Too big to fail: Selective Opacity Effects in Three Types of Georgian Relative Clauses.

Jacob Fernandes (jacob.fernandes@nyu.edu)

Proposal

- Relative Clauses(RCs) in Georgian provide examples of **Williams Cycle** effects, as in *wh*-questions (Bondarenko 2024)
- **The Size (Landing Site)** of a RC on the functional spine directly correlates to the ability or inability for extraction to clauses as a function of the size of the clause the head noun is extracted from.
- **Parallel Derivation** (Meadows 2024) derives the effects observed in RCs when compared with *wh*-extraction and long-distance-scrambling data.

Introduction

- Georgian has several strategies for forming RCs including *wh-phrase* headed RCs, *rom*-type RCs, and participial RCs (Foley 2013)

(1) *me ċaviḳitxe ċigni ..*
1.SG 1.SG.read.PST book
'I read the book'
a. *romeli-c rustavel-ma da-ċera.*
which-COMP Rustaveli-ERG wrote
'... which Rustaveli wrote.'
b. *rustavel-ma rom da-ċera.*
Rustaveli-ERG COMP PVB-write.NMLZ
'... that Rustaveli wrote.'

(2) *me ċaviḳitxe rustavel-is*
1.SG 1.SG.read.PST Rustaveli-GEN
da-ċer-il-i ċigni
PVB-write-PTCP-NOM book.NOM
'I read the book that Rustaveli wrote.'

Sizes and Landing sites

- Georgian RCs are an example of a **Williams Cycle effect**: a claim that the bigger the clause movement exits, the higher the landing site it must target.(Williams 2003)
- Growing body of literature displays similar facts across languages and language families (Keine 2016, Müller 2013, Meadows 2024)
- One account of Williams cycle effects that Georgian data specifically provide support for is termed Generalized Ban on Improper Movement (GBOIM) (Meadows 2023, Williams 2003; 2011)

(3) **Def. GBOIM** (Meadows 2024)
Movement to [Spec, XP] cannot proceed from [Spec, YP] or across YP, where Y is higher than X in the functional sequence.

Key Data

- C-Relativization and *rom*-relativizaiton are possible out of all complements[a].

(4) *me da-v-inaxe mankana. . . }*
1.SG PVB-1.SG-saw car
'I saw the car. . .'
a. *{✓romeli-c} mariam-ma {✓rom} ipikra rom šota-m iqida.*
{which-COMP} Mariam-ERG {COMP} thought COMP Shota-ERG bought.
'. . . which Mariam thought that Shota bought.'
b. *{✓romeli-c} mariam-s {✓rom} unda rom mezobel-ma iqidos*
{which-COMP} Mariam-DAT {COMP} wants COMP neighbor-ERG buy.OPT.3SG
'. . . which Mariam wants the neighbor to buy.'
c. *{✓romlis šeǧebva-c mariam-ma daiċqo} / {✓mariam-ma rom daiċqo šeǧebva}*
{which paint.NMLZ-COMP} Mariam-ERG started Mariam-ERG {COMP started paint.NMLZ}
'. . . of which Mariam started painting.'

- However, Participle relatives may only be formed by most speakers out of masdar; participles cannot combine with CP or TP (*rom*-headed) complements.

(5) a. *✗me vicnob mariam-is <ga-gonil> rom masċavlebel-i akebda <gagonil>*
1SG know Mariam-GEN <PVB-hear.PTCP> COMP teacher-NOM praise.3SG.IMPF <PVB-hear.PTCP>
mosċavle-s
student.DAT
Intended: 'I know the teacher mariam heard praising the student'
b. *✓me vicnob mariam-is keba <gagonil> mosċavle-s*
1SG know Mariam-GEN praise.NMLZ PVB-hear.PTCP student.DAT
'I know the teacher mariam heard to praise the student'

[a]Some speakers find wh-relatives without pied-piping impossible out of masdars

The Sizes of Things

- In Georgian, verbs are restricted in their possible complements, suggesting they come in different sizes.

(6) *Mariam-ma scada {✗rom ċigni daċera / ✓rom ċigni daeċera / ✓ċign-is daċera}*
Mariam-ERG tried COMP book write.AOR COMP book write.PLUP book-GEN write.NMLZ
'Mariam tried {✗that she wrote a book / ✓that she might write a book / ✓writing a book }

RC type	High Adverbs	Tense	Matrix Case	Aspect	Negation	Projection
wh-rel	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	∼CP
rom-rel	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	∼CP
participles	?	?	✗	✓	✓	∼ AspP
Complement of	High Adverbs	Matrix Case	Tense	Aspect	Negation	Projection
daiċqvebs 'start'	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓?	NegP/*v*P
unda 'want'	✗	✗	✗	*perfective only*	✓	∼ TP
xedavs 'see' (indirect)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	∼CP
pikrobs 'think'	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	∼ CP

Other Asymmetries

- Wh-elements may not be extracted from most complements (Bondarenko 2024), but may from *unda* type complements; Bondarenko suggests this to be an example of Williams Cycle effect.

(7) a. **ra-s$_1$ pikrob-s mariam-i [rom šota **t**$_1$ ċam-s]?*
what-DAT think-3.SG.PRES Mariam-NOM COMP Shota eat-3.SG.PRES
Intended: 'What does Mariam think that Shota's eating?' (Bondarenko 2024)
b. *šota-s **ra**$_1$ unda [rom keti-m **t**$_1$ moigos]*
Shota-DAT what.NOM wants COMP Keti-ERG win.OPT.3SG
'What does Shota want Keti to win?' (Bondarenko 2024)

Account

- I adopt Meadows' (2023) proposal of Parallel Derivation and Williams' (2003) Level Embedding Approach to account for Georgian data.

(8) **Level-Embedding Approach**: The bigger an embedded clause is, the later in the derivation it is introduced into a matrix clause. Syntactic operations must target the periphery of the current clausal extended projection.

(9) **Parallel Derivation**: Merge of components of clausal sequences applies in parallel across workspaces.

(10) a. **V-cycle**
$[V \ldots]_m$ (matrix), $[V \ldots]_e$ (embedded)
b. ***v*P-Cycle**: Masdar complement complete, must be merged
✓$[vP\ [v]\ [\ldots\ [VP\ [vP\ [\ldots]]_e\ [daic'qo]]]]_m$
c. ***v*P-Cycle**: TP-Complement incomplete, can't merge
✗$[vP\ [v]\ [\ldots\ [VP\ [vP\ [\ldots]]_e\ [unda]]]]_m$
d. **T-Cycle**: TP complement complete, can and must be merged
✓ $[TP\ [T]\ [\ldots\ [VP\ [TP\ [\ldots\ [VP\ [\ldots]]_e\ [unda]]]]]]_m$

- Only complements of sizes that merge before or at some cycle C_n can be targets for relativization at its time of derivation C_m, s.t $m \geq n$ in fseq.

(11) **AspP-Cycle**: AspP or smaller complements can be targets for participles
$[AspP\ [Asp]\ [\ldots]]_m$, $[AspP\ [AspP]\ [\ldots]]_e] \rightarrow$
✓$[AspP\ [Asp]\ [\ldots\ [AspP\ [Asp]\ [\ldots]]_e]]_m \rightarrow$
✓$[DP\ [NP\ [AspP\ [Asp]\ [\ldots[AspP\ \ldots]_e\ ]]_m$
$[N]][D]]$

(12) **TP-Cycle**: TP+ complements cannot be participle targets; movement must target current projection.
$[TP\ [T]\ [\ldots[AspP\ \ldots]]]_m$, $[TP\ [T]\ \ldots]_e \rightarrow$
✓$[TP\ [TP\ [T]\ \ldots]_e\ \ldots]]]_m$
✗$[TP\ [T]\ [\ldots[AspP\ [TP\ [T]\ \ldots]_e\ \ldots]]]_m$

References

Bondarenko, T. 2024. Getting by without movement: building & interpreting indirect wh-dependencies

Borise, L. 2023. The syntax of wh phrases, narrow foci, and neg-words in georgian

Foley, S. 2013. The syntax of georgian relative clauses. NYU

Keine, S. 2016. *Probes and their horizons*. UMass Amherst Dissertation.

Meadows, Tom. 2024. Size matters. Queen Mary University of London Dissertation.

Müller, G.. 2013. A local reformulation of the Williams Cycle. Universität Leipzig.

Williams, E. 2003. *Representation theory*.

Williams, E. 2011. Regimes of derivation in syntax and morphology