



HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY

Title	An equivalent of the standard of comparison relativization in Ainu
Author(s)	Bugaeva, Anna
Citation	北方人文研究, 8, 43-62
Issue Date	2015-03-31
Doc URL	https://hdl.handle.net/2115/58445
Type	departmental bulletin paper
File Information	08_03_bugaeva.pdf



An equivalent of the standard of comparison relativization in Ainu*

Anna BUGAEVA

National Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics

1. Introduction

Ainu allows to relativize on all the positions on Keenan and Comrie's (1977) accessibility hierarchy except for the alienable possessor and standard of comparison¹ proper. Ainu is generally famous for its ability of stranding postpositions (7b), (8), which is particularly conspicuous in relativization on adjuncts (23). I will focus on a newly discovered degree adjunct relativization strategy and propose to treat it as an Ainu equivalent of the standard of comparison relativization, which is used as a conventionalized superlative expression: $a_1=ona_2$ [*pak-no₃ nisp_a₄ isam₅*] *nisp_a₆ ne₇*. 'My father was a rich man with no equals'. lit. 'My₁ father₁ is₇ (a) **rich₆** **man₆** [till₃ (whom) (there) is₅ no₅ (such) (a) **rich₄** **man₄**].' I will show what structural properties of Ainu facilitate the use of this typologically unusual 'postposition stranding without resumptive pronoun strategy' and account for it in a broader context of other relativization types.

2. Basic properties of Ainu

Ainu is agglutinating, polysynthetic, incorporating and head-marking. The basic constituent order is SV/AOV. Arguments in Ainu (either nouns or pronouns) are not marked for case. Grammatical relations are distinguished by (i) obligatory verbal cross-referencing, and partially (ii) the relative position of A and O in the clause. Adjuncts are marked by postpositions. All modifiers are prepositive. There is no separate word class of adjectives, they are a sub-class of intransitive verbs. In verbal cross-referencing, Ainu has mixed alignment: nominative-accusative, neutral and tripartite, depending on the person/number. Pronominal arguments are usually omitted. There is a tendency for zero-anaphora, both in verbal and nominal (possessive) phrases.

Intransitive predicates are indexed for S (2), while transitive predicates for A and O (3), so there is a major difference between vi and vt. The third person is zero marked.

* Parts of this paper were presented at the 146th meeting of *Linguistic Society of Japan* (Ibaraki University, June 15, 2013) and 1st meeting of the project "Typological and Historical/Comparative research on the Languages of the Japanese Archipelago and its Environs" headed by John Whitman (NINJAL, July 6, 2013). I am grateful for comments to participants of these meetings, anonymous referees and editors. None of them are responsible for any errors.

¹ Referred to as 'object of comparison' in Keenan and Comrie's (1977).

- (1) [cóká]_S aynu or un inkar=**as**
 1PL.EXC human place ALL look=1PL.EXC.S
 ‘We (I and he/she/they) looked to the place of humans.’ (OI)
- (2) a. [cóká]_A [aynu kotan]_O **ci**=nukar rusuy
 1PL.EXC human village 1PL.EXC.A=see DESID
 ‘We (I and he/she/they) wanted to see an Ainu village.’ (OI)
- b. [unarpe]_A [(cóká)]_O **un**=nukar
 aunt 1PL.EXC 1PL.EXC.O=see
 ‘(His/her) aunt saw us (me and him/her).’ (constructed example)

A special clause type is represented by the copula verb **ne** ‘be, become’ which is a kind of transitive verb. However, the copula is cross-referenced only for the transitive subject with prefixes of the A series (3a), but not with prefixes of the O series (3b), which fully supports Dixon’s (2010: 100) claim that copula clauses should be regarded as a distinct clause type different from both intransitive and transitive clauses.

- (3) a. *tu-n* **ci**=*ne* *wa* *arki*=*as*.
 two-CLF(people) 1PL.EXC.A=COP and come.PL=1PL.EXC.S
- b. *cóká* *ne*.
 1PL.EXC COP
 ‘There are two of us and we came.’ lit. ‘we are two...’ (T 70) ‘It is us.’ (T1 23)

As mentioned, the use of case postpositions is restricted to adjuncts: locative *ta*, allative *un* (directed Motion), dative *eun* (Recipient), ablative *wa*, instrumental *ani*, comitative *tura*-(*no*), degree/allative *pak*-(*no*) ‘as far as, till/until’, traversal *peka* (‘over’), and mutative *ne* (‘as’).

Locative, allative, and ablative postpositions cannot generally attach to common nouns directly: a special relational noun² – neutral *or*-(*o*) ‘place (of)’ (4) or specific *sam*-(*a*) ‘near (to)’ (5) etc. – is added between noun and postposition.³ Only a few common nouns (e.g. *kotan* ‘village’, *kim* ‘mountains’, *pis* ‘seashore’ (6), *rep* ‘open sea’, *ya* ‘shore’ etc.) and geographical

² A class of words non-existent in European languages and translatable into English by adverbs.

³ The choice of the respective citation/possessive forms of relational nouns (e.g. *or* ‘place’ or *or-o* ‘the place of’) is to some extent determined by the animacy properties of their preceding nouns: animates require the possessive forms and inanimates most commonly co-occur with the citation forms (less commonly with the possessive forms).

names do not require a relational noun.⁴

- (4) *somo cise or un hosip-pa=an pe ne na.*
 NEG house place ALL return-PL=IND.S NMZ COP FIN
 ‘(If you hear unfamiliar voices,) do not come home.’ (K7908051UP.023)

- (5) *hopuni=an h_ine⁵ ape sam ta ek=an h_ine*
 stand.up.SG=IND.S and fire near LOC come.SG=IND.S and
mono a=an.
 silently sit.SG=IND.S
 ‘I stood up, came up to the fire and sat down.’ (K8106233UP.053)

- (6) *pis ta san ruwe ne h_ine,*
 seashore ALL go.down.SG INF.EV COP and
 ‘He went down to the seashore and...’ (K7708241UP.100)

Case postpositions are not homogeneous. For instance, Tamura (2000 (1988): 96) distinguishes between postpositional particles (e.g. locative *ta*, allative/locative *un*, and ablative *wa*) and postpositional adverbs (e.g. instrumental *ani* (8), dative *eun*, comitative *tura-(no)*, and degree/allative *pak-(no)*⁶) because the latter can be used independently, i.e. without nouns, cf. (7a) and (7b). I suggest that this is possible because postpositional adverbs clearly originate in verbs and are still in an early stage of grammaticalization.

- (7) a. *tapan pe pak-no ku=ytak*
 this thing till-ADV 1SG.S=tell
 ‘I will tell it till this.’ lit. ‘I will tell till/up to this thing.’ (TS5 3)

- b. *pak-no ku=ye hawe ne wa.*
 till-ADV 1SG.A=speak REP.EV COP FIN
 ‘I spoke till (here).’ (TS2 59)

⁴ In Tamura (1984: 39-40), the former are described as inherently ‘thing’ nouns and the latter as inherently ‘place’ nouns.

⁵ The symbol “_” indicates the occurrence of morphophonological alternations (sandhi), for the details of alternations see Bugaeva (2012: 468).

⁶ It is unclear whether there is any semantic or structural difference between the comitative postpositions *tura* vs. *tura-no* and degree/allative *pak* vs. *pak-no*.

In (8), *aeyayramekotep* ‘utensils’ before *ani* ‘with’ (< *ani* ‘hold sth’) is anaphorically omitted as if *ani* were still a verb and *aeyayramekotep* ‘utensils’ its direct object (lit. ‘holding (utensils)’). However, if *ani* were really a verb here, we would expect its plural form *anpa* instead and a coordinating conjunction, but none are present, meaning that synchronically it has intermediate status between verb and postposition.

- (8) *nep ka aeyayramekotep oka yak-ne ani a=supa*
 something even utensil exist.PL if-COP INST IND⁷.A=cook.PL
 ‘If we had the utensils we would boil our catch with (them).’ (K7803231UP.012)

Postpositional adverbs exhibit varying degrees of grammaticalization from verbs, yet none of them can be regarded as a verb synchronically (the listing is from more to less grammaticalized ones).

Table 1. *Postpositional adverbs: varying degrees of grammaticalization from verbs*

	Possibility of plural marking	Possibility of object marking	Possibility of cliticizing the coordinating conj. <i>no</i> ‘and’	Existence of corresponding verb
Dative <i>eun</i>	—	—	—	+
Instrumental <i>ani</i>	—	—	—	+
Degree/allative <i>pak-(no)</i>	—	+	+	—
Comitative <i>tura-(no)</i>	—	+	+	+

3. Relativization in Ainu: overview

With the exception of alienable possessor and object of comparison proper, all the positions on Keenan and Comrie’s (1977) accessibility hierarchy can be relativized on. The formation of all relative clauses in Ainu involves the NP gap strategy or, to be precise, the zero anaphora strategy, as it is labeled in Givón (2012: 21), which seems to be rather common for Asian languages including Japanese (Comrie 1996, 1998), (Matsumoto 1997). However, what we have in Ainu only superficially resembles Japanese. Unlike Japanese, Ainu involves the gapping of the relativized NP only while all its “accompanying” material from the main clause (if present there) is left intact in the relative clause, which helps to track the relation between the head noun

⁷ The indefinite form (‘IND’) has four functions: (i) the indefinite person proper (=the impersonal), (ii) the first person plural inclusive, (iii) the second person singular/plural honorific, and (iv) logophoric (person of the protagonist). The logophoric use is common in folktales because they have the structure of reported discourse. For convenience, the indefinite form with the logophoric function is translated as ‘I’, although it is glossed as ‘IND’.

and the clause. The clause constituent of the relative clause construction closely resembles the corresponding main clause with zero anaphora which is possible in both verb and noun (possessive) phrases.

Relative clauses may involve as their heads not only common nouns, but also a few so-called bound nouns with generic semantics, which are peculiar in that they cannot occur on their own and must be modified with a determiner, noun or relative clause. In fact, the following bound nouns are even more common as RC heads than common nouns: *kur* ‘person’, *utar* ‘people’ (9), *us(i)(ke)(he)* ‘(the) place/time (of)’ (12), *pe/p* ‘thing/person (pejorative)’ (10), *hike* ‘the one/side’ (similar to Japanese *hō*), and *hi/i* ‘place/time/thing’.

3.1. Relativization of arguments

O- and S-relativization are much more common than A-relativization in Ainu.

3.1.1. Subject of intransitive verb (S)

- (9) *[cise soy pak-no arki] utar anak-ne*
 house outside till-ADV come.PL men TOP-COP
a=ahun-ke yak pirka wa
 IND.A=enter-CAUS if be.good FIN
 ‘As to the **men** who came up to the doorway, I may let them in.’ (AB 95)

3.1.2. Subject of two-place transitive verb (A)

- (10) *rapok-ke [kem sawot] pe [tumi sawot] pe payeoka.*
 between-POSS famine flee thing/person war flee thing/person pass.by.PL
 ‘During that time, **people** (who) were fleeing from famine, and **people** (who) were fleeing from war passed by.’ (K8109193.UP.128)

3.1.3. Subject of three-place transitive verb (A)

No examples have been attested so far.

3.1.4. Object of two-place transitive (O)

There are not only inherent two-place transitives (11) but also many derived verbs, i.e. causatives and applicatives. Applicatives (12) offer an alternative way of introducing peripheral arguments as a direct object.

- (11) *[na u-oyak ta oka a=hok] okay-po utar*
 yet REC-another.place LOC exist.PL IND.A=buy/hire man-DIM PL

ka *pó-kor* *pa* *wa*, (K8010291UP.492)
 even/also child-have PL and

‘The **youngsters** we had hired at each place were also blessed with children.’

- (12) *katkemat* [*a=e-hotke*] *usi* *kar* *wa* *i=kor-e*
 housewife IND.A=at.APPL-lie.down place make and IND.O=have-CAUS
 ‘The housewife prepared a **place** to lie at (=sleeping place) for me.’ (AB 400)

3.1.5. Object of three-place transitive (O)

With only one exception (viz. *o* ‘put sth (PL) on sth’), all three-place verbs in Ainu are derived verbs, i.e. causatives or applicatives. Both base and derived objects can be relativized, and there are no restrictions on the role of a relativized object (Recipient in (13a) or Theme in (13b)).

- (13) a. [*kampi* *a=e-pakasnu*] *hekattar*
 paper/letter IND.A=about.APPL-teach.to children
 ‘**Children** who are taught to read and write.’ (KS #1237)
- b. [*kunneywa* *an* *kor*, *ne*, *a=i=y-e-pakasnu*]
 morning exist.SG when that IND.A=IND.O=EP-about.APPL-teach.to
usi-ke *un* *sitemraypa=an* *wa* *arpa=an*
 place-POSS ALL grope.one’s.way=IND.S and go.SG=IND.S
 ‘(Early) in the morning, I went groping to the **place** I was taught about.’ (TS2 6)

3.2. Relativization of non-arguments

Relativization of non-arguments, i.e. adjuncts and possessors, also employs the gap strategy as that for arguments. However, to make the grammatical relations of the gapped NP traceable,

- (a) a case postposition-retention strategy must be used for instrumental, comitative and dative adjuncts (§3.2.1.1) and also for the degree adjunct whose relativization is regarded here as an equivalent of the standard of comparison relativization (§5),
- (b) a possessive suffix (on the possessee)-retention strategy must be used for the possessor (§3.2.2),
- (c) the relational noun *or-o* ‘the place-POSS’ and a case postposition retention strategy must be used for locative and allative adjuncts (§3.2.3).

3.2.1. Relativization of adjuncts

3.2.1.1. Relativization of instrumental, comitative, and dative adjuncts

Only those postpositions which can occur independently (i.e. without associated nouns) in main clauses (i.e. zero anaphora use, see (8)), can be stranded in the relativization, viz. instrumental *ani* (14), comitative *tura-(no)* (15), dative *eun* (16), and degree/allative *pak-(no)* (§5). The

ability of several Ainu case postpositions to occur independently (and also that of some particles that originate in verbs) was first noticed in Chiri (2001 (1953): 19) where he contrasts it with Japanese case postpositions.

- (14) [*ani* *OCA*⁸ *a=ku*] *CAWAN* *sine-p* *NAGASI* *corpok* *ta*
INST tea IND.A=drink bowl one-thing sink under LOC
a=nuyna (K8108012UP.007)
IND.A=hide
‘I hid a bowl for drinking tea under the sink.’ lit. ‘a **bowl** (which) I drink tea **with**’
- (15) [*tura-no* *ku=yupo* *kamuy* *cotca*] *acapo*
COM-ADV 1SG.POSS=elder.brother.POSS bear/god shoot uncle
‘the **uncle with** (whom) my elder brother shot the bear.’ (AB 96)
- (16) [*eun* *a=nu*⁹] *usi* *ka* *isam*
DAT IND.A=hear/ask place even/also not.exist
‘There was no place (where) I (could) ask about (it).’ lit. ‘there was no **place towards** (where) I could ask.’ (AB 390)

3.2.2. Relativization of possessor

The possessor in inalienable possession can be relativized on; the possessive suffix on the possessee is retained, which helps to track the syntactic relations. Alienable possessor cannot be relativized on since the base construction itself employs an RC¹⁰.

- (17) a. [*cikir-ihī* *tanne*] *kikir*
 leg-POSS be.long insect
 ‘The insect (whose) legs are long.’ (T1 189) Cf. base construction:
- b. *kikir* *cikir-ihī* *tanne*
 insect leg-POSS be.long
 ‘The insect’s legs are long.’

⁸ Recent loan-words from Japanese are shown in capitals.

⁹ The verb **nu** ‘hear/ask sth’ is a two-place transitive which can take only Theme as its object. The Source role can be expressed with the applicative prefix **ko-** (**ko-nu** ‘hear/ask sth from sb’) or postpositions **wa** (ABL) and **eun** (DAT).

¹⁰ This fact indicates an island constraint (Ross 1967) at work.

- (18) [[*re-p* *ne*] *ni-tek-ehe* *an*] ***cikuni*** (K8303243UP.050)
 three-CLF(thing) COP tree-hand-POSS exist.SG tree
 ‘A tree whose branches formed a three-pronged fork.’ lit. ‘a tree (which) had branches
 being three.’ (‘a **tree**_i [(that) there are _i **branches**_j [_j are three]]’)

Note that (18) is an example of a stacked or multiple RC.

The possessee in the relative clause may be encoded not only with a common noun, but also with a relational noun and can function not only as an argument but also as an adjunct marked with a locative/allative case postposition, cf. (17a), (18) and (19a), (20).

- (19) a. [*corpok-i* *ta* *menoko-po* *as* *wa an*] ***cikuni***
 under-POSS LOC woman-DIM stand.SG and exist.SG tree
 ‘A **tree** under (which) the girl is standing.’ Cf. base construction:
 b. *toan cikuni corpok-i* *ta* *menoko-po* *as* *wa* *an*
 that tree under-POSS LOC girl-DIM stand.SG and exist.SG
 ‘The girl is standing under that tree.’ (ST1 161)

- (20) *ne,* [*or-o* *ta* *rewsi=an*] ***kur***
 that place-POSS LOC spend.a.night=IND.S person
 ‘That man at (whose) **place** I had spent the night (said it).’ (AB 276)

3.2.3. Relativization of locative and allative adjuncts

Relativization on the locative/allative adjuncts involves the retention of the relational noun *or(-o)* ‘the place(-POSS)’ followed by the locative postposition *ta* or ablative *un*, which cannot be used independently and stranded on their own. Recall that generally most Ainu nouns cannot appear in locative phases without relational nouns such as the neutral *or(-o)* ‘the place(-POSS)’ (4). Thus, in the relativization (21a), *or-o* remains in the RC and necessarily bears the possessive suffix, even if the suffix does not occur in the underlying sentence (21b) (Satō 2008: 171).

By analogy the resumptive relational noun *or-o* within the RC (22a) is occasionally used even in the case of those few head nouns which normally would not require it in the base construction (22b).

- (21) a. [*or-o* *ta* *cep* *poro-n-no* *hemesu*] ***pet***
 place-POSS LOC fish be.many-EP-ADV go.upstream river
 ‘the/a **river** where many fish go upstream’ (ST1 171)

- b. *pet or ta cep poro-n-no hemesu.*
 river place LOC fish be.many-EP-ADV go.upstream
 ‘Many fish go upstream in a river.’

- (22) a. [*or-o ta KOTCO e pa*] *us-ke-he ne*
 place-POSS LOC delicacy.food eat PL place-POSS-POSS COP
hawe ne
 REPEV COP
 ‘This is the place they ate a feast at, I have heard.’ (K8108012UP.088)
- b. *konto suy nea us-ke ta suke pa*
 then again that place-POSS LOC cook PL
 ‘And prepared me something to eat there.’ (K8007292UP.112)

4. Relativization in Ainu: summary

To summarize, the formation of all relative clauses involves the NP gap strategy. However, based on the presence/absence and nature of the gapped NP-tracking material in the relative clause which is retained from the hypothetical main clause, it is possible to distinguish the following cases:

Table 2. *Relativization types and their structural correlations in the main clause*

Relativization type	Retention of the gapped NP-tracking material in the relative clause	Structural correlations in the main clause
[1] Relativization of arguments	Absence of retention	Correlates with the lack of case marking for A/S/O and zero cross-referencing on the verb for the third person in the main clause
[2] Relativization of non-arguments	Presence of retention	Correlates with the lack of cross-referencing for non-arguments on the verb in the main clause
(a) Relativization of instrument/comitative/dative/degree adjuncts	Postposition retention (stranding) strategy	Correlates with the ability of the respective postpositions to occur independently in the main clause
(b) Relativization of possessor	Possessive suffix (on the possessee) retention strategy	Correlates with the head-marking structure of the possessive construction in the main clause
(c) Relativization of locative/allative adjuncts	Relational noun <i>or-o</i> ‘the place of’ and postposition retention strategy	Correlates with the inability of the respective postpositions to occur with most nouns without the relational noun <i>or-(o)</i> ‘the place(-POSS)’ in the main clause

Overall, I suggest that the structure of relative clauses in Ainu may be best viewed as a manifestation of the head-marking polysynthetic character of this language which generally presupposes the traceability of grammatical relations from the head (verbal or nominal).

5. An equivalent of the standard of comparison relativization

The relativization on the standard of comparison in the comparative construction, as in (26c), is fairly common in the world’s languages, say, for example, in Japanese: [[*Yumi no hoo ga wakai*] ***hito***] *wa dono hito desu ka?* (cf. base clause (*Sono*) ***hito*** *yor* *yumi no hoo ga wakai*). However, in Ainu, it has not been attested so far.

Nevertheless, the present research has revealed that in the equative-like construction (see (26b)) in Ainu, the relativization on the standard of comparison is very common since it occurs in such conventionalized expressions as lit. ‘*He was a person/rich man [till (whom) there was no (such) person/rich man]*’, which pragmatically may be regarded as a superlative expression, i.e. ‘*He was a person/rich man with no equals*’. This newly discovered relativization type will be regarded here as an equivalent of the standard of comparison relativization in Ainu.

The standard of comparison equivalent (23a) is encoded as an degree/allative adjunct marked with the postposition *pak-(no)* ‘till/as’, which is stranded in the relativization while the relativized NP is gapped, just like in the case of relativization of other adjuncts (i.e. instrumental, comitative, and dative), cf. §3.2.1.1. This is perfectly possible in Ainu due to the verbal origin of *pak-(no)* ‘reach (?)’, see Table 1.

The main clause is encoded with the equative copular construction (‘My father is a rich man...’), cf. (30), in which the copular complement (rich man) is modified by a RC (‘a rich man_i [till ___i there was no rich man_j]’). The RC subject is most commonly (23a), but not necessarily (cf. (31)), encoded by the same NP as the head noun but their referents are different (cf. the indices). The RC predicate is invariably *isam* ‘not exist’ and *pak-(no)* is its adjunct.

- (23) a. *a=ona* [*sorekusu*¹¹ *pak-no* *nispa* *isam*] *nispa* *ne*.
 IND.A=father.POSS especially till-ADV rich.man not.exist rich.man COP
 ‘Father was really a rich man, with no peers.’ (K8106233UP.002)
 lit. ‘My father was a **rich man** till (whom) there was really no rich man.’
 (‘a rich man_i [till ___i there was no rich man_j]’)
- b. *sorekusu* (*ne*) *nispa* *pak-no* *nispa* *isam*
 especially this rich.man till-ADV rich.man not.exist
 ‘There is no rich man as (lit. ‘till’) (this) rich man.’ (constructed example)

5.1. Equative construction equivalent as the base clause

The base (embedded) clause in (23b) is my constructed example, which is built on the model of the following textual example. It can be regarded as a kind of equative construction.

- (24) *ne* *turesi* *pak* *pirka* *menoko* *isam*
 this younger.sister till good woman not.exist
 ‘There was no (such) good woman **as** younger sister.’ (T2 505)

Compare a few other naturalistic examples of the equative construction with the predicate *an* ‘exist’, which is the antonym of the above-mentioned *isam* ‘not exist’.

¹¹ <Jap. *sorekoso* ‘exactly, especially’. The usage of this Japanese loan-word in Ainu is not entirely clear.

- (25) a. *kotan noski ta mosir pak cise an hine,*
 village middle LOC island till house exist.SG and
 ‘In the middle of the village, there was a house (as big) **as** an island.’
 (K8109171UP.200)
- b. *na cup as hine sirepa pak-no a=kotan-u an*
 still sun stand.SG and arrive till-ADV IND.A=village-POSS exist.SG
ruwe ne
 INF.EV COP
 ‘(A one with fast legs) will arrive to our village when the sun is still high.’ lit.
 ‘(As to a one with fast legs,) there will be our village (as close) **as** arriving when
 the sun is still high.’ (TS6 12)

According to Ultan (1972: 134), an equative construction is just one possibility in expressing at least four degrees of predicative comparison.

- (26) a. Positive: *John is tall.*
 b. **Equative**: *John is as tall as George.*
 c. Comparative: *John is taller than George.*
 d. Superlative: *John is the tallest of the boys.*

Structurally, “an equative construction as in (27) consists of five constituent parts.” (Haspelmath & Buchholz 1998: 278)

- (27) My sister *is* as pretty as you.
 1 2 3 4 5
 CMP PAM PARA STM STAN

※ 1: CMP comparee, 2: PAM parameter marker, 3: PARA parameter, 4: STM standard marker, 5: STAN standard.

It is also noted in Haspelmath & Buchholz (1998: 278) that in some languages there is no parameter marker, which is the case in Ainu. Thus the above-mentioned Ainu example (24) may be analyzed as follows.

- (28) *ne turesi pak pirka menoko isam*
this younger.sister till good woman not.exist
 5: STAN 4: STM 2: PARA 1: CMP

‘There was no (such) good woman as younger sister.’ (T2 505)

- (31) *[pak [kewtum-u pirka], pak [ramat-u pirka]*
 till heart-POSS good till spirit-POSS good
katkemat oar isam] pe e=ne aan ruwe ne.
 fine.woman completely not.exist thing/person 2.SG.A=COP ADM INF.EV COP
 ‘It appeared that there was no fine lady with a heart as good as yours, with a spirit
 as good as yours.’ lit. ‘It appeared that you were a **person** till (whom) there was
 completely no **fine lady** (whose) heart was good (whose) spirit was good.’ (TS2
 42) (‘...you were a **person** _i [till _{__j} there was no **fine lady** _j [_{__j} heart was good],
 [_{__j} spirit was good].’)

5.3. The main clause subject and stranded postposition *pak-(no)* ‘till’ adjacency conflict

The basic word order in Ainu is AOV, so naturally a sentence should start with the main clause subject. The relativization on degree adjunct results in an NP gap (zero) and the stranded postposition which is, in principle, adjacent to the main clause subject. This may cause a wrong interpretation that the postposition is syntactically related (“attaches”) to the main clause subject NP. There are several means to resolve this adjacency conflict:

- (a) Omitting main clause subject.

The 1-st, 2-nd and indefinite person subject of the main clause is normally omitted because it is obligatorily marked on the verb (30), (31). And even the third person subject NP, which is zero-marked on the verb, can easily be omitted when the context is sufficient (29).

- (b) Inserting an adverb between the main clause subject and stranded postposition, e.g. *sorekusu* ‘especially’ in (23a);
 (c) Topicalizing main clause subject and extraposing it from the sentence by the use of such restrictive particles as *ka* ‘even/also’ (32) or *yak-ka* ‘even/as to’ (33);
 (d) Dislocating main clause subject: change in word order (34), (35);
 (e) ? Extraposing original subject and dislocating new subject (36).

- (32) *a=yup-ih* *ka [pak-no nispa isam] nispa ne*
 IND.A=older.brother-POSS TOP till-ADV rich.man not.exist rich.man COP
 ‘Older brother also became a rich man with no peers.’ (K8010311UP.151)
 lit. ‘As to older brother, he was a **rich man** till (whom) there was no rich man.’

- (33) *a=yup-utar-i ne yak-ka*
 IND.A=elder.brother-PL-POSS COP if-even/also

[*pak ison kur isam kur_ ne.*
 till successful.hunter man not.exist man COP
 ‘Older brothers were great hunters with no equals.’ (K8109193UP.150)
 lit. ‘As to my older brother and company¹², (he) was a **man** till (whom) there was
 no man (who) is a successful hunter.’

It is unclear if the change of word order (d) results in a change of meaning to lit. ‘A **person/rich man** [till (whom) there was no (such) person/rich man] was he’¹³, see (i.) in (34). Alternatively, we might expect this to be a focus construction¹⁴, cf. (ii.) in (34).

(34) [*pak katkemat isam katkemat a=sa-ha ne.*
 till fine.woman not.exist fine.woman IND.A=older.sister-POSS COP
 ‘The finest woman of all was my sister.’ lit. ? (i) ‘A **fine woman** till (whom) there
 was no fine woman was my elder sister.’; ? (ii) ‘It is my elder sister who was a
fine woman till (whom) there was no fine woman.’ (K8109193UP.002)

(35) [*pak-no nispa isam nispa a=hekote nispa ne.*
 till-ADV rich.man not.exist rich.man IND.A=marry rich.man COP
 ‘My husband was a rich man with no equal.’ (K8109171UP.040)
 lit. ? (i) ‘A **rich man** till (whom) there was no rich man was the rich man (who) I
 married [=my husband].’; ? (ii) ‘It is the rich man (who) I married [=my husband]
 who was a **rich man** till (whom) there was no rich man.’

The examples with the reverse word order and an extraposed RC constituent (e), which is clearly not part of the same clause, are few. Their semantics and discourse function are not fully understood.

(36) [*ineapkusun ne menoko ne yak-ka*
 amazingly this woman COP if-even/also

¹² The translation implies an associative plural reading. A regular plural reading would be encoded with a slightly different form: *a=yup-i utar* <IND.A=older.brother-POSS PL> ‘my older brothers’.

¹³ Generally, the word order in Ainu is free and pragmatically motivated, so the assumed change in meaning is only what we can expect from the basic AOV word order; it has not been checked with the native speakers of Ainu.

¹⁴ This was pointed out to me by John Whitman (p.c.).

[*pak katkemat isam*] *katkemat* *a=mac-ih* *ne*
 till lady not.exist fine.woman IND.A=wife-POSS COP

‘My wife was really a fine woman, unequalled by others.’ (K8303243UP.314)

lit. ? (i) ‘Amazingly, as to that woman, a **fine woman** till (whom) there was no fine woman was my wife.’ ? (ii) ‘Amazingly, as to that woman, it was my wife who was a **fine woman** till (whom) there was no fine woman.’

6. Summary

In this paper, I have provided an overview of relativization in Ainu and suggested that overall the structure of Ainu relative clauses may be best viewed as a manifestation of the head-marking polysynthetic character of this language which generally presupposes the traceability of grammatical relations from the head (verbal or nominal).

I have particularly focused on a newly attested Ainu equivalent of the standard of comparison relativization involving the typologically unusual stranding of the degree/allative postposition *pak-(no)*. Although the construction in question is conventionalized as a partially idiomatic superlative expression, I have shown that its adequate syntactic analysis is still possible. Moreover, I have pointed to a number of special strategies which are employed to resolve the adjacency conflict between the main clause subject and stranded postposition *pak-(no)* ‘till’ created as a by-product of the postposition stranding-based relativization.

Abbreviations

1/2/3 = 1st/2nd/3rd person, Ø = zero-marked 3rd person, = = inflectional boundary in the morphemic line, - = derivational boundary in the morphemic line, _ = morpho-phonological alternations in the text line, A = transitive subject, ABL = ablative, ADM = admirative, ADV = adverbial, ALL = allative, APPL = applicative, AUX = auxiliary verb, CAUS = causative, CLF = classifier, COM = comitative, COP = copula, DAT = dative, DESID = desiderative, DIM = diminutive, EP = epenthetic consonant, EXC = exclusive, FIN = final particle, INC = inclusive, IND = indefinite, INF.EV = inferential evidential, INST = instrumental, LOC = locative, NEG = negation, NMZ = nominalizer, O = object, PL = plural, POSS = possessive, RC = relative clause, REC = reciprocal, REP.EV = reportive evidential, S = intransitive subject, sb = somebody, SG = singular, sth = something, TOP = topic, UP = *uwepeker* ‘prosaic folktales’, vi = verb intransitive, vt = verb transitive.

Sources and References

- AB Bugaeva, A.
2004. *Grammar and folklore texts of the Chitose Dialect of Ainu (Idiolect of Ito Oda)*. ELPR Publication Series A–045. Suita: Osaka Gakuin University.
- K Nakagawa, H. & Bugaeva, A.
A web-accessible corpus of folktales of the Saru dialect of Ainu by Mrs. Kimi Kimura (1900-1988), London University ELDP, <http://lah.soas.ac.uk/projects/ainu/>
- KS Bugaeva, A. & Endo S. (eds.), Kurokawa Setsu (speaker) & Nathan, David (multimedia developer) (2010) *A Talking dictionary of Ainu: A new version of Kanazawa's Ainu conversational dictionary*. ELDP, SOAS, University of London. <http://lah.soas.ac.uk/projects/ainu/>
- OI Ito Oda (1908-2000) consultant of the Chitose dialect of Ainu (fieldnotes).
- ST1 Satō, T. 2008.
- T Tamura, S. 1984.
- T1 Tamura, S. 1988/2000.
- T2 Tamura, S. 1996. *Ainugo Saru hōgen jiten* [A dictionary of the Saru dialect of Ainu]. Tokyo: Sōfūkan.
- TS2 Tamura Suzuko. 1985. *Ainugo shiryō* (2) [Ainu audio materials (2)]. Tokyo: Waseda daigaku gogakuyōiku kenkyūjo.
- TS5 Tamura Suzuko. 1988. *Ainugo shiryō* (5) [Ainu audio materials (5)]. Tokyo: Waseda daigaku gogakuyōiku kenkyūjo.
- TS6 Tamura Suzuko. 1989. *Ainugo shiryō* (6) [Ainu audio materials (6)]. Tokyo: Waseda daigaku gogakuyōiku kenkyūjo.

- Bugaeva, A.
2012. Southern Hokkaido Ainu. In N. Tranter (ed) *The languages of Japan and Korea*. London: Routledge, 461-509.
- Chiri, M. 2001 (1953).
Ainugo no joshi [Auxiliaries in Ainu]. In: *Kindaichi hakase koki kinen gengo minzoku roshū*. Sanseidō. Reprinted in: *Ainugo-kō, Bunpō* I, v. 4, 1-20. Tokyo: Yumani Shobō.
- Chiri, M.
1974 (1956) *Ainugo nyūmon: toku-ni chimei kenkyūsha no tame ni*. Tokyo. Reprinted in: in *Chiri Mashiho chosakushū*, v. 4, Tokyo: Heibonsha.
- Givón, T.
2012. Toward a diachronic typology of relative clause. In: Comrie, Bernard & Estrada-Fernández, Zarina (eds) *Relative clauses in languages of the Americas: A typological overview* (TSL 102). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 3-25.
- Comrie, B.
1996. The unity of noun modifying clauses in Asian languages. *Pan-Asiatic Linguistics: Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium on Languages and Culture for Rural Development*, Mahidol University at Salaya.
- Comrie, B.
1998. Rethinking the typology of relative clauses. *Language Design* 1: 59–86
- Dixon, R. M. W.
2010. *Basic linguistic theory*. v. 2. Oxford: OUP.
- Haspelmath, M. & Buchholz, O.
1998. Equative and similative constructions in the languages of Europe. In: Johan van der Auwera (ed.) *Adverbial constructions in the languages of Europe*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Keenan, E. L. & Comrie, B.
1977. Noun phrase accessibility and universal grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* Vol.8, No.1: 63-99.
- Matsumoto, Y.
1997. *Noun-modifying constructions in Japanese: A frame semantic approach* (Studies in Language Companion Series 35). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ross, J.
1967. *Constraints on variables in syntax*. MIT PhD dissertation.
- Satō, T.
2008. *Ainugo bunpō no kiso* [The basics of Ainu grammar]. Tokyo: Daigakushorin.

Tamura, S.

1984. *Aynu Itak. Aynugo nyūmon. Kaisetu* [The Ainu language. An introduction into Ainu. Commentary], (Goken kyōzai sensho 32). Tokyo: Waseda daigaku gogaku kyōiku kenkyūjo.
- 1988/2000. Ainugo [The Ainu language]. In Kamei, Takashi, Rokuroo Kono, and Eiichi Chino (eds.). *Gengogaku daijiten*. Tokyo: Sanseidō, 6-94. English version: *The Ainu language*. ICHL Linguistic Studies v. 2, Tokyo: Sanseidō.

Ultan, R.

1972. Some features of basic comparative constructions, *Working papers on language universals* (Stanford) 9: 117-162.

アイヌ語における比較対象相当の関係節構文

アンナ・ブガエワ

国立国語研究所

本稿では、アイヌ語における関係節の概要を述べた。全体的にアイヌ語の関係節構造では関係節の主要部である動詞などを見ることにより、どのような文法関係にある名詞が修飾されているのか理解することができるが、これには、アイヌ語の持つ「主要部標示型」的性質と「複統合的」な性質が大きな役割を果たすことが判明した。今回は、欠落した(gapped) NP と残留した(stranded)程度後置詞 *pak(-no)*「まで」によって表示されている比較対象相当の関係節の構文が新たな発見になった。この構文は、最上級の表現として慣用的であるが、統語的な分析が十分可能である。そして、程度付加詞の比較対象相当の関係節化では、NP の欠落（ゼロ NP）によって、主節主語と残存後置詞 *pak(-no)*「まで」の隣接による競合的解釈が生じるが、それを解決するための手段についても本稿では詳しく述べた。