

# Universals and Parameters in Head-Internal Relativization

Ken Hiraiwa (Meiji Gakuin University)

**1. Typology of Head-Internal Relativization:** Languages show a limited number of relativization strategies. Depending structural positions in which a relativized head noun appears, relative clauses (RCs) are classified into prenominal, postnominal, and head-internal types. This classification is further refined in structural terms. A head in prenominal RCs may or may not be external to the relative clause. Similarly, a head in postnominal RCs may or may not. Thus, there are logically three types of head-internal relative clauses (HIRCs): in-situ HIRCs, left-headed HIRCs, and right-headed HIRCs.

**2. Issues in the Syntax of HIRCs:** The aim of this talk is two-fold. First, I will shed light on the refined typology above from the perspective of some Gur languages. Second, I will look at various syntactic features of HIRCs (e.g. island effect, head-movement, stacking, long-distance relativization, the indefiniteness restriction, indefinite HIRCs) from a broader range of languages and examine if there is any new meaningful correlation between them.

The HIRCs in those Gur languages bring quite significant insights for typology and linguistic universals, which are not available from other languages outside Gur. Various linguists have proposed parameters for HIRCs. Langendon (1977), Kuroda (1974-77/1992) and Cole (1987) put forth the famous word order generalization that HIRCs are restricted to SOV languages (with a null pronoun) (cf. also Kayne 1994). Watanabe (1992) argued that *Wh*-in-situ is the defining parameter. However, such proposed parameters are challenged by Gur languages. They attest HIRCs even though they are SVO languages without pro-drop (see also Tellier 1989, Gil 2000 for pertinent observations). Furthermore, not all Gur languages allow HIRCs. Some of them (Bùlì, Kabiyé, Mooré, Dagbani) allow HIRC, while others (Gurenɛ, Dàgáárè, Sisaala-Pasaale, Kɔnni) lack HIRC. Significantly, *Wh*-in-situ does not correlate with the availability of HIRCs either. Watanabe (2004) proposes yet another generalization that HIRCs are limited to languages with a so-called indeterminate system. However, as I show, this generalization does not apply to those Gur languages either.

**3. Proposals—Universals and Parameters:** As I will show, not every Gur language allows HIRCs, however. Those Gur languages in my sample that allow HIRCs include Bùlì, Kabiyé, Mooré, and Dagbani. In HIRCs, the head remains in-situ, while the head can be also dislocated to the left. On the other hand, those Gur languages that do not allow HIRCs in my sample include Sisaala-Pasaale, Gurenɛ, Kɔnni, and Dàgáárè. In these languages, the relativized head obligatorily moves to the left periphery. Among those, at least the relative clause in Dàgáárè is left-headed HIRC. A close examination reveals interesting descriptive generalizations that those Gur languages with HIRCs (i) show a determiner element at the right edge of the relative clause, whereas those Gur languages without HIRCs (ii) show a determiner element adjacent to the head noun at the left edge.

Furthermore, building on the study above, I observe that HIRCs comes in two varieties cross-linguistically: the determiner-type (e.g. Navajo, Lakota, Georgian, etc.) and the nominalization-type (e.g. Japanese, Dogrib, Quechua, etc.). HIRCs in Gur belong to the former. The latter, on the other hand, uses nominalization instead of determiners. In fact, the word order generalization seems to hold only in the latter type of HIRCs. In other words, HIRCs of the nominalization type

are only found in SOV languages, while HIRCs of the determiner-type are found both in SOV and SVO languages. Another possible interesting correlation is found between stackability and indefiniteness. Thus, the present study leads us to a new typology of HIRCs and refined universals. Finally, I will touch upon HIRCs in Japanese and show that they are different from the other nominalization-type HIRCs.