

→ Consider this additional information...

There exist other obliques in Ainu besides the ones expressing location discussed in Lesson 11. The following items are most commonly found: *ani* (HA and SA) that indicates instrument, *turano* (HA) or *tura* (SA) that indicates company, and *eun* (attested only in HA) that indicates the goal or beneficiary of an action. *Ani*, *tura(no)*, and *eun* follow the noun they refer to and are nothing but verb forms used adverbially – for instance, *ani* is a verb meaning ‘carry’ and *tura* is a verb meaning ‘accompany’. The semantics of these verbs have led to their use to mark oblique case relations. Therefore, *ani*, *tura(no)*, and *eun* are different from postpositions like *-ta*, *-un*, *-(e)ne*, *-wa*, *-pe-ka*, and *-poka* (see again Lesson 11).

→ Dataset 1 – Relativisation of non-arguments

Consider the following sentences showing relativised and non-relativised constructions. Why are the ungrammatical examples (marked with *) so? What are the morphosyntactic differences with other instances of relativisation where ungrammaticality does not arise? Do you find any correspondence between these morphosyntactic differences and the function of the noun that is being relativised? On the basis of this, what amendments are you able to make to the information you started your analysis from?

Set 1.1 (Hokkaidō Ainu)

1. **Kuyupo kamuy cotca acapo.*

‘The uncle together with whom my elder brother shot the bear.’

2. *Katkemat ehotke usi kar.*

‘The woman prepared a [sleeping] place on which he [could] lie down.’
(adapted from Bugaeva 2004, 400)

3. *Teppo ani kuyupo kamuy tukan.*

‘My older brother shot the bear with a gun.’

4. **Cep poronno hemesu pet.*

‘A river in which many fish go upstream.’

5. *Cikirihi tanne kikir.*

‘An insect whose legs are long.’ (Tamura 2000, 189)

6. *Cisesoy pakno arki utar.*

‘The men who came up to the doorway.’ (Bugaeva 2004, 95)

7. *Katkemat orota hotke usi kar.*

‘The woman prepared a [sleeping] place on which he [could] lie down.’

8. *Turano kuyupo kamuy cotca acapo.*

‘The uncle together with whom my elder brother shot the bear.’ (Bugaeva 2004, 96)

9. * *Katkemat hotke usi kar.*

‘The woman prepared a [sleeping] place on which he [could] lie down.’

10. *Petotta cep poronno hemesu.*

‘In the river many fish go upstream.’

11. *Acapo turano kuyupo kamuy cotca.*

‘My elder brother shot the bear together with the uncle.’

12. * *Cikir tanne kikir.*

‘An insect whose legs are long.’

13. *Ani kuyupo kamuy tukan teppo.*

‘The gun with which my older brother shot the bear.’ (Bugaeva 2004, 95)

14. *Aekasihi ka nupe ranke.*

‘My grandfather dropped tears (= was weeping).’

15. * *Sinuma cisesoy pakno arki utar.*

‘The men who came up to the doorway.’ (Bugaeva 2004, 95)

16. *Kikir cikirihi tanne.*

‘The insect’s legs are long.’

17. *Orota cep poronno hemesu pet.*

‘A river in which many fish go upstream.’ (Bugaeva 2004, 96)

18. *Aekasihi ka ranke nupe.*

‘The tears my grandfather shed.’ (Bugaeva 2004, 95)

19. *Oro aiyomare otor aiyomare hine iwororun aiyani.*

'I was put into a coffin in which people are put [when they die] and I was taken to the borders of the village.' (Tamura 1985, 4)

20. *Aupsoro aomare wa arpaan.*

'I put them in my bosom and went.' (Bugaeva 2004, 127)

Set 1.2 (Sakhalin Ainu)

1. * *Kannapaake 'eniskurukerotoh 'oyasi.*

'A monster whose upper jaw touched the sky.'

2. *Pon hekaci nunnun kirupu.*

'The [animal] fat that a small baby boy sucked.' (Dal Corso 2021, 293)

3. * *Hemata 'oyasiykehe tekihi 'ahun usiikehe.*

'The place into which the paw of some kind of spirit entered.'

4. 'Oyasi kannapaakehe 'eniskurukerotoh.

'The monster's upper jaw touched the sky.'

5. *Pon kahkemah [...] koitah 'ahciutah.*

'The old women to whom [our] little young woman speaks.'

6. *Hemata 'oyasiykehe tekihi usiikehe'onne 'ahun.*

'The paw of some kind of spirit entered into [that] place.'

7. *Pon hekachi kirupu nunnun.*

'A small baby boy sucked the [animal] fat.'

8. * *Pon hekaci pe nunnun kirupu.*

'The [animal] fat that a small baby boy sucked.'

9. *Hemata* 'oyasiykehe tekihi 'onne 'ahun usiikehe.

'The place into which the paw of some kind of spirit entered.' (Dal Corso 2021, 335)

10. **Pon kahkemah* [...] *itah* 'ahciutah.

'The old women to whom [our] little young woman speaks.'

11. *Kannapaakehe* 'eniskurukerotoh 'oyasi.

'A monster whose upper jaw touched the sky.' (adapted from Dal Corso 2021, 394)

12. *Pon kahkemah* [...] 'ene an 'ahciutah koitah.

'[Our] little young woman speaks to such old women.' (adapted from Dal Corso 2021, 180)

13. *Neya* 'oro 'anreske 'ekasi.

'The old man by whom [the bear] had been raised.' (Dal Corso 2021, 200)

14. 'Iso *neya* 'ekasi'orowa 'anreske.

'The bear had been raised by the old man.'

6.2 Research

Now look at this other dataset and also read the examples from other languages given after it, which you will need for the third and last activity of this lesson.

→ *Dataset 2 - Other cases*

Consider the following examples (? marks dubious cases). Given what you have discovered up to this point of your analysis, do you think these are relative clauses too? Why/why not? What is the morphosyntactic structure of these sentences? If you think these structures are not in fact relative clauses, how else would you call them?

Set 2.1 (Hokkaidō Ainu)

1. *Kamuyutar nuwap kor okay hawe anu.*

‘I heard the voices of gods groaning.’ = ‘I heard that gods are groaning.’
(Bugaeva 2015, 92)

2. *?Pase katkemat kor wa uwepirka asur [...] anu.*

‘I heard the news (= that) he married a noble woman and they are happy together.’ (Tamura 1985, 22)

3. *Pon menoko [...] nepka ye siri ka anukar.*

‘I even saw the looks that (= that) the young girl said something.’
(Bugaeva 2004, 277)

Set 2.2 (Sakhalin Ainu)

1. *‘Aynu ‘okay kotan nee wakayki ...*

‘Although it was a village in which there were [many] people.’ (Dal Corso 2021, 401)

2. *Ku‘unuhu naa kuacapoho naa [...] arikihci [...] wepekere nee.*

‘It is the story [of when] both my aunt and my uncle [...] went [there].’
(Dal Corso 2021, 302)

3. *Kotan koro utara ceh e kotanonne payehci.*

‘The inhabitants of the village went to the village where they ate fish.’
(Pilsudski 1912, 99)

Examples from Other Languages...

Yoruba (Niger-Congo, Nigeria et al.)
(examples from Lawal 1987, 69)

Ọkùnrin tí [ó ra aṣọ] tí dé.
Man that he bought cloth has come
‘The man who bought the cloth has come.’

Aṣọ tí [ọkùnrin náà rà] dára.
cloth that man the bought good
‘The cloth that the man bought is good.’

Àdà tí [mo fi gé igi] mú.
 Cutlass that I with cut tree sharp
 ‘The cutlass that I cut the tree with is sharp.’

Some languages may employ **retention** as a means to retrieve the original position of the relative head within the relative clause. Sometimes retention can be used **along with the gap strategy**, like in the case of Yoruba. In Yoruba retention is obligatory for both arguments and obliques. With arguments, we see **pronoun retention** which is when a pronoun is found within the relative clause to reference to the relativised noun. In the first sentence the resumptive pronoun is *ó*, that refers to the animate *òkúnrin* ‘man’, while in the second sentence the pronoun is *náà*, that refers to the inanimate *aṣọ* ‘cloth’. With obliques, on the other hand, the gap strategy is used, but we also see **retention of the preposition** that indicates the original function that the relative head had prior to relativisation. In the third sentence the relative head *àdà* ‘cutlass’ is gapped, but the preposition *fi* ‘with’ is retained within the relative clause.

Japanese (Japonic, Japan)

[Kinō Hiroko-ga atta] hito-ga ki-ta.
 yesterday Hiroko-NOM meet.PASS person-NOM come-PASS
 ‘The man whom Hiroko met yesterday came.’

[Watashi-ga sakana-o tabe-ta] hashi.
 I-NOM fish-ACC eat-PASS chopstick
 ‘The chopsticks with which I ate the fish.’

In some languages the gap strategy is the only available strategy for relativisation and it is used **regardless of the function** that the relativised noun had in the relative clause. Japanese, for instance, employs the gap strategy for both arguments and obliques. In the first sentence above, the relativised *hito* ‘person’ is an argument of the verb *atta* ‘met’ in the relative clause. In the second sentence, the relativised *hashi* ‘chopsticks’ is an oblique (instrument) of the verb *tabeta* ‘ate’. Nevertheless, there is **no morphosyntactic indication** within the relative clause to signal this original function, which is then understood solely on a pragmatic basis.

Karachay-Balkar (Turkic, Russia) (examples from Comrie 1998, 81)

[Prezident kel-gān] hapar.
 president come-PTCP news
 ‘The news that the president has come.’

[Et biš-gän] iyis.
meat cook-PTCP smell
'The smell of meat cooking.'

Many languages also display constructions that, when we look at the linear order of constituents, are identical to relative clauses. In the Karachay-Balkar examples above the nouns *hapar* 'news' and *iyis* 'smell' follow a clause that they are the head of. This is exactly the order of constituents found in relative clauses in this language. However, both these nouns originally **do not occupy any position within the relative clause** – both *kel* 'come' and *biš* 'cook' are intransitive verbs whose subject is already present. This means that nothing has been gapped from within the clause in square brackets. These constructions are not relative clauses, but rather they are treated as **general noun-modifying clause constructions** (or GNMCCs) (Comrie 1998). In GNMCCs a noun heads a clause while not being formerly included in it. There is **no explicit expression of the relation** between this head noun and the clause, but the clause simply describes the semantics of the head noun. We can think of the first sentence as 'What kind of news?' 'The president-has-come news.' Some languages employ a subordinator of some kind (like the participle *-gän* in Karachay-Balkar) but many others do not employ any overt marking of dependency.

6.3 Analysis and Description

In no less than 400 words discuss relative clauses in HA and SA on the basis of your analysis of the data provided in Set 1 and Set 2.

- What premises did your analysis start from?
- What strategies are employed in HA and SA for relativisation?
- What are the limitations of these strategies?
- Are there specific kinds of verbs or specific constructions that trigger an unexpected kind of retention in relative clauses?
- Are there constructions that resemble relative clauses which are not actually a relative clause? What are they and how are they different from relative clauses?
- Do HA and SA behave differently in some way?