Relativisation in Kúsáål

Hasiyatu Abubakari
hasiyatu.abubakari@univie.ac.at

Abstract
This paper discusses the syntax and semantics of relativisation in Kúsáål, a Mabia (Gur) language spoken in the Upper East Region of Ghana. The relevance of this study cannot be overemphasized since very little is known in the literature on this topic with reference to Kúsáål. This paper explores the various elements, functions, and formations of Kúsáål relativisation and, among other things, shows that the language has both in-situ internally-headed relative clauses and left-headed internally-headed relative clauses (Hiraiwa et al. 2017). This was carried out with data collected from fieldwork, in addition to my own native speaker intuitions.
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1. Introduction
Relative clauses are subordinate/embedded clauses that function as modifiers within a noun phrase. Functionally, relative clauses (REL-clauses), together with other noun modifiers, form part of the grammar of referential coherence providing either anaphoric or cataphoric clues for referential identification (Givón 2001: 175). The following restrictive REL-clause in Kúsáål modifies the definite head noun dáú ‘man’ in (1a-b). The event coded in the REL-clause is assumed to be familiar or known to the hearer, a familiarity referred to as “pragmatic presupposition” (Givón 2001: 176).

(1) REL-clause in Kúsáål
a. Dáú [kànè sà dà’ gbá’y lá ]
man REL PAST buy.PERF book DEF
m̀r lígídí.
  have money
‘The man who bought the book has money’

b. Dáuí-sò’ né sà dà’ gbá’y l̀]
man-INDEF.P COMP PAST buy.PERF book DEF
The REL-clause in (1) expresses an event of ‘buying’ where the agent is co-referent with the head noun dáú ‘man’ which is modified by the REL-clause. Thus the subject of the main clause (2) is modified by the REL-clause in (3) and its co-referent noun is the subject. The speaker does not assert the proposition in the relative clause (2); however, s/he presupposes that it is known or familiar to the hearer (3).

(2) Main clause
Dáú lá m̱r ̀lgídí.
man DEF have money
‘The man has money.’ (asserted)

(3) Subordinate clause
Dáú lá sà dã́ gbáún lá.
man DEF PAST buy.PERF book DEF
‘The man bought the book.’ (presupposed)

This paper examines the syntax and semantics of relativisation in Kúsáál. Although extensive research exists on sister Mabia languages on the topic (see Hiraïwa et al. 2017: 3 footnote for a list of languages), no pioneering work has been published on Kúsáál yet. The main aim of this study is to fill the gap by discussing the various functions, formations and elements of Kúsáál relativisation. I look at in-situ internally-headed relative clauses and left-headed internally-headed relative clauses. I also explore restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses as well as the various noun phrase (NP) positions accessible to relativisation in Kúsáál. I will indicate areas where Kúsáál patterns with observations made in sister languages and areas where they differ. This is purposely done to show the close relatedness or otherwise of these languages in relative clause formation.

Kúsáál is an SVO language in which the verb does not inflect for tense or number. The remoteness of an activity or event is expressed using particles: sà for an event that is a day old, dà for an event that is two days and beyond but less than a year and dà for an event that is a year old and beyond. As a tonal language, all data and examples are marked for tones. There are two dialects of Kúsáál: Atoende and Agole. Both dialects are spoken in the Upper East Region of Ghana. However, while the Atoende dialect is spoken in Bawku West and the surrounding areas, the Agole dialect is spoken in Bawku Municipal, Garu-Tempane and adjoining areas. The data used in this work mainly come from the Agole dialect though there are instances where the Atoende dialect is used to clarify some concepts. This is mentioned anytime such a move is taken.
The paper is divided into six sections with the rest organised as follows: after this introduction, section 2 looks at the syntactic structures of REL-clauses in Kúsáàl whilst section 3 provides further insight on other elements of Kúsáàl relativisation. Section 4 discusses the accessibility hierarchy showing the possibility of relativising all elements in the scale in Kúsáàl. Section 5 gives account of restrictive versus non-restrictive relative clauses and their respective interpretations in Kúsáàl, and section 6 summarises the work.

2. Syntactic structures of relative clauses in Kúsáàl

Though this paper takes a more descriptive approach to the analysis of relativisation in Kúsáàl, an insight on the formal structural composition of the relative clause remains indispensable. Such formal explications, where required, will be carried out using the minimalist approach (Chomsky 1995).

Cross-linguistic realisations of relative clauses are generally grouped into two categories based on the structural positioning of the relativised head noun. The types are: an externally-headed relative clause (EHRC) where the relativised head noun is structurally located outside the relative clause complementiser phrase (CP); and an internally-headed relative clause (IHRC) where the head noun is structurally located inside the relative clause CP (Hiraiwa et al. 2017; Bodomo & Hiraiwa 2009). Hiraiwa et al. (2017: 4) add that relative clauses are further divided into three types depending on linear positions of the relative head noun (H). A relative clause is described as left-headed, if H appears to the left of the relative clause, whilst it is said to be right–headed when H appears to the right. It can also be in-situ, when H is located within the relative clause. Hiraiwa et al. (2017) show that Mabia languages including Buli, Dagbani, Gurenɛ, Dagaare and Kabiyé have left-headed IHRCs; in addition, all the aforementioned languages with the exception of Dagaare also have in-situ IHRCs. Kúsáàl like Buli, Gurenɛ, Dagbani and Kabiyé has both in-situ IHRCs and left-headed IHRCs.

i. In-situ head-internal relativisation in Kúsáàl

(4) Fù́n sà nyë́ dáú-sò́ lá àn(é)
2SG PAST see.PERF man-IND.P DEF COP.be

mì zù́á.
1SG.POSS friend
‘The man whom you saw is my friend.

(5) Ádú́k sà nyë́ Ádólú́b né sù̅́ōe
Aduk PAST see.PERF Adolub COMP own.PERF

ná́-sìébá lá.
cow-INDEF.P.PL DEF
‘Aduk saw the cattle that Adolub owned.’
The examples in (4-5) demonstrate the most important properties of head-internal relativisation in Kúsáàl. The head noun is left in its original position and directly followed by an indefinite pronoun acting as a relative particle. The structure of the in-situ relative clause is as in (6).

(6) [DP [CP…(COMP)…H-INDEF.PRO (REL)]…] DEF]

ii. Left-headed head-internal relativisation in Kúsáàl

(7) Dáú kànè ká fìì sà nyè lá ân(è)
man REL.P COMP 2SG past see.PERF DEF COP.be

mì zúá.
1SG.POSS friend
‘The man whom you saw is my friend.’

(8) Àdúk sà nyè ná’ábànè ká Àdólúb
Aduk PAST see.PERF cow.PL.REL COMP Adolub

sù’óe lá.
own DEF
‘Aduk saw the cattle that Adolub owned.’

(9) M̀ sà nyè bìkànè sà wà’ād lá.
1SG PAST see child.REL PAST dance DEF
‘I saw the child who was dancing.’

From the examples in (7-8), it can be seen that in left-headed IHRC in Kúsáàl, the REL-clause occurs adjacent to the head noun. Unlike subject relativisation that requires no complementiser, it is obligatory to have the complementiser in object relativisation. Structurally, left-headed IHRC is represented as in (10) (see Hiraiwa et al 2017: 11).

(10) [DP [CP…Hj-REL…(COMP)…tj…] DEF]

Generally, relative clauses in Kúsáàl can be said to have the following features, which are subsequently discussed in subsections 2.1-2.3.

i. A head/antecedent NP

ii. The particles ne and ka in-situ IHRC and left-headed IHRC respectively

iii. An obligatory relative clause marker kanè/bane for left-headed IHRC and
2.1. The particles né and ka’ in relativisation in Kúsáàl

The particles né and ka’ are used in in-situ internally-headed relative clause and left-headed internally-headed relative clause respectively in Kúsáàl. These particles also function as NP and VP conjunctions respectively where both mean ‘and’. They have other variants, which are used for discourse purposes: the particles né with a high tone and ka’ with a low tone function as contrastive/exhaustive focus particles in Kúsáàl (see Abubakari 2016a). The particles né and ka’ again surface as markers of subordination in relativisation consequent to their original functions as conjunctions in the language. Similar trends are observed by Fiedler & Schwarz (2005) for Buli and Dagbani where they identify the said particles læ and te’ for Buli and n(í) for Dagbani as conjunctions. The same particles are however glossed as complementisers by Hiraiwa et al. (2017) for Buli and Dagbani (see examples 25-27). I opt to gloss né and ka’ in relativisation in Kúsáàl as complementisers. It is important to add that there are some dialectal variations in the use of né. Whilst it is predominantly used in the Atoende dialect, it is realized as n’ in the Agole dialect and at times even silent in casual speech. This will be discussed further in section 2.2 below.

2.2. Asymmetry in relativisation in Kúsáàl

The asymmetry between left-headed IHRC and in-situ IHRC deserves mention in any discussion on relativisation in Kúsáàl. In left-headed IHRC the relative pronouns kànɛ̀ and bànɛ̀ are used for marking singular and plural respectively. These pronouns are obligatory indicators of relativisation in left-headed IHRC in Kúsáàl and cannot be omitted. An additional feature of these pronouns is that they only agree in number but not in person. Person agreement is not characteristic of Kúsáàl. The stem of the head noun forms a compound with the relative pronoun and number is determined on the relative pronoun that is used. For instance bibànɛ̀ ‘the children who’ is composed of bíís ‘children’ and bànɛ̀ ‘REL.PL’ and dikànɛ̀ is composed of diúb ‘food’ and kànɛ̀ ‘REL.SG’ in (11a) and (12a) respectively.

(11) Subject relativisation (plural)

a.  M̀ sà ŋyè bìbànɛ̀ sà
    1SG PAST see.PERF child- REL.PL PAST

   wa̅ˈa̅d lá.
   dance.PERF DEF
   ‘I saw the children who were dancing.’

b.  *M̀ sà ŋyè bìís lá sà wāˈad
    1SG PAST see.PERF child DEF PAST dance.PERF
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DEF
Lit.: ‘I saw the children who were dancing.’

(12) Subject relativisation (singular)
a.  Ádük sà dī díkànè ká
    Aduk  PAST  eat.PERF  food-REL  COMP
    Ásìbì sà dũg lá.
    Asibi  PAST  cook.PERF  DEF
    ‘Aduk ate the food which/that Asibi cooked.’
b.  * Ádük sà dī dúb ká Ásìbì
    Aduk  past  eat.PERF  food  comp  Asibi
    sà dũg lá.
    PAST  cook.PERF  DEF
    Lit.: ‘Aduk ate the food which/that Asibi cooked.’

The relative pronouns in (11a) and (12a) occur after the head noun of the relative clause in both subject and object relativisation. The other difference between these two forms is that whilst the particle ká occurs after the relative pronoun in object relativisation (12a), the same is not the case for subject relativisation in (11a) since object relativisation involves the extraction of the supposed object to the clause initial position of the embedded clause. All forms of non-subject displacements that leave gaps at the extraction sites have the particle ka after the moved constituents in Kúsáál (see Abubakari 2016a).

(13) Non-subject relativisation
a.  Ádük sà dī díkàn ká Ásìbì
    Aduk  PAST  eat.PERF  food  REL  COMP  Asibi
    sà dũg lá.
    PAST  cook.PERF  DEF
    ‘Aduk ate the food which/that Asibi cooked.’
b.  *Ádük sà dī dúkàn Ásìbì sà
    Aduk  PAST  eat.PERF  food  REL  Asibi  PAST
    dũg lá.
    cook.PERF  DEF
    Lit.: ‘Aduk ate the food which/that Asibi cooked.’
In in-situ IHRC on the other hand, the “indefiniteness restriction”, which requires that internally headed relative clauses have a definiteness effect (Williamson 1987), strictly applies in Kúsáàl. The indefinite pronouns, in the table in (14) below, are used in correlation with the status of the relativised head noun. These pronouns are mostly used as suffixes with the stem of the relativised head noun in both subject and object relativisation in in-situ IHRC. Thus, number is generally determined on the pronoun and not on the head noun (see Abubakari 2016b).

### Table 1: Indefinite pronouns in Kúsáàl

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indefinite Pronoun</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>síˈá</td>
<td>Generic</td>
<td>any, some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-sɔ́, sɔ́'</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>anyone, someone, somebody, whoever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>síˈél</td>
<td>Non-human</td>
<td>something, anything, somewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>síɛbá</td>
<td>Generic plural</td>
<td>some.PL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The complementiser né is used in in-situ IHRC. It occurs after the subject of the matrix clause in subject relativisation as in (15-16). However, should the subject of the matrix clause be the same as the head of the relativised NP, né follows the indefinite pronoun sɔ́ as in (16). As mentioned in the previous section, the complementiser in in-situ IHRC can be realised as either né or n’ depending on the dialect in use. The example in (15a) is Atoende whilst (15b) is Agole.

(14)

a.  Adúk  né  sà  nyē  pūˈá
    Aduk COMP PAST see.PERF woman

    sɔ́'  lá  kūosidné  ġuvir.
    INDEF.P.SG DEF sell.IMPERF cola nut
    ‘The woman whom Aduk saw/met sells cola nuts.

b.  Adúk  nī  sà  nyē  pūˈá  sɔ́'
    Aduk COMP PAST see.PERF woman INDEF.

    lá  kūosidné  ġuvir.
    DEF sell.IMPERF cola nut
    ‘The woman whom Aduk saw/met sells cola nuts.’

(15)  Pūˈá  lá  né  sà  dā́  náˈası́ lá
      woman  DEF COMP PAST buy.PERF COW.INDEF.P DEF
àné ná’ábil.
COP.be calf
‘The cow the woman bought is a small one/the cow the woman bought is a calf’

(16) (Nín)- số nè kū́l lá àné
person.INDEF.P COMP go-home.PERF DEF COP.be

m̀ zúá.
1SG.POSS friend
‘The person who went home is my friend.’

In both dialects, pronominalised subjects in relative clauses are always the emphatic forms (18a). Abubakari (2016a) argues that the emphatic pronoun in Kúsaal can be explained to occur due to the assimilation of the subject pronoun with the contrastive focus particle nè.

(17)

a. Fún(é)1 sà nỳè dáú-số lá
2SG.EMPH PAST see.PERF man-INDEF.P DEF

àn(é) m̀ zúá.
COP.be 1SG.POSS friend
‘The man whom you saw is my friend.’

b. *Fù sà nỳè dáú-số lá
2SG. PAST see.PERF man-INDEF.P DEF

àn(é) m̀ zúá.
COP.be 1SG.POSS friend
‘The man whom you saw is my friend.

In object relativisation, the complementiser nè occurs after the subject of the relative clause with the indefinite pronoun occurring on the relativised head noun. Pronouns are also the emphatic forms in the same environments (19).

(18) Ádúk sà nỳè Ádólúb nè sù’ôe
Aduk PAST see.PERF Adolub COMP OWN.PERF

1 Whilst Agole drops the e in the emphatic pronoun fon(e), Atoende does not, hence the realization of the full form which is fon+ne=fone 2SG.EMPH. ‘you’.
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2.3. Clause final determiner *la*

In relative clause constructions in Kúsáál, the particle *la* is used as a marker of definiteness and it is restricted to clause final position. This particle is the same as the definite article in the language, thus making the relative clause obligatorily definite. Consequently, the head of the relative clause cannot occur with a determiner as shown below in (20).

(20) $[Bí (*lá) kànè ká Àdólúb sà nyē]

child DEF REL COMP Adolub PAST see.PERF

*(lá)* kul-yá.

DEF go.home-PERF

‘The child who Adolub saw has gone home.’

(21) Main clause

$Bííg *lá kul-yá.$

child DEF go.home-PERF

‘The child has gone home.’

(22) Subordinate clause

$Àdólúb sà nyē bíg lá.$

Adolub PAST see.PERF child DEF

‘Adolub saw the child.’

In both the main clause and the subordinate clause the subject and object NP bíg ‘child’ respectively is modified by the definite article *lá* but this is missing on the relativised head bíg in the relative clause in (20). Unlike in languages like Akan (Saah 2010: 94) where the head of the relative clause can occur with or without a determiner, Kúsáál in conjunction with other Mabia languages that allow in-situ IHRC has a clause final determiner or demonstrative. Examples (24-26) are taken from Hiraiwa et al (2017:7) to show the predominant use of the clause final determiner in these languages.
It then follows that Kúsáàl is consistent with the observation made by Hiraiwa et al. (2017) for the structure in (27) where these languages uniformly have the demonstrative (D) element occurring at clause final position in the relative construction.

(27) \[\text{DP} \text{[CP ... (C) ... H-REL.]D} \] (Hiraiwa et al. 2017: 5)

It is interesting to note the recurrent use of the identical morpheme \textit{la} as clausal determiners in Kúsáàl, Buli, Gurenɛ as well as Dagbani where \textit{maa} alternates with \textit{la}. The clausal
determiner is said to “assert the content of the proposition, relating to something that has been said earlier in the conversation” (Hiraiwa et al. 2017: 5-7; see also Lefebvre 1992; 1998; Larson 2003).

(28) Púˈá lá sāˈał Àdúk lá.
woman DEF advise.PRF Aduk DEF
‘The woman advised Aduk, as I said.’

As elaborated by Hiraiwa et al. (2017), the clausal determiner in IHRCs is a determiner for the clausal constituent taking the CP as its complement. Comparing this to the structure of a DP in Kúsáál, both the NP and the CP in a determiner phrase and a relative clause respectively move to the specifier of DP (whilst assuming the same extended projection principle (EPP) features for D).

(29) a. Structure of DP

```
DP
  NP      D'      t
  ...    D    t_{NP}
```

b. Structure of IHRC

```
DP
  CP      D'      t
  ...    D    t_{CP}
```

However, anytime the relativised head noun is indefinite, the clause final definite determiner must be absent. The indefinite determiner sīˈà/ ‘a certain’ can be used in place of the definite determiner. This determiner cannot fully have the intended indefinite meaning; it has an interpretation where the indefinite determiner functions as a numeral ‘one’ (also see Bodomo & Hiraiwa 2009).

(30) Object relativisation (Definite)

```
1SG. PAST read.PERF book REL COMP Asibi PAST
s̃b lá.
write.PERF DEF
‘I read the book that Asibi wrote’
```

(31) Object relativisation (Indefinite)

```
a. 1SG. PAST read.PERF book COMP Asibi write.PERF
```
‘I read a book that Asibi wrote.’

b.  

\[
egin{array}{llllll}
M & dà & kārīm & gbāọ̀n sī'à & ká \\
1SG. & PAST & read.PERF & book & certain & COMP \\
\end{array}
\]

\[Àsibì \ sọb \ lá.\]

Asibi  write.PERF  DEF

‘I read a certain book which Asibi wrote’ (the book is one)

2.4. Resumptive pronouns and the relative clause in Kúsáål

A common strategy employed by some languages in relative clause constructions is the use of resumptive pronouns at the site where the referent of the head NP should have been (Maxwell 1979; Payne 1997; Saah 2010: 97). Sigurd (1989: 107) argues that this method is to “recall the referent in the position where it should have been”. The use of resumptive pronoun in Kúsáål relativisation is optional and limited to object relativisation. However, there are always two interpretations anytime the pronoun occurs in relativisation. The resumptive pronoun creates both restrictive and non-restrictive interpretations (discussed in section 5). The pronoun, when used, occurs immediately after the verb representing the relativisation site of its antecedent as shown in (32a). The sentences in (32 and 33) have similar restrictive interpretations respectively with (32a) and (33a) having additional non-restrictive interpretations.

(32)

\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
Púá & kàn & ká & m & sá & nyé & (ò) & lá \\
woman & REL & COMP & 1SG. & PAST & see.PERF & (3SG) & DEF \\
\end{array}
\]

\[kùōsídné \ gùvr.\]

sell.IMPERF  cola nut

‘The woman I saw sells cola nuts.’

b.  

\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
Púá & kàn & ká & m & sà & nyé & (ø) & lá \\
woman & REL & COMP & 1SG & PAST & see.PERF & (3SG) & DEF \\
\end{array}
\]

\[kùōsídné \ gùvr.\]

sell-IMPERF  cola nut

‘The woman I saw sells cola nut.’

(33)

\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
Púá & kàn & ká & dáú & lá & tìs & ò \\
woman & REL & COMP & man & DEF & give.PERF & 3SG \\
\end{array}
\]
The use of the pronoun in (34) renders the construction ungrammatical. Moreover, resumptive pronouns do not occur when the antecedent NP is non-human (35-37).

b. *Pù’á kànè ká dáú lá tīs (o) lígídí lá*

woman REL COMP man DEF give (3SG) money DEF

*kūl-yá.
go.home-PERF

‘The woman to whom the man gave money is gone home’

(34)  M̀ sà nyée bibàńè (*ba) sà wå̃ad lá.

1SG. PAST see child-REL.PL (3PL) PAST dance DEF

‘I saw children who were dancing.’

The use of the pronoun in (34) renders the construction ungrammatical. Moreover, resumptive pronouns do not occur when the antecedent NP is non-human (35-37).

(35)  Bůkànè ká m̀ sà dà’ (*li) lá

goat-REL COMP 1SG. PAST buy.PERF (*it) DEF

àn(é) butítá’ár.
cop.be goat-big

‘The goat which/that I bought is big.’

(36)  Bůkànè ká m̀ sà tīs (*li) váánd lá

goat-REL COMP 1SG. PAST give (*it) leaves DEF

bên čdné.
sick

‘The goat I gave leaves to is sick.’

(37)  Fûkànè ká m̀ sà dà’ (*li) lá

dress-REL COMP 1SG. PAST buy.PERF (*it) DEF

àn(é) fištítá’ár.
cop.be dress-big

‘The dress which I bought is big.’
Similarly, the resumptive pronoun does not occur in in-situ IHRC. Anytime a resumptive pronoun is used after the verb in such constructions the interpretation changes to include a possessive reading as also observed in Gurenɛ (see Atintono 2003: 121).

(38)  
Mán sà nyḕ pù́á só lá
1SG.POSS PAST see.PERF woman INDEF.P DEF

ku̅s̅idné̅ gù́vr.
sell-IMPERF cola nut
‘The woman I saw sell cola.’

(39)  
Mán sà nyḕ ò̀ pù́á
1SG.EMPH PAST see.PERF 3SG.POSS woman

só́ lá ku̅s̅idné̅ gù́vr.
INDEF.P DEF sell-IMPERF cola nut
‘His wife that I saw sells cola.’

3. Other elements of Kúsáàl relativisation
3.1. Long-distance dependency
Kúsáàl allows long-distance relativisation in which case an obligatory pronoun is required for subjects but not in cases involving objects. The relativiser kànɛ̀/bànɛ̀ must be used in the highest clause of the embedded clauses and cannot be used in the intermediate clauses.

(40) Long-distance relativisation (Object)

a.  
Àtíbil dà gbávịん kànɛ̀ ká m̀ mị́ị
Atibil buy.PERF book REL COMP 1SG. know

yé Àsíbì kàrìm lá.
COMP Asibi read.PERF DEF
‘Atibil bought the book that I know that Asibi read.’

b.  
*Àtíbil dà gbávị̀ m̀ mị́ị yé
Atibil buy.PERF book 1SG. know COMP

Àsíbì kàrìm kànɛ̀ lá.
Asibi read.PERF REL DEF
‘Atibil bought the book that I know that Asibi read.’
3.2. Island/subjacency

Relativisation in Kúsáal is constrained by island/subjacency effects. It is ungrammatical to have relativisation out of a complex NP or an adjunct clause in Kúsáal, which suggests that relativisation is created by movement (see Ross 1967; Bodomo & Hiraiwa 2009).

(42) Complex NP constraint

* M dà kàrìm gbàwì kànè ká m nyé
1SG PAST read.PERF book REL COMP 1SG. see.PERF
púˈá kànè ká s̄b lì lá.  
woman REL COMP write it DEF
‘I read the book that I saw the woman who wrote.’

(43) Adjunct Island
*M dà kàrìm gbàvì kànè ká m nyè*
1SG PAST read.PERF book REL COMP 1SG. see.PERF

púˈá lá ón s̄b lì lá.
woman DEF 3SG.EMPH. write it DEF
‘I read the book that I saw the woman when she was writing it.’

Extraction of the relative clause is impossible, irrespective of whether the extraction is overt or covert. The same situation applies to instances of A-dependency such as Wh-question and cleft/focus.

(44) Island effect for Wh-movement/Wh-in-situ
*bó ká fù dà nyè púˈá kànè*
what FOC 2SG. PAST see.PERF woman REL

s̄b lá?
wrote.PERF DEF
‘What did you see the woman that wrote?’

(45) * fù dà nyè púˈá kànè s̄b*
2SG. PAST see.PERF woman REL wrote.PERF

bó lá?
what DEF
‘What did you see the woman that wrote?’

3.3. Tense and particles within relative clauses in Kúsááł
Preverbal particles as well as aspectual morphemes are compatible with relative clauses in Kúsááł. The temporal preverbal particle sa, marking events that are a day old, and future particle na, are used as illustrations in (46-47) below.

(46) Object relativisation (past)
* M sà kàrìm gbàvì kànè ká Àsìbì dà*
1SG. PAST read.PERF book REL COMP Asibi PAST

s̄b yùvim lá.
write.PERF year DEF
‘Yesterday, I read the book which Asibi wrote last year.’

(47) Object Relativisation (future)

\[
\text{M̀ sà nyè̃ gbàù̃̃ kà̀nè́ kà̀ Àsìbì̀ nà́}
\]
1SG. PAST see.PERF book REL COMP Asibi FUT

\[nò̅kì̅ tì̅sì̅f̅ b̀é̅́g̅ lá̅.\]
take give-2SG tomorrow DEF
‘I saw the book that Asibi will give you tomorrow’

The tense particle \(sà\) in (46-47) occurs right before the verb and the relativiser maintains its usual position that is after the head noun. The fact that these tense particles can occur within the relative clause in Kúsáàl shows that relative clauses in Kúsáàl are fully finite.

3.4. Adverb placement
An embedded adverb cannot be placed immediately before or after the relative head noun. The well-formed adverbial distribution is either before or after the end of the entire construction.

(48) Adverb placement in Kúsáàl relativisation

a. \(\text{M̀ sà d̀í̱ dìkànè́ kà̀ Ásìbì́} \)
1SG. PAST eat.PERF food-REL COMP Asibi

\[d̀ū̅g̅ sù̅̃ò̅s̅ lá́.\]
cook.PERF yesterday DEF
‘I ate the food which Asibi cooked yesterday’

b. \(\text{Sù̅̀ò̅s̅́,́ m̀ sà d̀í́ dìkànè́} \)
yesterday, 1SG. PAST eat.PERF food-REL

\[kà̀ Ásìbì́ d̀ū̅g̅ lá́.\]
COMP Asibi cook.PERF DEF
‘I ate the food which Asibi cooked yesterday’

c. \(*)\text{M̀ d̀í́ dìkànè́ kà̀ sù̅̀ò̅s̅́} \)
1SG. eat.PERF food-REL COMP yesterday

\[Ásìbì́ sà d̀ū̅g̅ lá́.\]
Asibi PAST cook.PERF DEF
‘I ate the food which Asibi prepared yesterday.’

d. * M sà dìì sù’òs dikànè
   1SG PAST eat.PERF yesterday food-REL

ká Àsíbì sà dūg lá.
COMP Asibi PAST cook.PERF DEF
‘I ate the food which Asibi prepared yesterday.’

e. * M sà dìì dúb sù’òs kànè
   1SG PAST eat.PERF food yesterday REL

ká Àsíbì sà dūg lá.
COMP Asibi PAST cook.PERF DEF
‘I ate the food which Asibi prepared yesterday.’

Adverbials can precede the subject in simple clauses as illustrated in (49).

(49) Sù’òs Àsíbì sà dā’ fiūg lá.
    yesterday Asibi PAST buy.PERF dress DEF
    ‘Yesterday, Asibi bought the food.’

3.5. Stacked relative clauses
Kùsááll, like Dàgáàrà (Hiraiwa & Bodomo 2004: 62), does not allow stacking of relative clauses compared to other Mabia languages like Buli and Gurene where stacking of relative clauses is grammatical (see Atintono 2003; Hiraiwa 2003).

(50) *M dà kārīm gbāyị kànè ká [Àsíbì dà sѐb
   1SG. PAST read book REL COMP Asibi PAST write

   yụ̀m-áyị] [Àyípókà kànè dā’ sù’òs lá] year-two Ayipoka REL buy yesterday DEF
   ‘I read the book that Asibi wrote two years ago that Ayipoka bought yesterday.’

One possible way of rendering the above sentence is by turning the whole structure into a complex construction as below:

(51) M dà kārīm gbāyị kànè ká Àsíbì dà
   1SG. PAST read.PERF book REL COMP Asibi PAST
3.6. Extraposed relative clauses

The canonical form of the relative clause is such that the relative head noun is immediately followed by the relative clause. This adjacency is described by Givón (2001: 207) as one of the most transparently iconic devices used in directing the hearer’s attention to the head noun that is co-referent with the missing argument inside the REL-clause. However, another strategy referred to as extraposed REL-clause allows the REL-clause to be ‘ejected’ to the end of the main clause. Kúsáàl does not allow extraposed relative clauses in both narrative constructions (52) and in casual speech (53-59).

(52) Ná’á-sá’í dà bê ká ó yu’ím-áyí sà bûn ìÁyípókà sà dâ.
    chief INDEF.P PAST COP.be CONJ 3SG name call Ayopka PAST buy.PERF

‘There lived a chief whose name was Ayopka.’

(53) Dáú kà bê sà bûn ìÁyípókà bëdëg lá.
man REL COMP 3SG.POSS goat PAST lost-PERF. DEF

sà këñ sú’ım lá.
PAST come.PERF. yesterday LOC

‘The man who lost his goat came yesterday.’

(54) *Dáú lá sà këñ sú’ım ná [kànè]
man DEF PAST come.PERF yesterday LOC REL

kà ó bûn ìÁyípókà bëdëg lá]
COMP 3SG.POSS goat PAST lost DEF

‘A man came in yesterday who lost his goat.’

Another way of rendering (54) is to use (55)

(55) Dáú lá sà këñ sú’ım sà bûn [kànè]
man DEF PAST come yesterday LOC 3SG.EMPH

Another way of rendering (54) is to use (55)
4. The accessibility hierarchy

A topical issue on studies on relativisation in languages cross-linguistically concerns the various positions of the noun phrase that are relativisable. Typological variances exist in languages regarding elements that can be relativised and what cannot. The most recognised parameter used for this judgment is the NP accessibility hierarchy by Keenan & Comrie (1977) and Comrie (1981; 1989). The accessibility hierarchy (AH) shows the relative accessibility to relativisation of NP positions in simplex main clauses. The AH is shown in (59) where the symbol ‘>’ means ‘more accessible than’.

(59) Subject > Direct Object > Non-Direct Object > Possessor

(Comrie 1989: 156)

According to Comrie (1989: 56), if a language can form relative clauses on a given position on the accessibility hierarchy, then it can also form relative clauses on all positions higher
to the left on the hierarchy. From the accessibility scale above, the subject represents the easiest relativisable element compared to all others. It also means that it is easier to relativise the direct object than it is to do the same for the non-direct object. Cross-linguistically, the possessor appears to be the most difficult and a language that can relativise the possessor NP can relativise all other elements on the scale which is the case in Kúsáál. Kúsáál shows no grammatical restrictions on elements that are relativisable as far as the hierarchy is concerned. In possessive relativisation, the possessee noun phrase is left in-situ with a resumptive possessive pronoun.

4.1. Possessor relativisation

(60) M̀ sà nyë̀ pú́á kànè ká m̀
    1SG. PAST see.PERF woman REL COMP 1SG.

dà kàrûm ò gbàvùŋ lá.
PAST read.PERF 3SG.POSS book DEF
‘I saw the woman whose book I read’

It is also possible to relativise the non-direct object, the object of locative, the object of the postposition, and the object of comparison in Kúsáál.

4.2. Non-direct object

(61) Pú́á kànè ká dàú lá tì́s
    woman REL COMP man DEF give.PERF

lìgìďí lá kūl-yá.
money DEF go.home-PERF
‘The woman to whom the man gave the money is gone home.’

4.3. Locative relativisation

(62) M̀ dà́ péóg kànè ká Àsìbì nā́k
    1SG. buy.PERF basket REL COMP Asibi take.PERF

bò́rbè nìң lá.
pineapple put.PERF DEF
‘I bought the basket in which Asibi put the pineapple.’
4.4. PP relativisation

(63) Gádvig kànè ká Àsíbì gbìsìdì li zúg lá
    bed REL COMP Asibi sleep.PERF it head DEF

àn(é) gád-títá'ar.
COP.be big.bed
‘The bed on which Asibi slept is big.’

4.5. Comparative relativisation

(64) Dáú kànè ká Àsíbì wá'á tvóg lá kpf-yá.
    man REL COMP Asibi long pass DEF die-PERF
‘The man who Asibi is taller than is dead.’

Other Mabia languages where the possibility exists for possessor relativisation high down to subject relation include Dagaare (Bodomo & Hiraiwa 2004) and Gurenɛ (Atintono 2003: 121-122). In addition, languages like Akan (Saah 2010) and Ewe (Dzameshie 1983; 1995) show the same flexibility in relativisation.

5. Restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses

The difference between restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses is semantically captured in the following lines from Perlmutter & Soames (1979: 267-268).

A restrictive clause restricts prediction to the class of individuals specified in the relative clause. An appositive relative clause does not. When the clause is appositive, the predication is made of all those individuals specified by the head NP; it is further asserted that this set of individuals is the same set of individuals specified by the relative clause.

Adding to this, Givón (1993: 107) asserts that restrictive relative clauses are the prototypical types of REL-clauses and the most common cross-linguistically. This reason perhaps explains why studies including Givon (1993) and Comrie (1981) are silent on non-restrictive relative clauses also referred to as appositive relative clauses (Perlmutter & Soames 1979: 267-268; Saah 2010: 101). Givon’s assertion aptly applies to the case in Kúsáàl where unlike a restrictive relative clause, a non-restrictive relative clause has limitations regarding the form of the relative head noun it may occur with. It is impossible to have non-restrictive relative clauses with proper nouns as head nouns in Kúsáàl as illustrated in the examples below.

(65) Non-restrictive relative clause
    *M dà nyẽ Àsíbì, kànè dà sodb
    1SG. PAST see.PERF Asibi REL PAST write.PERF
Relativisation in Kusåál

If a relativiser is used with a proper noun, it receives a restrictive interpretation.

(66) Restrictive Relative Clause

\[
\text{M̀dà ny̱é Àsíbì kànë dà s̱̀b}  \\
1\text{SG. PAST see.PERF Asibi REL PAST write.PERF}
\]

\[
\text{gbáùŋ lá.}  \\
\text{book DEF}
\]

‘I saw Asibi, who wrote the book’

Both restrictive and non-restrictive interpretations however can be obtained with normal noun phrases. The example in (67) can be interpreted as restrictive in the sense that one woman is selected among a set of other women. It can also be interpreted non-restrictively in which sense it is adding more information about the woman who is already known by both interlocutors in the discourse (see Bodomo & Hiraiwa 2004). This is because of the presence of the resumptive pronoun, which triggers the non-restrictive interpretations.

(67) Restrictive/non-restrictive interpretation

\[
\text{M̀sà ny̱é púá kànë ká m̀}  \\
1\text{SG. PAST see.PERF woman REL COMP 1SG}
\]

\[
kàṟím ò gbáùŋ lá.  \\
\text{read.PERF 3SG.POSS book DEF}
\]

‘I saw the woman whose book I read’

‘I saw the woman, whose book I read’

(68) Ón/mán/fùn kànë kūl Ghánà

\[
3\text{SG.EMPH./1SG.EMPH/2SG.EMPH. REL go.home Ghana}
\]

\[
y̱ùm kànë gáád lá m̀ṯi ti tɛŋ yélà.  \\
\text{year REL PAST DEF know 2PL.POSS land matter-PL}
\]

‘He/I/You, who went home to Ghana last year, know(s) about our country.’

6. Summary

In summary, this paper has shown that relativisation in Kusåál can be either in-situ IHRC or left-headed IHRC similar to sister languages such as Buli, Gurene, Dagbani and Kabiye’
observed by Hiraiwa et al (2017). It has further been established that the use of resumptive pronouns is restricted to object relativisation in which instance both restrictive and non-restrictive interpretations are generated. In addition, the stacking, as well as the extraposition, of relative clauses is not allowed in Kúsáål. Kúsáål does not have any restrictions as far as elements that are relativisable are concerned when using the accessibility hierarchy of Keenan & Comrie (1977).

Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C/COMP</td>
<td>complementiser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONJ</td>
<td>conjunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>copular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>complementiser phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/DEF</td>
<td>definite determiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/DEM</td>
<td>demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPH</td>
<td>emphatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>head noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPERF</td>
<td>imperfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEF.P</td>
<td>indefinite pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAST</td>
<td>time depth particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERF</td>
<td>perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>relative pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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