INTERNAL RELATIVE CLAUSES IN TENYIDIE (ANGAMI): A CASE OF HIERARCHICAL PRECEDENCE VS. LINEAR PRECEDENCE?[1]

K. V. Subbarao
Mimi Kevichüsa
University of Delhi

1.0. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this paper is to study the nature of the internal relative clause (IRC) in Tenyidie, a dialect of Angami Naga, especially as it concerns the interplay between hierarchical order and constituent word order. We attempt to show that, although in most of the cases hierarchical as well as linear order plays a crucial role in the interpretation of an IRC in Tenyidie, there is an instance where neither plays any role at all. In support of the occurrence of an NP as the head of an IRC we provide two pieces of evidence: (i) the position of occurrence of the constituents in the embedded internal relative clause, and (ii) the presence as well as the absence of overt lexical case markers with the constituent that is being relativized.

We shall show that a constituent that is not lexically case-marked in Tenyidie can head an IRC, unlike the situation in the Quechua group of

---

The transcription used in this paper is broad.

List of Abbreviations

ABL	Ablative	IRC	Internal relative clause
ACC	Accusative	LOC	Locative
AGR	Agreement marker	NOM	Nominative
AUX	Auxiliary	NOMZ	Nominalizer
COM	Comitative	OB	Other benefactive
CP	Conjunctive participial	OO	Oblique object
DAT	Dative	PP	Postpositional phrase
DEF	Definite	PRES	Present
DIM	Diminutive	PRES HAB	Present habitual
DM	Deictic marker	PROG	Progressive
DO	Direct object	PST	Past
HAB	Habitual	SG	Singular
INST	Instrumental	2	Second person
IO	Indirect object	3	Third person

languages (Cole et al. 1982). Although the DO that occurs with monotransitive verbs is not lexically case-marked in Tenyidie, it can still head an IRC. We shall also demonstrate that in instances involving potential ambiguity of the DO *vis-à-vis* other constituents (such as IO, locative PP, ablative PP), it is the DO which has hierarchical precedence over the other constituents in heading an IRC, whereas the comitative and instrumental PPs which occur as the second constituent in the embedded S have precedence in interpretation over the DO, indicating that linear precedence in constituent word order plays an important role in the interpretation of a constituent as head of an IRC. We shall also show that there is a single instance where neither the hierarchical precedence nor the linear order of constituents plays any role at all in the interpretation of an IRC. We shall demonstrate that IRCs are unmarked in Tenyidie, since the comitative permits only the IRC and no corresponding external relative clause is permissible. In the final section we hint at a way an internally headed NP is case-checked under the case and agreement theory of Chomsky 1995.

2.0. TYPOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS

Tenyidie is more generally known as Angami. It is a verb-final language and it is left-branching in the unmarked word order. It has postpositions, and a postsentential complementizer occurs to the right of the embedded sentence. The auxiliary verb follows the main verb. As in other verb-final languages, such as Japanese, Korean, Telugu, Malayalam, etc., the genitive precedes the governing noun and the marker of comparison follows the standard of comparison. Time adverbs precede place adverbs (Subbarao 1984). Just as in many other verb-final languages, it has postverbal negatives. A relative-correlative construction also occurs.

However, Tenyidie exhibits certain non-verb-final language characteristics as well. The direct object precedes the indirect object in the unmarked word order, when the lexical dative case marker **ki** is not overtly present with the indirect object of ditransitive verbs such as **tsɨ** 'give', **petha** 'teach', **tɨchɨ** 'talk to', and **pesi** 'inform'. With ditransitive verbs such as **ketse** 'send', **pu** 'tell, mention, report', **ketsɔ** 'ask', and **fon chɨ** 'telephone', where the lexical dative case marker **ki** occurs with the indirect object, Tenyidie conforms to the expected order in verb-final languages, namely, IO preceding DO. Based on evidence from internal relative clauses, we argue that the IO-DO order is the unmarked order in Tenyidie as in other verb-final languages. Adjectives, demonstrative adjectives and numerals follow the noun. Although word order is relatively free, there are certain instances where scrambling is prohibited (cf. Subbarao and Kevichüsa, in prep.).

3.0. RELATIVIZABLE POSITIONS OF INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL RELATIVE CLAUSES IN TENYIDIE

According to Keenan 1985, IRCs are found only in those languages whose basic word order is SOV. Tenyidie, too, has IRCs that contrast with external relative clauses in their syntactic behavior.

Cole et al. 1982 refer to internal relatives as "headless relatives" because the head (the NP that is being relativized) does not occur in the matrix clause, but only in the embedded sentence. They provide two pieces of evidence to show that relative clauses in the Quechua group of languages are headless. These arguments are based on **word order** and **case marking**. Imbabura Quechua is a verb-final language. The relativized noun phrase appears *in situ* "in the normal position for a direct object within a relative clause, that is to say between the subject and verb" (Cole et al. 1982:118). For example:

(1)   [runa   **alcu-ta**   jatu   shea]   ali

        man   dog-ACC   sell-PAST   NOMZ   good dog

     alcu-mi

     VALIDATOR

     'The dog that the man sold is a good dog.'

The head NP occurs in the embedded clause, and the matrix sentence does not have a corresponding occurrence of the identical NP.

3.1. Case roles of the heads of internal relative clauses

In Tenyidie, too, the NP that is being relativized occurs in the embedded sentence and not in the matrix sentence. The embedded verb occurs in the infinitival form with the infinitival (nominalizing) marker **ke** following the verb. Both the deictic marker **cɨ** and the definite marker (which agrees in number and gender with the NP occurring internally) occur to the right of the infinitival marker **ke**. First we provide examples of IRCs with direct object, instrumental, locative, goal, ablative and comitative PPs as heads. As the relativization with an indirect object differs from that of the other positions, we will then provide an analysis of the internal and external relative clauses with an indirect object as head.

Direct Object as Head

(2) nɔ   lešɨdaᵢ   phrɨ-ke-cɨ-0ᵢ-u   vi

     2sg   book   read-NOMZ-DM-0-DEF   good

     'The book that you read is good.'

Instrumental PP as Head

(3) nɔ   kutariᵢ   pie   nhasi   le

     2sg   knife   INST   fruit   cut

     ke-cɨ-0ᵢ-u   puoɨ   vi   se

     NOMZ-DM-0-DEF   sharpness   good   very

     'The knife with which you cut the fruit is very sharp.'

Locative PP as Head

(4) nɔ   miɨᵢ   gi   lešɨda   khapieba

     2sg   table   on   book   keep

     ke-cɨ-0ᵢ-u   si   pie   chɨ

     NOMZ-DM-0-DEF   wood   INST   do

     'The table on which you kept the book is made of wood.'

Goal as Head

(5) nɔ   lieᵢ   nu   tsu-ya-ke-cɨ-0ᵢ-u

     2sg   field   to   go-PRES HAB-NOMZ-DM-0-DEF

     peetse   se

     far   very

     'The field you go to is very far.'

Ablative PP as Head

(6) nɔ   dzɨkhuᵢ   nunu   dzɨ-ɨ   sevɔr

     2sg   well   from   water-fetch   brought

     ke-cɨ-0ᵢ-u   su   se

     NOMZ-DM-0-DEF   very   deep

     'The well from which you brought the water is very deep.'