

TYOLOGICAL VARIATION IN RELATIVE CLAUSES

BURCU BAŞOĞLU SARITAŞ
CANKUT SARITAŞ
Baskent University

<https://doi.org/10.37602/IJSSMR.2022.5311>

ABSTRACT

According to Foley and Hall (2003), relative clauses are subordinate clauses that refer to the noun of the main clause, identifying it, or adding extra information. This research aims to illustrate how languages vary in the relativization strategies they utilize. It also explains the effects of relative clause structure on L2 acquisition and problems for ESL/EFL students. Now let me start with the characteristics of English Relative Clauses first and then gradually explain the other languages' relative clauses.

Keywords: relative clauses, relativization strategies, L2 acquisition

PART I. Review of relative clauses in English:

Foley and Hall (2003), say that there are two types of relative clauses: defining clauses (identifying the noun or classifying it as part of a group) and non-defining clauses (adding information about the noun). So, let me give some examples of both defining and non-defining relative clauses.

1) Defining relative clauses:

a) Identifying relative clause: Is this the book that you were looking for?

(Foley & Hall, 2003, p. 299)

b) Classifying relative clause: Would all those who have booked dinner please go to the restaurant now?

(Foley & Hall, 2003, p. 299)

“In defining relatives, the relative clause gives information which is necessary for the sense of the sentence” (Foley & Hall, 2003, p. 299). They explain that in the second example, the relative clause classifies the members of a group. However, in the first example, if we just say Is this the book? this would not convey the key meaning of the whole sentence, i.e the book that you were looking for.

According to Foley and Hall, defining relative clauses are used to describe an important quality of someone or something.

Example 1: Van Gogh was an artist who used a lot of bold, vibrant colors.

(Foley & Hall, 2003, p. 299)

Moreover, they also use defining clauses to emphasize it.

Example 2: It is always a violent crime that provokes the most extreme reaction from the public.

(Foley & Hall, 2003, p. 299)

2) Non-defining relative clauses:

Foley and Hall remind us that non-defining relative clauses can be used to add extra information about the subject of a main clause.

Example 3:

a) ITV's News at Ten, which occupied the mid-evening slot for many years, was a very popular program. (main clause= ITV's News at Ten was a very popular program.)

(Foley & Hall, 2003, p. 299)

Foley and Hall state that one can also use non-defining relative clauses to illustrate consecutive actions as given below.

Example 4:

b) Heskey passed the ball to Owen, who scored a magnificent goal.

(Foley & Hall, 2003, p. 299)

Restrictive Versus Nonrestrictive Relative Clauses:

As I have explained the form of the relative clauses (and will put more emphasis on it later on), now let me give some possible examples of punctuation and pausing variations in the semantic relationship of relative clauses. According to Foley and Hall, in English punctuation, commas, and pausing play a great role in the separation of the relative clauses from the main clause in non-defining relatives. However, this is not true for defining clauses.

Example 6: The tribespeople, who traded with the settlers, retained their land.

(Foley & Hall, 2003, p.299)

Example 7: The tribespeople who traded with the settlers retained their land.

(Foley & Hall, 2003, p.299)

There seems to be a great difference in meaning between the two sentences given above because of the commas. In the first sentence, what is implied is that all of the tribespeople retained their land, and, incidentally, they traded with the settlers. However, in the second

example, only some of the tribespeople retained their land, only the ones who traded with settlers, -this clause defines the group.

In some cases, commas reflect the way we say the two types of relative clauses. "In defining relative clauses, there is no pause between the main clause and the relative clause." (Foley & Hall, 2003, p.299)

Example 8: We asked for the double room which had a sea view.

(Foley & Hall, 2003, p.299)

"In non-defining relatives, there is a short pause after the main clause or between the two parts of the main clause." (Foley & Hall, 2003, p.299)

Example 9: We were given a lovely double room (), which had a sea view.

I first met Harry Gardiner (), who eventually became my father-in-la (), at a Law Society meeting.

(Foley & Hall, 2003, p.299)

Introduction to Typology, by Lindsay J. Whaley, and The Advanced Grammar book, by Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman (1999), also show some similar examples for the English relative clauses which show a variation in their semantic relationship.

PART II. Typological Variation in Relative Clauses

My main focus in this paper is part II where I'll discuss the typological variation in relative clauses. Bernard Comrie (1997 and 2003) and Whaley (1997) propose some relevant parameters in the typology of relative clauses. I have summarized their ideas in Table 1.

Table 1

Relevant parameters in the typology of relative clauses:			
1.	2.	3.	4.
position of head noun in relation to modifying clause	expression of head noun in modifying clause	role of head noun in modifying clause	role of head noun in main clause

The table lists the meanings of the parameters in the typology of relative clauses and I will explain them in their sequence. For the first parameter, I will explain the position of the head noun in relation to modifying clauses in different languages. For the second parameter, I will

inform the expression of the head noun in modifying a clause by four major strategies: Non-reduction-strategy, gap strategy, pronoun retention strategy, and relative-pronoun strategy. The third parameter which I will explicate is the role of the head noun in modifying a clause and it includes the NP Accessibility Hierarchy which I will discuss as the paper goes on. The last parameter is the role of the head noun in a main clause which is also explained later on.

1.0 Position of head noun

Comrie (1997) and Whaley (1997) explains that one characteristic of relative clauses is the relativizer but that does not mean that it has to be in a sentence for the presence of a relativization. An example sentence for this could be "the guy Angelina Jolie is married to". Here we don't necessarily use 'that' as a relativizer for the relativization to occur. Whaley maintains that some languages don't use either a relative pronoun or a relativizer and one example he gives is from Japanese.

Example: [watasi ga hon o ataeta] kodomo

I SBJ book OBJ. give.PRV child

'The child I gave a book to'

(Whaley, 1997, p. 261)

As from the given Japanese example it is possible to infer that English can omit the relativizer in some instances but that Japanese never uses one.

According to Whaley, the example given above also brings out the importance of word order relationship between the head noun and the relative clauses since in Japanese the relative clause is found before the noun but in English, Polish and Ewe it is the opposite. As we look back again to the Japanese example we can see this order clearly since komodo 'child' is the noun and the words before that, which are in brackets, are the relative clause.

As quoted in Whaley (1997), Dryer points out that both the position of the head noun in the relative clauses and its modifying adjective clause are associated with the word order of that language. He indicates that languages which have OV order possess a weaker preference for noun+ relative clause ordering when compared to VO languages. According to Comrie the word order of relative clauses in English is the postnominal type since the relative clause follows its head. However, this is not true for Turkish and it has the pronominal type where the relative clause precedes its head. There are, of course, some other languages that fit into postnominal type other than English and they are the VO languages. Pronominal types are the OV languages, such as Turkish. There are some examples of these types taken from a website cited below.

Example: Head-initial: English and other VO languages.

[NP The clothes that I like] are expensive

(Matthews, 2005, p. 1)

In this example for VO languages, one can easily see the noun+ relative clause ordering, and is the postnominal type since the relative clause follows its head.

Head-final: some OV languages such as Japanese; Mandarin

[Wo xihuan de yifu] hen gui

I like PRT clothing very expensive

'The clothes I like are expensive'.

(Matthews, 2005, p. 1)

The example above for OV languages shows that the relative clause precedes its head which fits the pronominal type thus, the Japanese meaning of the sentence is 'the clothes I like are expensive' but not 'I like clothing that is expensive'.

Comrie (1981) and Whaley (1997) also say that the two types given above are not the only ones since there is also a third type in which the head occurs inside the relative clause. "In the internal type of relative clause, the head noun remains expressed within the relative clause, in the usual form for a noun of that grammatical relation within a clause, and there is no overt expression of the head in the main clause." (Comrie, 1981, p.138) Comrie shows an example from Bambara and Whaley also shows Bambara (Niger-Congo:Mali) as an example where the head noun can be placed within the relative clause. Now, let's look at their examples.

Example from Whaley: a) tyɛ ye [ne ye so min ye] san
man PST I PST horse REL see buy

'The man bought the horse (that) I saw'

(Data from Bird as cited in Whaley 1997)

Example from Comrie: a) N ye so ye.

I PAST house the see.

'I saw the house.'

(Comrie, 1981, p. 138)

b) Tyɛ be [n ye so min ye] dyc.
man the PRESENT I PAST house see build

'The man is building the house that I saw.'

(Comrie, 1981, p. 138)

“In this construction, the whole clause *n ye so min ye* functions as direct object of the main clause, but the sense is clearly that of a relative clause.” (Comrie, 1981, p. 138) Comrie also explains that since Bambara has SOV word order, the main clause of the example (b) given above has the order of subj., aux., direct object, and verb. Comrie also shows examples from Diegueño in which the noun phrase refers to a head.

Example: a) Tənay ?əwa : ?əwu :w.

yesterday house I saw

‘I saw the house yesterday.’

(Comrie, 1981, p. 138)

b) ?əwa :-pu -L’ ?ciyawx.

house DEFINITE LOCATIVE I - will - sing

‘I will sing in the house.’

(Comrie, 1981, p. 138)

c) [Tənay ?əwa : ?əwu :w]-pu -Ly

yesterday house I saw DEFINITE LOCATIVE

?ciyawx.

I-will-sing

‘I will sing in the house that I saw yesterday.’

(Comrie, 1981, p. 138)

Comrie reminds us that in the construction of Diegueño there seems to be no problem concerning the syntax of relative clause since it has a simple sentence structure. However, Bambara speakers would be confused because the noun phrase within the relative clause is ambiguous; therefore the language has a way of clarifying its function in the main clause. Comrie says that in Bambara this problem is solved by “placing the relative marker *min* after the noun phrase within the relative clause that is head of that construction.” (Comrie. 1981, p. 139) He also notes that this problem solving can not always be applied to all languages since some may not have such a marker as in Imbabura Quechua. This may lead to the same ambiguity as we have mentioned before for Diegueño.

Example: [Kan kwitsa-man kwintu-ta willa-shka]

You girl to story ACC. Tell NOMINATIVE

-ka llapa sumaj -mi.

TOPIC very pretty VALIDATOR

‘The girl to whom you told the story is very pretty.’

‘The story that you told to the girl is very pretty.’

(Comrie, 1981, p. 139)

A correlative construction from Hindi can also be shown below as a second kind of relative clause construction which is sometimes referred to as having an internal head.

Example: Ādmī ne jis cākū se murgī ko

man ERGATIVE which knife with chicken ACC.

mārā thā, us cākū ko Rām ne dekhā

killed that knife ACC. Ram ERG. Saw

‘Ram saw the knife with which the man killed the chicken.’

(Comrie, 1981, p. 139)

“The literal translation of the Hindi example would be: ‘with which knife the man killed the chicken, Ram saw that knife.’ Although in this example, the noun phrase of the first clause is repeated in the second clause, it would be possible to have a coreferential pronoun in the second clause instead of the repeated noun phrase.”(Comrie, 1981, p. 139) According to Comrie, there are two classifications of this construction and the first one is that it has an internal head since ādmī...thā which is the relative, contains a noun phrase jis cākū which is considered as referring to the head. Another classification could be that of a subtype of the pronominal relative clause since the head is actually the noun phrase whether with a full noun or a pronoun which is present in the second clause. So, Comrie suggests that this construction combines features of both internal-head and pronominal types.

In addition to the discussion above, there are also other languages that have internal-head type of relative clauses and these are the OV languages. Such an example from Tibetan, which is taken from a website, is cited below.

Example: Head-internal: some OV languages such as Tibetan

[PeemE thep khii-pa] the nee yin

Peem.Erg book carry-Part the I.Gen is

'The book Peem carried is mine'

(Matthews, 2005, p. 1)

Head-internal relatives in Cantonese? (Matthews & Yip 2001, 2003)

[NP/S Antonio tai go bun syu] hou m hou tai aa?

Antonio read that CL book good not good read

'Is the book Antonio is reading any good?'

(Matthews, 2005, p. 1)

Before moving on to the next part I would like to note that there are also some languages which permit headless relative clauses. One instance can be observed from the Greek sentence below.

Example: hos ou lambanei ton stauron autou...

REL.NOM.MSC not take-3S ART cross his

(The person) who does not take his cross...

This example shows how Greek can use a relative clause without a head noun. Whaley points out that in English indefinite relatives begin with whoever, whatever, and so on, thus Greek is very much alike to English when it signifies the indefinite reference.

2.0 ENCODING (EXPRESSION) OF HEAD NOUN IN MODIFYING CLAUSE

Comrie (1981) suggests that from the viewpoint of typological variation, the manner in which the head noun is expressed in the head clause is one of the most significant parameters. Four major forms of this parameter can be distinguished from one another through some strategies given below.

2.1 Non-reduction 'strategy'

“The non-reduction type simply means that the head noun appears in full, unreduced form, in the embedded sentence, in the normal position and/ or with the normal case marking for a noun phrase expressing that particular function in the clause.” (Comrie, 1981, p. 140) He illustrates this kind of strategy by showing examples from languages such as Bambara, Diegueno and Hindi.

Example from Bambara: Tye be [n ye so min ye] dyc.

man the PRESENT I PAST house see build

'The man is building the house that I saw.'

(Comrie, 1981, p. 138)

Example form Diegueno: [Təny ?əwa : ?əwu :w]-pu -Ly

yesterday house I saw DEFINITE LOCATIVE

?ciyawx.

I-will-sing

'I will sing in the house that I saw yesterday.'

(Comrie, 1981, p. 138)

Example from Hindi: Ādmī ne jis cākū se murgī ko
Man ERGATIVE which knife with chicken ACC.
mārā thā, us cākū ko Rām ne dekhā
killed that knife ACC. Ram ERG. Saw
'Ram saw the knife with which the man killed the chicken.'

(Comrie, 1981, p. 139)

2.2 Pronoun retention 'strategy'

Another type of strategy is the pronoun retention in which the head noun of the relative clause stays as in the pronominal form. "This type is found in non-standard English, as when from the sentence I know where the road leads one forms the relative clause this is the road that I know where it leads. In this construction the pronoun it indicates the position relativized, i.e, enables retrieval of the information that relativization is of the subject of the indirect question clause." (Comrie, 1981, p. 139) According to Comrie, in this relative clause the resumptive pronoun 'it' refers to the 'road' which is the head noun and it stays in the position of subject. He maintains that, this strategy has a peripheral place in English however; in other languages it has a central importance. He supports his idea by explaining the use of this strategy in a language where it is used obligatorily most of the time such as Persian. He says that this type of usage is a must for relativization of all grammatical relations for Persian. However, there are exceptions too for this pronoun retention such as subject (unusual) and direct object (optional). The examples given below by Comrie illustrate the relativization on subject, direct object, and indirect object.

Example a: Mard-i[ke (*u) bolandqadd bud] juje

Man that he tall was chicken

-rā košt

ACCUSATIVE killed

'The man that was tall killed the chicken.'

(Comrie, 1981, p. 141)

Example b: Hasan mard-i- rā [ke zan (u - rā)
Hasan man ACC. that woman he ACC.
zad] mišenāsad.

hit knows

‘Hasan knows the man that the woman hit.’

(Comrie, 1981, p. 141)

Example c: Man zan -i -rā [ke Hasan be u
I woman ACC. that Hasan to her
sibe zamini dād] mišenāsam.

Potato gave I-know

‘I know the woman to whom Hasan gave the potato.’

(Comrie, 1981, p. 141)

Comrie notes that it is not possible to leave out the words such as be u ‘to her’ or just u ‘her’. He also points out two important considerations for these examples given above. First, he says that Persian may have more than one type of relative clause construction, which indicates that examples of (a) and (c) are both pronoun retention and gap strategy types (see 2.4 for more information about this). Comrie believes that having two types is not unique to the pronoun retention strategy and says it is possible for other typological parameters too. This enables languages to receive not only finite but also non-finite types or that they could have both prenominal and postnominal types. One example of this could be seen in a language such as Tagalog.

Example d. babae -ng [nagbabasa ng diyaryo]
woman that reads P newspaper

[nagbabasa ng diyaryo-ng] babae

‘the woman that reads the newspaper.’

(Comrie, 1981, p. 141)

Secondly, he notes that “the order of types being presented here proceeds from most explicit to least explicit, with regard to encoding of the role of the head noun within the relative clause. The non-reduction type is as explicit as it is possible to be; the pronoun retention type is less explicit, since it is necessary to establish the appropriate anaphoric relation for the

pronoun before the relative clause construction as a whole can be interpreted.” (Comrie, 1981, p. 141)

Yaowapat (2005) also agrees with Comrie and illustrates some examples of pronoun retention type seen in Khmer and Thai. Here is an example taken from Yaowapat’s article.

(Yaowapat, 2005, 121)

In the Khmer example given above, *kruu m-neāk* ‘a teacher’ is the NP that is relativized. Yaowapat asserts that the basic word order of Khmer is SVO and that the resumptive pronoun *koat* ‘s/he’ is both present as a subject in the relative clause since it is a precedent of the verb *banjrien* ‘teach’ and co-referent with the NP. Now, let’s have a brief look at another example of Yaowapat.

(Yaowapat, 2005, 122)

In the Thai example given above, *khruu* ‘teacher’ is the head noun that is relativized.

Yaowapat asseverates that the basic words order of Thai is the same as Khmer SVO and that the pronoun *khāw* ‘s/he’ which is co-referential with the head noun *khruu* ‘teacher and occurs in the subject position in the relative clause, that is preceding the verb ‘teach’.

Other examples of pronoun retention in Hebrew and Cantonese are illustrated below:

Example e. “common in head-initial relatives, e.g. Hebrew” taken from the website

<http://www.hku.hk/linguist/program/Typology7.html>

ha-ishi [she-hui meod xaxam]

the-man that-he very smart

"The man who is very smart"

(Matthews, 2005, p. 1)

Example f. “rare in head-final relatives, e.g. Cantonese” taken from the website

<http://www.hku.hk/linguist/program/Typology7.html>

[lei sung faa bei keoii go go bengjani] hou faan saai

you send flower give her that CL patient well back all

"The patient you sent flowers to has recovered"

(Matthews, 2005, p. 1)

2.3 Relative pronoun 'strategy'

The third type of strategy that Comrie describes is the relative pronoun strategy which is common in European languages but not in other languages of the world. "As with the pronoun retention type, there is a pronoun in the relative clause indicating the head, but instead of being in the usual position, in terms of linear word order, for a pronoun expressing that grammatical relation, it is moved to clause-initial position. For the pronoun in question to encode the role of the head noun within the relative clause, given that this can not be done by order, it is essential that the pronoun be cased marked, at least to the same extent that the noun phrases in main clauses are, to indicate its role." (Comrie, 1981, p. 142) According to Comrie, in English, relative-pronoun type of relative clauses can be observed through the nominative who and accusative whom characterizations. However, he gives Russian as an example of a language which is richer than English in the case of relative pronouns.

Example a. Devuška prišla.

Girl-NOMINATIVE arrived.

'The girl arrived.'

(Comrie, 1981, p. 142)

Example b. devuška, [kotoraja prišla]

girl who-NOMINATIVE arrived

'the girl who arrived'

(Comrie, 1981, p. 142)

Example c. La videl devušku.

I saw girl-ACC.

(Comrie, 1981, p. 142)

Example d. devuška, [kotoraju ja videl]

girl who-ACC. I saw

'the girl whom I saw'

(Comrie, 1981, p. 142)

Example e. La dal knigu devuške

I gave book girl-DATIVE

'I gave the book to the girl.'

(Comrie, 1981, p. 142)

Example f. devuška, [kotoroj ja dal knigu]

girl who-DATIVE I gave book

'the girl to whom I gave the book.'

(Comrie, 1981, p. 142)

In the examples of relative clauses that I have listed above from Russian, Comrie asserts that the relative pronoun *kotor-*, in clause initial position, converts the role of the head noun in the relative clause. Comrie believes that this kind of relative-pronoun type should appear clause-initially and not in the basic word order position. However, he also notes that there are some languages such as Czech where both the pronoun-retention and the relative-pronoun types can occur because of unstressed pronouns such as clitics which move towards sentence-second position.

Example: To děvče uhodilo toho muže.

that girl hit that man

'That girl hit that man.'

(Comrie, 1981, p. 143)

'A clitic pronoun, however, must immediately follow the first major constituent, so that pronominalizing *toho muže* 'that man' to *ho* 'him' necessarily involves a change of word order.'" (Comrie, 1981, p. 143) Comrie indicates that in Czech the normal word order of SVO has to become a SOV when a stressed pronoun follows the first major constituent.

Example: To děvče ho uhodilo.

that girl him hit

'That girl hit him.'

(Comrie, 1981, p. 143)

One way which Comrie explains to form a relative clause in Czech is to use the conjunction *co*. This however, can only occur together with a clitic pronoun which refers back when the relativization is of the direct object or just the indirect object. Now let's have a brief look at the example given below.

Example: muž, [co ho to děvče uhodilo]

man that him that girl hit

'the man that that girl hit'

(Comrie, 1981, p. 143)

So, this example could be interpreted as either pronoun-retention or relative pronoun. There can be pronoun-retention strategy here because of it' a pronominal type and there can also be a relative pronoun strategy since the pronoun is expressed in the clause-initial position.

Another example of relative pronoun strategy in Czech:

Example g. "widespread in Indo-European languages, e.g. Czech;" taken from the

website <http://www.hku.hk/linguist/program/Typology7.html>

Jan videl [NP toho muzei, [kterehoi to devce uhodilo]]

John saw that man whom that girl hit

"John saw the man whom the girl hit"

(Matthews, 2005, p. 1)

2.4 Gap 'strategy'

Whaley (1997) describes this strategy as a way of expressing how different languages treat the relativized noun in the relativization process. He explains that this strategy occurs by leaving a gap in the adjective clause where the relativized noun takes place. He also believes that this strategy is the most frequently used one and that no other strategy could compete with it to be used in languages which apply pronominal relative clauses.

According to Comrie, this type does not give any obvious signal about the role of the head noun within the relative clause. "In English, at least in those varieties that do not have a who/whom distinction, this type is used to relativize subjects and direct objects:" (Comrie, 1981, p. 144)

Example 1: the man who/ that gave the book to the girl

(Comrie, 1981, p. 144)

Example 2: the book which/ that the man gave to the girl

(Comrie, 1981, p. 144)

Example 3: "less common in head-initial relatives, e.g. in English (restricted)" taken from the website <http://www.hku.hk/linguist/program/Typology7.html>.

[NPThe movie [we saw _ last week]]... (object relative)

There was [NP an old man [_ lived down the road]] (subject relative:

dialectal)

So, it is implied that either 'to' or 'from' can be interpreted from this sentence since both are possible.

Another example of gap strategy which is commonly found in head-finals in Japanese can be illustrated as;

Hanako-ga [[Taroo-ga _tukutta] susi-o NP] tabeta

Hanako-Nom Taroo-Nom made sushi-Acc ate

"Hanako ate the sushi that Taroo made"

(Matthews, 2005, p. 1)

Another linguist Yaowapat (2005) has explained the gap strategy in both Khmer and Thai languages. He asserts that in the gap strategy of Khmer, the NP which is co-referential with the noun is absent. This is clearly seen through the example given below which is in S-V-O order and the main verb which is in the embedded clause, the argument *dael riinjtuuk?ah* 'which is dry' is missing in the relative clause which is the NP (subject position).

(Yaowapat, 2005, 121)

He also says that due to the fact that this missing NP is formed by the gap strategy and which is the co-referent of the head NP, the missing subject can be recoverable as *tii moaststuuj muey* 'a river'.

Yaowapat believes that many positions in Khmer such as subjects, direct objects, indirect objects, and possessors can be relativized. However, there is a difference between on how they are relativized for instance; subjects and indirect objects can only be relativized through the gap strategy and pronoun retention type. On the other hand, direct objects can be relativized only by the gap strategy and possessive NP's by pronoun retention. Now, let's observe the examples given below which clearly illustrate those positions.

Examples:

a) (Yaowapat, 2005, 121)

In the example given above it is possible to infer that a gap is left in the subject position by the subject NP *cmaa* 'cat' which is relativized in the relative clause.

b) (Yaowapat, 2005, 121)

In the example given above, it is inferred that the direct object NP *cam naot* 'exercise' is relativized and leaves a gap in the direct position of the relative clause. It is possible to see this gap after the verb 'work'.

c) (Yaowapat, 2005, 121)

This example given above shows how the indirect object *kmeen* 'child' is relativized and that it leaves a gap in the final position of the clause as can be seen through the brackets.

d) (Yaowapat, 2005, 121)

This last example from Khmer illustrates how the possessor *kav?ey* meaning 'chair' is relativized. In order to convert the possessive role of the head noun *kav?ey* 'chair' the personal pronoun *vie* 'it' occurs in the relative clause.

Now that we have observed the Khmer language, let's have a brief discussion about the Thai language as well.

According to Yaowapat (2005), the postnominal types of relative clauses in Thai can be formed by two strategies, either the gap type or pronoun retention. For all the four positions that were mentioned for Khmer, it is possible to use either type. Below are some illustrations of the NP positions that can be relativized.

Examples:

a) (Yaowapat, 2005, 121)

In the example given above it is possible to infer that NP third in 'land' is relativized and that there is a gap before the verb *tit* 'next'. This gap which is in the subject position is of the embedded clause is also the co-referent of NP.

b) (Yaowapat, 2005, 121)

Here is another example of a direct object 'the area around the Lumpini Garden' which is relativized and then leaves a gap after the verb 'use' in the direct object position of the relative clause.

c) (Yaowapat, 2005, 121)

This example given above points out the indirect object 'child' as being relativized and then after the direct object 'money', it leaves a gap in the relative clause.

d) (Yaowapat, 2005, 121)

The last example from Thai shows the possessor 'man' as being relativized and there appears a gap after the possessed NP 'wife' which is the co-referent of that noun.

3.0 ROLE OF THE HEAD NOUN IN MODIFYING CLAUSE

Another parameter that Comrie (1981) and other linguists such as Whaley (1997) and Alexiadou, Meinunger, and Wilder, (2000) suggest is the role of the head noun in modifying clauses. This parameter according to these linguists has to do with what kind of nominals languages allow to be relativized. For instance, Whaley believes that English is unique in that it has a wide range of constituents that are relativized. He illustrates these relativized constituents as given below.

Table 1:

Example: Subject:	the woman that _____ likes Mary
Direct object:	the woman (that) Mary likes _____
Oblique:	the woman (that) Mary spoke with _____
Possessor:	the woman whose family Mary knows _____
Comparative:	the woman that Mary is taller than _____
Clause:	Mary got good grades, which surprised my parents.

(Whaley, 1997, p. 263)

Comrie (1981) also supports Whaley (1997) by saying that there is no restriction for the relativization of constituents in English and that it is possible to relativize the subject, direct object, non-direct object, and possessor.

Table 2:

Example: the man [who bought the book for the girl]
the book [which the man bought for the girl]
the girl [for whom the man bought the book]
the boy [whose book the man bought for the girl]

There are more examples of the constituents that are relativized in English as given in table 2 below.

Table 3: Information taken from the website cited below and reformed into a table.

English Constituents that are Relativized
Subject relatives: head noun serves as subject of relative clause [All the guests who _ came to the party] were invited
Object relatives: head noun serves as object of relative clause [All the guests (who(m)) we invited _] came to the party
Indirect object relatives: head noun serves as indirect object of relative clause

[All the guests (to) who(m) we sent invitations _] came to the party

[All the guests [(who) we sent invitations to _]] came to the party

Oblique relatives: head noun plays role other than subject/object of relative clause predicate

[All the guests [to whom I talked _]] enjoyed to the party ("pied-piping")

[All the guests (?who) I talked to _] enjoyed to the party ("preposition-stranding")

Possessor relatives: head noun serves as possessor of a NP in the relative clause

[All the guests whose partners could come] were invited

Comparative relative

[That girl that I said you were smarter than_] won the competition

(Matthews, 2005, p. 1)

However, Comrie and Whaley claim that in many languages the relativization of these kinds of positions is highly restricted. As quoted in Whaley (1997), Keenan and Comrie (1977) had found that most of the languages, in a 50-language sample, allow only some of these positions. Thus Whaley gives an example from Malagasy (Austronesian: Madagascar) relatives which have a restriction to only subjects.

Example: ny mpianatra [izay nahita ny vehivavy]

the student that saw the woman

'the student who saw the woman'

(Whaley, 1997, p. 263)

Whaley notes that "although Comrie and Keenan found that there are differences in what individual languages relativize, the variation is not random but follows a clear pattern" (Whaley, 1997, p. 263) According to Whaley, it seems like this pattern is the reason why they proposed the Noun Phrase Accessibility Hierarchy that is discussed in the next parameter.

3.1 The NP Accessibility Hierarchy

Table 4: I have combined Whaley's and Comrie's hierarchy into one table.

The Noun Phrase Accessibility Hierarchy
Subject > Object > Indirect object > Oblique > Possessor > Comparative > Clause

(Whaley, 1997, p.264 and Comrie, 1981, p. 149)

According to Whaley and Comrie the NP Accessibility Hierarchy shows the ease of accessibility to relative clause formation. In other words, when we look at the table 4 above we can observe that it is easier to relativize subjects than it is to relativize objects or any other positions so, the positions show which ones are easier than others regarding relativization. Comrie also indicates that there is a language universal to be considered about these positions that can be relativized. "If a language can form relative clauses on a given position on the hierarchy, then it can also form relative clauses on all positions higher (to the left) on the hierarchy; moreover, for each position on the hierarchy, there is some possible language that can relativize on that position and all positions to the left, but on no position to the right." (Comrie, 1981, p. 149) As I have discussed before on page 32 there is a language that can only relativize subjects such as Malagasy and Comrie shows that language as an example and Kinyarwanda as an example of language where relativization is possible only of subjects and direct objects. He believes that by showing these languages as examples he could provide evidence for the two points I have quoted. Now let's have a brief look at the examples that he has given.

Example from Malagasy: a) Nahita ny vehivavy ny mpianatra.

saw the woman the student

'The student saw the woman.'

(Comrie, 1981, p. 149)

Comrie recalls that Malagasy has the basic word order of VOS.

b) ny mpianatra [izay nahita ny vehivavy]

the student that saw the woman

'the student who saw the woman'

(Comrie, 1981, p. 149)

Comrie says that the example (b) can not have the meaning of 'the student whom the woman saw' and also the relative clause in this sentence can not be translated literally into Malagasy.

Example from Kinyarwanda:

a) N-a -bonye umugabo [w -a -kubise abagore].

I PAST see man RELATIVE PAST strike women

'I saw the man who struck the women.'

(Comrie, 1981, p.150)

b) Nabonye abogore [Yohani yakubise].

I-saw women John he-struck

'I saw the women that John struck.'

(Comrie, 1981, p.150)

However, Comrie notes that forming a relative clause by taking an instrument like *n-ikaranum* 'with the pen' and interpreting it as 'the pen with which John wrote the letter' is not possible as seen from the example below.

Example: c) *Yohani yanditse ibaruwa n -ikaramu.*

John wrote letter with pen

'John wrote the letter with the pen.'

(Comrie, 1981, p. 150)

According to Comrie and Whaley most of the languages allow relativization of the positions that I have discussed before however, there are some exceptions and these are specifically, Austronesian languages. They permit relativization of subjects but not the relativization of direct objects and then later they do permit the relativization of genitives, which shows evidence of violation of the absolute universal discussed above on page 35. One instance of this relativization can be clearly seen in Malay.

Example: a) *Gadis [yang duduk du atas bangku] itu kakak Ali.*

lady that sit on top bench the elder-sister Ali

'The lady who sat on the bench is Ali's elder sister.'

(Comrie, 1981, p. 150)

b) *Orang [yang abang -nya memukul saya] itu*

person that elder-brother his hit me the

'the person whose elder brother hit me.'

(Comrie, 1981, p. 150)

According to these exceptions Comrie infers that the language universal of relative clauses is not an absolute but a tendency. "The number of exceptions is small relative to the over-all sample, moreover the fact that most of the exceptions belong to a single genetic and areal grouping serves only to accentuate their exceptional nature." (Comrie, 1981, p. 151) He believes that since the exceptions are limited to a small group of languages it is better to reformulate the universal by distinguishing different strategies to create more specific universals. He explains that this distinguishment can only take place if one differs between pronominal, postnominal, and internal-headed relative clause. He also adds that

another way of distinguishing can occur if one also differs between “relative clauses where the role of the head noun in the relative clause is encoded ([+ case]) versus those where it is not ([- case]).” (Comrie, 1981, p. 151) He suggests that only by this way the general universal that I have discussed before on page 32 can replace its place by two more specific universals: “(a) every language can relativize on subjects; (b) any relative clause strategy must cover a continuous segment of the reformulation hierarchy.” (Comrie, 1981, p. 151) It is also interesting that Whaley (1997) also implies those two specific universals when he explains the NP Accessibility Hierarchy. He believes that some languages utilize more than one strategy in order to form a relative clause and thus this cause for exceptions to occur in the hierarchy. One instance that he shows from Persian is:

Example: Mardi [ke _____ bolandqadd bud]

man that tall was

‘The man that was tall’

(Whaley, 1997, p.264)

In the example above it is possible to say that Persian uses not only the gapping strategy that I have addressed before but also a pronoun retention strategy which is also talked before thus violating the hierarchy universal. He states that one cannot apply both structures equally at any time. The reason why he thinks that way is that gapping is used for the relativization of subjects but on the other hand in order to relativize the direct object one has to use both gapping and pronoun strategy. What’s more the pronoun strategy is also used for the other nominal types. According to Whaley, Persian is surely an exception since the pronoun retention strategy is not applicable for the subjects. In conclusion he agrees with Comrie and proposes the reformation of the absolute universal hierarchy by the help of the two claims talked about in the previous page.

When we come back to Comrie’s book, he gives rise to a question which is concerned with the grammatical relations of the relative clauses. I have discussed about his views on subjects which is used for the statement of universal restrictions on NP accessibility but now he asks whether “the relevant grammatical relations are those of surface structure, or whether more abstract syntactic analysis is required?” (Comrie, 1981, p.151) The answer for this question is the surface structure because he shows evidence on concrete analysis such as Malagasy which has a high level of constraints on relativization. According to Comrie, Malagasy language has relativization only on subjects and another example he gives from is Kinyarwanda which has relativization only on subjects and direct objects.

On page 36, example (a), I have addressed an example of Malagasy where the active was illustrated by Comrie. Now, he illustrates more examples of the same language but this time with more voices which modify different arguments of the action to perform as a surface structure subject. According to Comrie “the example (a) given below is in the active; the example (b) is in the so-called passive, with the direct object of the active as surface subject; and the example (c) is in the so-called circumstantial voice, with a non-direct object (here, benefactive) as surface subject.” (Comrie, 1981, p.152)

Example: a) Nividy ny vary ho an'ny ankizy ny vehivavy.

bought the rice for the children the woman

'The woman bought the rice for the children.'

(Comrie, 1981, p.152)

b) Novidin' ny vehivavy ho an'ny ankizy ny vary.

was-bought the woman for the children the rice

'The rice was bought for the children by the woman'

(Comrie, 1981, p.152)

c) Nividianan' ny vehivavy ny vary ny ankizy.

was-bought-for the woman the rice the children

'The children were bought rice by the woman.'

(Comrie, 1981, p.152)

Comrie maintains that in the example (a) we can only relativize the subject which is ny vehivavy 'the woman'. Nevertheless is also possible to express the English relative clause into this language. This can only take place when one applies the non-active voice with the noun phrase that is relativized in the subject position. So, Comrie gives examples of this situation by expressing that from the example (b) above we can form (d) and likewise from the example (c) we can form (e).

Example: c) ny vary [izay novidin'ny vehivavy ho an'ny ankizy]

'The rice that was bought for the children by the woman.'

(Comrie, 1981, p.152)

e) ny ankizy [izay nividianan'ny vehivavy ny vary]

'The children who were bought rice by the woman'

(Comrie, 1981, p.152)

As from the examples given above, Comrie infers that the information of English relative clauses like 'the rice that the woman bought for the children' or 'the children for whom the woman bought the rice' is conveyed.

Another example that Comrie illustrates is about Kinyarwanda. He maintains that there can be a secondary construction for the example of (c) on page 37. This secondary construction is

the semantic instrument which comes along as a direct object. Now, let's look at the example below.

Example: Yohani yandikishije ikaramu ibaruwa.

'John wrote the letter with the pen.'

(Comrie, 1981, p.152)

He notes that one cannot translate this sentence literally into English and that the suffix –ish indicates the alteration in voice. He also indicates that just like other direct objects, 'pen' can be relativized.

The relativization of both Malagasy and Kinyarwanda is affected by surface structure grammatical relations and Comrie adds that these languages also have voices in addition to the basic voice.

Comrie claims that the kinds of generalizations made before also involve more complex constructions. "An extension that seems to be valid is that it will never be easier to relativize a given constituent of a subordinate clause than to relativize the same constituent of a main clause." (Comrie, 1981, p.154) He maintains that the direct object of a main clause would be much easier than to relativize the direct object of a subordinate clause. What's more he also reformulates this as an implicational universal. "If a language can relativize a subordinate direct object, then it can relativize a main clause direct object." (Comrie, 1981, p.154) He gives examples for these implicational universal languages such as English where it is possible to relativize both, Malagasy where it is not accomplishable to relative either of them, and Russian where it is contingent to relativize the main clause direct objects but not the subordinate clause direct objects.

Example from Russian: a) devuška, [kotoruju ja ljublju]

girl who-ACC. I love

'the girl that I love'

(Comrie, 1981, p. 154)

b) * devuška, [kotoruju ty dumaješ, što ja ljublju]

girl who-ACC. you think that I love

'the girl that you think (that) I love'

(Comrie, 1981, p. 154)

Another extension of the generalization that Comrie had made before could be the possibility of the relativization of possessors. "Whether it is easier to relativize a possessor that is part of a subject noun phrase than one that is part of a direct object noun phrase." (Comrie, 1981, p. 154) Comrie tries to find languages where one can relativize a possessor without inquiring

the role of the noun phrase of the possessor. He does actually provide some evidence for this claim by showing examples of languages such as Malay where it is achievable to relativize the possessor of subject but not the possessor of a noun-subject.

Example: a) orang [yang abang -nya memukul saya] itu

person that elder-brother his hit me the

'the person whose elder brother hit me'

(Comrie, 1981, p. 154)

b) * orang [yang saya memukul abang -nya] itu

person that I hit elder-brother his the

'the person whose elder brother I hit'

(Comrie, 1981, p. 154)

However, Comrie suggests that more work should be done in order to avoid problems in the generalization of these extensions. "Subordinate clauses should be more accessible to relativization than non-subjects. However, all the evidence suggests the opposite." (Comrie, 1981, p. 154) He believes that one can freely relativize subjects of subordinate clauses in English however; on the other hand, it is contingent to relativize subjects on condition that there is no conjunction.

Example: the girl [that you think (that) I love]

the girl [that you think (*that) loves me]

(Comrie, 1981, p. 155)

Another example that Comrie gives is from Hungarian where non-subjects often can be relativized but not the subordinate subjects.

Example: a) a pénz, [amit mondtam, hogy a

the money which-ACC. I-said that the

fiu elvette]

book took-away

'the money that I said (that) the boy took away'

(Comrie, 1981, p. 155)

b) * a fiu, [aki mondtam, hogy elvette a pénzt]

the boy who I-said that took-away the money-ACC.

‘the boy that I said took away the money’

(Comrie, 1981, p. 155)

“In Imbabura Quechua, it is possible to relativize a non-subject of an embedded clause using the gap type, but not the subject of an embedded clause:” (Comrie, 1981, p. 154)

Example: a) [Marya kri -j Fuzi riku-shka
Maria believe NOMINALIZER José see NOMINALIZER
-ta] warmi llugshi-rka.
ACC. woman leave PASR-3SINGULAR

‘The woman whom Maria believes that José saw left.’

(Comrie, 1981, p. 155)

b) * [Marya Fuzi -man ni -shka Fuan-ta
Maria José to say NOMINALIZER Juan ACC.
riku-shka -ta] warmi llugshi-rka.
see NOMINALIZER ACC. woman leave PAST-3SINGULAR

‘The woman who Maria told José saw Juan left.’

(Comrie, 1981, p. 155)

Comrie claims that although there is not enough explanation for the reason of this generalization, it is still credible that it is harder to relativize subordinate subjects when compared to subordinate non-subjects.

Having discussed many aspects of relative clauses across languages, it is possible to conclude that positions that are higher on the hierarchy are more easily relativised. It has been discussed that the distribution of relative clauses is not necessarily arbitrary for those languages which have more than one relative clause type. For instance, it is highly probable that one can use the pronoun retention type lower down the accessibility hierarchy and the gap strategy for higher up if there is a selection between a gap relative clause and pronoun retention in a language. All languages can relativize subjects but not all languages can relativize objects such as Malagasy. Pronoun retention strategy is more probable to be applied at lower positions on the NP accessibility hierarchy. For example, in English pronoun retention is used for the integrated object positions, in Welsh it is used in oblique position and in Persian it is used on direct objects, non-direct objects, and genitives. Other instances could be Cantonese where the pronoun retention is applied for the indirect object and Malay where it

is used for genitives. However, according to Comrie, the gap strategy is applied to higher positions. For instance, Persian applies the gap type on subjects and direct objects and Malay for subjects.

4.0 ROLE OF HEAD NOUN IN MAIN CLAUSE

Before explaining Comrie's study on the role of the head in main clause, I would like to briefly discuss the hypothesis of Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman since it's really interesting and helpful to understand Comrie's ideas. Murcia and Freeman have quoted Kuno's 1974 hypothesis on the role of the head noun in the main clause. According to their quote, OS and OO relatives are much easier to learn when compared to SS or SO types. Their reason for thinking so is that "when the embedded relative clauses interrupted the sentence by coming directly after the subject of the main clause, they would be more difficult to process than those relative clauses that modified the object of the main sentence and thus came at the end of the sentence." (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999, p. 577) They support Kuno's idea by showing examples of other studies that had been conducted in the field of second language acquisition by some linguists such as Schuman (1978), Kruse and Ioup (1977). Below are some illustrations of their hypothesis.

SS "Subject of the embedded sentence is identical to the subject of the main clause;

for example:" (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999, p.577)

The girl who speaks Basque is my cousin.

(Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999, p.577)

OS "Subject of the embedded sentence is identical to the object of the main clause;

for example:" (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999, p.577)

I know the girl who speaks Basque.

(Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999, p.577)

SO "Object of the embedded sentence is identical to the subject of the main clause;

for example:" (Murcia-Freeman, 1999, p.577)

The man who(m) you met is my teacher.

(Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999, p.577)

OO "Object of the embedded sentence is identical to the object of the main clause;

for example:" (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999, p.577)

I read the book that you mentioned.

(Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999, p.577)

There are also other similar examples that can be found:

Relative (matching): head noun is Subject of main clause and also Subject of relative clause

[The student who studied Greek] called me

(Matthews, 2005, p. 1)

SO Relative (non-matching): head noun is Subject of main clause and Object of relative clause

[The student I know] called me

(Matthews, 2005, p. 1)

OO Relative (matching): head noun is Object of main clause and also Object of relative clause

I called [The student I knew]

(Matthews, 2005, p. 1)

OS relative (non-matching): head noun is Object of main clause but Subject of relative clause

I called the student [who studied Greek]

(Matthews, 2005, p. 1)

The examples from the website of Matthews, raise up a bit contraction in the conclusion since it says that OO relatives are easier than SO or OS but according to Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman as discussed before on page 33, OS and OO relatives are much easier to learn when compared to SS or SO types. One reason for this contraction could be that the examples given in the website are written by a Professor in the University of Hong Kong where the education is in British English but, Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman's book is written in American English.

Comrie (1981) has also studied on the role of the head in the main clause regarding the world's languages. He believes that this issue does not make a huge difference in forming relative clauses for the most of the languages but still there are some exceptions. Now let me discuss these languages where the exception can occur.

One instance that Comrie investigates is attraction which is rarely found in languages and is also a research area of Greek and Latin grammarians. "The case marking of the head noun in one clause is attracted into that of the other clause." (Comrie, 1981, p.146) Comrie believes that a specific example of this attraction can be found in Persian and notes that the examples given below would have relativization of subject and direct object respectively without attraction.

Example: a) Ān zan -i-rā [ke diruz āmad] didam.

that woman ACC. that yesterday came I-saw

‘I saw that woman who came yesterday.’

(Comrie, 1981, p.146)

b) Zan -i [ke didid] injā -st.

woman that you-saw here is

‘The woman that you saw is here.’

(Comrie, 1981, p.146)

According to Comrie one can show example (c) as an alternative to (a). They are mostly similar but in (c) –rā is eliminated from the direct object of the main clause. The main reason for the omission is that the head of the relative clause also serves as subject of that clause.

Example: c) Ān zan-i [ke diruz āmad] didam.

(Comrie, 1981, p.146)

Likewise, Comrie also suggests for the case of (b) the head of the relative clause has two functions, first it is the subject and secondly it is the direct object so it is possible that this example can be marked with the direct object marker of Persian which is –rā in the subject position as well.

Example: Zan-i- rā [ke didid] injā -st.

(Comrie, 1981, p.146)

What’s more in Ancient Greek, it is believed that attraction functions the reverse way. “An expected accusative relative pronoun in the relative clause is being attracted into the case of its antecedent.” (Comrie, 1981, p.146) According to Comrie, the attraction in ancient Greek works as an accusative relative pronoun which is attracted into the pre-existent case. The example of this attraction is illustrated below.

Example: ek tōn pòleōn [hōn éxei]

from the cities-GENITIVE which-GENITIVE he-has

‘from the cities which he has’

(Comrie, 1981, p.147)

“The preposition ek requires the genitive case, so the genitive case of tōn pòleōn is as expected in the main clause.” (Comrie, 1981, p.147) However, he notes that although the

verb 'he has' éxei supposed to have had an accusative object, this turned out to be the case of the attraction of relative pronoun into noun phrase within the main clause.

According to Comrie, in order for a relative clause to be grammatical, the head noun must complete the identical role in both clauses. So, this enables for a more established interaction among the main clause and embedded clause in languages that have the equi type of relative clause. "In some Australian languages, the general requirement that noun phrases can only be omitted if both clauses have the same subject that leads more particularly in the case of relative clause constructions with omission of the head in one clause to the requirement that the head be subject of both clauses." (Comrie, 1981, p.147) He also notes that the equi type is actually a subtype of relative clause since the omission of the noun phrase destroys encoding of its role within that clause. He says that in Modern Hebrew it is possible to find a more common usage of the equi type. This common usage of equi type occurs only if a position necessitates a preposition is relativized, and if this preposition also takes place on the head noun in the main clause. Then, it is possible that the preposition is excluded. Now let's have a brief look at the example given below form Modern Hebrew.

Example: Natati sefer le oto yeled [še Miriam natna (lo) sefer].

I-gave book to same boy that Mary gave to-him book

'I gave a book to the same boy that Mary gave a book to.'

(Comrie, 1981, p.147)

As from what Comrie says, it is possible to conclude that the equi type of relative clause does not occur in every language, in other words this type only takes place where there are severe restrictions on the positions that can be relativized in the relative clause.

*Does Turkish have a relative clause?

Comrie (1981) defines the notion of relative clause as being quite different in their syntactic structures across languages. He believes that one reliable way of illustrating this cross-linguistical different syntax is by contrasting English relative clauses with Turkish.

Example: [Hasan-in Sinan-a ver -dig-i] patates-i yedim.

Hasan of Sinan to give his potato ACC. I-ate

'I ate the potato that Hasan gave to Sinan.'

(Comrie, 1981, p.135)

The reason why I have also mentioned about the syntactic structure of Turkish is to show that there are other ways of showing relative clauses and that can be explained only through the comparison of the two syntactic forms. From the example given above, it is easily recognized that the syntactic structure of the two languages differs considerably. "The verb form ver-dig- is a non-finite form of the verb ver 'give', with the nominalizing suffix -dig; like other nominalized verb forms in Turkish, it requires its subject (Hasan) in the genitive and the

appropriate possessive suffix (here –i ‘his’) on the verb noun.” (Comrie, 1981, p.135) Comrie translates the literal meaning of the head noun patates and relative clause Hasanin Sinana verdiğ i patates as ‘the potato of Hasan’s giving to Sinan’. However, as a native speaker of Turkish I would like to mention that when we add possessive markers to the noun such as Hasan-in we put an apostrophe as in English. i.e Hasan’s / Hasan’in.

There are also some controversies that arise among linguists whether Turkish has a relative clause or not and Bernard Comrie seems to be one of those linguists who believe that Turkish does not have a relative clause. Comrie asserts that in English, subordination is accomplished through finite clauses. However, in Turkish; subordination is executed by non-finite constructions. Thus, he claims that Turkish might not have a relative clause according to the English syntax system but the example he gave before completely illustrates the fulfillment of the same function of relative clauses in that it restricts the head noun by telling us which particular potato (the one that Hasan gave Sinan).

If a language can fulfill the same job as the relative clauses of English, then Comrie suggests that we are to compare relative clauses among languages then we should neglect the syntactic difference and search for the functional usage of them. So, what he points out is one parameter that can be used in the comparison such as the distinction between finite and non-finite relative clauses.

Comrie (1981) defines relative clauses as having a head noun and a restricting clause. So, he also believes that, the Turkish example given earlier shows a relative clause since it has a head with a range of referents. Thus, a fifth parameter can be implied by this functional usage of relative clauses.

PART III. The effects of relative clause structure on L2 acquisition and problems for ESL/EFL students:

Languages vary in whether they have relative clause structures. According to Ellis (1997), some languages such as English and Arabic have them however, other languages like Chinese and Japanese do not. “This linguistic difference influences the ease with which learners are able to learn relative clauses.” (Ellis, 1997, p. 63) He believes that it is easier to learn relative clauses for a learner who’s L1 includes them compared to those learners whose L1 do not. Thus, learners whose L1 includes relative clauses are more likely to learn them.

A second effect of relative clause structure on L2 acquisition can be identified. “In languages like English, a relative clause can be attached to the end of a matrix clause:

The police have caught the man who bombed the hotel or they can be embedded in the main clause:

The man who bombed the hotel has been caught by the police.” (Ellis, 1997, p.63) According to Ellis, the acquisition of relative clauses begins with the first type when learners of L2 English develop the structure. This indicates that the structure of relative clauses determines how acquisition takes place.

The third way the linguistic properties of relative clauses affect L2 acquisition. “Linguists have shown that languages are more likely to permit relative clauses with a subject pronoun (for example, ‘who’) than with an object pronoun (for example, ‘whom’).” (Ellis, 1997, p.64) According to Ellis, a hierarchy of relativization, known as the accessibility hierarchy can be identified in the table below.

Relative pronoun function	Example
Subject	The writer <i>who won the Booker prize</i> is my lifelong friend.
Direct object	The writer <i>whom we met</i> won the Booker prize.
Indirect object	The writer <i>to whom I introduced you</i> won the Booker prize.
Object of preposition	The writer <i>with whom we had dinner</i> won the Booker prize.
Genitive	The writer <i>whose wife we met</i> won the Booker prize.
Object of comparative	The writer <i>who I have written more books than</i> has won the Booker prize.

(Ellis, 1997, p.64)

This table illustrates the full range of relative pronoun functions for English. However, some languages other than English may have restrictions to their hierarchy. “Any language that permits the direct object function will necessarily permit the subject function but may not allow the indirect object function.” (Ellis, 1997, p. 64) Ellis also draws attention to the question asked by SLA researchers regarding his accessibility hierarchy table. “Does the hierarchy predict the order of acquisition of relative clauses? There is some evidence that it does. For example, it has been found that the hierarchy predicts the frequency with which learners make errors in relative clauses, fewest errors being apparent in relative clauses with subject pronouns and most in clauses with the object of comparative function.” (Ellis, 1997, p.65) Ellis points out that, L2 learner of English makes more mistakes in the function of object of comparative relative clauses than subject or any other function. However, he also indicates that the results for the genitive function are rather complicated. He proposes that “genitive relative clauses are not part of a single hierarchy but rather constitute a distinct hierarchy of their own. ” (Ellis, 1997, p.65) According to Ellis, genitive structures are more difficult than non-genitive ones however, still there might be some genitive structures which are even more difficult than others which requires a separate hierarchy table for genitives.

According to The Grammar Book, there are similar problems for ESL/ EFL students because of language differences regarding relative clauses. Celce-Murcia together with Larsen Freeman (1999) quotes J.Schachter (1974) and identifies three main dimensions along which relative clauses can differ. “The first dimension has to do with the position of relative clause with respect to the head noun. i.e., the noun being modified. English relative clauses follow the head noun. This is also true of relative clauses in most European languages and also in

languages such as Farsi and Arabic. Not all languages however adhere to this syntactic pattern. Japanese, Chinese, and Korean, for instance, all require that the relative clause occur before the head noun.” (Murcia & Freeman, 1999, p. 573) They believe that the students whose language is one of them are supposed to comprehend this basic ordering difference.

Celce-Murcia and Larsen Freeman illustrate a second dimension of Schachter by explaining how relative clauses are marked. “English uses a relative pronoun (for example, who) to mark that what follows is a relative clause. Persian, Arabic, and Chinese employ other kinds of markers between the head noun and the relative clause.” (Murcia & Freeman, 1999, p. 573) They say that relative pronouns should not cause any difficulties for the students who are native speakers of these languages. However, Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman notes that Japanese students may need to practice more with English relative pronouns since their native language has particles in the relative clause itself to mark its restrictive function.

The presence or absence of a pronominal reflex is the third dimension of which languages differ with respect to relative clauses as Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman mention in the Grammar Book. “In English the relative pronoun substitutes for the identical NP in the embedded sentence. For example, in the sentence Shirley called out to the boy that she knew the ‘that’ replaces ‘the boy’ in the embedded sentence, ‘she knew the boy’. In other languages- for instance, Arabic, Hebrew, and Persian – a relative clause marker is introduced, but the object noun in the embedded sentence that is identical to the head noun is often retained in a form called a pronominal reflex.” (Murcia & Freeman, 1999, p. 573) According to this information, they believe that students who are native speaker of these languages are likely to make errors such as;

- (1) Shirley called out to the boy that she knew him.

(Murcia & Freeman, 1999, p. 573)

Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman also give examples of other languages such as Chinese and Arabic which let pronominal reflexes to occur as objects of preposition. This causes them to make errors too such as;

- (2) The man who you were talking to him is my uncle.

(Murcia & Freeman, 1999, p. 573)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alexiadou, A. & Hall, T.A. (1997). Studies on universal grammar and typological variation. *Linguistik Aktuell/ Linguistics Today* 13. (pp.252) Zentrum für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft, Berlin.

“The articles of the present volume consist of generative analyses dealing with several current topics of discussion and debate in syntactic theory, such as clitics, word order, scrambling, directionality, movement. The data in the volume are drawn from a number of typologically diverse languages (e.g. Arabic, Berber, Dutch, Gaelic, Greek, Malagasy).”

Alexiadou, A., Law, P., Meinunger, A., and Wilder, C.(2000). The syntax of relative clauses. *Linguistik Aktuell/ Linguistics Today* 32. (pp.397) Zentrum für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft, Berlin.

“This book presents a cross-section of recent generative research into the syntax of relative clauses constructions. Most of the papers collected here react in some way to Kayne’s (1994) proposal to handle relative clauses in terms of determiner complementation and raising of the relativized nominal. The editors provide a thorough introduction of these proposals, their background and motivations, arguments for and against. There are detailed studies in the syntax and the semantics of relative clauses constructions in Latin, Ancient Greek, Romanian, Hindi, (Old) English, Old High German, (dialects of) Dutch, Turkish, Swedish, and Japanese. The book should be of interest to any linguist working within generative syntax.”

Celce-Murcia, M. and Larsen-Freeman, D. (1999).*The Grammar Book: An ESL/EFL Teacher’s Course*. 2nd ed. Heinle & Heinle

Explains the Relative Clauses in English and shows some parameters used in relative clauses. Also illustrates non-restrictive vs. restrictive clauses which can be used as examples in this research paper.

Comrie, Bernard. (2003). *Typology and language acquisition: the case of relative clauses* It is an article that explains Comrie’s point of view in the case of typological relative clauses.

Comrie, Bernard. (1981). *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*. University of Chicago Press.

This is a perfect book for this research paper. Comrie explains everything that I need to know about relative clauses in many languages. He gives lots of examples of the parameters and etc.

Ellis, R. (1997) *Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford University Press: New York This book discusses about the effects of relative clause structure on L2 acquisition and problems for ESL/EFL students.

Foley, M. and Hall D, (2003). *Advanced Learner’s Grammar*. Longman Press.

This book explains what the relative clauses are and gives examples, illustrates them with charts etc.

Matthews, S. (2005). *LING6021 Language Types and Universals. Lecture 7: Typology of Relative Clauses*, Department of Linguistics, the University of Hong Kong Web site: <http://www.hku.hk/linguist/program/Typology7.html> This website gives an idea of how typology in relative clauses can be summarized.

Relativizer. (2009, January 8). In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 02:48, May 6, 2009, from the web site: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Relativizer> This website gives the definition of relativizer and tells which languages do use it.

Whaley, L.J. (1997). *An Introduction to Language Typology: The Unity and Diversity of Language*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

This book is a good source to have a pre-knowledge about the typological variation in relative clauses. It has compared English relative clauses to some other languages which can be used as examples in this paper.

Yaowapat, N. (2005). *Pronoun Retention in Khmer and Thai Relative Clauses*. <http://sealang.net/sala/archives/pdf8/natchanan2005pronoun.pdf> In this website it is contingent to find a very clear online article about pronoun retention in Khmer and Thai relative clause. Yaowapat actually agrees with Comrie in many aspects.