Many relative clause types
• N<RC or RC<N (prepositional RCs are really coreferential) (4a), (4b)
• WhP relative pronoun at left edge, no complementizer/Co Arg (3)
• No relative pronoun, non-initial complementizer: (4)

Key properties of Georgian
• Split Ergativity: Three different case alignments depending on tense, aspect, and mood (TAM) (10).

Experiment 1: Case informativity
• Design: 3 [TAM] FUT, PAST, PERF x 2 [Gap] SRC, ORC
  (3) Example: Fur (Nom-Acc), SRC/ORC
  gogo, romel-le sac did saxl-ši magal-ši bič-si / naxa/s ... girl-Adv who which-nom big house-in tall-Adv how-Adv see-Adv ...
  ‘the girl [who] will see [the tall boy] will see [the big house]...’

• Predictions
  • Structural Theory: RTs increase at an unambiguous ORC cue.
  • Case Theory: RTs increase at informative cases (ERG/DAT).

• Results
  • SGA observed at ERG Co Arg. and at after RC-final Verbs.
  • Below: Mean RT by participant + 95% confidence intervals.

Experiment 2: RC Position
• Design: 2 [RCPos] N<RC, RC=N x 2 [Gap] SRC, ORC
  (4) a. N<RC, SRC/ORC
  is gogo, bič-si rom did saxl-ši naxa, ... girl-Adv who boy-saw Adv big house-in see-Adv ...
  b. RC=N, SRC/ORC
  bič-si rom did saxl-ši naxa, is gogo... girl-Adv who boy-saw Adv big house-in see-Adv girl-Adv saw...
  Both: ‘that girl [who] saw [the boy] saw [the big house]...’

• Predictions
  • Distance Theory: SGA at N<RC Verb, OGA at RC=N HnD.
  • Structural Theory: SGA at both regions.

• Results
  • Again, RTs slow at ERG Co Arg.
  • Slight OGA at V/HnD in RC=N.

Discussion: Georgian consistently shows a SGA, despite split ergativity and flexibility in RC position. RTs increased at ERG Co Arg (which disambiguates an ORC parse), but not ERG or DAT whPs (both compatible with a SRC parse); in Experiment 1, the SGA is echoed at RC-final Verbs. This provides strong support for a Structural Source of the SGA, though a slight OGA at the Verb & Head Noun in post-nominal RCs suggests that linearity may also play a role.
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