

Internally Headed Relative Clauses and Correlatives in Georgian: the case of *rom* relatives

Rajesh Bhatt (UMass Amherst) & Léa Nash (Université Paris 8/CNRS)

Crosslinguistically we find relative clauses with overt relative operators (English, German, Hindi) (henceforth *wh* relatives) and relative clauses without such an operator but with a C head (English, Persian) (henceforth *that* relatives). Analogous to *wh* relatives, we find *wh* free relatives. But *that* relatives seem to lack free relative counterparts (**I read [Op_i that you read t_i]*). Looking at Georgian *rom* relatives, we show that one can construct free relative-like structures based on the counterparts of *that*-relatives, with the caveat that the resulting structures are best treated as Internally Headed Relatives. These internally headed relatives and their headless variant can appear dislocated together with resumption, illustrating a new kind of correlative.

Rom relatives: One way of constructing relative clauses in Georgian involves *rom*, which is homophonous with the finite complementizer. There is no overt relative operator in *rom* relatives; *rom* cannot be initial and it has to precede the verb.

- (1) k'aci [ninom rom ___ dap'atiža] ak aris
man.NOM Nino.ERG ROM invited here is 'The man that Nino invited is here.'

Rom-relatives can appear without an external head. We distinguish two configurations: (i) the *rom* clause is in-situ e.g. in an argument position. In such cases, an internal head is obligatory.

- (2) siamovneb-it c'avik'itxe [gigom rom vanos *(c'igni) misca]
pleasure-with I-read Gigo.ERG ROM Vano.DAT book gave
'I read the/a book that Gigo gave Vano with pleasure.'

(ii) the *rom* clause is in a left-dislocated position. If the *rom* clause is not internally headed, it must be resumed by a demonstrative. If it is, resumption is possible but not obligatory.

- (3) Left dislocated *rom* relatives and resumption:

- a. no internal head: **obligatory** resumption:

[gigom rom vanos ___ misca] [siamovneb-it is (c'igni) c'avik'itxe]
Gigo.ERG ROM Vano.DAT gave] pleasure-with that book I-read
'I read the book that Gigo gave Vano with pleasure.'

- b. internal head: **optional** resumption

[gigom rom vanos c'igni misca] [siamovneb-it (is (c'igni)) c'avik'itxe]
Gigo.ERG ROM Vano.DAT book gave] pleasure-with that book I-read
'I read the/a book that Gigo gave Vano with pleasure.' (overt dem. → *the*)

We refer to *rom* relatives with an internal head as 'internally headed' relatives (3a) and to *rom* relatives with no internal head and no external head as 'headless' (3b). The distribution of internally headed *rom* relatives is that of DPs/externally headed *rom* relatives – they can appear in argument position and be dislocated like an ordinary DP (i.e. without overt resumption). They can also appear dislocated in the left periphery, resumed by a demonstrative. In contrast headless *rom* relatives can only appear in the left periphery with resumption.

LF Head Raising and ineffectual null operators: We analyze internally headed *rom* relatives as undergoing LF head raising as in Cole (1987). The derivation takes us from an overt structure which lacks an external head ([... XP ROM ... NP ... V ...]) to an externally headed structure ([NP₁ [... XP ROM ... t₁ ... V ...]]) at LF. Why then are headless *rom* relatives so different? They plausibly involve null operators ([OP₁ [... XP ROM ... t₁ ... V ...]]). We propose that null operators are unable to nominalize their CP, in contrast to overt nominal heads which can. This is in the spirit of Cecchetto & Donati (2015) who argue that projecting movement of a

nominal out of a CP nominalizes a *wh* CP allowing it to become a nominal argument. Null operators behave differently from their overt counterparts in a number of ways – for one, they cannot pied-pipe prepositions (*the student* [[*to whom*]_{*i*} *Mary gave a book t_i*] versus **the student* [[*to Op*]_{*i*} *Mary gave a book t_i*]). Furthermore the null operator cannot be used to satisfy the non-initiality requirement of *rom*.

Rom relatives as correlatives: Correlatives display a demonstrative requirement which can be analyzed as a constraint against vacuous binding – the correlative clause binds the demonstrative (Srivastav 1991). A demonstrative requirement also holds for left dislocated *rom* relatives.

- (4) [[Head-less ROM clause], [.....**Dem-NP**/***Q-NP**.....]]:

[gigom rom vanos misca] [siamovneb-it **is**/***sami c'igni** c'avik'itxe]
Gigo.ERG ROM Vano.DAT gave pleasure-with that/three book I-read

‘The thing that Gigo gave Vano, I read that book/*three books with pleasure.’

We could assume that the left dislocated *rom*-relatives are similar to free relatives and like free relatives receive definite/maximal interpretation as in Jacobson (1995)/Dayal (1996). But *rom*-relatives differ from other well-studied correlatives (for example in Hindi-Urdu) in a significant way. They are not always interpreted as definite/maximal. Correlative structures, where the *rom* clause is resumed by a demonstrative, display uniqueness/maximality effects (4). But the uniqueness/maximality in the presence of a demonstrative could be due to properties of pronominal anaphora (from Kadmon 1990, via Brasoveanu 2008).

- (5) a. Leif has a chair. *Leif could have many chairs.*
b. Leif has a chair. It is in the kitchen. *Leif has only one salient chair.*

Examining *rom* clauses on their own reveals that uniqueness/maximality is not required.

- (6) davp'atiže [ninos rom gogo mosc'ons]
1-invited [Nino.DAT ROM girl.NOM likes]

‘I invited a/the girl that Nino likes.’

This is in sharp contrast to Hindi-Urdu correlatives where singular free relatives in argument position are definite and plural free relatives are maximal. In other words, definiteness/maximality is not baked into the semantics of *rom* relatives as opposed to free relatives where it is. *rom* relatives instead have property type meanings (of type *et*). This property can be shifted to type *e* in cases of anaphora by demonstratives. But left to its own devices, it can also deliver indefinite meanings (6). Support for the property denoting nature of *rom* relatives comes from the fact that in correlatives they can evade the demonstrative requirement if there is a silent NP they can bind. Hindi-Urdu correlatives are based on free relatives which always denote individuals and hence cannot evade the demonstrative requirement via binding of a silent NP.

- (7) [gigom rom vanos misca] siamovneb-it **sami** (***c'igni**) c'avik'itxe
Gigo.ERG ROM Vano.DAT gave pleasure-with three books I-read

‘The things that Gigo gave Vano, I read three of those books with pleasure.’

Contributions and Prospects: Georgian displays a ‘free relative’ counterpart of a *that* relative but it turns out to be an internally headed relative. Internally headed relatives (and not just free relatives) can be used to construct correlatives. The absence of overt relative phrases correlates with lack of structural definiteness in the cases we have surveyed but this does not yet follow from our theoretical assumptions. Finally, the absence of *that* free relatives in English can be derived from the overtness of *wh*-movement in English, the failure of null operators to pied pipe an overt head, and their own inability to label the relative clause as nominal.