1. Introduction

- Set Merge: when α and β are merged, either α or β may supply the label, Chomsky (2008).
- Example (1a) is ambiguous.

(1a) what you wrote

b. read [] what you wrote [] (free relative)

c. wonder [] what you wrote [] (interrogative)

- Relabeling: when a single head raises from within a clause and then labels the clause.
  - e.g. what in (1b), relabels and nominalizes a clause.
  - Cecchetto & Donati (2015), hereafter C&D, develop a comprehensive theory of relativization based on relabeling.
  - The wh-relative example in (2a) is derived using man to relabel the underlying clause John saw which man as shown in (2b):

(2a) the man which John saw

b. [the ] man [] [who saw ]

In this theory, relabeling is necessary for relativization.

(3a) cannot be interpreted as an (in-situ) free relative, and only heads are permitted to relabel (from C&D).

(3b) only has available a clause reading (cf. (1a)):

(a) you read what


We extend C&D’s relabeling analysis to account for basic Japanese relative clauses.

Japanese has internally headed relative clauses and externally headed relative clauses.

(4a) is an internally-headed relative clause with a nominalizing (NM) morpheme – no.

(4b) is an externally-headed relative clause with the external head keeki ‘cake’.

(4a) Yoko-wa [Taro-ga sara-no ue-ni keeki-o oita]-no] o tabeta

Yoko-Top Taro-Nom plate-gen on-Loc cake-Acc put-NM.Acc ate

Yoko-Top Taro-Nom plate-gen on-Loc put cake-Acc ate

‘Yoko ate the cake that Taro put on the plate.’ (Shimoyama 1999:147)

Shimoyama argues against an invisible LF-raising account of IRHs based on scope facts.

(5a-b) exhibit a scope contrast with respect to hotondo ‘most’.

(5a) most of the cookies were in the fridge. If kukkii ‘cookie’ were to undergo LF raising together with hotondo, then hotondo should be able to get higher scope with kukkii-o hotondo in the relative clause head position (cf. Shimoyama 1999).

(5b) most of the cookies were brought to the party.

(5a) Yoko-wa [Yoko-ga reezooko-no] kukkii-o hotondo oita-cite-o la]-no] paatii-ni motte-itta

Taro-Top Yoko-Nom fridge-Loc cookie-Acc put-NM.Acc party-Dat brought

‘Yoko put most cookies in the fridge and Taro brought them to the party’ (Shimoyama 1999:149-150)

(5b) Taro-Top Yoko-Nom fridge-Loc cookie-Acc put-NM.Acc party-Dat brought

‘Taro brought most cookies that Yoko put in the fridge to the party’ (Shimoyama 1999:149-150)

- Question: How does relabeling work in Japanese relative clauses, if there is no raising in IRHs?

2. Proposals

- The nominalizer -no is the relabeler that precipitates relativization.
  - The nominalizer -no blocks extraction – causes an island effect.

- There is no raising and relabeling in an IRH such as (5a).

- In (5a) assume that the phrase kukkii-o hotondo ‘most cookies’ is formed in-situ and does not raise.

- The nominalizer no Agrees with (binds) kukkii to obtain an interpretation.

3. Further Evidence

- In (5b), kukkii raises to become the head of the relative clause, which then merges with hotondo at the matrix clause level, thereby deriving the attested scope facts.

- (6) has the same truth conditions as (5b), indicating that hotondo merges with the relative clause headed by no:

(6a) Taro-Top Yoko-Nom fridge-Loc cookie-Acc put-NM.Acc most party-Dat brought

‘Taro brought most cookies that Yoko put in the fridge to the party’

Shimoyama (1999) observes that, under scrambling, an expected scope difference with a quantificational IHR fails to materialize.

- The expected scope difference is observed when EHRs are substituted for the IHRs in (7a-b).

- Hotondo-no gakusei-ga [Taro-ga dono syukudai-mo sikemai-ni da] -no o most-Gen student-Nom Taro-Nom every homework before-exam assigned-NM.Acc tensu yutsuita

- Taro-Top Yoko-Nom fridge-Loc cookie-Acc put-NM.Acc most party-Dat brought

‘Taro brought most cookies that Yoko put in the fridge to the party’

(8) Taro-Top Yoko-Nom fridge-Loc cookie-Acc put-NM.Acc party-Dat brought

‘Taro brought most cookies that Yoko put in the fridge to the party’

4. Conclusions and Further Issues

- In a Japanese EHR, the root of the relative head freely re-Merges and relabels the CP, followed by obligatory Merge of an external n (as all roots must be categorized) (cf. Fig. 2).

- In a Japanese IHR, since Merge is free, the available option of no re-Merge by the relative root is taken; a nominalizer no is externally Merged to nominalize the CP (cf. Fig. 1).

- Relabeling and nominalizer no are in complementary distribution.

- Nominalizer no identifies with a salient argument in the RC.

- Note that extra-syntactic head identification is also required in gapless relatives, as in (8).

- (8) meizin-ga ryori-sita azi expert-Nom cooked flavor ‘the flavor that results when an expert cooks’ (Tsujiuma 2007:305, per Kitagawa 1982:201).

- Questions arise regarding which arguments no can identify with (bind).

- In the IHR (9a) the object keeki ‘cake’ can be relativized.

- In (9b), the subject Taro cannot be relativized.

- In a Japanese EHR, the root of the relative head freely re-Merges and relabels the CP, followed by obligatory Merge of an external n (as all roots must be categorized) (cf. Fig. 2).

- In a Japanese IHR, since Merge is free, the available option of no re-Merge by the internal relative root is taken; a nominalizer no is externally Merged to nominalize the CP (cf. Fig. 1).
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- Nominalizer no identifies with a salient argument in the RC.
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- Yoko comforted Taro who dropped his cake on the floor.