

INTERNATIONAL ENCYCLOPEDIA
OF
LINGUISTICS

WILLIAM BRIGHT

Editor in Chief

Volume 3

New York Oxford
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

1992

different languages to the same construction type; they have explained language-particular morphology in terms of the associated syntactic constructions; and they have used the typology of clause types restricted by laws of grammar to explain the properties of individual constructions. The RG/APG literature (Dubinsky & Rosen 1987) shows that clause structures in a wide range of languages are amenable to analysis in terms of a small set of theoretical constructs.

DAVID M. PERLMUTTER

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AISSEN, JUDITH L. 1987. *Tzotzil clause structure*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- AISSEN, JUDITH. 1990. A theory of agreement controllers. In Postal & Joseph 1990, to appear.
- DAVIES, WILLIAM D., & CAROL G. ROSEN. 1988. Unions as multi-predicate clauses. *Language* 64.52–88.
- DUBINSKY, STANLEY, & CAROL G. ROSEN. 1987. *A bibliography on Relational Grammar through May 1987*. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- GIBSON, JEANNE, & EDUARDO RAPOSO. 1986. Clause union, the Stratal Uniqueness Law and the chômeur relation. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 4.295–331.
- JOHNSON, DAVID E., & PAUL M. POSTAL. 1980. *Arc Pair Grammar*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- PERLMUTTER, DAVID M., ed. 1983a. *Studies in Relational Grammar*, vol. 1. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- PERLMUTTER, DAVID M. 1983b. Personal vs. impersonal constructions. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 1.141–200.
- PERLMUTTER, DAVID M. 1989. Multiattachment and the Unaccusative Hypothesis: The perfect auxiliary in Italian. *Probus: Journal of Latin and Romance Linguistics* 1.63–119.
- PERLMUTTER, DAVID M., & PAUL M. POSTAL. 1983. Some proposed laws of basic clause structure. In Perlmutter 1983a, pp. 81–128.
- PERLMUTTER, DAVID M., & PAUL M. POSTAL. 1984a. The 1-Advancement Exclusiveness Law. In Perlmutter & Rosen 1984, pp. 81–125.
- PERLMUTTER, DAVID M., & PAUL M. POSTAL. 1984b. Impersonal passives and some relational laws. In Perlmutter & Rosen 1984, pp. 126–170.
- PERLMUTTER, DAVID M., & CAROL G. ROSEN, eds. 1984. *Studies in Relational Grammar*, vol. 2. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- POSTAL, PAUL M. 1986. *Studies of passive clauses*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- POSTAL, PAUL M., & BRIAN D. JOSEPH, eds. 1990. *Studies in Relational Grammar*, vol. 3. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- ROSEN, CAROL G. 1981. *The relational structure of reflexive clauses: Evidence from Italian*. Harvard University dissertation. Published, New York: Garland, 1988.
- ROSEN, CAROL G. 1984. The interface between semantic roles and initial grammatical relations. In Perlmutter & Rosen 1984, pp. 38–77.

RELATIVE CHRONOLOGY. Linguistic change occurs in time, and events of change are dated in specific periods of time. If two changes A and B occur in language L, and we say that the first happened in century Y and the second in century Z, we are making a statement about the absolute chronology of these changes. We may simply say, however, that A occurred before B. If so, we are making a statement about the relative chronology of A and B, but not about their absolute chronology. Obviously, a complete account of the absolute chronology of two or more changes also fully defines their relative chronology. (For general reference, see Bremer 1894, Hoenigswald 1960, and Bynon 1977.) [See also Historical Linguistics, *article on* Obsolescence, Neologism, and Replacement.]

Although our knowledge of absolute chronology mostly depends on the availability of suitable documentary evidence, relative chronology can sometimes be established through structural considerations. Thus, in the early history of Latin, we identify two changes:

- (1) $s > r / V \text{ ____ } V$ (Intervocalic [s] was replaced by [r].)
- (2) $ss > s / \bar{V} \text{ ____ } V$ (Prevoicalic [ss] was replaced by [s] after a long vowel or diphthong.)

The presence in classical Latin of forms like *honōris* < **honōses* ‘of the honor’ and *causa* < *caussa* ‘cause’ makes it likely that change 1 occurred before change 2. If [ss] > [s] had occurred before [s] > [r], we would have had forms like **caura*, which are not attested.

A third Latin change,

- (3) $dt > ss / V \text{ ____ } V$

led to the replacement of intervocalic [dt] by [ss], as in *fossus* < **fod-tos* ‘dug’. Forms like *clausus* ‘closed’ < **klaud-tos* (which can be reconstructed with confidence, cf. *claud-ō* ‘I close’) suggest that 3 operated before 2. If 3 had operated after 2, classical Latin would have *claussus*—which is in fact attested, but only as a sporadic archaism. Thus both 1 and 3 must be ordered

before 2. Did 3 precede or follow 1? Evidence comes from data which substantiate an absolute chronology: our earliest Latin texts have instances of intervocalic [s] which will be later changed into [r], but no memory is preserved of forms like **klaudtos*. Thus [dt] > [ss] at a prehistoric stage, while [s] > [r] in the historic period. In other words, 3 precedes 1, and we can adopt a chronological ordering 3 → 1 → 2 (provided, of course, that we operate in terms of the notation and rules adopted).

Questions of relative chronology arise whenever the history of a language provides evidence for two or more stages, and we want to reconstruct the intermediate stages. Obviously, these questions concern all levels of analysis: phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics. However, the most fruitful and discussed area is that of phonology and morphophonemics. Some further examples may illustrate both achievements and problems.

In Attic Greek we identify the following changes:

- (4) $\bar{a} > [e:]$ in most environments ([ní:ka:] > [ní:kæ:] 'victory').
 (5) $ae > a$: ([ni:káete] > [ni:kâ:te] 'you win').
 (6) $Vns > V:n / (C) \text{ ______ } V$ (**ékriṅse* > [ékri:ne] 'he judged', **ámunsai* > [á:mu:nai] 'to protect').

We must now account for forms like [éphe:na] < **éphansa* 'he showed', instead of the expected *[épha:na] predicted by 6. It would be possible to redefine 6 and to set up an additional rule:

- (7) $ans > [ɛ:n] / (C) \text{ ______ } V$

But a simpler solution is available. Rule 5 must be later than 4; otherwise, we would have had a change [ni:káete] > [ni:kâ:te] > **[ni:kê:te]. If 6 is earlier than 4, we can reconstruct a development **éphansa* > [épha:na] > [éphe:na]. This account commends itself because of its elegance and simplicity. It also allows us to set up for Attic the same number of rules as we do for other dialects (but see below).

It follows from what has been said that the techniques used to establish the relative chronology of our rules are closely connected with those which we employ to identify the rules themselves (Hoenigswald 1973:6–7). This is a more important point than is normally supposed. In discussing the Latin examples mentioned above, we could have set up two different rules, such as these:

- (3') $dt > ss / V \text{ ______ } V$
 (3'') $dt > s / \bar{V} \text{ ______ } V$ (**klaud-tos* > [klausus]).

Yet, given the independent evidence for rule 2, it seemed simpler to adopt the solution proposed. Our decision is historically correct, because *claussus* exists. In other instances, there is a conflict between simplicity and historical accuracy. The two examples that follow, from Germanic and from Greek, show at different levels of complexity that the 'simplest' and intuitively most obvious account of both changes and chronology need not always be correct. Before we consider them, however, it is important to stress that our diachronic rules should not be confused with the synchronic rules established for GENERATIVE PHONOLOGY [q.v.], though sometimes they appear to overlap with them. In our rules, the assumption is that all forms were actually pronounced at some time—i.e., are forms of the surface structure. The symbol '>' indicates replacement in time, and the forms to the right of it are chronologically later than those to the left. Any ordering we suggest for these rules is established on different principles from those used for the ordering of synchronic rules.

In the development from O[ld] H[igh] G[erman] to Modern German, we encounter two changes: the devoicing of final stops, and the loss of final vowels (Hock 1986:242 ff.). OHG nom.sg. [tag] 'day' and dat.sg. [tage] are replaced by modern nom.sg. [tāk] and dat.sg. [tāk]. The obvious account is that first, final vowels were lost (hence dat.sg. [tage] > [tag]); and second, final stops were devoiced (hence nom.sg. and dat.sg. [tag] > [tāk]). Yet there is enough intermediate evidence to show that the devoicing of final stops came first, and only afterward did [tage] > [tagə] > [tag]. If so, the dat.sg. [tāk] must result from later leveling. The historical ordering differs from that which we were tempted to reconstruct.

Again, we posit two changes for prehistoric or early Greek:

- (8) $s > \emptyset / V \text{ ______ } V$ (**génesos* > [géneos] 'of the family').
 (9) $Vnty > \bar{V}s / (C) \text{ ______ } V$ (**mōnt-ya* > [mō:sa] 'Muse').

Rule 9 must be later than 8, because otherwise we would have *[mō:a]. Most forms with intervocalic [s] in classical Attic result from the output of 9 (hence [mō:sa]), or from analogical restoration as in [ni:kê:sa:s] 'having

won' (instead of the expected [ni:kê:a:s]), which is rebuilt on the model of e.g. [gráp-sa:s] 'having written'. However, in late Laconian, a Greek dialect, we find aorist participles of the type [ni:ká:a:s] and forms like [mô:a] 'muse'. The obvious suggestion is that, in Laconian, 9 occurred before 8, leading to [mô:a], while the expected [ni:ká:a:s] was preserved. However, evidence from early Laconian (where forms with intervocalic [s] are attested) proves conclusively that, in Laconian too, 8 and 9 operated in this order, and that Laconian too had a remodeled [ni:ká:sa:s]. For Laconian we establish a later rule 10; in absolute chronology, this was probably several centuries later than 8, which deleted intervocalic [s] of inherited origin. The historical sequence was as follows:

- (8) $s > \emptyset / V \text{ ____ } V$
 (9) $Vnty > [V:s] / (C) \text{ ____ } V$
 (10) $s > \emptyset / V \text{ ____ } V$

Note that 9 is now in a FEEDING relationship with 10; i.e., it provides input for it (Kiparsky 1982:37 ff.). Note also that if we were setting up synchronic rules instead of describing historical events, then the grammar of late Laconian would probably require only 9 and 10 in this order.

We have seen that, when absolute chronology does not provide a check, it is sometimes possible to give more than one account of the rules of change and their ordering. A choice is then made on a variety of grounds, such as appeal to structural plausibility or teleological explanations. Apropos of the Latin example above, it could be argued that rule 2, $ss > s / \bar{V} \text{ ____ } V$, had to occur after rule 1, $s > r / V \text{ ____ } V$; the change was prompted by the need to fill the empty slot left by $s > r / V \text{ ____ } V$. Moreover, only this ordering could prevent the merger of [ss] and [s], and allow forms like La. *quaerō* < [kwaiso:] 'I look for' vs. *quaesō* < [kwaisso:] 'I ask you, please' to be kept apart. These points should be noticed, but it is doubtful that they can provide conclusive evidence (Lass 1980); if taken to their extreme conclusion, such arguments would exclude the possibility of merger. Furthermore, one would hesitate to decide chronological issues on the basis of any general theory about the preferred order of synchronic rules and its putative connection with a diachronic ordering.

Implicitly or explicitly, we often depend on premises based on phonological 'naturalness', or on typological validity; but these require a fuller statement than they are normally given. With regard to rules 1–2, what we

know for certain (if we disregard the data bearing on absolute chronology) is simply that the relevant consonantal stretches in the Latin words for 'of the honor' and for 'cause' remained distinct. The ordering $1 \rightarrow 2$ (**honōses* > *honōris* before *caussa* > *causa*) posits a transitory stage at which no intervocalic [s] existed (except perhaps in loanwords which may not have been fully integrated). We implicitly reject the alternative possibility that *caussa* > *caus₂a*, when **honōs₁es* had not yet changed into *honōris*; i.e., we avoid postulating a stage at which there were two contrasting sibilants. We may ask whether we are entitled to take this decision on general grounds, or whether we need more specific evidence.

Other approaches exploit, from a genealogical or typological point of view, the evidence of other dialects or cognate languages. Genealogical arguments are used for both absolute and relative dating. It is often assumed that we must distinguish a Common Greek period from the period which saw a division of Greek into dialects. Pandialectal changes are treated as early, and dialect-specific changes as late—with the result, e.g., that rule 9 above, which is common to all Greek dialects, is deemed to be much earlier than rule 6, which is Attic (**ékri_nse* > Attic [ékri:ne], but Aeolic [ékri_nne]). However, it would be possible to restate 6 as 6a-c, in which 6a at least could be early:

- (6a) $Vns > [Vnh] / (C) \text{ ____ } V$ (Pan-Greek)
 (6b) $Vnh > [V:]$ (Attic)
 (6c) $Vnh > [Vnn]$ (Aeolic)

Furthermore, the example of rule 8, which is matched in Laconian by an 'identical' but much later rule 10, may warn us of possible pitfalls in the interpretation of our evidence. The warning is strengthened by the presence of descriptively identical but demonstrably independent changes in closely related languages or dialects. Similar objections can also be raised against the suggestion that, if we have clear evidence for a certain chronology in dialect A, it is likely that events occurred in the same order in dialect B. Nor do we need to assume that one rule of change in dialect A must be matched by a single rule in dialect B. As we have seen above, the form of quasi-typological support produced by cognate languages or dialects is pleasing; yet it should not count as proof.

To summarize: most studies of relative chronology have concentrated on establishing rules of change (often on the basis of morphophonemic data), and on ordering

them in time. If an absolute chronology, however partial, is available, this provides a countercheck for both methods and results. However, there is no such thing as an error-proof algorithm to establish relative chronology. In a historical discipline, this is neither surprising nor disappointing.

ANNA MORPURGO DAVIES

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BREMER, OTTO. 1894. Relative Sprachchronologie. *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 4.8–31.
- BYNON, THEODORA. 1977. *Historical linguistics*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
- HOCK, HANS HENRICH. 1986. *Principles of historical linguistics*. (Trends in linguistics: Studies and monographs, 34). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- HOENIGSWALD, HENRY M. 1960. *Language change and linguistic reconstruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- HOENIGSWALD, HENRY M. 1973. *Studies in formal historical linguistics*. (Formal linguistics series, 3.) Dordrecht: Reidel.
- KIPARSKY, PAUL. 1982. *Explanation in phonology*. (Publications in language sciences, 4.) Dordrecht: Foris.
- LASS, ROGER. 1980. *On explaining language change*. (Cambridge studies in linguistics, 27.) Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

RELATIVIZATION. A RELATIVE construction is a construction consisting of a (possibly empty) nominal and a subordinate clause which semantically modifies the nominal. The nominal is the HEAD, and the subordinate element is the R[ELATIVE] C[LAUSE]: The modifying relation between them is such that the head is involved in the situation expressed by the clause. (For reference, see Matisoff 1972, Peranteau et al. 1972, Ferreiro et al. 1976, Hale 1976, Sankoff & Brown 1976, Keenan & Comrie 1977, Downing 1978, Bache & Jakobsen 1980, Touratier 1980, Keenan 1985, and Lehmann 1984, 1986.)

The following examples will be analyzed throughout this article (RCs are within brackets):

- (1) *The book [(which) you are consulting] is up-to-date.*
- (2) *[Whichever book you choose] will be fine for me.*
- (3a) Walbiri (Australia):
 [njuntulu-*lu* kutja-*θ*-*npa* wawiri
 YOU-ERG SUBORD-AUX-SUBJ.2 kangaroo
 pantu-*nu*.] *ŋula kapi-na pura-mi ŋatjulu-*lu*.*
 spear-PAST DEM FUT-SUBJ.1 cook-PRES I-ERG
 'The kangaroo that you speared, I will cook.'

- (3b) *ŋatjulu-*lu* kapi-na wawiri pura-mi,*
 I-ERG FUT-SUBJ.1 kangaroo cook-PRES
 [kutja-*θ*-*npa* pantu-*nu* njuntulu-*lu*.]
 SUBORD-AUX-SUBJ.2 spear-PAST YOU-ERG

'I will cook the kangaroo you speared.'

- (4) Latin:
 [Quae mihi antea signa
 REL.ACC.PL.NEUT I.DAT before statue.ACC.PL.NEUT
 misisti] ea nondum
 send.PERF.ACT.INDIC.2.SG DEM.ACC.PL.NEUT not.yet
 vidi.
 see.PERF.ACT.INDIC.1.SG

'The statues you sent me recently I have not seen yet.'

- (5) Turkish:
 [Bavul-u ver-dig-im] hamal nerede?
 suitcase-ACC give-NOMZ-POSS.1 porter where
 'Where is the porter to whom I gave the suitcase?'
- (6) Navajo:
 [(shí) léécháá'í b-á hashtaab-ígi] nahat' in.
 I dog 3-for IMPF.1.sing-NOMZ IMPF.3.bark
 'The dog for which I am singing is barking.'

- (7) Persian:
Mard-i [ke u va zan-aš diruz
 man-IND SUBORD he and wife-POSS.3.SG yesterday
 āmad-and] mi-rav-ad.
 came-3.PL IMPF-leave-3.SG

(lit.) 'The man that he and his wife came yesterday is leaving.'

1. Types and functions of relative constructions. In ex. 1, the phrase *book (which) you are consulting* is a relative construction; *book* is its head, and *(which) you are consulting* is the RC.

A RC is RESTRICTIVE if it narrows the head concept: in ex. 1, the RC restricts the concept of *book* to one exemplar. However, in *you, who never buy books*, the RC does not further restrict the concept of *you*: it is called APPOSITIVE or non-restrictive because of its similarity to appositional constructions. If a language has RCs, it has restrictive RCs, but not necessarily appositive RCs.

The function of restrictive RCs varies between the poles of ENTITY IDENTIFICATION and CONCEPT FORMATION. The RC in ex. 1 identifies an entity; the RC in 2