, and this allow distinguishing between different

genitives in the phrase. In Armenian, it is beard by the head noun, which, consequently, cannot be possessive for itself.

References :

Göksel A., Kerslake C., 2005, *Turkish, A comprehensive Grammar*, New York, Routledge, 580 p.(ch 25).
 Haig, G., 1998, *Relative Constructions in Turkish*, Wiesbaden, Harrasowitz Verlag, *Turcologica* 33, 254 p.

An experimental study of relativization in Armenian dialects
Katherine Hogdson

Armenian makes use of a wide range of syntactic structures for expressing relativization, including both non-finite (participial) and finite (including headed and free, postposed and preposed) forms. The aim of this research is to attempt to define which factors play a role in the choice of form, particularly in the choice between finite and non-finite forms, and whether these vary across dialects and language contact situations. Speakers of various dialects with varying degrees of proficiency in various contact languages (Russian, Azeri, Turkish and Georgian) responded orally to stimuli aimed at eliciting relative clauses, adapted from the 'short story' and 'definitions' stimuli used by Naama Friedman and her associates. These stimuli were varied for grammatical relations, complexity of relative clause or arguments within it, realis vs. irrealis, state or general property vs. event, and topic vs. focus, all of which have been suggested to play a role in the choice of relative construction. The results show that non-finite forms are strongly preferred for subject and direct object RCs, i.e. for the roles highest on the relativization hierarchy, while finite forms are generally preferred for other grammatical relations, a result which is in line with typological predictions, though significant for the typology of Armenian, which has been described as a language that predominantly makes use of finite relativization strategies. Also typologically unsurprising is that when the relative clause is relatively complex (e.g. contains more than one object or adverbial elements), finite strategies seem to be preferred even in the case of subject and direct object relatives. More surprising are results that show that, although perhaps not the preferred strategy, non-finite forms may be used for roles that are very low on the relativization hierarchy (including adpositional objects and possessors). The acceptability of these forms, however, varies between dialects, and seems to be positively correlated with age and bilingualism in Azeri.

² One important difference is that in Turkish, they may also appear in other syntactic patterns, for example in complement clauses, where Armenian use infinitive.

³ cf. Göksel & Kerslake 2005:455. This form is more frequent in provincial Turkish and especially in Kurdish-speaking regions (*gelmişim* instead of Standard Turkish *geldim*, with a perfect (not evidential) meaning (*gelmişim*=ekac em; *gelmiştim*=ekac êi)