This paper analyzes a new set of data from Osaka Japanese (OJ) to clarify our understanding of the three Japanese relative clause patterns. Head-internal relative clauses (HIRCs) in standard Tokyo Japanese (TJ) terminate in the particle no, which is traditionally analyzed as a complementizer (C) or a nominalizer (2a). The HIRC pattern co-exists with the head-external relative clause (HERC) pattern in (2b), and also, as pointed out by Erlewine and Gould (2014/2016) (hereafter E&G), the doubly-headed relative clause (DHRC) pattern in (2c).

In contrast to TJ, OJ allows two distinct morphemes in what appears to be the counterpart of the TJ HIRC: n and non (3a). (3b) suggests that n is a C, because only n, not non, can be used in the counterpart of TJ no da ‘it is that’ clauses. (3c) shows that non is pronominal because only non, not n, can be used in pronominalization contexts.

Although both n and non are possible in the relative clause pattern with an internal head (3a) in OJ, the n-headed RC has only one interpretation, while the non-headed RC has two different interpretations with respect to the double quantifier tests developed by E&G. This contrast is salient in the context (1), where there are two groups of six apples and only three apples in the first group are peeled (indicated by white circles). In TJ, according to E&G, there are two possible interpretations in all three RC patterns in (2): Taro ate the three peeled apples in the first group (E&G’s witness set reading) and Taro ate all the six apples in the first group (E&G’s domain reading). E&G report that HIRCs, HERCs, and DHRCs are all interpreted the same with respect to these readings in TJ. In OJ, however, the n-headed RC as well as the HERC unambiguously have the witness set reading. In contrast, only the non-headed RC and the DHRC can also have the domain reading.

This contrast follows directly from the fact that non is pronominal, and thus able to pick up its reference from any salient entity in discourse. When the reference is to the three peeled apples, we get the witness set reading. When the reference is to the entire first group that includes the peeled apples, we get the domain reading. The plural definite description sorerano ringo ‘those apples’ in the DHRC allows the same two referential possibilities. Even in the non-headed RC and the DHRC, the more salient reading is the witness set reading; in order to get the domain reading, the N non in the non-headed RC and the external head in the DHRC sorerano ringo ‘those apples’ have to receive focus intonation. These data show that non-headed RCs in OJ are in fact a type of DHRC, headed by a pronoun. From a comparative standpoint, Kim (2017) shows that Korean also allows HIRCs with the clear pronominal head ku kes ‘that (one)’ (4), and also points out that this pattern behaves like a type of DHRC.
(1) (E&G (2016): 5, (9)) (2) is based on E&G (2016): (13)-(15).

(2) a. Taro-wa [Hanako-ga ringo-o mit-tu muita no]-o
Taro-TOP Hanako-NOM apple-ACC three-CL peeled C-ACC
zenbu tabeta.
Lit. ‘Taro ate all of [that Hanako peeled three apples].’

Taro-TOP Hanako-NOM three-CL peeled apple-ACC all ate
‘Taro ate all of the apples [that Hanako peeled three of].’

c. Taro-wa [Hanako-ga ringo-o mit-tu muita]
Taro-TOP Hanako-NOM apple-ACC three-CL peeled
sorerano-ring-o zenbu tabeta.
Those-apple-ACC all ate
Lit. ‘Taro ate all of those apples [that Hanako peeled three apples].’

(3) a. Taro-wa [Hanako-ga ringo-o mit-tu muita n/non]-o
Taro-TOP Hanako-NOM apple-ACC three-CL peeled C/N-ACC
zenbu tabeta.
all ate

b. [Taro-wa kono hon-o koota n/*non] ya.
Taro-TOP this book-ACC bought C/N COP
‘It is that Taro bought this book.’

c. Taro-wa sono akai n/non-o kureta.
Taro-TOP that red C/N-ACC gave
‘Taro gave (me) the one that is red.’

(4) Na-nun [Tom-i tosekw-an-eyse chayk-ul taychwil-ha-n]
I-TOP Tom-NOM library-from book-ACC check.out-ADN
kukes-ul ilk-ess-ta.
that.(one)-ACC read-PAST-DEC
Lit. ‘I tried reading the one [that Tom checked out the book from the library].’