

THE MATCHING ANALYSIS OF RELATIVE CLAUSES: EVIDENCE FROM UPPER SORBIAN

Summary The aim of this talk is to show that Upper Sorbian (henceforth USO) provides morphological evidence for the Matching Analysis of relative clauses. The relevant morphological evidence comes from the suffix *-ž* appearing on relative pronouns in USO. The talk is structured as follows. I first show that previous analyses of the suffix *-ž* are empirically insufficient. I then argue that the suffix *-ž* is a reflex of the deletion of the copy of the head noun. Lastly, it will be shown that this analysis faces none of the problems the previous analyses have.

Relative Clauses in USo Relative clauses in USo can be formed in two ways (for a detailed overview taking also Lower Sorbian into account, cf. Bartels & Spiess 2012). Either a relative pronoun is fronted agreeing in ϕ -features with the head noun, or the invariant element *kiž* appears, which does not agree in ϕ -features with the head noun. Importantly, irrespective of which strategy is chosen, the suffix *-ž* has to appear on the fronted element (cf. 1); its omission results in ungrammaticality.

- (1) Tón hólc, štóž/kotryž/kiž tam sedži, je mój bratr.
the boy who which REL there sits is my brother
The boy who is sitting there is my brother.

Previous Approaches In the literature on USo, two approaches have been suggested for the obligatory presence of the suffix *-ž* on relative pronouns. The first and most common (Fasske 1981, p. 615) analyzes *-ž* as a derivational suffix that turns interrogative pronouns into relative pronouns (cf. 2).

- (2) relative pronoun = interrogative pronoun + *ž*
Such an approach faces two problems. First, there are relative elements with the suffix *-ž* for which no corresponding interrogative pronoun exists (cf. 3).

- (3) a. [relative pronoun kiž] \neq [interrogative pronoun ki]+*ž*
b. *Ki / √štó / √kotry je to činił?
who is that done
Who has done that?

Second, it fails to explain why *-ž* is also found on many adverbial complementizers (cf. 4).

- (4) *prjedyž* (before), *dónž* (until), *hačrunjež* (despite), *ručjež* (as soon as), *dokelž* (because)
The second approach analyzes *-ž* as a subordination marker (Libš 1884, p. 190; Schaarschmidt 2002, p. 34). This approach faces three problems. First, it is morphologically unlikely because the general subordination marker is *zo* in USo (cf. 5), so the change from *zo* to *-ž* needs to be stipulated.

- (5) Ja wěm, **zo** je to wopak.
I know.1SG that is that mistake
I know that that was a mistake.

Second, this analysis wrongly predicts that *-ž* should appear in all embedded contexts; however, *-ž* must not appear in embedded questions (cf. 6).

- (6) Ja wěm, štó(*ž) je to činił.
I know.1SG who is that done
I know who did that.

Third, this analysis does not capture the position of *-ž*, since it can also appear NP-internally (cf. 7).

- (7) To je ta žona, [NP čejuz knihu] sym ja čitał.
that is the woman whose book am I read.
That is the woman whose book I read.

Importantly, the sentence in 7 cannot be argued to involve Left Branch Extraction, as shown in (8), because Left Branch Extraction is optional in USo. Given this, when fronting the whole NP from example 7, *-ž* is predicted to occur after that whole NP. This, however, is ungrammatical (cf. 9).

- (8) To je ta žona, čejuz-ž [NP t_i knihu] sym ja čitał.
(9) * To je ta žona, [NP čejuz knihu]-ž sym ja čitał.

Analysis The analysis I want to put forward is that *-ž* is a morphological reflex of the deletion of the copy of the head noun internal to the relative clause, as shown in (10).

- (10) Tón hólc, [kotry hólc] tam sedži, je mój bratr.
→ Tón hólc, [kotry-ž] tam sedži, je mój bratr.

The viability of this analysis hinges of course on the correctness of a matching derivation for relative clauses. More specifically, it hinges on the correctness of the idea that the relative clause contains a copy of the head noun. Evidence for the correctness of this claim is available in USo. This evidence comes from antipronominal contexts (Perlmutter 1972, Postal 1994), that is, contexts barring pronouns from NP positions. One such context for USo is illustrated in (11).

- (11) Marko je na $\sqrt{\text{te wašnje}}$ / ***njo** rečal.
 Marko is on that way it spoken
*Marko has spoken in that way (*in it).*

Relative pronouns, however, are insensitive to this restriction, that is, they are licensed in antipronominal contexts (cf. 12).

- (12) Wašnje, **na kotrež** je Marko rečal, je mje překwapilo.
 way on which is Marko spoken is me surprised
The way in which he spoke surprised me.

The insensitivity of relative pronouns to antipronominal contexts follows neatly from the matching derivation because the relative pronoun is in fact an NP in disguise, as the structure for the sentence in 12 before the insertion of -ž shows.

- (13) Wašnje, [_{PP} na [_{NP} kotre **wašnje**]] je Marko rečal, je mje překwapilo.

Importantly, the insensitivity of relative pronouns to antipronominal contexts is unrelated to the determiner *kotr-* because this determiner itself is not licensed in antipronominal contexts (cf. 14a). Nor is it related to the presence of a trace at the base position whose status as an R-expression could circumvent the violation because movement in itself does not rescue such a violation (cf. 14b).

- (14) a. * Na kotre je Marko rečal?
 b. * Na čo je Marko rečal?

Consequences Although this analysis doesn't face the problems the other approaches have, it seems to create new ones. First, it has a problem with the relativizer *kiž* because no corresponding determiner *ki* exists. Second, it also doesn't seem to capture the presence of -ž on adverbial complementizers. The first problem is only apparent because *ki* can in fact be analyzed as a determiner, but as one that requires its complement to be elided. Such determiners exist in other languages, for example in German, where the indefinite reading of *welch-* is only possible when its NP-complement is elided (cf. 15).

- (15) Wir suchen Milch; haben Sie hier **welche** (*Milch)?
 we look.for milk have you here which milk
We need milk. Do you have any?

As for the second problem, that -ž is also found on many adverbial complementizers, this is only a problem if one wishes to distinguish adverbial subordinate clauses from relative clauses. However, previous work by Geis 1970 and recent work by Haegeman 2010 and Demirdache & Uribe-Etxebarria 2004, among others, demonstrate that adverbial clauses are best analyzed as relative clauses to silent NPs in the matrix clause. Adopting this assumption, the second problem vanishes. An adverbial clause such as in (16) will then have the structure in (17), and the presence of -ž follows as desired.

- (16) Wón je domoj šoł, prjedyž dało so do deščika.
 he is home went before gave REFL to rain
He went home before it started raining.
 (17) Wón je domoj šoł prjedy **TIME X TIME-X** dało so do deščika.
 → Wón je domoj šoł prjedy **TIME X -ž** dało so do deščika.

References

- Bartels, Hauke & Spiess, Gunter. 2012.** Restrictive relative clauses in the Sorbian languages. *Language Typology and Universals*, 65(3), pp. 221-245. **Demirdache, Hamida & Uribe-Etxebarria, Myriam. 2004.** The Syntax of Time Adverbs. In: Guéron, Jacqueline & Lecarme, Jacqueline. *The Syntax of Time*. MIT Press, pp. 143-179. **Fasske, Helmut. 1981.** *Grammatik der obersorbischen Schriftsprache der Gegenwart*. Domowina Verlag: Bautzen. **Geis, Michael. 1970.** *Adverbial Subordinate Clauses in English*. Phd thesis, MIT. **Haegeman, Liliane. 2010.** The internal syntax of adverbial clauses. *Lingua* 120(3), pp. 628-648. **Libš, Jurij. 1884.** *Syntax der wendischen Sprache in der Oberlausitz*. Verlag Michael Hornik: Bautzen. **Perlmutter, David. 1972.** Evidence for Shadow Pronouns in French Relativization. In: Perenteau, Paul; Levi, Judith; Phares, Gloria (eds.), *The Chicago Which Hunt*. Chicago Linguistic Society, pp. 73-105. **Postal, Paul. 1994.** Contrasting Extraction Types. *Journal of Linguistics*, 30(1), pp. 159-186. **Schaarschmidt, Gunter. 2002.** *Upper Sorbian*. Lincom: München.