Maria Privizentseva
(Lomonosov Moscow State University, taimary@mail.ru)

Case and agreement puzzle in Moksha relative clause

There are two basic relativization strategies in Moksha. The first one is presented in example (1). The head of the relative clause is external and the relative pronoun is marked for case according to its position in the dependent clause. Example (2) illustrates the second type. In this case the head is internal and the relative pronoun does not bear any agreement marking (neither case nor number).

(1) *vandi*   *sa-j*   *jalga-z'ə,*   *[kona-n'd'i*   *t'ɛš-n'ə-n'*
     tomorrow come-NPST.3SG   friend-1SG.POSS.SG   which-DAT   write-IPFV-PST.1SG
     kizə-n'   *per'f*   *s'orma-t].*
     year-GEN   around   letter-PL
     'Tomorrow arrives my friend, to whom I wrote letters throughout the year.'

(2) *[kona*   *jalga-z'ə-n'd'i*   *t'aš-n'ə-n'*   *kizə-n'*   *per'f*   *s'orma-t],*
     which   friend-1SG.POSS.SG-DAT   write-IPFV-PST.1SG   year-GEN   around   letter-PL
     vandi   *sa-j.*
     tomorrow   come-NPST.3SG
     'My friend, to whom I wrote letters throughout the year, arrives tomorrow.'

In addition to this, Moksha relative clause demonstrates phenomenon known as inverse attraction: external head of the relative clause is marked for case assigned to the relativized position in the dependent clause. The head of the relative clause in (3) is subject of the main clause and we expect it to be nominative. The relative pronoun occupies direct object position and bears dative case marking. The head of the relative clause, contrary to our expectations, acquires dative case marking as well.

(3) *jalga-z'ə-**n'd'i**,*   *[kona-**n'd'i***   *t'ɛš-n'ə-n'*   *kizə-n'*   *per'f*
     friend-1SG.POSS.SG-DAT   which-DAT   write-IPFV-PST.1SG   year-GEN   around
     s'orma-t], vandi   *sa-j.*
     letter-PL   tomorrow   come-NPST.3SG
     'My friend, to whom I wrote letters throughout the year, arrives tomorrow.' (Lit.: To my friend, to whom I wrote letters throughout the year, arrives tomorrow.)

There rises a question: may the head in relative clause with inverse attraction be in fact internal, but not external. There is a bunch of parameters that groups together 'regular' externally headed relatives and constrictions with inverse attraction, while the properties of relative clauses with internal head differ from both other types (Kholodilova, Privizentseva 2015). Some of these parameters are the set of possible relativizers and its declension, semantic interpretation of the relative clause, the presence of determiners in the head etc. Following this, we assume that the head in the relative clause with inverse attraction is external.

The fact, that the head of the relative clause may bear case assigned inside the dependent clause, poses a challenge for some major approaches to the syntax of the relative clause. For instance, in head-raising analysis (Kayne 1994, Bianchi 1999, de Vries 2002 among others) one of the reasons for movement of the head from the dependent clause to the higher position is the lack of case feature in the lower position[1]. If the head of the relative clause may acquire case from the dependent clause the movement is no longer needed.

In the remaining part of the paper we will prove data that suggests pure morphological, post-syntactic origin of the case in relatives with inverse attraction. Evidence comes from case

---

[1] [Bianchi 2000] presents an analysis of case attraction in Latin relative clauses based on the head raising from dependent to main clause, but the data on inverse attraction in Moksha does not fit into this account, but we cannot discuss it here because of lack of space.

marking in secondary predication. Examples (4) and (5) show that the case marking of secondary predicate may agree in case with the noun it refers to. In (4) *vačədə* 'hungry' modifies noun in the subject position and has no case marking. On the other hand, the same secondary predicate in (5) refers to marked for genitive direct object, which makes genitive marking of secondary predicate possible as well.

(4) st'ər'-s'   mol'-i   vačədə / *vačədə-t'
     girl-DEF.SG   walk-NPST.3SG   hungry   hungry-DEF.SG.GEN
     'The girl walks hungry.'

(5) mon   vasft-in'ə   st'ər'-t'   ušəstə   vačədə   /^{OK}vačədə-t'
     I   meet-PST.3.O.1SG.S girl-DEF.SG.GEN outside   hungry   hungry-DEF.SG.GEN
     'On the street I met the girl, which is hungry.'

Example (6b) shows that in case of inverse attraction secondary predicate, which may agree in case with the head of the relative clause (6a), cannot acquire genitive, while the noun it refers to has such case marking.

(6) a.   st'ər'-s',   kona-n'   mon vasft-in'ə   ušəstə mol-i   vačədə
          girl-DEF.SG which-GEN I   meet-PST.3.O.1SG.S outside walk-NPST.3SG   hungry

     b.   st'ər'-t',   kona-n'   mon vasft-in'ə   ušəstə
          girl-GEN.DEF.SG   which-GEN I   meet-PST.3.O.1SG.S outside
          mol'-i   vačədə /*vačədə-t'
          walk-NPST.3SG   hungry hungry-DEF.SG.GEN

'The girl, which I met on the street, walks hungry.'

Thus, we conclude, that inverse attraction of the case of the head noun have no influence on other grammatical processes in the sentence and may be pure morphological phenomenon.

Abbrivations

DAT — dative; DEF — definite; GEN — genitive; IPFV — imperfective; NPST — nonpast; O — marker of object; PL — plural; POSS — possessive; PST — past; S — marker of subject; SG — singular.

References

Bianchi, V. 1999. Consequences of Antisymmetry. Headed Relative Clauses. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bianchi V. 2000. Some Issues in the Syntax of Relative Determiners. // The Syntax of Relative Clauses, Philadelphia, 2000

de Vries, M. 2002. The Syntax of Relativization. Utrecht: Landelijke Onderzoekschool Taalwetenschap.

Kayne, R. 1994. The Antisymmetry of Syntax (Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 25), MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Kholodilova M. & M. Privizentseva. 2015. Inverse attraction in Finno-Ugric languages. Talk at "Insufficient strength to defend its case": Case attraction and related phenomena, Wrocław, 18.–19.09.15.