<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Title</strong></th>
<th>Relativization in Dàgááré and its typological implications: Left-headed but internally-headed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Author(s)</strong></td>
<td>Bodomo, A; Hiraiwa, K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Citation</strong></td>
<td>Lingua, 2010, v. 120 n. 4, p. 953-983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issued Date</strong></td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>URL</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://hdl.handle.net/10722/90288">http://hdl.handle.net/10722/90288</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rights</strong></td>
<td>Lingua. Copyright © Elsevier BV.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relativization in Dàgáárè and its typological implications:
Left-headed but internally-headed

Adams Bodomo, Ken Hiraiwa

Department of Linguistics, The University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam, Hong Kong
Department of English Literature, Meiji Gakuin University, 1-2-37 Shirokanedai, Minato-ku, Tokyo, 108-8636, Japan

Received 22 August 2008; received in revised form 12 June 2009; accepted 19 June 2009

Abstract

This article examines in detail the syntax of relativization in Dàgáárè, a Mabia (Oti-Volta) language of the Gur branch in the Niger-Congo family. The main aims of our investigation are twofold. The first is to describe a cluster of typologically interesting syntactic features of relativization in Dàgáárè in the light of the fact that no detailed description exists in the literature. The second is to demonstrate that relative clauses in Dàgáárè are head-internal relative clauses (HIRCs), even though they are, on the surface, postnominal relative clauses, like those in English. Thus, they are not of the in-situ type of HIRC that is well known in the literature. We call this type of relative clause a left-headed HIRC. This type of relativization has rarely been noticed cross-linguistically in the previous literature and therefore is of considerable significance for general linguistics, linguistic typology, as well as theoretical linguistics. Evidence comes from coordination in possessor relativization and PP relativization. Our discovery shows that Universal Grammar allows left-headed HIRCs as an option in addition to the more familiar types: in-situ HIRCs and head-external relative clauses (HERCs).
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1. Introduction: varieties of relative clauses

The syntactic structure of relative clauses is an old but significant issue in linguistic theory. Chomsky (1977) proposed that relative clauses have an adjunction structure, as shown in the structure in (1a), (see also Jackendoff, 1972; Stockwell et al., 1973; Chomsky, 1977, 1995; Cinque, 1982; Lebeaux, 1990; Borsley, 1997; Sag, 1997, among others. See also Platzack, 2000 for “complement-of-Nth” analysis of relative clauses). In this analysis, the relativized head noun is base-generated outside a relative clause and it is linked to the null operator that moves from the original position to [Spec, CP]. On the other hand, as shown in the structure in (1b), Vergnaud (1974) proposed that the relativized head of a relative clause raises from its original position to the left-peripheral position (see also Smith, 2000).

(1) a. Adjunction (Stockwell et al. 1973, Chomsky 1977)

```
DP
  D  NP
    NP
      CP
        OP...
        I...
```

b. Raising (Vergnaud 1974, Kayne 1994)

```
DP
  D  CP
    NP
      C'
        C
          TP
            ...
            I...
```

Kayne (1994) and others have proposed a raising analysis of relative clauses in English, roughly comparable to the one in (1b).

English relative clauses are, as is well known, postnominal – left-headed, in our terms introduced momentarily. Generally, they are considered to be externally-headed (hereafter head-external relative clauses (HERCs)). Historically, the term “postnominal relative clause” also often meant HERCs automatically. However, this is not quite precise in a more refined syntactic theory, because there are two analytical possibilities when a relativized head appears at the left-periphery: it can be external or internal to the CP clause. In this article, we use the terms head-external and head-internal purely in structural terms. A relative clause is head-external, if its relativized head noun appears outside the CP projection. A relative clause is head-internal, if its relativized head noun appears inside the relative clause (i.e. CP). Therefore, an externally-headed structure can be either generated by raising or base-generated. In contrast, the term postnominal or left-headed refers to the linear position of a relativized head noun. Thus, left-headed means postnominal as opposed to prenominal without any structural commitment. Thus, both analyses in (1) have been proposed for left-headed relative clauses in English, but the adjunction analysis (1a) argues for externally-headedness, whereas the raising analysis (1b) internally-headedness.

Returning to Kayne’s raising analysis (1b), the structure that he proposed is left-headed but internally-headed. However, Bhatt (2002) convincingly argues for a hybrid raising analysis for English, whose structure is diagramed as in (3). In this derivation, the relativized noun first undergoes an A-movement (“raising”) to [Spec, CP], from which it further moves and adjoins to CP. Then, the relativized noun projects from there and it merges with the determiner. It is very important to notice that under his theory, English relative clauses are derived by raising but they are syntactically externally-headed with the head noun clearly outside CP (see also Iatridou et al., 2001; Cecchetto and Donati, 2008 for similar/related approaches). Hulsey and Sauerland (2006) reach yet another conclusion that English relative clauses are structurally ambiguous between head-external and head-internal structures.

(2) This is the book that John wrote.
Typologically, it is well known that there is another type of relative clauses called *head-internal relative clauses* (HIRCs) (Cole, 1987; Williamson, 1987; Basilico, 1996; Watanabe, 2004, among others). It is called ‘head-internal’ because the relativized head noun remains in its original position as shown in (4) (some researchers propose a null operator movement, while others posit a null pronoun in the external head position, a choice of which is immaterial here). Basilico (1996), in his study on HIRCs, made an interesting and pertinent observation that in some languages, the relativized head noun at the left periphery is still located internally to the relative clause. The sentence (5a) is an example of an *in-situ* HIRC in Diegueño where the relativized head noun is *wi:m* ‘with the rock’ and appears in its original position. This relative clause has the structure in (4). In the example (5b), the head noun is moved to the left, leaving an obligatory resumptive pronoun in-situ. He argues that it is still located inside the relative clause, however. His evidence is based on the fact that in the example (5c), the relativized head noun is optionally moved leftward but it cannot receive the subject case-marker, which should be possible if the head noun were external to the clause. Instead, as shown in the grammatical example (5b), the relativized head noun must be zero-marked (i.e. marked with the object-marking). Thus, the case-marking shows that the fronted head noun is still internal to the relative clause, even though it appears at the left periphery. In other words, the example (5b) is an HIRC whose head noun does not remain in-situ. Let us call the relative clause in the example (5b) an *ex-situ* HIRC.

Typologically, it is well known that there is another type of relative clauses called *head-internal relative clauses* (HIRCs) (Cole, 1987; Williamson, 1987; Basilico, 1996; Watanabe, 2004, among others). It is called ‘head-internal’ because the relativized head noun remains in its original position as shown in (4) (some researchers propose a null operator movement, while others posit a null pronoun in the external head position, a choice of which is immaterial here).

Basilico (1996), in his study on HIRCs, made an interesting and pertinent observation that in some languages, the relativized head noun at the left periphery is still located internally to the relative clause. The sentence (5a) is an example of an *in-situ* HIRC in Diegueño where the relativized head noun is *wi:m* ‘with the rock’ and appears in its original position.1 This relative clause has the structure in (4). In the example (5b), the head noun is moved to the left, leaving an obligatory resumptive pronoun in-situ. He argues that it is still located inside the relative clause, however. His evidence is based on the fact that in the example (5c), the relativized head noun is optionally moved leftward but it cannot receive the subject case-marker, which should be possible if the head noun were external to the clause. Instead, as shown in the grammatical example (5b), the relativized head noun must be zero-marked (i.e. marked with the object-marking). Thus, the case-marking shows that the fronted head noun is still internal to the relative clause, even though it appears at the left periphery. In other words, the example (5b) is an HIRC whose head noun does not remain in-situ. Let us call the relative clause in the example (5b) an *ex-situ* HIRC.

1 The sentence (5a) is actually ambiguous and the other interpretation is ‘the dog that I hit with the rock was black’. However, the head-fronting in the relative clause (5b) disambiguates the sentence.
Basilico (1996) argues that the moved head noun in (5b) is adjoined to IP via scrambling. This is illustrated in the structure below.\(^2\) He assumes that the determiner takes a IP/TP clause, but I indicate a CP as well (a head parameter is irrelevant in the following schematic structure).

(6) Ex-situ HIRC (à la Basilico 1996)

\[ \text{C} \rightarrow \text{TP} \]

In this article, we will argue that relative clauses in Dàgáárè are also ex-situ HIRCs. However, we will demonstrate two significant properties: (i) the movement of the head in Dàgáárè is obligatory (unlike Diegueño) and (ii) the head noun lands in the left-edge position, higher than TP—i.e. the edge of CP. This is shown in the structure (7). Thus, we will call the relative clause of this type left-headed HIRCs. Notice that the relativized head noun phrase, even though it appears at the left periphery, is still internal to the CP clause. In other words, left-headed HIRCs are a subtype of ex-situ HIRCs in that the head noun is displaced, but they crucially differ in its landing site – TP vs. CP.

(7) Left-headed HIRC

\[ \text{NP}_1 \rightarrow \text{C'} \]

It should be emphasized that it is typologically significant to bring to light the existence of (7) in Dàgáárè, because such data bridge a gap in the typology of HIRCs. One of the main aims of parametric syntax and typology is to uncover principles that define possible languages (see Baker, 2001). Typological studies in the past decades have discovered languages that allow only in-situ HIRCs (e.g. Lakhota, Navajo) as well as languages that allow both in-situ and left-headed HIRCs (e.g. Diegueño, Mojave, Japanese). The obvious missing paradigm is languages that only allow left-headed HIRCs. This type of language is indeed expected to exist if no other principles block the option. This is the gap that Dàgáárè fills in.

\(^2\) However, strictly speaking, he does not show evidence that it is adjoined to IP, not, for example, CP.
Although movement of an internal head has been described in some detail before by Basilico (1996) and he analyzes it as optional scrambling, the obligatory left-fronted positioning of the head in Dágááre is typologically not known yet. It should be noted that the left-headed HIRC pattern has also been observed in Yavapai (a Yuman language) by Kendall (1976), which was taken over in Lehmann (1984). Lehmann, however, judges the source as unreliable and no further investigation has been carried out. Therefore, confirmation of left-headed HIRCs with data from Dágááre (a language unrelated to Native American languages) is of much typological significance.

A word of caution is in order here. The structure of left-headed HIRCs (7) is essentially quite similar to Kayne’s structure (1b). This might be a little confusing at first, since Kayne proposed the structure for English, whose relative clauses are assumed to be “externally-headed”. But as we have explained above, theoretically, the relative clause (1b) is indeed internally-headed (putting aside whether English has this structure or not). In this article, we assume the explicit syntactic criterion: the crucial structural difference between HIRCs and HERCs is that in the former, the external D takes a CP as its complement, whereas in the latter, it takes an NP as its complement. From this criterion, the structures (1b), (4), (6) and (7) are all internally-headed, while the structures (1a) and (3) are externally-headed.4

The main aim of this article is to demonstrate that relative clauses in Dágááre are always left-headed, but still internally-headed, as those in Diegueño and Mojave are. However, Dágááre does not have subject-predicate agreement in most cases. Case-marking is also absent, unlike in Diegueño and Mojave. Thus, we will provide two pieces of novel evidence for left-headed HIRCs – PP relativization and possessor relativization and their interactions with coordination.

One of the crucial examples that we will focus on in this article is the following pairs of sentences in (8). In the example (8a), the complement noun of the P(ostposition) is relativized and appears at the left edge. In contrast, in the example (8b), the whole PP is pied-piped to the left edge. Building on coordination data, we will demonstrate that if relative clauses in Dágááre are externally-headed and have the adjunction structure (1a), relevant data become mysterious.

(8) Relativization and pied-piping of P

a. ń dá də lá ə [lʊёрə nə], Dákóráá náng gàng ọ póó. 1Sg Pst buy.Perf F D car Dem Dákóráá C lie.Perf p reciprocal ‘I bought the car in which Dákóráá slept.’ ‘*I bought the inside of the car in which Dákóráá slept.’

b. ń dá də lá ə [lʊɚə nə póó], Dákóráá náng gàng t. 1Sg Pst buy.Perf F D car Dem in Dákóráá C lie.Perf  ‘I bought the car in which Dákóráá slept. ‘I bought the inside of the car in which Dákóráá slept.’

The organization of this article is as follows: Section 2 describes significant features of relativization in Dágááre, to lay ground for main discussions. Section 3 investigates the syntactic structures of two types of Dágááre relativization – PP relativization and possessor relativization – in relation to coordination, and argues that Dágááre relative clauses belong to what is called a left-headed HIRC in Hiraiwa (2005, 2008). Section 4 discusses typological implications. Section 5 concludes the article.

2. Elements of Dágááre relativization

Dágááre is a Mabia (Oti-Volta) language of the Gur branch of the Niger-Congo family and is spoken in the Upper-West region of Ghana. The language is spoken by approximately two million people. In this article, we will focus on the Jirapa dialect of Dágááre, the major dialect, which is also known as the Central dialect. Most readers and books for schools are written in this dialect, and the so-called standard Dágááre is based on it. The syntax and semantics of Dágááre relativization has been little described except for brief discussions in Bodomo (1997, 2000). Therefore, we

---

3 He warns in a footnote (p. 121) that the pattern could be an idiolectal property of an informant whose speech is influenced by English or Spanish, and states that Yavapai is the only known language so far with this property. We are grateful to an anonymous reviewer for bringing our attention to this fact.

4 Recall that Kayne’s “head-internal” structure (1b) is refuted for English relative clauses by Bhatt (2002) in favor of the “head-external” structure (3) after all. It is not our aim in this article to examine the syntactic structures of English relative clauses. See Hulsey and Sauerland (2006) for more discussions.
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aim to reveal the workings of relativization in Dágáäre. In so doing, it will become clear that Dágáäre relativization has much to contribute to general linguistics and theoretical linguistics. In particular, this article shows that Dágáäre has left-headed HIRC’s, which are typologically almost unnoticed. Furthermore, our data show that a language can have left-headed HIRC’s even though it does not allow in-situ HIRC’s (or at least it allows very marginal in-situ HIRC’s), in contrast with a language like Diegueño.

In this section, we will take a closer look at syntactic features of Dágáäre relativization. The first section focuses on the exterior syntax such as determiners, and the second section examines the interior syntax with special focus on preverbal particles, C and the subject position.

2.1. The exteriors

As the declarative sentence (9a) shows, Dágáäre is an SVO language with no null pronouns or overt agreement. It does not have scrambling and the word order can only be changed via A-movement (Wh-movement, focus-movement, or topicalization). Bodomo (1997, 2000) and Dakubu (2005) present detailed overviews of aspects of the grammar of Dágáäre. Many declarative root sentences have the postverbal declarative focus particle lá, behaviors of which are extremely complicated (see Dakubu, 1992; Bodomo, 1997, 2000; Hiraiwa and Bodomo, 2008 for some discussions). Dágáäre is an obligatory Wh-fronting language as shown in the Wh-Question (9b). Dislocated Wh-phrases are followed by the focus particle and the complementizer ka.5

(9) Declarative and Wh-question sentences

a. ñ dá lá à gáni.  
   1Sg buy.Perf F D book
   ‘I bought the book.’

b. bòng lá ká fó dá?  
   what F C 2Sg buy.Perf
   ‘What did you buy?’

Now let us examine relative clauses in (10) in detail.

(10) a. Subject relativization

ñ nyé lá à pòkâ, ná e/*ò, nág nóg Dákóráá  
   1Sg see F D woman Dem φ/3Sg C like Dakoraa
   ‘I saw the woman who likes Dakoraa.’

b. Object relativization

ñ nyé lá à pòkâ, ná Dákóráá nág nóg e/*ò,  
   1Sg see F D woman Dem Dakoraa C like φ/3Sg
   ‘I saw the woman who Dakoraa likes.’

In Dágáäre relativization, the head noun of the relative clause – indicated in boldface – comes in the initial (i.e. left-edge) position of the relative clause, just like Wh-phrases. The relativized head noun takes the definite determiner à and the distal demonstrative determiner ná. The deictic distal meaning of the latter, however, disappears in relativization, as in many other Gur /non-Gur languages, and this indicates that the demonstrative determiner in question has grammaticalized in some sense (cf. Kayne, 2008). In addition, the particle nág has to come before the verb. As we will show, this element is a complementizer. In Dágáäre relativization, there is always a gap with a systematic exception for relativization of possessors or objects of postpositions, where a resumptive possessive pronoun is required as we will see later. Otherwise, if a resumptive pronoun is used in the examples below, they are ungrammatical.

In Dágáäre, there seems to be no grammatical relational restriction on relativizable elements (see Keenan and Comrie, 1977). It is possible to relativize a possessor noun phrase in Dágáäre. It is most natural to leave the possessee

---

5 The complementizer ka is obligatorily absent in root subject Wh-questions.
noun phrase in-situ with a resumptive possessive pronoun, but it is also grammatical to pied-pipe the entire noun phrase.6,7

(11) Possessor relativization
   a. ñ dá nyé lá à [põgõ, ná] ñ náng sórë ̣, gánè déyàŋ.  
      1Sg Pst see.Perf F D woman Dem 1Sg C  read.Perf 3Sg book last.year  
      ‘I saw the woman whose book I read last year.’
   b. ñ dá nyé lá à [põgõ ná gánè], ñ náng sórë til déyàŋ.  
      1Sg Pst see.Perf F D woman Dem book 1Sg C  read.Perf last.year  
      ‘I saw the woman whose book I read last year.’

Furthermore, it is also licit to relativize the object of postposition and the object of comparison in Ñàgàärè.

(12) PP relativization
   a. à [pêe; ná] Dákòráá néng gång ̣, zu é lá kpong.  
      D roof Dem Dákòráá C  lie.Perf 3Sg on be F big  
      ‘The roof top on which Dákòráá lay is big.’
   b. à [pêe; ná zu], Dákòráá néng gång til é lá kpong.  
      D roof Dem on Dákòráá C  lie.Perf be F big  
      ‘The roof top on which Dákòráá lay is big.’

(13) Comparative relativization
   à [dáá, ná] Dákòráá néng è wógi gångè e3 záá kpio lá.  
      D man Dem Dákòráá C  be tall pass yesterday die F  
      ‘The man who Dákòráá is taller than died yesterday.’

The structure of the PP relativization and the possessor relativization will be discussed in greater detail in Section 3. Crucially, Ñàgàärè does not allow in-situ HIRCs unlike some other Gur languages (Bùlì (Hiraiwa, 2005, 2008, in preparation), Mooré (Peterson, 1974; Tellier, 1989), Dagbani (Wilson, 1963)), where the relativized head noun can remain in its original position. Compare (10b) with (14).8

(14) a. Object HIRC
   *ñ dá sórë lá à Dákòráá néng ngmàá ̣, gánè déyàŋ.  
      1Sg Pst read.Perf F D Dákòráá C  write.Perf book last.year  
      ‘I read the book that Dákòráá wrote last year.’
   b. Object HIRC
   *ñ dá sórë lá à Dákòráá néng ngmàá ̣, gánè ná déyàŋ.  
      1Sg Pst read.Perf F D Dákòráá C  write.Perf book Dem last.year  
      ‘I read the book that Dákòráá wrote last year.’

---

6 The use of resumptive pronouns in possessor relativization and PP relativization is fairly common in HIRCs in Gur languages. In addition, Bùlì uses a resumptive pronoun in long-distance relativization. Kabiye uses resumption in subject positions. Also recall that ex-situ HIRCs discussed by Basilico (1996) employs resumption as well.

7 This example has another interpretation ‘I saw the woman’s book that I read last year.’ but we will ignore this interpretation as it is irrelevant to our discussions.

8 As we mentioned in the beginning of this section, the dialect that we deal with in this article is the Jirapa dialect, the main dialect of Ñàgàärè. In fact, another dialect seems to allow in-situ HIRCs marginally in certain cases. Because it has interesting differences in syntax and lexical items and also because we do not have sufficient data, we will leave an investigation of dialectal differences for future research.
Because there is much parallelism between relative clauses and noun phrases cross-linguistically, let us examine the syntax of DP in some more detail. First, let us look at the placement of determiners. The element ná in Dágááré usually functions as a demonstrative determiner in Dágááré.

(15) Demonstrative ná

\[ \text{ná dā là à gánè ná.} \]
1Sg buy.Perf F D book Dem

‘I bought that book.’

The definite determiner à cannot basically be deleted (without changing the definiteness reading) when the DP appears without a relative clause, while the demonstrative ná can be omitted.

(16) Definite demonstrative omission

a. \[ \text{ná dā là à gánè φ.} \]
1Sg buy.Perf F D book (Dem)

‘I bought the book.’

b. \[ \text{*ná dā là φ gánè ná.} \]
1Sg buy.Perf F (D) book Dem

‘I bought that book.’

One puzzle about the Dágááré DP structure is the fact that it is uniformly head-final except for the definite determiner à. Given the SVO word order of Dágááré, the head-final DP word order is presumably derived from movement. Specifically, we assume that the demonstrative head Dem has an EPP feature \ [+DP] that attracts the closest DP to its specifier, whereas the D head lacks such a feature. The derivation is represented as follows. The D lacks an EPP feature and hence nothing comes to its specifier. On the other hand, The Dem has an EPP feature and hence the entire DP moves to its specifier. As a result, the “D NP Dem” order obtains.

(17) a. à gá-mà ná
D book-Pl Dem
‘those books’

b. DP-structure

\[ \text{DP} \]
\[ \text{D} \]
\[ \text{à} \]
\[ \text{NumP} \]
\[ \text{Num’} \]
\[ \text{Dem’} \]
\[ \text{Dem[EPP]} \]
\[ \text{NP} \]
\[ \text{gá-} \]
\[ \text{Num} \]
\[ \text{mà} \]
\[ \text{Dem[NumP]} \]

9 As Matt Shibatani (p.c.) pointed out, there may have been some diachronic changes from one word order to the other. Unfortunately, there is no record of older stages of the language.
In relative clauses, the demonstrative ná is optional and its presence/absence does not affect a semantic interpretation. On the other hand, the complementizer náng is obligatory. Significantly, the definite determiner à can also be omitted, with the demonstrative ná retained. If both the demonstrative and the definite determiner are omitted, however, the sentence becomes ungrammatical as a definite relative clause; it can only be interpreted as an indefinite relative clause.

(18)  a. Subject relativization (Definite/Indefinite)

\[ n \, dà \, sòrè \, lā \, à \, gànè \, nà \, / \, gànè \, nà \, / \, gànè * (náng) \, bìng \, kyè. \]


‘I read the/the/a book that is lying here.’

b. Object relativization (Definite/Indefinite)

\[ n \, dà \, sòrè \, lā \, à \, gànè \, nà \, / \, gànè \, nà \, / \, gànè \, Dàkòráà * (náng) \]


write.Perf last.year

‘I read the/the/a book that Dàkòráà wrote last year.’

Thus, the fact that the definite determiner is freely omitted in relative clauses but not in non-relative contexts suggests that the determiner à in relative clauses is located in a different position. We propose that it in fact takes a CP clause as a complement, as shown in (19) (see Kayne, 1994).\(^{10}\)

(19)  a. D and relative clauses

\[ DP \]

\[ D \quad CP \]

\[ à\quad DemP\quad C' \]

\[ gànè\, nà \quad C \quad TP \]

\[ \ldots \]

b. D and NP

\[ DP \]

\[ D \quad DemP \]

\[ à \quad NumP \quad Dem' \]

\[ gànè\, nà \quad Dem \quad t_{NumP} \quad ná \]

In other words, the determiner à takes the DemP as its complement in noun phrases, but it takes the CP instead in relative clauses.\(^{11}\) In DPs, the demonstrative ná clearly forms a constituent with the noun phrase, as shown by the clefting test below.

\(^{10}\) Another construction in which a D takes a CP clause is a so-called Factive construction as shown in (i) (see Collins, 1994).

(i)  Factive Construction

\[ [ à [ D àkòráà \, náng \, ngmàá \, à \, gànè \, déyâng \, yèlé]] \, pître \, lā \, pòb (j) \, pòb \, yâgà. \]

D Dàkòráà C write.Perf D book last.year Part. whiten.Perf F 3Sg wife stomach a.lot

‘The fact that Dàkòráà wrote a book last year pleased his wife a lot.’

\(^{11}\) As we have observed, the omission of ná in relative clauses does not show any significant semantic difference – in particular, distal function. This leads us to think that the demonstrative determiner in relative clauses is syntactically and semantically bleached and grammaticalized into a definite determiner. We will, tentatively, assume that the demonstrative determiner ná is reanalyzed as a definite marker, losing its deictic function, when the NP functions as a relativized head in Dàgàárà. We leave for future research the investigation of the nature of the function of the demonstrative determiner in relative clauses in general.
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(20) a. à móngó-rí ná
   D mango-Pl Dem
   ‘those mangoes’

   b. à móngó-rí ná lá kà Dákóráá dì zàámêng.
   D mango-Pl Dem F C Dákóráá eat.Perf yesterday
   ‘It is the mangoes that Dákóráá ate yesterday’

One might wonder if ná has grammaticalized into a complementizer in relative clauses, as that in English. There is good reason, however, to think that ná in relative clauses is a determiner not a complementizer. Consider the pair (21).

(21) Relativization and numerals

   a. ñ dá dì lá à móngó-rí ãnúú ná Dákóráá náng dá
      1Sg Pst eat.Perf F D mango-Pl five Dem Dákóráá C buy.Perf
      zàámêng.
      yesterday
      ‘I ate the five mangoes that Dákóráá bought yesterday.’

   b. ñ dá dì lá à móngó-rí ná ãnúú Dákóráá náng dá
      1Sg Pst eat.Perf F D mango-Pl five Dákóráá C buy.Perf
      zàámêng.
      yesterday
      ‘I ate the five mangoes that Dákóráá bought yesterday.’

As the sentence (21b) shows, the numeral ãnúú can come to the right of ná. This should be impossible if ná were a clausal functional head (like C(omplementizer)) as shown in (22). 12

(22) *ná as C (i.e. a clausal functional head)

    DP
     |
   D  CP
     |  
   à  CP
    |
   gâñè C TP
      |
    ná

Similarly, when two modifying clauses are coordinated to modify the relativized head noun, ná cannot appear in the second conjunct. If ná were a complementizer, it would be expected to appear in both conjuncts. Compare the Dágááre examples (24) with the English counterpart.

12 When P is pied-piped with the relativized head noun, it must follow the demonstrative ná (if any); it cannot come before the demonstrative.

(i) The Placement of P and the demonstrative

    *ñ dá dì lá à lôsôrê póò ná [Dákóráá náng gâng].
      1Sg Pst buy F D car in Dem Dákóráá C lie.Perf
      ‘I bought the car in which Dákóráá slept.’

This confirms that the demonstrative ná is not a complementizer or a relative pronoun, but rather forms a constituent with the relativized head noun. See the detailed discussion in Section 3.
(23) a. This is the article [that John wrote] and [that Mary reviewed].
   b. This is the article [which John wrote] and [which Mary reviewed].

(24) Coordination of relative clauses and ná
   a. ñ ñó lá à zómò ná Dákóráá náng dà nyógè ká Dërê dà
      1Sg eat.Perf F D fish Dem Dákóráá C Pst catch.Perf Conj. Dërê Pst
dógè.
     cook.Perf
     ‘I ate the fish that Dákóráá caught and Dërê cooked.’
   b. *ñ ñó lá à zómò ná Dákóráá náng dà nyógè ká ná Dërê
      1Sg eat.Perf F D fish Dem Dákóráá C Pst catch.Perf Conj. Dem Dërê
dà dógè.
Pst cook.Perf
     ‘I ate the fish that Dákóráá caught and Dërê cooked.’

Finally, let us address a significant question of whether the relationship between the relativized head and the gap
(or its resumptive pronoun) is mediated by movement or control or a kind of binding. As shown in the examples (25), the
fact that relativization in Dàga`arè is subject to islands/subjacency suggests that the former is right. They show that
relativization out of a complex NP or an adjunct clause is illicit in Dàga`arè. Note that island effects remain irrespective
of the presence/absence of the resumptive pronouns.

(25) a. Complex NP Constraint
   *ñ dà sôrè lâ à gànè, nà [ná náng nyé [à pògò ná náng
      1Sg Pst read.Perf F D book Dem 1Sg C see.Perf D woman Dem C
      ngmàà (òtì)].
     write.Perf (3Sg)
     ‘I read the book that I saw the woman who wrote.’
   b. Adjunct Island
   *ñ dà sôrè lâ à gànè, nà [ná náng nyé [à pògò ò náng
      1Sg Pst read.Perf F D book Dem 1Sg C see.Perf D woman 3Sg C
      ngmàà-rá (òtì)].
     write-Imper (3Sg)
     ‘I read the book that I saw the woman when she was writing it.’

2.2. The interiors: complementizer and particles

We now turn our attention to the interiors with particular focus on the preverbal particles observed in relative
clauses and the position of the subject. We provide evidence that the particle nàng is a complementizer. It cannot be
omitted in Dàga`arè relativization and therefore is an indispensable syntactic ingredient.

2.2.1. Preverbal particles

Dàga`arè has a rich inventory of preverbal Tense-Aspect-Mood particles (see Bodomo, 1997). The preverbal particle
nàng has other uses in the grammatical system of Dàga`arè. Outside relative clauses, one of its clearest uses is as a
preverbal particle that means ‘still’. Note, however, that the tone is low in this use.

(26) A preverbal particle nàng
   à dóó nàng nyúúró lá à kòó.
   D man still drink.Imp F D water
   ‘The man is still drinking the water.’
In relativization, on the other hand, it is marked with a high tone.

(27) *náng* in a relative clause

\[ \text{ñ dà sôrè lâ à gânè nà [Đàkóráà náng ngmàà dêyâng].} \]

1Sg Pst read.Perf F D book Dem Đàkóráà C write.Perf last.year

‘I read the book that Đàkóráà wrote last year.’

The high-tone complementizer *náng* is also used in temporal adverbial clauses.

(28) *náng* in a temporal clause

\[ [à dô náng wà tā], ñ dê lâ gânè kò ó. \]

D man when come.Perf reach.Perf 1Sg take.Perf F book give 3Sg

‘When the man arrived I gave him a book.’

Despite the morphological identity, these particles are distinct syntactic heads. The complementizer *náng* can in fact co-occur with the preverbal particle *nàng*. Furthermore, it can also co-occur with other preverbal particles such as the past tense particles *da* and *zaa*. Crucially, the complementizer *náng* precedes all of those so-called preverbal particles.

(29) Preverbal particle *nàng* and complementizer *náng*

\[ \text{ñ nyêc lâ à gânè nà [Đàkóráà náng náng ngmàà-rà].} \]

1Sg see.Perf F D book Dem Đàkóráà C still write-Imperf

‘I saw the book that Đàkóráà is still writing.’

(30) a. Object relativization (Past)

\[ \text{ñ dà sôrè lâ à gânè nà Đàkóráà (**dà**) náng (dà) ngmàà.} \]

1Sg Pst read.Perf F D book Dem Đàkóráà (Pst) C (Pst) write.Perf last.year

‘I read the book that Đàkóráà wrote last year.’

b. Object relativization (Past)

\[ \text{ñ dà sôrè lâ à gânè nà Đàkóráà (**záa**) náng (záa) ngmàà.} \]

1Sg Pst read.Perf F D book Dem Đàkóráà (Pst) C (Pst) write.Perf

‘I read the book that Đàkóráà wrote yesterday.’

Whereas the relativizing particle *náng* must precede the tense and all the other particles, the preverbal particle *nàng* must follow the tense particle.

(31) a. ò dà náng bâ wà sôrè.

3Sg Pst still Neg come yet

‘He hadn’t come yet.’

b. ñ nyêc lâ à gânè nà Đàkóráà náng dà náng ngmàà-rà.

1Sg see.Perf F D book Dem Đàkóráà C Pst still write-Imperf

‘I saw the book that Đàkóráà was still writing.’
The future particle *nä* also follows the complementizer *nâng*, as shown below.

(32) Object relativization (Future)

\[ ñâ dy c, lá à gânè nâng Dâkórââ (*nà) nâng (nà) kó má biéú. \]
I Pst see.Perf F D book Dem Dâkórââ (Fut) C (Fut) give me tomorrow

‘I saw the book that Dâkórââ will give me tomorrow.’

It is worth noting that the fact that these tense particles can occur within the relative clauses in Dâgâárê indicates that the relative clauses are fully finite (and hence not “reduced” in any sense). The co-occurrence and word order facts demonstrate that the relativizing particle *nâng* is a complementizer.

(33) The hierarchical structure of particles

\[
\text{CP} \quad \text{C} \quad \text{TP} \\
\downarrow \quad \downarrow \\
\text{nâng} \quad \text{T} \quad \text{vP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{dâ/nâng} \quad \text{vP} \\
\downarrow
\text{v} \quad \text{VP}
\]

2.2.2. C, subject, and verb

As the examples in (34) show, the time adverb in Dâgâárê can be placed at the right edge of the clause (34a), or at the left-edge of the clause (34b), but not in the medial positions (34c)–(34e). In either case, the natural assumption is that the former is adjoined to TP and the latter is topicalized. The grammatical example (34f) indicates that the temporal adverb can also incorporate into T.

(34)

a. Dâkórââ dâ ngmââ lá à gânè dêyang.
   Dâkórââ Pst write.Perf F D book last.year
   ‘Dâkórââ wrote the book last year.’

b. dêyang Dâkórââ dâ ngmââ lá à gânè.
   last.year Dâkórââ Pst write.Perf F D book

c. *Dâkórââ dâ ngmââ lá dêyang à gânè.
   Dâkórââ Pst write.Perf F last.year D book

d. *Dâkórââ dâ ngmââ dêyang lá à gânè.
   Dâkórââ Pst write.Perf last.year F D book

e. *Dâkórââ dâ dêyang ngmââ lá à gânè.
   Dâkórââ Pst last.year write.Perf F D book

f. Dâkórââ dêyang dâ ngmââ lá à gânè.
   Dâkórââ last.year Pst write.Perf F D book

Now let us examine adverb placement in relative clauses. An embedded adverb cannot come before the complementizer (35c). It cannot be placed before the demonstrative *ná* (35d) or just after it (35e). Neither can

13 The particle *nâng* does not have any use as a complementizer in Wh-questions and focus constructions. In these constructions, the complementizer *ka* is used (see (9b) and (20b)). It should be noted that there is no construction where *ka* and *nâng* co-occur, which supports our conclusion that *nâng* is a complementizer, rather than a Tense-Aspect-Mood particle.
the adverb precede the relativized head noun (35f). Thus the well-formed adverb placement is either between the complementizer náng and the verb (35b) or at the end of the relative clause (35a).

The fact that the adverb cannot precede náng shows that the latter is located higher than T. Therefore it confirms our conclusion that it is C.

(35) Adverb placement in Dágááre relativization

a. ń da sôré lá [ा gânē ná Dákóráá náng da ngmâá déyâng].
   1Sg Pst read.Perf F D book Dem Dâkorâá C Pst write.Perf last.year
b. ń da sôré lá [ा gânē ná Dákóráá náng déyâng da ngmâá].
   1Sg Pst read.Perf F D book Dem Dâkorâá C last.year Pst write.Perf

c. *ń da sôré lá [া gânē Dákóráá déyâng náng da ngmâá].
   1Sg Pst read.Perf F D book Dâkorâá last.year C Pst write.Perf

d. *ń da sôré lá [া gânē déyâng ná Dákóráá náng da ngmâá].
   1Sg Pst read.Perf F D book last.year Dem Dâkorâá C Pst write.Perf

e. *ń da sôré lá [া gânē ná déyâng Dákóráá náng da ngmâá].
   1Sg Pst read.Perf F D book Dem last.year Dâkorâá C Pst write.Perf
f. *ń da sôré lá [déyâng à gânē ná Dâkorâá náng da ngmâá].
   1Sg Pst read.Perf F last.year D book Dem Dâkorâá C Pst write.Perf

Assuming that the adverb in the example (34b) is a topic position, [Spec, TopP], the ungrammaticality of the examples (35e) and (35f) suggests that relative clauses lack a TopP projection. In fact, no topicalization is allowed in Dágááre relative clauses.

Now, notice that the subject in the relative clause must precede the complementizer. We assume, adopting Rizzi (1997), that the left periphery of the CP domain is decomposed into layers of functional categories: TopicP (TopP), ForceP (ForceP), FocusP (FP), and FinitenessP (FinP).14 The natural conclusion then will be that the Fin head has an EPP feature just like T, and requires the subject – the closest element – to move to its specifier (see Hiraiwa, 2005 and Chomsky, 2000, 2004). In fact, such a subject movement over C is well attested in some other Gur languages (Hiraiwa, 2005, 2008).

Assuming that the adverb in the example (34b) is a topic position, [Spec, TopP], the ungrammaticality of the examples (35e) and (35f) suggests that relative clauses lack a TopP projection. In fact, no topicalization is allowed in Dágááre relative clauses.

2.3. Interim summary

To summarize, Dágááre relativization involves a left-moved head noun and the complementizer (Fin) náng. The subject obligatorily moves to [Spec, FinP]. The relativized head noun optionally takes a definite determiner and a

---

14 A CP-recursion structure is also compatible with the analysis presented below.
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demonstrative for definite relative clauses. The particle náng is best understood as a complementizer given the co-occurrence and word order evidence. In contrast, the placements of the demonstrative ná show that it is not a complementizer. Rather it is a constituent of the relativized noun phrase.

(37) a. The relativized head always appears at the left edge of the clause.
   b. The demonstrative ná is not a constituent of the relative clause (i.e. it is not a complementizer, either).
   c. The complementizer náng is located structurally higher than other preverbal TAMP particles.
   d. Movement is involved.

Having established the internal structure of the relative clauses in Dàgàárè, in the next section, we will show evidence that the relativized head nouns are still located internally to the relative clauses.

3. Left-headed but internally-headed relative clauses

Given the fact that Dàgàárè is an SVO language, it is indeed expected that its relativized head noun appears at the left periphery, not at the right periphery, according to Emmon Bach’s correlation between word order and Wh-movement (see Bach, 1971; see also Bresnan, 1970). As we have shown in the first half of this article, Dàgàárè does not allow what is clearly considered to be in-situ HIRCs. Namely, the relativized head noun cannot remain in-situ. Rather, the relativized head noun is always placed at the left edge of the clause, just as in English. This is apparently in accordance with Peter Cole’s generalization that HIRCs are limited to SOV languages (see Cole, 1987). However, Hiraiwa (2005) argues that such a word order generalization does not hold cross-linguistically and shows that there are Gur languages that have SVO word order but still allow in-situ HIRCs perfectly, as first noticed by Tellier (1989). The important question, then, concerns the precise structure of the relative clause in Dàgàárè—where does the fronted relativized head noun reside, and is it external or internal to the relative clause? If evidence suggests that it is internal despite its appearance, Dàgàárè provides a significant example of another new type of HIRC: left-headed HIRCs. As we have seen, however, mere word order does not tell us whether the left-peripheral head is internal or not.15

Basilico (1996) notes the existence of HIRCs in Diegueno and Mojave with its relativized head displaced but yet clause-internally. As we have seen in Section 1, movement of the head noun in front of the subject is optional and he argues that it targets the TP-adjointed position. In this section, we argue that Dàgàárè relative clauses are indeed internally-headed and hence instantiate ex-situ HIRCs. However, Dàgàárè crucially differs from those languages in that the landing site of the internal head noun is the CP-edge and the movement is always obligatory.

(38) a. The head noun in Dàgàárè is obligatorily moved.
   b. The landing site is the edge of CP – [Spec, ForceP].

These are in fact naturally expected given that Dàgàárè is a Wh-movement language and there is cross-linguistic parallelism between Wh-questions and relativization. Recall also that Dàgàárè does not have scrambling.

The proposed structure is shown in (39) (successive-cyclic movement is not indicated for simplicity). In other words, the left-moved head noun is located at the edge of CP, but crucially not outside of the relative clause.

---

15 Dàgàárè relative clauses do show reconstruction effects. In the example (i), the subject pronoun of the embedded clause must be disjoint with the R-expression within the relativized head noun. Thus, the Condition C violation shows that raising is involved in relativization in Dàgàárè. However, it still does not tell us whether the final structure of relative clauses is internally-headed or externally-headed (Recall Section 1).

(i) ̀n nyì lá à Dàköràá fotò ná ̀nìì nàng pénti.
   1Sg see.Perf F Dàköràá photo Dem 3Sg C paint.Perf
   ‘I saw Dàköràá’s picture that he painted.’

As a side note, a reflexive binding via reconstruction does not work in Dàgàárè for some reason that we do not understand.

(ii) ̀n nyì lá à ̀bì méngé fotò Dàköràá nàng pénti.
   1Sg see.Perf F D 3Sg self photo Dàköràá C paint.Perf
   ‘I saw the picture of himself that Dàköràá painted.’

---
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Translating a CP-recursion structure into Rizzi’s articulated CP clausal structure, the head noun undergoes an Â-movement to a higher CP layer [Spec, ForceP]. Recall that the complementizer náŋ has an EPP feature and hence the closest DP – the subject – moves to [Spec, FinP]. Because the determiner à lacks an EPP feature in Dâgâáre (see Section 2), the relativized head noun does not move to [Spec, DP], remaining internally to the relative clause.¹⁶

(39) Left-headed HIRC

Dâgâáre strikingly differs from some other Gur languages (such as Bûlî; see Hiraiwa, 2005, 2008) in that an in-situ HIRC is impossible. Furthermore, unlike Diegueño and Mojave, whose head-raising is simply an option, the movement of the head noun is obligatory. If correct, then the existence of Dâgâáre-type left-headed HIRCs is of considerable typological significance. The existence of left-headed HIRCs, if established, also has far-reaching consequences for the cross-linguistic typology of HIRCs. First, this type of ex-situ HIRCs has not been observed in the literature. Second, most importantly, it suggests a totally new picture of the typology of HIRCs (cf. Gorbet, 1977; Cole, 1987; Culy, 1990) and a careful re-examination of the relative clauses that have been simply assumed to be HERCs. Furthermore, it provides another piece of evidence against Cole’s Generalization (Cole, 1987) that HIRCs are restricted to languages with null pronouns and SOV word order; Dâgâáre neither allows null pronouns nor shows SOV word order.

In the reminder of this article, we demonstrate that Dâgâáre relativization is an instance of left-headed HIRCs, based on two empirical arguments – coordinated PP relativization and coordinated possessor relativization. The evidence is based on syntactic constituency, which is one of the most solid tests for syntactic structures in transformational syntactic theory. The conclusion is further supported by the ungrammaticality of extraposition of relative clauses and the Indefiniteness Restriction.

3.1. PP relativization and pied-piping

Dâgâáre has a number of postpositions. For example, the postposition pôó ‘in’ takes a noun phrase as its complement.

(40) Dâkóráá gàng lá [PP à lôrè pôó].
Dâkóráá lie.Perf F D car in
‘Dâkóráá slept in the car.’

¹⁶ See Rizzi (1997) for evidence that a relativized head noun in Italian is located in [Spec, ForceP], higher than a position for Wh-phrases. The fact that Wh-phrases and focused elements are obligatorily marked with the focus marker lá in Dâgâáre shows that they are considered to be in [Spec, FocP], in contrast with relativized head nouns, which never take such a marker.
In Dágááré, there are two ways to relativize the complement of P: either a P is stranded with a resumptive pronoun of the relativized head noun as in the example (41a) or it is pied-piped with the relativized head to the initial position as in the example (41b). In the former case, the resumptive pronoun is obligatory.17

(41) Relativization and pied-piping of P
   a. ñ dá lá à [\text{ForceP} ìóré nà [Dákóráá náng gàng ó póó]].
      1Sg buy.Perf F D car Dem Dákóráá C lie.Perf 3Sg in
      ‘I bought the car in which Dákóráá slept.’
   b. ñ dá lá à [\text{ForceP} ìóré nà póó [Dákóráá náng gàng]].
      1Sg buy.Perf F D car Dem in Dákóráá C lie.Perf
      ‘I bought the car in which Dákóráá slept.’

That both relative clauses in (41) allow the same interpretation in which the relativized head is ìóré alone is supported by the fact that they can be an answer to a Wh-question (42).

(42) ìóó-bòò lá ká fó dá?
    car-which F C 2Sg buy.Perf
    ‘Which car did you buy?’

If the relative clause is internally-headed and left-headed, the structure should be as follows.

(43) Left-headed HIRC

The pied-piping facts alone, however, do not provide us with decisive evidence for left-headed HIRCs. In fact, they could also be accounted for if the relative clauses in Dágááré were externally-headed (whether (1a) or (3)). Under such an analysis, one might say that the PP (the postposition and the resumptive pronoun) is actually moved to [Spec, ForceP] and the relativized head noun is base-generated in a position external to ForceP (it is base-generated externally in traditional analyses or is raised in Bhatt’s (2002) analysis). This hypothetical derivation is illustrated in the structure (44).

17 There is a semantic effect of pied-piping. The relative clause without pied-piping only has an interpretation in which what was bought was ‘the car’. On the other hand, when pied-piping takes place, the relative clause becomes ambiguous: what was bought was ‘the car’ or ‘the inside of the car’ (possibly, the interior of the car alone). Sometimes, the latter interpretation is more readily available, but in principle, (41b) allows the same interpretation as (41a). We ignore the latter interpretation in this article, because it is irrelevant to our main focus.
Of course, this analysis poses a conceptual question: why is the PP moved to [Spec, ForceP]? Furthermore, even if one could somehow motivate this movement, it would be necessary to restrict such a movement only in cases where the complement of P is an empty category.

However, this analysis makes a wrong prediction. The derivation (44) should expect that the coordination of PP relative clauses would be grammatical, with the PPs fronted to [Spec, ForceP] in each conjuncts. This is in fact grammatical in English, whose relative clauses are allegedly externally-headed (see Bhatt, 2002 for extensive evidence).

(45) This is the car [\text{ForceP in which John slept}] and [\text{ForceP on which Mary slept}].

(46) HERC and coordination of PP relative clauses

However, such examples are ungrammatical in Da`gááù, contrary to the prediction. As shown in (47b), when the P is pied-piped, the sentences result in ungrammaticality. Instead, the PPs must be left in-situ with resumptive pronoun as in (47a).

(47) Pied-piping and coordination

a. à [lôôrê nà [Dákòráá náng gâng ô póõ] kà [Déré gâng ô zû]

D car Dem Dákòráá C lie.Perf 3Sg in Conj. Déré lie.Perf 3Sg on lá nyé].

Cop this

‘The car in which Dákòráá slept and on which Déré slept is this.’
One might wonder if the sentence (47b) is ungrammatical, because the movement of PP in the second is not licensed for some reason. However, the sentence is still ungrammatical even if the PP is left in-situ with the resumptive pronoun.

(48) *à lôrè ná [ tô póó Dákóráá náng gàng] ká [Dërê gàng ô zû] lá
   D car Dem 3Sg in Dákóráá C lie.Perf Conj. Dërê lie.Perf 3Sg on Cop
   nyé.
   this
   ‘The car in which Dákóráá slept and on which Dërê slept is this.’

All of these facts are mysterious if the relative clause in Dàgàárö permits an externally-headed structure at all. The ungrammaticality of (47b) is explained if the relative clause in question has the head-internal structure as illustrated in (49). This is because the PP and the head noun must form a constituent and hence there is no way to coordinate CPs excluding the relativized head noun and to produce the surface form (47b).

(49) Left-headed HIRC and coordination of PP relative clauses

\[
\text{DP} \\
\text{D} \quad \text{ForceP} \\
\text{ForceP1} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{ForceP2} \\
[\text{PP NP P} \ldots]\quad [\text{PP NP P} \ldots]
\]

On the other hand, the example without pied-piping (47a) is naturally explained as a result of Across-the-Board extraction of the possessor relativized noun phrase as depicted in (50).

(50) Left-headed HIRC and coordination of in-situ PP relative clauses

\[
\text{DP} \\
\text{D} \quad \text{ForceP} \\
\text{NP} \quad \text{Force’} \\
\quad \text{Force} \quad \text{FinP} \\
\quad \text{FinP1} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{FinP2} \\
\quad \ldots[\text{PP ti P}] \ldots \quad \ldots[\text{PP ti P}] \ldots
\]
3.2. Possessor relativization and pied-piping

The second evidence comes from possessor relativization. Recall that Dàgàárà̀ allows possessor relativization (51a). Of great importance for our discussion is the fact that the sentence (51b) is also grammatical, where the whole possessor-possessee complex has been moved to the left (the resumptive pronoun is required in (51a) and slightly preferred in (51b).

(51) Possessor relativization without pied-piping
   a. ñ dá nyé lá à [póɡó há [ñ náng sóré *ðá gánè déyáng]].
      1Sg Pst see.Perf F D woman Dem 1Sg C read.Perf 3Sg book last.year
      ‘I saw the woman whose book I read last year.’

   b. ñ dá nyé lá à [póɡó há ³ðá gánè [ñ náng sóré déyáng]].
      1Sg Pst see.Perf F D woman Dem 3Sg book 1Sg C read.Perf last.year
      ‘I saw the woman whose book I read last year.’

The syntactic derivation of possessor relativization with pied-piping is represented below where NP₁ is gánè and NP₂ is the possessor póɡó há.

(52) Left-headed HIRC (pied-piping of the possessed NP)

```
DP
   D
   /\     ForceP
  á     á
 NP₁,  Force   FinP
    \   /     /     /
     ...NP₂...
     Subj   Fin[EPP]
          /       /     /
          náng   tSubj  T
          /     /     /
            VP
                ...
```

Again, an interaction of coordination and pied-piping demonstrates that the relativized head is still internal to the relative clause. Compare the English examples with the Dàgàárà̀ counterparts. While English relative clauses are externally-headed and hence allow coordination of relative clauses with fronted possessed NPs (with the relative pronouns), Dàgàárà̀ disallows such coordination.

(53) I greeted the woman [ForceP whose book I read yesterday] and [ForceP whose husband John knows well].
This is expected given that the relative clauses in English are externally-headed and the relativized head noun and the relative pronoun (plus the possessed NP) do not form a syntactic constituent. In contrast, in left-headed HIRCs, the relativized possessor NP and the pied-piped possessed NP form a syntactic constituent and are located in [Spec, ForceP] (see (52)). Hence the coordination fails with pied-piping because the form is never derivable under the left-headed HIRC structure, as shown in the examples (55) and (56).

(55) Possessor relativization and pied-piping

a. *n piór’ lá à [pògò ná [n näng sòrè ò gànè] kà Déré 1Sg greet.Perf F D woman Den 1Sg C read.Perf 3Sg book Conj. Déré bòngè ò sérè].

know 3Sg husband
‘I greeted the woman whose book I read and whose husband Déré knows.’

b. *n piór’ lá à [(ò) gànè n näng sòrè] kà [(ò) 1Sg greet.Perf F D woman Den 3Sg book 1Sg C read.Perf Conj. 3Sg sérè Déré bòngè].

husband Déré know
‘I greeted the woman whose book I read and whose husband Déré knows.’

c?*n piór’ lá à [pògò ná [(ò) gànè n näng sòrè] kà [Déré 1Sg greet.Perf F D woman Den 3Sg book 1Sg C read.Perf Conj. Déré bòngè ò sérè]].

know 3Sg husband
‘I greeted the woman whose book I read and whose husband Déré knows.’

(56) Left-headed HIRC and coordination of pied-piped possessor relative clauses
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The coordination is licit as long as the possessed NPs are left in-situ, as we have also seen in PP relativization.\footnote{To complete our arguments, we should note that coordinated PP relativization and coordinated possessor relativization behave exactly in the same way as normal relative clauses in terms of island effects. Thanks to an anonymous reviewer for pointing this out.}

\begin{equation}
\text{(57) Left-headed HIRC and coordination of possessor relative clauses}
\end{equation}

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\text{D} \\
\text{ForceP} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{Force} \\
\text{FinP} \\
\text{FinP1} \\
\text{and} \\
\text{FinP2} \\
\end{array}
\]

3.3. Extraposition

The conclusion that relative clauses in Dágáárë are not externally-headed is confirmed by the fact that extraposition of relative clauses are strictly ungrammatical in Dágáárë, unlike in English, whose relative clauses are arguably externally-headed.

\begin{equation}
\text{(58) a. I read the book } [\text{ForceP which John wrote last year}] \text{ yesterday.}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{b. I read the book yesterday } [\text{ForceP which John wrote last year}].
\end{equation}

Note that in left-headed HIRC’s, the ForceP contains the relativized head NP and hence the former cannot be extraposed in such a way that excludes the latter. In externally-headed relative clauses like those in English, the ForceP is either adjoined to an NP or is the complement of an N. Thus a relative clause can be extraposed independently of the relativized head NP.

\begin{equation}
\text{(59) *Extraposition of relative clauses}
\end{equation}

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. \(\text{I read the book } [\text{ForceP gánè ná } \text{Dákóráá náng } \text{ngmáá } e_t/ô_t \text{ dêyâng}] \text{ zàáméng. last.year yesterday 'I read the book that Dákóráá wrote last year yesterday.'}
\item b. *\(\text{I read the book } [\text{ForceP gánè ná } \text{zàáméng } \text{Dákóráá náng } \text{ngmáá } e_t/ô_t \text{ dêyâng}]. \text{ write.Perf } \phi/3\text{Sg last.year 'I read the book that Dákóráá wrote last year yesterday.'}
\end{enumerate}
We should mention that this point can also be illustrated with coordinated relative clauses.

(60)  

know 3Sg husband yesterday  
‘I greeted the woman whose book I read and whose husband Dêrê knew yesterday.’  

b. *ń pùòrí lá á pógó ná zaâmêng [ń näng sôrê o gânê]  
1Sg greet.Perf F D woman Den 1Sg C read.Perf 3Sg book kà [Dêrê bôngê o sêrê].  
Conj. Dêrê know 3Sg husband  
‘I greeted the woman yesterday whose book I read and whose husband Dêrê knew.’

This eliminates the possibility that coordinated possessor relative clauses have a totally different structure. Hulsey and Sauerland (2006) show that extraposition is ungrammatical even in English, when a raising derivation – a head-internal structure in their terms – is forced. They argue that English relative clauses are structurally ambiguous between head-external and head-internal structures. Thus, when an idiom chunk or reconstruction is involved as in (61) and (62), extraposing the relative clause is prohibited, just as we have seen in Dàgáárè (the examples are cited from Hulsey and Sauerland, 2006).

(61)  
a. Mary praised the headway that John made.  
b. *Mary praised the headway last year that John made.

(62)  
a. I saw the picture of himself that John liked.  
b. *I saw the picture of himself yesterday that John liked.

Thus the ungrammaticality of extraposition in Dàgáárè and a certain type of relative clauses in English are expected given the structure (39).

3.4. Non-restrictives and the indefiniteness restriction

Another piece of corroborating evidence is the lack of appositive relative clauses in Dàgáárè. Dàgáárè lacks non-restrictive relative clauses with a proper noun as a head noun, as indicated by the ill-formed example (63).

(63) Non-restrictive relative clause

?*ń dá nyè lá Dàkóráá náng ngmàá à gânê déyâng.  
1Sg Pst see.Perf F Dàkóráá C wrote D book last.year  
‘I saw Dàkóráá, who wrote the book last year.’

If the proper noun Dàkóráá is accompanied by the definite determiner and the demonstrative, the relative clause obligatorily becomes restrictive, which restricts a set of people whose name is Dàkóráá.

(64) Restrictive relative clause

ń dá nyè lá á Dàkóráá náng ngmàá à gânê déyâng.  
1Sg Pst see.Perf F Dàkóráá Dem C wrote D book last.year  
‘I saw the Dàkóráá who wrote the book last year.’

The absence of non-restrictive relative clauses in Dàgáárè would be puzzling given that no other principles prevented the language from allowing non-restrictives.
However, it straightforwardly follows if the structure of the relative clauses in Dàgáárè is always internally-headed. It has been well known in the literature that HIRCs are cross-linguistically subject to what Williamson (1987) calls The Indefiniteness Restriction. Thus, relativized head nouns of HIRCs must always be indefinite. A famous example in Lakhota is cited below. Note that the relativized head noun can take the indefinite determiner, but not the definite determiner.

\[(65)\] Lakhota (Williamson 1987: 171)

\[a.\] [\{[Mary owjá wà kàgé kí kí] he\} ophewathù.
Mary quilt ld make D Dem 1Sg-buy
‘I bought the quilt that Mary made.’

\[b.\] *[\{[Mary owjá kí kàgé kí kí] he\} ophewathù.
Mary quilt D make D Dem 1Sg-buy
‘I bought the quilt that Mary made.’

Not surprisingly, an in-situ HIRC in Lakhota disallows a non-restrictive relative clause. Thus, the following sentence, with the first person pronoun as an internal head, is ungrammatical.

\[(66)\] Lakhota (Williamson 1987: 175)

*[[(Miye) makuže] kí/cha] wichawota kí ektá mnj kte
1Sg.Emph 1Sg.sick D/D feat D to 1Sg.go Fut
‘I, who am sick, will go to the feat.’

Now, we correctly expect that a proper noun, which is clearly a definite noun phrase, cannot appear as a relativized head in Dàgáárè despite the fact that it appears at the left periphery as in English. This is so, precisely because the relative clause is internally-headed and hence must conform to the Indefiniteness Restriction. And to the best of our knowledge, there is no language attested at this point in which non-restrictives are formed using HIRCs.

Finally, it should be emphasized that the coordination facts, the impossibility of extraposition, as well as the Indefiniteness Restriction all demonstrate that relative clauses in Dàgáárè are unambiguously internally-headed. If Dàgáárè allowed externally-headed relative clauses in addition to internally-headed relative clauses, the coordinated PP/possessor relativization, extraposition, and a non-restrictive relative clause should all be grammatical.\(^{19}\)

### 3.5. Alternatives

The editors for *Lingua* pointed out a possibility that the coordinated relative clauses in English and Dàgáárè actually involve a deletion of an identical relativized noun phrase. The schematic structure would then be something like below.

\[(67)\] a. I greeted [the woman] [whose book I read yesterday] and [the woman] [whose husband John knows well].

\[b.\]

```
NP1_i
NP1_i ForceP1
NP2_i and
NP2_i ForceP2```

---

\(^{19}\) Recall that relativized head nouns in Dàgáárè are marked with the demonstrative *nà*. This raises a question about the Indefiniteness Restriction. We assume, however, that the demonstrative in this environment is grammaticalized and has lost definiteness and suggest that it may function as a specific indefinite determiner. Some Gur languages use a dedicated specific indefinite determiner to mark a relativized head. See Hiraiwa (2008, in preparation) for a comparative study of relative clauses in Gur languages and the role of specific indefinite determiners. See Greenberg (1978) for grammaticalization of demonstratives.
Under this analysis, what are syntactically coordinated are two identical noun phrases – external relativized head nouns –, rather than relative clauses. But phonological deletion of the second identical NP gives rise to the appearance that two relative clauses (ForcePs) are coordinated. If this is a possible analysis, the apparent coordination facts lose their force. For example, one could argue that the grammaticality of the coordination in English is due to the deletion rule, while its ungrammaticality in Dâgârârè is due to an absence of such a rule (whatever an explanation for this asymmetry may be). If so, the (un)grammaticality in English and Dâgârârè would not tell us anything about the syntactic structures of their relative clauses.

Of course, such an analysis requires a principle of deletion that does not overgenerate unwanted sentences and such a rule must also be general enough. We do not think of any such principle, but let us simply suppose that such a deletion existed. However, this alternative can be explicitly excluded for Dâgârârè because the language uses different coordination markers for nominal and clausal coordinations. While the clausal coordinator is ka as we have seen above, the nominal coordinator is ne.

The use of ka in the sentences (47a) and (55a) clearly demonstrates that the coordinated relative clauses in question are an instance of clausal coordination. If it were a nominal coordination with the second identical noun elided as in the structure (67b), the coordinator should have been ne. Thus the alternative analysis (67b) is excluded for Dâgârârè, which supports our conclusion that Dâgârârè relative clauses are internally-headed.

In the case of English, the situation is a little more complicated because the coordinator and is used both for nouns and clauses. However, the same point can be made by using the coordinator but. It can conjoin clauses but not noun phrases.

(a) I ate a banana and/*but a mango.
(b) I ate a banana and/but she ate a mango.

Now if the sentences (45) and (53) were a coordination of noun phrases as represented in the structure (67b), we would expect that a use of but would lead to ungrammaticality. This prediction is not borne out, however.

Thus, it is legitimate to think that the coordinated relative clauses in question do not involve an elided head noun in either language. Therefore, the asymmetry in the coordination of relative clauses between English and Dâgârârè shows the asymmetry in the structure: the externally-headed structure for English and the internally-headed structure for Dâgârârè.

Let us further consider another alternative analysis that an anonymous reviewer pointed out, in which the entire PP or the entire possessor-possessee NP is an external head in the traditional adjunction analysis or in Bhatt’s (2002) raising and reprojection analysis.

The obvious difficulty is to characterize the proper relation between a higher verb and these complex noun phrases. The analysis of PP relativization (71a) means that the entire category is a PF, which cannot function as an argument in a higher clause. Indeed, such a PP cannot combine with the verb ‘to buy’ without a relative clause to mean ‘I bought the car’, whereas the PP relativization with pied-piping has exactly that interpretation.
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The same difficulty arises for the possessor relativization (71b). Again, the noun phrase without a relative clause in the example (73a) only allows the interpretation in which the entire noun phrase is a thematic object of the verb (‘I saw the woman’s book’). In contrast, the one with a relative clause in the example (73b) allows the interpretation in which only the possessor NP1 is a thematic object of the verb. This is unexpected under the head-external analysis as shown in the derivations (74), because in either example, the same noun phrase a as in the same position – the direct sister position of the verb,

(74) a. *ñ dá dá lá [PP á lóřè ná póš].
   1Sg Pst buy.Perf F D car Dem in
   ‘I bought the car.’

b. (41b)
   ñ dá lá á lóřè ná póš Dákóráá náng gàng.
   1Sg buy.Perf F D car Dem in Dákóráá C lie.Perf
   ‘I bought the car in which Dákóráá slept.’

The same difficulty arises for the possessor relativization (71b). Again, the noun phrase without a relative clause in the example (73a) only allows the interpretation in which the entire noun phrase is a thematic object of the verb (‘I saw the woman’s book’). In contrast, the one with a relative clause in the example (73b) allows the interpretation in which only the possessor NP1 is a thematic object of the verb. This is unexpected under the head-external analysis as shown in the derivations (74), because in either example, the same noun phrase a as in the same position – the direct sister position of the verb,

(73) a. ñ zâá dá nyé lá á póɡó ná gâné.
   1Sg yesterday Pst see.Perf F D woman Dem book
   ‘I saw the woman’s book yesterday.’ *I saw the woman with a book.’

b. (51b)
   ñ dá nyé lá á póɡó ná ò(ô) gâné ñ náng søré déyâng.
   1Sg Pst see.Perf F D woman Dem 3Sg book 1Sg C read.Perf last.year
   ‘I saw the woman whose book I read last year.’

No such problem arises if the relative clauses are internally-headed even though left-headed in Dágáárè on the surface. In fact, this kind of phenomena are also observed in other Gur languages that allow in-situ HIRCs. In what appear to be clearly in-situ HIRCs (as well as ex-situ HIRCs), possessor relativization and PP relativization are semantically felicitous, as illustrated in the examples (75) and (76) from Büli (see Hiraiwa, 2005 for extensive discussions about Büli).

(75) Bülı: Relativization and pied-piping of P

a. *ñ dá [Àtim àlì gwá ló:-dí:y pó lá].
   1Sg buy.Perf Atim C lie.Perf car-Rel in Dem
   ‘I bought the car in which Atim slept.’ (In-situ)

b. *ñ dá [ló:-dí:y àti Àtim gwá di pó lá].
   1Sg buy.Perf car-Rel C Atim lie.Perf 3Sg in Dem
   ‘I bought the car in which Atim slept.’ (Ex-situ)

See Hiraiwa (2008) for parametric differences between Dágáárè-type languages and Bülı-type languages among Gur languages, and for a theoretical proposal.
4. Typological implications

Having established that relative clauses in Dàgàárà are left-headed HIRCs, we would like to consider some typological implications (see Hiraiwa, in preparation for extensive discussions on cross-linguistic typology of HIRCs).

In the typology of *Wh*-questions, three types of language have been attested: *Wh*-in-situ languages, optional *Wh*-movement languages, and *Wh*-movement languages.

Similarly, there are theoretically three possible types of HIRCs permitted by a parametric theory. There are languages that only allow in-situ HIRCs. There are also languages that allow both in-situ and ex-situ HIRCs. However, the third-type, a language that only allows ex-situ HIRCs (i.e. left-headed HIRCs), has been unattested in the previous literature. As we have shown, Dàgàárà bridges this missing gap in the typology of HIRCs.

If we include HERCs, we obtain the following typology.
Let us touch on the two gaps in the chart (79). First, right-headed HIRCs should be in principle absent as long as specifiers are always located at the left-hand branch universally (Kayne, 1994; Chomsky, 1995). Thus the structure (80) is not possible under this assumption.

(80) Right-headed HIRC

However, it is still technically possible to have right-headed HIRCs under this assumption. Suppose that the relativized head noun moves leftward to [Spec, CP] as we have seen in Dagaare. Now suppose that the TP undergoes a remnant movement to a higher position. This derivation is illustrated below.

(81) Right-headed HIRC

In fact, this is the way to derive right-headed relative clauses in Kayne’s theory. As long as such TP movement is shown to be possible, we would expect right-headed HIRCs. The prediction is at least not borne out in Japanese. Japanese allows HIRCs as well as right-headed/prenominal relative clauses (Kuno, 1973; Kuroda, 1992). Now recall the Diegueño data in Section 1: Case-marking provides a direct clue about where a relativized head noun is located. Now in the HIRC example (82a), the relativized head noun ringo ‘apple’, being the subject in the relative clause, must take nominative Case-marking. In contrast, in the right-headed relative clause (82b), the same relativized head must take accusative Case-marking, which comes from the higher verb tabe ‘to eat’. This demonstrates that right-headed relative clauses in Japanese can never be internally-headed.

(82) Japanese

The other gap in the chart (79), internally-headed head-external relative clauses, is more straightforward. It is theoretically predicted to be impossible because a relative clause cannot be internally- and externally-headed at
the same time, and indeed, to the best of our knowledge, no one has argued for this type of relative clause so far.  

(83) *Internally-headed HERC

\[ \ldots H_{Case} \ldots \] \ldots V/T_{Case} \alpha

5. Conclusions and further issues

In conclusion, the availability of pied-piping in PP and possessor relativization shows that what looks like an externally-headed relative clause in Dágáráre is indeed internally-headed, with the relativized head noun moved to the left edge but still remaining clause-internal. We have argued that the head obligatorily moves to \([\text{Spec}, \text{ForceP}]\) just as a \(Wh\)-phrase does. Dágáráre is different from the languages that Basilico (1996) discusses in that the movement is obligatory and not a scrambling. This is corroborated by the absence of scrambling in the language and by the fact that the language is an obligatory \(Wh\)-fronting language as we have seen in Section 2.22

Watanabe (2004) refutes the face-value correlation between HIRCs and \(Wh\)-in-situ (cf. Watanabe, 1991) based on Quechua and instead links the availability of HIRCs in Quechua to the availability of focus-in-situ. However, it is still not unreasonable to think that \(Wh\)-movement and the movement of the head noun of HIRCs utilize the same mechanism, as Watanabe (2004, 2006) argues. If so it is not surprising that the head noun in Dágáráre always appears at the left periphery internal to CP, although we have to leave open a fine-grained parametric theory of HIRCs.

We have demonstrated that Dágáráre presents a new type of HIRC, called left-headed HIRC and this opens up a possible reconsideration of the facts of relative clauses in other languages in the light of this syntactic derivation. This is important in two respects. First, this type of ex-situ HIRCs has not been observed in the literature. Second, it suggests a totally new picture of the typology of HIRCs (cf. Gorbet, 1977; Cole, 1987; Culy, 1990) and a careful re-examination of the relative clauses that have been simply assumed to be HERCs. Furthermore, it provides another piece of evidence against Cole’s Generalization (Cole, 1987) that HIRC is restricted to languages with null pronouns and SOV word order (see also Culy, 1990; Hiraiwa, 2008, in preparation); Dágáráre neither allows null pronouns nor shows SOV word order. Needless to say, Cole’s generalization was based on in-situ HIRCs, but a theory incorporating both in-situ and ex-situ HIRCs must be pursued in the future.

\[+\] Models
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