That some typological relation exists between the order of the object with respect to the 
verb and the order of the relative clause (RC) with respect to its Head is known since 
Greenberg (1963). While VO languages (SVO, VSO and VOS) have postnominal RCs, 
prenominal RCs are found almost exclusively in OV languages. In other words:

\[(1) \quad a. \quad \text{VO} \supseteq \text{NRel} \quad \quad b. \quad \text{RelN} \supseteq \text{OV}\]

---

* I wish to thank for their comments Josef Bayer, Christian Lehmann, and Jan Rijkhoff. This article is 
going to appear (without the two appendices) in M. Vulchanova and T.A. Åfarli (eds.) Grammar and 
Beyond. Essays in honour of Lars Hellan. Oslo, Novus Press

\text{states: “If a language has VO, then it has NRel” (but see fn.4 below).} \]

The original figures from Greenberg’s (1963) 30-language sample are given here, adapted from his table 
10, p.90. In fn.20, p.106, he lists the languages (both these and the numbers in the table add up to 29, 
though):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VSO</th>
<th>SVO</th>
<th>SOV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RelN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRel</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both RelN and NRel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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These implications cannot be strengthened by adding NRel ⊃ VO and OV ⊃ RelN, because OV languages seem to show no clear preference for either a pre- or postnominal positioning of their RCs. This appears most clearly from Dryer’s (1992a) 543-language sample:

(2) Order of Relative clause and Head and the VO/OV distinction (source: Dryer 1992a,86)²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NRel</th>
<th>RelN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OV</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VO</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dryer’s conclusion that Verb/Object order and Head/RC order do not form a correlation pair in the same sense as Verb/Object and Adposition/Object do is very widely shared. See, among others, Hawkins (1994, 265,273);³ Croft and Deligianni (2001,3); Diessel (2001,446); Song (2001,244); Rijkhoff (2002,307).⁴

². The numbers here refer to genera, not languages. Also see Dryer (2003) for similar figures within a somewhat expanded sample.

³. Cf. also Hawkins (1990, 241) where it is said that “44% of verb-final languages have postnominal relatives in the sample of Hawkins (1983)”.

⁴. Rijkhoff (2002,307) also states that, for his sample, “the correlation is stronger in the group of VO-languages than in the OV-languages. Thirteen OV-languages have RelN order and eight have NRel order; in the group of VO-languages, on the other hand, eleven languages have NRel order, whereas only two have RelN order: Ngiti and Tsou.”. However, Ngiti is a somewhat unusual SVO language (the SVO order systematically alternates with SAuxOV; it has postpositions; the genitive precedes the N – Kutsch Lojenga 1994). Kutsch Lojenga (1987/2003), in fact, explicitly argues for the verb final character of the language.

Dryer (2000) states that “RelN order in VO languages is exceedingly rare crosslinguistically; the only attested instances are Bai and the Chinese languages, both Sino-Tibetan” (p.26). Mallinson and Blake (1981,285) in their 150-language sample found only one other VO language with exclusively prenominal RCs, Palauan (Malayo-Polynesian – Austronesian). For VO languages that have both pre- and postnominal RCs, see Mallinson and Blake (1981,285), Comrie (1981,141), and Keenan (1985,144), among others.
The mere numbers, however, may conceal the existence of a significant generalization relating the order of the verb and its complements to the order of the Head and the RC. In their chapter 5 (“Relative Clauses”, pp.261-371), Mallinson and Blake (1981) list the 150 languages of their sample according to subject/verb/object order, and according to whether they display RC-Head order, Head-RC order, or both. The numerical results largely confirm (ante litteram) Dryer’s results in showing no clear tendency for OV languages (especially if languages with exclusive NRel and those with both NRel and RelN as alternative options are added together).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NRel</th>
<th>RelN</th>
<th>both NRel and RelN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OV</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VO</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, more telling than the actual numbers is to observe from their table which OV languages allow only the RelN order and which allow the NRel order as the exclusive or as an alternative order. The former group (Ainu, Amharic, Basque, Burmese, Burushaski, Chibcha, Fore, Japanese, Kannada, Korean, Mongolian, Piro, Sherpa, Sinhala, Sri Lanka Malay, Sri Lanka Portuguese, Tamil, Telugu) appears to contain

---

5. Each of the 150 languages of table 4 (“Word Order and Head/RC Order”) appears in the following format (taking Turkish, an SOV language, with both pre- and (in the more literary register) postnominal RCs, as an example):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Word Order</th>
<th>RC-Head</th>
<th>Head-RC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>139. Turkish</td>
<td>SOV</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Greenberg’s (1963) 30-language sample also showed (albeit in a weaker form) that OV languages are compatible with both RelN and NRel (cf. fn.1).

7. While Schwartz (1971,141), Gragg (1972,159) and Hawkins (1983,320; 1994,316) classify Amharic as only having prenominal RCs (see also Givon 1975, 97-98), Mallinson and Blake (1981,276,288) actually classify it as having both pre- and postnominal RCs. Girma Demeke, however, confirms to me that RCs are exclusively prenominal in Modern Amharic (and, incidentally, that complement clauses are also strictly preverbal, which will be relevant for the proposal below). Also see Tremblay and Kabbaj (1990,167f) and Demeke (2001). The source of the inconsistency may be the fact that Amharic “until fairly recently, apparently had VSO word-order and postnominal relatives” (Downing 1978,393, based on Hudson 1972).
languages corresponding to Greenberg’s (1963,79) “rigid” type; the latter group (Adyghe, Fur, Galla (Oromo), Hindi, Hittite, Hottentot (Nama), Kanuri, Khamtı, Marathi, Nubian, Quechua, Rashad, Sandawe, (Classical) Tibetan, Tigre, Turkish) appears to contain languages corresponding to his “non rigid type”. Assuming this generalization to be essentially right, one could propose the following correlations:

(3) a. If VO then NRel
    b. If “rigid” OV, then RelN
    c. If “non-rigid” OV, then NRel or both NRel and RelN

Even if possibly correct, such a statement would, however, fail to expose what is at the basis of these correlations. We submit that the correlation between V/O order, and the order of RCs and their Heads is intimately related to the order of complement and adjunct subordinate clauses w.r.t. the verb. In VO languages subordinate clauses follow the V, as they can, typically, in “non-rigid” OV languages (cf. Dryer 1980, 130, 172). In the same languages, RCs follow the Head. Subordinate clauses, however, do not

8. Greenberg (1963) puts Turkish in the “rigid” subtype of SOV languages (namely those “in which the verb is always at the end”, p.79), noting however that it exceptionally allows certain phrases to follow the verb (see his fn.10). Limited exceptions to absolute verb-finality are also found in other languages often categorized as “rigid” SOV languages (e.g., the Dravidian – see fn.10, below). To judge from his Universal 7, “non rigid” SOV languages are for Greenberg those that allow adverbial modifiers to follow the verb (presumably, adverbial PPs and clauses). Close to Greenberg’s original sense, here we take the term “rigid SOV languages” to refer to those languages where nothing can follow the V (except perhaps as an afterthought), and the term “non-rigid SOV languages” to refer to those languages where various things but lexical NP objects can follow the V (complement and adverbial PPs, complement and adverbial subordinate clauses).

9. Later in the chapter (p.299), Mallinson and Blake hint themselves at this possible generalization: “SOV languages are only clearcut RC-Head languages if they are rigidly SOV (Korean, Mongolian and Japanese are strong examples of this), whereas languages which are not rigidly SOV may also allow the order Head-RC”. See the Appendix for further evidence in favour of this generalization, which we will try to relate to a property of the subordinator introducing both relative and complement/adverbial clauses.
ordinarily follow the V in “rigid” OV languages, which are more strictly V-final. In the same languages, RCs do not follow their Head, either. The generalization could be phrased more perspicuously as follows:

(4) a. In the general case, OV languages that do not allow postverbal subordinate clauses (“rigid” OV languages) do not allow postnominal RCs.

b. In the general case, OV languages that allow postverbal subordinate clauses (“non rigid” OV languages) also allow postnominal RCs.

If this generalization survives further scrutiny, then there may be a genuine correlation between V/(clausal) O order in the sentence and N/RC order in the DP.

From the languages in the two Appendices below, which includes the OV languages of Mallinson and Blake’s own sample and a number of other OV languages, it appears that the generalization is basically correct.

Generalization (4) says that in those OV languages in which there can be a post-Head clause in the sentence ([..V Clause..]) there can be a post-Head RC in the nominal phrase ([..N RC..]).

In turn, the possibility for a clause to follow the V or the N seems to some extent related to the presence of initial complementizers. While preverbal and prenominal (finite)

---


11. Dryer (1992a,87), despite the observed skewed preference for NRel across VO and OV languages, suggests that the pair N and relative clause is after all still a correlation pair with V/O order, proposing that what ties the V/O order to the N/RC order is his Branching Direction Theory, whereby “verb patterners are non-phrasal (non-branching, lexical) categories and object patterners are phrasal (branching) categories” (p.89). This requires one to ignore the phrasal (branching) character of the relative clause Head overtly visible in such cases as the [interesting book about Gandhi] that we read (cf. Kayne 1994,154fn13). That the RC Head is the whole branching constituent [interesting book [about [Gandhi]]] is indicated by the fact that the missing object within the relative clause is understood as “(an) interesting book about Gandhi”. This may generalize to all “verb-patterners”, including “verbs”, which also appear to be “branching” in certain cases (e.g. in their relation to adpositions [[V O] PP] vs. [PP [ O V]]), as Dryer himself notes. Perhaps the relevant notion of Head is not head in the X-bar sense (an X°), but an (extended) projection of the lexical head (N,V,etc.) of a phrase (DP, VP, etc.).
clauses have final rather than initial complementizers ([\[\text{Clause} \ldots \text{COMP}\] V/N], postverbal and postnominal (finite) clauses have initial rather than final complementizers ([V/N [\text{Clause} \text{COMP} \ldots \ldots]]). Hawkins (1990, 256) notes that VO languages are exclusively Comp initial, while OV languages are either Comp initial or Comp final (see also Dryer 1992a, sections 4.3 and 4.5, 1992b; Diessel 2001):

(5) VO languages $S'[\text{Comp S}]$ only

OV languages $S'[\text{Comp S}]$ or $S[\text{S Comp}]

In the light of what we just observed about V/O order and RC/Head order, the double possibility in complementizer positioning of OV languages, vs. the single possibility of VO languages, leads us to expect that $S[\text{S Comp}]$ will be found preverbally in “rigid” OV languages and $S[\text{Comp S}]$ will be found postverbally in both VO and “non-rigid” OV languages. This appears confirmed by the following passage from Hawkins (1994): “[..] grammars that would potentially generate D [i.e., Comp S V] seem to have an extraposition rule converting D into A [i.e., V Comp S] [..]. This is true for Persian and for German. It is also true for the finite S’ structures of Yaqui and Turkish (cf. Dryer 1980). Moreover, in all the languages mentioned, Extraposition is obligatory in this environment, with the result that these languages exhibit a “left-right asymmetry” [..]: a rightward skewing for sentential direct objects, even in languages that are SOV for non-sentential objects [..].” (pp.263-64).12

12. These are robust tendencies rather than absolute rules. Although it is generally stated that there are no languages with prenominal RCs that have an initial finite complementizer (e.g., Andrews 1975, 44; Downing 1978, 394), some in fact exist. See below the cases of Galla (Oromo) in (10), Silli Greek in (11), and Tigre in (12). Though rare, the counterpart with preverbal complement clauses ([\text{clause COMP} \ldots \ldots \text{V}]) also exists. See, e.g., (i), from Oromo (Owens 1985, 146, cited in Julien 2001, 55):

(i) joollée [akka I-tt hin-séenne] d’ólk-i

children that it-to Neg-enter prevent-IPR ‘Prevent the children from entering it’

One also finds the converse (postverbal and postnominal finite clauses with final complementizers: ([V/N \ [\text{clause} \ldots \ldots \text{COMP}]]). Postverbal finite complement clauses with final complementizers are found, among others, in Lakota (Siouan – Dryer 1980, 132), Ngiti (Nilo-Saharan - Kutsch Lojenga 1994, 395), Telugu and Malayalam (Dravidian - Bayer 2001, fn.11), Dhivehi (Indo-Aryan – Cain and Gair 2000, 37)
Bayer (2001), noting that “Indo-Aryan languages with Dravidian contact often show a
dual system of sentential complementation with clause-initial complementizers for
clauses in post-verbal position and clause-final complementizers for clauses mainly in
pre-verbal position” (p.11), makes the important observation that the initial and final
complementizers are lexically different, and cannot be used interchangeably (i.e. “the
lexical choice of the complementizer goes hand in hand with word order”, p.15). The
so-called ‘quotative’ complementizers, which derive from verbs of saying, are
necessarily final. The necessarily initial complementizers, instead, appear to have
originated in noun-modifying clauses as relative pronouns (p.18ff). More important
than their origin, though, is the fact, pointed out by Bayer, that they are differently
specialized w.r.t the types of clauses they select, and seem to enter different structures.
Observing that with postverbal clauses introduced by an initial complementizer there
can be a nominal correlate “in the expected position to the left of the verb” (p.21)
(cf.(6) from Bengali (Bangla) = his ex. (10)), Bayer suggests that perhaps they always

and Santali (Munda – see Appendix II). Postverbal adverbial clauses with final subordinators are found,
among others, in Yagua (Peba-Yaguan – Dryer 1992b,62), Malayalam (deaccented, Jayaseelan p.c.) and
Gapapaiwa, Nama, Teribe and Tol (see Appendix II). Postnominal RCs with final complementizers are
found, among others, in Slave (Athapaskan – Rice 1989,chapter 47; Dryer 2003,31); Lendu (Nilo-Saharan
- Kutsch Lojenga (1987/2003,9); Teribe (Chibchan - see Appendix II).

13. An identical situation is found in Uzbek (Turkic), where the quotative complementizer deb (lit.
‘saying’) is necessarily clause final (in preverbal position), as opposed to the necessarily clause initial
complementizer ki (in postverbal position). See (i) and (ii), from Noonan (1985,85):

(i)  Men bilamen ki bu o dam joja-ni oğırladi
    I know-1sg comp this man chicken-obj stole-3sg ‘I know that this man stole the chicken’
    (Extraposition obligatory with this sort of s-like complement)

(ii) Xotin bu o dam joja-ni oğirladi deb dedi
    woman this man chicken-obj stole-3sg saying said
    ‘The woman said that this man stole the chicken’
    (Extraposition not possible with this sort of s-like complement)

14. This nominal correlate can be either a simple pronoun, or a demonstrative, or a general DP like “this
talk, story, etc.” (Bayer 1999,fn.51; 2001,21).
do, and that when nothing appears one should posit an unpronounced nominal correlate:¹⁵

(6) chele-Ta e kOtha jane na *(je) baba aS–be
    boy-CL this story knows not (that) father come-will
    ‘The boy does not know it that his father will come

This conjecture appears to be supported by the fact that postverbal finite clauses with initial complementizers (as opposed to preverbal ones with final complementizers) behave the same way as “extraposed” relative clauses and “extraposed” clausal complements of N(P)s. They are “frozen” in place; e.g. they cannot be topicalized (cf. Bayer 2001,18ff).

What all of this suggests is that to be clause initial is possibly a property of those complementizers that are nominal in character; i.e., that appear with RCs, with complements of Ns, and nominalized clausal complements of verbs.¹⁶

What is crucial from the present perspective is that such “initial” complementizers/subordinators turn out to be a feature of VO and “non rigid” OV languages.

To judge from Diessel (2001), a similar pattern is displayed by adverbial clauses: “While adverbial clause constructions that tend to precede the main clause/predicate only occur in OV languages in my sample, adverbial clauses that are commonly pre- and postposed occur in both VO languages and a significant minority of OV languages. If we look at the latter more closely, we find that (almost) all of them are marked by an initial conjunction or adverb, while adverbial clauses that usually precede the main clause/predicate always include a final subordinator (i.e., a final conjunction, adverb, or suffix). There is thus a strong correlation between the ordering of main clause/predicate and adverbial clause and the position of the subordinator in the subordinate clause: adverbial clauses including a final subordinator tend to precede the main clause/predicate, whereas adverbial clauses that are marked by an initial subordinator are commonly found in both initial and final position regardless of the order of verb and

¹⁵. Bayer (2001,21) also notes that the Bengali complementizer je, which is homophonous to the relative pronoun, cannot be missing in the presence of an overt correlate.

¹⁶. Kayne (2003, sections 4.6, 4.7) makes the suggestion that (most) finite clausal complements of verbs need to be nominalized to be licensed as arguments of a verb.
object.” (p.434). Also see Dryer (1992a, §4.5). Once again, the postverbal positioning of the adverbial clause in VO and, we take, “non rigid” OV languages appears to be a function of the initial subordinator/complementizer.

To summarize, we have suggested that, in OV languages, 1) the presence of prenominal RCs correlates with the presence of preverbal complement and adverbial clauses; 2) conversely, the presence of postnominal RCs correlates with the presence of postverbal complement and adverbial clauses\(^{17}\); and 3) the two correlations are related to the presence, in the three types of clauses, of final and initial complementizers, respectively. The latter claim is supported by the languages in Appendix II only partially, though. Of the 46 OV languages with postnominal RCs and postverbal complement and adverbial clauses considered there, only 13 (Brahui, Galla (Oromo), Georgian, Hindi, Hittite, Marathi, Pashto, Persian, Pima Bajo, Svan, Tùnèn, Turkish, Zazaki) have an initial complementizer in the three types of clauses; 8 (Bagri, Bangla, Gapapaiwa, Latin, Santali, Somali, Xakas, Yaqui) have an initial complementizer in two of the three types of clauses; 2 (Hopí and Teribe) have a final complementizer in two of the three types of clauses; 9 (Ala’ala, Coahuilteco, Evenki, Nama, Sandawe, Sentani, Shipibo-Konibo, Tol, West Greenlandic) show a (mainly final) complementizer for only one of the three types of clauses (the adverbial clause); 2 (Godoberi, Santali) show a final complementizer only for complement clauses; 9 (Desano, Eudeve, Kabardian, Kairiru, Kutsch Lojenga (1987/2003,9; 1994, 395). Even some Dravidian “rigid” OV languages (Telugu and Malayalam) appear to allow deaccented postverbal complement and adverbial clauses (with a final complementizer) (Bayer 2001, fn.11; and Jayaseelan, p.c.), yet, only have preverbal (participial) RCs. Lezgian (Nakh-Daghestanian) also has (some) postverbal finite complement clauses, arguably of Persian origin (Haspelmath 1993, chapter 20,§7), yet only prenominal participial RCs (chapter 19). Dhivehi (OV; Indo-Aryan – Cain and Gair 2000) also appears (cf. their ex.(110), p.37) to have postverbal complement clauses (with a final complementizer), but only prenominal, participial, relative clauses (“perhaps as a result of Dravidian influence”, p.35).

If its few apparently postnominal RCs are actually free relatives in apposition (cf. Lehmann 1984,61; Rebuschi 2001, fn.9, who refers to Oyharçabal 1987), Basque, which has postverbal complement clauses (Lehmann 1984,59), would be another case in point.

Rigid SOV Korean appears to allow (albeit only rarely) also postnominal RCs (cf. Rijkhoff 2002,209).
Manam, Northern Paiute, Quechua, Skou, Wichita) do not show any complementizer for any of the three types of clauses; and 3 (Canela-Crahô, Kuku Yalanji, Pech) have a final complementizer for all three types of clauses.

Despite this less than perfect correlation between the postverbal/postnominal positioning of the clause and the presence of a clause initial complementizer (which may in part depend on the limited character of the sample), we take the correlation to be real; and to follow from a property, recently discussed by Kayne (2000a, 2001, 2003, 2005), of the (initial) complementizer of finite subordinate clauses (whether complement, adverbial, or relative).

*Initial complementizers.* On the basis of various considerations, Kayne suggests that clauses are generated in their argument or adjunct position without a complementizer. They then move to their licensing position, to the left of which an overt complementizer is subsequently inserted. Exemplifying with German:

\[(7)\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{[nicht [VP[DP[IP Fritz Maria kennt] [NP(es)]] glaubt]]} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{[[DP[IP Fritz Maria kennt] [NP(es)]] [nicht [VP t glaubt]]]} \\
\text{c.} & \quad \text{[[IP Fritz Maria kennt] C [[DP t [NP(es)]] [nicht [VP t glaubt]]]]} \\
\text{d. (Weil Hans) [daß [[IP Fritz Maria kennt] C [[DP t [NP(es)]] [nicht [VP t glaubt]]]]]} \\
\text{Believe}
\end{align*}\]

The property, here relevant, that complementizers have (in VO languages, and in many OV languages; i.e. those of the “non-rigid” type) is that of attracting to their left everything that follows their clausal complement, hence turning (7)d into (8)

\[\text{[nicht [VP[DP[IP Fritz Maria kennt] [NP(es)]] glaubt]]} \rightarrow \text{[nicht [VP t glaubt]]} \rightarrow \text{[IP Fritz Maria kennt] C [[DP t [NP(es)]] [nicht [VP t glaubt]]]} \rightarrow \text{[IP Fritz Maria kennt] C [[DP t [NP(es)]] [nicht [VP t glaubt]]]} \rightarrow \text{[IP Fritz Maria kennt] C [[DP t [NP(es)]] [nicht [VP t glaubt]]]} \rightarrow \text{[IP Fritz Maria kennt] C [[DP t [NP(es)]] [nicht [VP t glaubt]]]}
\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{[nicht [VP[DP[IP Fritz Maria kennt] [NP(es)]] glaubt]]} \\
\text{[nicht [VP t glaubt]]} \\
\text{[IP Fritz Maria kennt] C [[DP t [NP(es)]] [nicht [VP t glaubt]]]} \\
\text{[IP Fritz Maria kennt] C [[DP t [NP(es)]] [nicht [VP t glaubt]]]}
\end{align*}\]

\[\text{(Because H.) that F. knows M. it does not believe}\]

\[\text{[nicht [VP t glaubt]]}\]

---

18. I.e., to the specifier of a higher functional head (indicated with C in (7)), much like direct object DPs move to their licensing position of Case (from a position adjacent to the verb to a position which can be separated from it by adjuncts less closely related to the verb): Er hat *wen* zum Mittagessen *t eingeladen ‘he has invited someone for lunch’.

19. In line with Bayer (1996,1999,2001), and Kayne (2003) (cf. also Stowell 1981), I will assume that the object argument IP, except perhaps for the IP complement of verbs of saying, is in fact an adjunct to an overt, or covert, nominal head.
(8) (Weil Hans) (es) nicht glaubt daß [er Maria kennt] t .. ‘As he doesn’t think that he knows M.’

with the consequence that both the complementizer and the clause “end up” after the matrix verb.20

This movement could be thought of as a kind of ‘intraposition’, the “antisymmetric” analogue of the ‘extraposition’ operation that in earlier stages of the theory was assumed to derive (the string of words in) (8) from (the string of words in) (7)d (Kayne 1994).

If we take the overt (and abstract) complementizers of RCs to have essentially the same attraction property (as in fact Kayne 2000, 318f himself suggests), then the similarity in post-“Head” positioning of the clause in the sentence and in the nominal phrase (i.e., the generalization noted above) can be captured:21

(9) a. [[we bought [which expensive book]] expensive book] →

b. C [[we bought [which expensive book]] expensive book] →

20. This attraction may well be obligatory even in German, despite the fact that a sentence like Weil Hans daß er Maria kennt nicht glaubt... is also possible. As Josef Bayer pointed out to me (p.c.), such a sentence and Weil Hans nicht glaubt daß er Maria kennt... do not mean the same. In the former glauben denotes a belief, whereas in the latter it is a plain propositional attitude verb, like meinen (which in fact can only enter the latter structure).

21. The Head (expensive book) may be preceded by an unpronounced SUCH, the Head counterpart of which. “Head” here should be taken as in fn.11, not in its X-bar sense (non-phrasal category). In fact, in a way parallel to what is noted for RC “Heads” there, also the verbal “Head” preceding subordinate clauses appears to be phrasal (it can be accompanied by various other complements and adjuncts, which also precede the subordinate clause. Cf. I [convinced Bill] that he should try). As implicit in (9), we take the RC to be base-generated in prenominal position (for which see Cinque 2003), though nothing crucial depends on that assumption. In (9), the “matching”, rather than the “raising”, option is illustrated. Also note that in a relative clause given that part of the “complement” is attracted to the left of that (i.e., the constituent which matches the Head), the further attraction of the Head must be effected by an abstract head merged higher, with the same attraction properties (what we indicated as X in (9)). It remains to be seen if the derivation of complement clauses is not in fact closer still to that of a relative clause, in that it is an instance of hidden relativization (something like: Hans doesn’t believe ([THE STORY [ACCORDING TO WHICH STORY [that Fritz knows Maria]]])).
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c. [we bought [which expensive book] C [t] expensive book] →
d. [that [[we bought [which expensive book]] C [t] expensive book] →
e. [which expensive book [that [[we bought t ] C [t] expensive book]] →
f. X [which expensive book [that [[we bought t ] C [t] expensive book]] →
g. [expensive book X [which expensive book [that [[we bought t ]] t ]] C [t] →
h. (I lost) the [expensive book X [which expensive book [that [[we bought t ]] t ]]] C [t]

As noted, such “initial” complementizers turn out to be a feature of VO and “non-rigid” OV languages.
The case of initial complementizers in pre-Head position, as in (7d) above, is apparently rather marked. We interpret it as arising from the attraction of IP by a non-pronounced lower complementizer (the C of (7)d and (9)d), and from the (marked) property that the higher overt complementizer has of attracting nothing.22
Though again quite rare, the case of initial complementizers in finite RCs also seems to exist. It is generally stated, or assumed, that there are no languages with prenominal RCs that have an initial finite complementizer (e.g., Andrews 1975,44; Downing 1978,394). Yet, Galla (Oromo) (Cushitic), Silli Greek (which is spoken in Asia Minor, and on which Turkish may have played a role), and Tigre (Ethio-Semitic), appear to be three such languages. See (10)-(12):23

(10) [kan [ kalēsa gale]] namtičča an arge (Galla (Oromo) - Mallinson and Blake 1981,289)
   Rel yesterday arrived(finite) man-def I saw
   ‘I saw the man that arrived yesterday’

(11) [kiát [ira ]] perí (Silli Greek - Song 2001,256)
   Comp saw-I boy
   ‘The boy that I saw’

22. Merge of C and X of (3) above VP yields relative clause extraposition (cf. Kayne 2000a,318f). As Kayne notes, this may turn out to be the only option available.

23. Galla (Oromo) and Tigre also allow postnominal RCs.
Although they are quite common in preverbal position (as well as in postverbal position) in VO languages, subordinator-initial adjunct clauses normally occur postverbally in OV languages, though some exceptions exist. See, e.g., (13).

(13) [kawu [nji yakin-da-ro ]] bari bukin (Kanuri - Hutchison 1976,141)

before water drink.1sg.impf-det-dat meal eat.1sg.impf
‘I will eat before I drink water’

In (“rigid”) OV languages instead one typically finds in preverbal position subordinator-final adjunct clauses. See the quote from Diessel (2001) above and Dryer (1992a, §4.5).

**Final complementizers.** It is tempting to take the “final” complementizers typical of “rigid” OV languages to be the spell out of the lower C of (7) and (9); the one which attracts the “complement” IP or the relative IP (and which is ordinarily not spelled out in VO and “non-rigid” OV languages). See the case of complement clauses in (14), the case of relative clauses in (15) and the case of adjunct clauses in (16) and (17):25


T. topic Z. nom. mad is Comp thought
‘Taroo thought that Ziroo is mad’

b. mene [[Madhu se bethane] ke liye] kaha (Hindi – Singh 1977,204)

I M. to sit for said
‘I asked Madhu to sit down’

---


25. On the apparent relative paucity of finite clauses preceding the complementizer in OV languages, see the discussion in Kayne (2003, sect.4.7).
c. Chele-Ta [[or baba aS- be] bole] Sune-che boy-CLF his father come-FUT Comp hear-PST3 ‘The boy has heard that his father will come’ (Bangla – Bayer 1996,255)\(^\text{26}\)

(15) a. [[Vok rool ?a pee] mii] lawthlawpaa ka mu? pig food 3sg give Comp farmer 1sg see ‘I saw the farmer who gave food to the pig’ (Lai – Kathol and Vanbik 1999,434)


(16) [[ọ duma tún timi] seribi] arî waijī bō-mi 3Pl song sing Cont.Past while I turn come-Past ‘While they were singing, I returned’ (Ijo – Williamson 1965,78)\(^\text{27}\)

(17) [[ enu-nege-pi ] tawa] tarep war-an spear-me-3sg MEDIAL lest dance get-1sg PAST ‘Lest he spear me, I dance about’ (Daga – Thompson and Longacre 1985,188)

In this respect, “rigid” OV languages would lack the higher complementizers of VO languages (the one that attracts VP in the case of complement and adjunct clauses and the ones that attract the relative pronoun and the Head NP in the case of relative clauses). Alternatively, they would have unpronounced ones which fail to attract any material. The existence of languages with postverbal or postnominal (“extraposed”) complement or relative clauses with final complementizers appears to support the

---

\(^{26}\) Recall that some OV languages may have either an initial or a final complementizer (depending on the type of complement clause). See the text above (6) for the case of Bangla, and fn.13 for the case of Uzbek.

\(^{27}\) Cited from Dryer (2003,53).
second alternative. In these languages, we may assume that the higher unpronounced complementizers retain the property of attracting the VP, or the relative pronoun and the RC Head. See (18), (19), and (20)\textsuperscript{28}.

(18) a. cu-te i-mā amji jarēn C [\(\text{[cu-mā akīn] na}\) ] (Canela-Crahô - Popjes and Popjes 1986, 165)
   \[\text{3-Past 1-Tempry self told 3-Temp 2-like subord} \]
   ‘He told me that he likes you’

   \[\text{when you.know Q creek to fall Comp} \]
   ‘When did you find out that he fell in the creek?’

   \[\text{man 1sg see-ABIL REL} \]
   ‘The man who saw me’

b. thik’ihi C [\(\text{neyaa yet’ah golō thehk’ê sii}\) ] (Slave – Dryer 2003, 31)
   \[\text{gun 2SG.son it.with moose 3.shot COMP N Rel} \]
   ‘the gun that your son shot the moose with’

(20) a. ami ekhane eSe-chi C [\(\text{[tomar SONge kOtha bol-bo] bole}\) ] (Bangla – Bayer 1996, 255)
   \[\text{I here come-Pst1 you with speech say-Fut1 Comp} \]
   ‘I have come here in order to talk with you’

b. ?amá k’a way C [\(\text{[ma hīße] mpes}\) ] (Tol - Holt 1999, 51)
   \[\text{land dry Cop Neg Pres.rain.3 because} \]
   ‘The land is dry because it doesn’t rain’

*Circumpositioned complementizers/subordinators.* The existence of two complementizers/subordinators sandwiching the complement/adjunct or the relative

\textsuperscript{28} Other languages displaying the same property are mentioned in fn. 12 above. Also see Santali, Canela-Crahô, Kuku Yalanji, and Pech of the Appendix II, below.
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clause also seems to constitute evidence for the hypothesized unpronounced higher complementizer, as it seems plausible to take the simultaneous appearance of an initial and a final complementizer to be the spelling out of both positions. See (21) for examples of complement clauses, (22) for an example of an adjunct clause, and (23) for examples of relative clauses:

(21) a. tuisi tu?i ke hu hamut bwika-kai (Yaqui – Dryer 1980, fn.7) very good comp this woman sing-subord ‘It is very good that this woman sings’

(22) [se mi-wi’ẽ a] mi-kò fi’e (Fanti – Welmers 1946, 72) when 1sg-finish when 1sg-go home ‘When I’m finished, I go home’

(23) a. mo yə e jó săŋ ă’ă (Banjoun (Ghomala) – Watters 2003, 255) man Rel 3ps see.Past bird Rel ‘…the man who saw the bird’
b. ɲa? [naŋ ka-keŋ ɛŋ ge-ya pola? naŋ] ge-mu ge-meŋ (Jabêm – Ross 2002d, 281) man DEM 1sg-give 3sg 3sg-go:3 Polac DEM 3sg-go:back 3sg-go:1 ‘Has the man I sent to Polac come back or not?’

Internal complementizers. The case of Bangla “Comp-internal clauses” discussed in Bayer (1996, 1999, 247; 2001, fn. 12), Bhattacharyya (2001), and references cited there,

29. Note that the final complementizers of Yaqui and (Lhasa) Tibetan in (14) are enclitic. Another case of (almost) circumpositioned complementizers is the Bangla example in (20) below.
I take those cases where a finite (complement, adjunct or relative) clause appears in pre-head position without any overt complementizer/subordinator to involve non-pronounced Cs that fail to attract the remnant. Where a finite (complement, adjunct or relative) clause appears in post-head position without any overt complementizer/subordinator, I will instead assume that the higher (covert) C has the property of attracting the remnant to its Spec.
may possibly be another instantiation of the property that the (higher) finite complementizers have of attracting material to their left in “non-rigid” OV languages. Bayer and Bhattacharya point out that finite complement clauses can have an initial COMP if they follow the matrix verb ((24)a), but can no longer have an initial COMP if the complement clause precedes the matrix V ((24)b). In that case, the COMP is rather internal to the complement clause itself ((24)c). I would like to interpret both cases as consequences of the attraction property of the complementizer. Either the remnant following the complement clause – i.e., the matrix V(P) – is attracted (with the consequence that [COMP S] will be postverbal – see (25)), or part of the complement clause itself will (see (26) (with the consequence that the remnant – the matrix V(P) – can no longer be attracted, but has to stay in situ, to the right of its complement)).

(24) a. chele-Ta Sune-che [je [or baba aS–be]]
   boy-CL hear-Pst3 that his father come-will
   ‘The boy heard that his father will come’
b. *chele-Ta [je [or baba aS–be]] Sune-che
   boy-CL that his father come-will hear-Pst3
   ‘The boy heard that his father will come’
c. chele-Ta [or baba je [aS–be]] Sone-ni
   boy-CL his father that come-will hear-neg/Pst3
   ‘The boy hasn’t heard that his father will come’

(25) a. C chele-Ta [or baba aS–be] Sune-che →
b. [or baba aS–be] C chele-Ta Sune-che →
c. je [or baba aS–be] C chele-Ta Sune-che →
d. chele-Ta Sune-che [je [or baba aS–be] C t] (=24)a

(26) a. C chele-Ta [or baba aS–be] Sune-che →
b. [or baba aS–be] C chele-Ta Sune-che →

30. A similar derivation is proposed by Kayne (2000b,49f) for Amharic if-clauses. For the comparable case of Amharic argument clauses, see (i), from Demeke (2001,196):

(i) [ e [ Saba worq-u-n yā-[[šāT-āčč-iw] yi-māśl-all ]]
   S. gold-def-acc comp-sell_perf-1s-3ms 3ms-seem-Auxpres(etc)
   ‘It seems that Saba sold the gold’
c. je [or baba aS–be] C chele-Ta Sune-che 

d. chele-Ta [or baba je [ t aS–be]] Sone-ni (= (24)c)

That je corresponds to the higher complementizer *daß* (*that*) of (7), rather than to the lower complementizer C, is suggested by the fact that C may be spelled out as well (together with the ‘final’ complementizer *bole* seen in (14)c). See (27) (also from Bayer 1996,263f):

(27)  

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[chele je poR-be] bole} & \text{ ami mon-e kor-I ni} \\
\text{boy JE study-Fut3 BOLE I mind-loc do-1 neg-pst} \\
\text{‘I haven’t thought that the boy will study’}
\end{align*}
\]

Like in complement and adjunct clauses in the sentence, in some OV languages constituents of the RC may also end up to the left of the relative complementizer. This is more obvious (pace Kayne 1994,93) in those cases where the relative and declarative (or interrogative) complementizers have the same form, as is the case, apparently, in Amharic (Demeke 2001,196ff), and Basque (De Rijk 1972,116; Lehmann 1984,59). See (28).\footnote{The complementizer can be internal to the RC also in Georgian, modulo the further raising of the RC Head (presumably to the Spec of a still higher Comp). See (i), from Harris (1994,132), and Georgian in Appendix II below.}

(28)  

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[lā-saba [yā-šāT-ku-t] C māšhaf ]]}} & \text{(cf. Demeke 2001,203)} \\
\text{to-Saba comp-sellperf-1s-3ms book} \\
\text{‘a book that I sold to Saba’}
\end{align*}
\]

As (following Kayne 2000a,2001,2003,2005) I take the post-“Head” positioning of a clause to depend on the presence of an overt (or abstract) complementizer (of the right kind), it could be that a non-rigid OV language with postverbal complement clauses still has only prenominal RCs if the language has no (relative pronoun or) relative

\footnote{(i)  

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[xalxi [kareb-tan axlos ro [ t idga ] [C [aq’aq’anda]]]]} \\
\text{people doors-at close that he-sit he-clap} \\
\text{‘the people who sat close by the doors began to clap’}
\end{align*}
\]
complementizer of the same right kind.\textsuperscript{32} Conversely, it could be that a certain OV language with postnominal RCs introduced by relative pronouns or relative complementizers (of the right kind) has no postverbal clause as it lacks declarative complementizers (of the same right kind). Slave appears to be such a case. It has preverbal subordinate clauses (Rice 1989, chapt.42), but postnominal RCs (with final complementizers) (Rice 1989,chapt.47; Dryer 2003,31).\textsuperscript{33} In any case, we submit that both such situations are marked, the more general case being that if a language allows \textit{postverbal} subordinate clauses (i.e., is VO or “non-rigid” OV) then it also allows \textit{postnominal} RCs. This was seen to be a consequence of a property of higher complementizers.

\textsuperscript{32} See the cases of mismatch mentioned in fn.17 above. If its few apparently postnominal RCs are actually free relatives in apposition (cf. Lehmann 1984,61; Rebuschi 2001, fn.9, who refers to Oyharçabal 1987), Basque, which has postverbal complement clauses (Lehmann 1984,59), would be another case in point.

\textsuperscript{33} Although no lists, or numbers, of languages are cited, Lehmann (1984,183) may also be relevant here.
APPENDIX I

(M&B = Mallinson and Blake 1981)

OV languages of the “rigid” type (no postverbal subordinate clauses; no postnominal RCs):

Ainu (isolate - M&B,276; Tamura 2000), Amharic (Ethio-Semitic – see fn.7 above),
Betta Kurumba (South Dravidian – Coelho 2003,78ff,214,223), Burmese (Tibeto-Burman - M&B, 277; Lehmann 1984,183; Soe 1999), Burushaski (isolate - M&B,277),
Lushai (Tibeto-Burman - Hillard 1977,339ff, 343); Malayalam (South Dravidian - Mohanan 1982,510; Asher and Kumari1997,§1.1.2)35, Mao Naga (Tibeto-Burman – Giridhar 1994)36, Meithei (Tibeto-Burman – Chelliah 1997), Mongolian (Altaic -

34. The author explicitly says that “modifiers, including subordinate clauses, precede the head” (p.52),
and gives only prenominal RCs and preverbal complement and adverbial clauses except for the following
example of postverbal purpose clause:

(i) pasung khata-ko raicha sung khom-si
    old_man go-NML report PRT wood  cut-PURP    ‘the old man went to cut firewood’

35. As noted, Malayalam appears to allow postverbal deaccented complement and adverbial clauses. Cf.
fn.10 and 17 above.

36. Giridhar (1994) gives only prenominal relative clauses and preverbal complement and adverbial clauses except for one postverbal indirect question complement clause (p.465):

(i) ai sù mo-e pfo vu ko vu le mono
    I know not he come or not come will whether ‘I don’t know whether he will come or not’

37. Also see the case of the Mongolic languages Mangghuer (p.317), Monghul (p.303) and Ordos (p.207) in Janhunen (2003).

38. Givón (1984, 215f), however, says that in Sherpa sentential complements may also follow the verb (though it is not clear from the text whether this option is only possible as an afterthought - cf. fn. 10).

39. As noted (fn.17), Telugu appears to allow for (deaccented) postverbal complement clauses. Cf. also fn. 10.

40. One exception to the otherwise preverbal position of both complement and adverbial clauses (similar to that observed for Mao Naga in footnote 36) is given by Anderson and Harrison (1999, 78):

(i) men bilhes men kaynaar baar men
    I know-Neg.Pres/Fut I to.where go-Pres/Fut I ‘I don’t know where to go’
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APPENDIX II

OV languages of the “non rigid” type (postverbal subordinate clauses; postnominal RCs, either as the exclusive, or as the alternative, option): 41

‘Ala’ala (Non-Austronesian Papuan – Ross 2002c)
postverbal complement clauses:
Ia e-‘ou [Koloka ‘ani e-ba] (Ross 2002c,361)
he 3sg-tell Koloka EMPH 3sg-die
‘He told me Koloka had died’

postverbal adverbial clauses:
kau e-da’a luma ['ola-na melo e-da’a loba] (Ross 2002c,360)
man 3sg-go house because boy 3sg-go garden
‘The man went to the house because the boy went to the garden

postnominal RCs: 42
Ate’ate [a-ika-ia] bose a e-vua-ia (Ross 2002c,352)
Woman 1sg-see-3sg basket 3sg-carry-3sg
‘The woman I saw was carrying a basket’

Bagri (Indo-Aryan – Gusain 2000)
postverbal complement clauses:
me< socu< hu< [ke bó javego] (Gusain 2000,66)
I think.Prst am that he go.Fut.3ms

41. Of the OV languages which Mallinson and Blake (1981) characterize as having postnominal RCs, we could not find sufficient information concerning the position of complement and adverbial clauses for the following: Adyghe (Northwest Caucasian - M&B,276), Fur (Nilo-Saharan - M&B,278), Kanuri (Nilo-Saharan - M&B,279) and Khamti (Tai-Kadai - M&B,280), for which they give the postnominal order as the exclusive order of RCs, and Rashad (Kordofanian - M&B,282), Nubian (Nilo-Saharan - M&B,281), and Tigre (Ethio-Semitic – M&B,283).

42. ‘Ala’ala also has prenominal relative clauses (Ross 2002c,352).
‘I think that he will go’
postverbal adverbial clauses:  

postnominal RCs:
\[ \text{bó admi [jiko kál ayo ho]} \]  
(Gusain 2000,62)
that man rel. yesterday come-Perf aux-pst.3ms
‘the man who came yesterday’

postverbal complement clauses:
\[ \text{chela-Ta Sune-che [je or baba aS-be]} \]  
(Bayer 1996,255)
boy-CF hear-Past.3 that his father come-Fut.3
‘The boy has heard that his father will come’

postverbal adverbial clauses:  
\[ ?\text{tomar ma khuSi hO-be [tumi kolkata-Y ge-le]} \]  
(Bayer 1996,282)
your mother happy become-FUT2 you Calcutta-LOC go-CondPrte
‘Your mother will be happy if you go to Calcutta’

postnominal RCs:
\[ \text{ami Sey lok-Ta-ke [je eSe-che] cin-i na} \]  
(Bayer 1996,256)
I the man-CF-OBJ that come-Past.3 know-1 not
‘I don’t know the man who came’

43. Although in Gusain (2000) no examples of postverbal adverbial clauses are given, it is explicitly said that “Finite adverbial clauses may be placed in presentential as well as post sentential position” (p.69).

44. As Bhatt (2003,488) notes, most Indo-Aryan languages have postnominal RCs (besides correlatives, and prenominal participial relatives). Cf. the case of Hindi and Marathi below. Bhatt (2003) also mentions the fact that Southern Konkani, Saurashtri and Sinhalese neither have postnominal RCs (p.488,fn.4), nor correlatives (p.491).

45. Bayer (1996 chapter 7,fn.41), notes that the “slight awkwardness of the [postverbal variant] may have to do with a problem for tense linking”. 
Brahui (North Dravidian - Elfenbein 1998) In addition to the Dravidian prenominal pattern, Brahui (possibly due to the influence of the neighbouring Indo-Aryan languages - Elfenbein 1998, 409, 411f) has also postverbal finite complement and adverbial clauses and postnominal finite RCs introduced by the same complementizer *ki* (borrowed from Balochi - Elfenbein 1998,411):

postverbal complement clauses:
\[
ō tēnā ust-āṭī pāṛē [ki ī duzziw=ta]
\]  
(Elfenbein 1998,412)
he-nom his heart-locI say-past-3 that I steal-fut1sg=3sobl
“he said in his own heart that he would steal it”

postverbal adverbial clauses:
\[
i nā xal-ōī uṭ, [ki nī dawn apāsa]?
\]  
(Elfenbein 1998,404)
I you hit-prt.necess be, that you thus speak-impfc-prs-2s
‘Am I to be struck by you because you are speaking in this way?’

postnominal RCs:
\[
kunē=ṅē hāmē kuṯak-as [ki drust kē-nē]
\]  
(Elfenbein 1998,412)
bite-prs3s=2obl same dog-def that knowledge do-prs3s=2obl
“The dog that bites you is the same dog that knows you”

Canela-Crahô (Jê (Amazonian) – Popjes and Popjes 1986)
postverbal complement clauses:
\[
cu-te i-mā amji jarēn, [cu-mā akīn na]
\]  
(Popjes and Popjes 1986,165)
3-Past 1-Tempry self told 3-Temp 2-like subord
‘He told me that he likes you’

postverbal adverbial clauses:
\[
jačo me capi te pī kēhē jakep [ame to ajpēn cahhyr prām te]
\]  
(Popjes and Popjes 1986,165)
Jaco and Capi Past wood twig cut 3pl Inst Recip beat want because
‘Jaco and Capi cut twigs because they wanted to beat each other with them’

postnominal RCs:
\[
wā i-te rop pupun, [capī te ih-curun ata]
\]  
(Popjes and Popjes 1986,171)
I I-Past dog see Capi Past 3-kill Dem/Rel
‘I saw the dog Capi killed’

**Coahuilteco** (Language isolate formerly spoken in Texas – Troike 1981,2004)
postverbal complement clauses:
na-\textit{k}‘\textit{a}·\textit{m} [\textit{ta-}\textit{x}\textit{-p}a-ta-w\textit{a} \textit{wex san pa-n}]
1S-hope 1O-2S-Sub-help Fut Rel-1Con
‘I hope that you will help me’

postverbal adverbial clauses:                 (Troike 1981,671)
\textit{na-\textit{k}}\,\textit{ax in,.. [\textit{ux}\textit{w}‘\textit{a}‘l’ \textit{tuk}\textit{w}‘\textit{e-}m \textit{mak-pa-}\textit{cu} \textit{santupa-yok}\textit{w}‘\textit{e-}n]}
1S-2\textdegree-give also sky Dem-2Con 2S:3pO-Sub-carry in order that-1Con
‘I give you also (the indulgences) in order that you carry them to Heaven’

postnominal RCs:
saxpame \textit{pinapsa} [\textit{xami-n xa-p-xo}‘\textit{ra} tupa-\textit{n}]
\textit{sins you 2-Sub-know Dem-1C}
‘the sins that you know’

**Desano** (Tucanoan – Miller 1999)
postverbal complement clauses:
y\textit{?i pepi-a} [\textit{sir}\textit{i-a \textit{wa-gok\textbackslash{\texttt{b}}}\textit{bo}]}
1s think-Non3\textsuperscript{\textdegree}Pres die-Perf go-Prob\textsuperscript{3fs}
‘I think she will die’

postverbal adverbial clauses:                 (Miller 1999,152)
b\textit{\texttt{b}}\textit{a} \textit{igo-re karta goha-\textit{b}\texttt{as}i-a \textit{figo b\texttt{a}s}i-bo-\textit{ro dopa-ta]}\textit{]}\textit{]
2pl 3fs-Spec letter write-Abil-Nom3\textsuperscript{\textdegree}Pres 3fs know-pot-deverb like-Lim
‘You can write her a letter so that she will know’

postnominal RCs:
y\textit{re su}\textit{?ri [\textit{\texttt{a}s\texttt{a}s-basa-ra-ye] s\texttt{a}y\texttt{a}-bi}}\textit{]
1s-Spec clothes buy-Ben-Deverb-Clf put\textsuperscript{\textdegree}on-Non3\textsuperscript{\textdegree}Pst
‘I put on the dress that was bought for me’
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**Eudeve** (Uto-Aztecan – Shaul 1991)

postverbal complement clauses:

\[ \text{nee aguátera-n [dominco-tze amo missa ca vitzá-cauh]} \]  
1sg know-Pre Sunday-Loc thy mass Neg see-Past 
‘I know that you didn’t see mass on Sunday’

postverbal adverbial clauses:

\[ \text{eme-ne suba-m [eme deni-hips-cade]} \]  
thee-1sg like-Pre thee good-heart-Nom 
‘I like you because you have a good heart’

postnominal RCs:

\[ \text{hipsem-ta [no vvas-vva mavva-tzem-ta] ovvic} \]  
people-Obj my field-Ali weed-Nom-Obj call 
‘Call the Indians who are to weed my field’

**Evenki** (Tungusic - Nedjalkov 1997; Bulatova and Grenoble 1999)

postverbal complement clauses:

\[ \text{nungan sa:-re-n [eme-d’enge-vi]} \]  
he know-nfut-3sg come-part-prefl 
‘He knows that he will (be able to) come’

postverbal adverbial clauses:

\[ \text{nungan ala:t-cheche-n [o:kin girki-n eme-d’e-n]} \]  
he wait-impv-3sg when friend-3sg.pss come-FUT-3sg 
‘He was waiting when his friend would come’

---

46. Nedjalkov (1997,44) reports that “adverbial participles always precede the main clause. Converbal forms expressing time (except for posteriority), manner, condition and cause, as a rule, precede the main clause, whereas converbs of posteriority, purpose and result, as a rule follow the main clause. Conjunctive adverbial clauses [like the example given here, with indicative mood (G.C)] also, as a rule, follow the main clause.”
postnominal RCs:\(^{47}\)
\[bi\ \text{beje-ve} [\text{tatkit-tu haval-d'a-cha-ve} \text{archa-0-m}]\] (Nedjalkov 1997,36)
I man-accd school-dat work-impv-part-accd meet-nfut-1sg
‘I met the man who worked at school’

\textbf{Galla (Oromo)} (Cushitic - M&B,278,289, Gragg 1972,162-165; Dryer 1992fn.5; Stroomer 1995)\(^{48}\)
postverbal complement clauses:
\[\text{atini hin-beek-tu, [akka bisaani nyaap'a-ii irra ta-u]}\] ?(Stroomer 1995,127)
You Neg-know-2Neg.Pres, that water enemy-Subj on be.present-3Pres.Subord
‘Don’t you know that your enemies are staying by the water?’

postverbal adverbial clauses:
\(\ldots\ \text{Nuu dandeenee guyyaa sadiillee hinoolluu, [atoo bisani hind'ugini]}\)
\(\ldots\ \text{we be.able.1pl.Past day three.also neg.pass.day.1pl.neg.Pres, if water neg.drink.neg.Past}\)
‘… we cannot live even three days, unless we drink water’

postnominal RCs:
\[\text{nam-tičča [kan kalēsa gale] (sana) an arge}\] (Gragg 1972,162; M&B,289)
man-def Rel yesterday arrived (Dem) I saw
‘I saw the man that arrived yesterday’

\textbf{Gapapaiwa (Oceanic (Austronesian) - McGuckin 2002)}
postverbal complement clauses:
3:NON.PRES-say Comp quickly 2PL-FUT-return
‘They say that you must return quickly’

\(^{47}\) Comrie (1998,79f) reports that in this language RCs may either precede or follow their Head. From
the examples he gives it appears that they can also be “extraposed” to the right of the verb.

\(^{48}\) The example of postverbal complement clause is from Stroomer (1995,127). As noted by Mallinson
and Blake (1981,289), Galla (Oromo) allows the finite relative clause introduced by the relative marker
\textit{kan} also to appear prenominally. See (10) above (their (5.46)).
postverbal adverbial clauses:

\[ I-\text{oru} \quad ku=\text{okowa} \quad [da \quad \text{vi-towa} \quad \text{kubiine}] \quad (\text{McGuckin 2002,320}) \]

3:NON.PRES-go-down to-river Comp CAUS-bathe PURP
‘They went down the river for the purpose of taking a bath’

postnominal RCs:

\[ \text{ededa} \quad [i-\text{riku}] \quad a-\text{kita}=i-si \quad (\text{McGuckin 2002,305}) \]

children 3:NON.PRES-dance 1Sg-see=TR-3PL
‘I saw the children who danced’


postverbal complement clauses:  (Khatuna Okroshidze, p.c.; cf. Testelec 1998a,240)
\[ \text{me vici} \quad [\text{from sen} \quad \text{xval} \quad \text{ar} \quad \text{moxval}] \]

I know.Prs that you tomorrow not come.Fut
‘I know that you will not come tomorrow’

postverbal adverbial clauses:

\[ \text{ar gauvlia ert k’vires, [rom amas meore șemtxveva-c daerto]} \quad (\text{Harris 1995,1393}) \]

not it/pass one week, that him/DAT second incident-too it/occurred/him
‘Not a week had passed, when a second incident also occurred to him’

postnominal RCs: 49

49. As noted above, there is also a gap variant of the postnominal RC employing just the complementizer \( \text{rom}/\text{ro} \) ‘that’, internal to the RC (Harris 1994,132):

\[ \text{(i) xalxi} \quad [\text{kareb-tan} \quad \text{axlos ro idga}] \quad \text{aq’aq’anda} \]

people doors-at close that he-sit he-clap ‘the people who sat close by the doors began to clap’

The RC types which Harris (1994,133) analyses as ‘gap’ prenominal (see (ii)) and ‘non-reduction’ prenominal (see (iii)) seem rather to be correlative constructions without a (\textit{which} type) relative marker of the kind found in Bambara (Bird 1968), and, respectively, without and with an internal head:
The people [who doors-at close were standing] began to shout
‘The people who were standing near the doors began to shout’

Godoberi (Dakho-Dagestanian – Kibrik 1996)
postverbal complement clauses: (Kibrik 1996,175)

\[ \text{il-u-ra} \quad b=i?-at-a-da \quad [ \text{waša Ridu} \quad w-a?a-bu-li] \]

mother-OBL-AFF NEUT=know-PRS-CONV-COP boy to.Godoberi MASC=come-PST-PRT-SUB

‘Mother knows that they boy has come to Godoberi’

postverbal adverbial clauses:50

\[ \text{mak’i} \quad \text{čar-u} \quad wu=na \quad [ \text{bac’a} \quad \text{ha?-ir-a-di}] \]

child run.PAST-CONV Masc=go.PST [wolf see-MASD-OBL-ERG]

‘The child ran away because he saw the wolf’

postnominal RCs:

(ii) šen-gan ro miviçeb, im pul-it me gadavixdi val-s

you-from that I.receive.it, that money-INST I.NOM I.pay.it debt-DAT

‘I will pay off the debt with that money which I receive from you’

(iii) minda, Betania-ši rom k’olmeurnoba-a, is vnaxo

I.want.it Betania-in that collective-it.is, it.NOM I.see.it

‘I want to see the collective-farm that is in Betania’

The correlative nature of these Modern Georgian RCs may be indicated by the existence in Middle Georgian of clearer correlative cases like of the following, also given by Harris ((1994,134):

(iv) Durmišxan-s Alget-ze rom c’iskvili eč’ira, is c’iskvili…

Durmišxan-DAT Alget-on that mill he.have.it, that mill…

‘the mill which Durmishxan had on Alget…’

50. Although most types of adverbial clauses are preverbal, because clauses, like the one given here, can be postverbal.
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*di-ra*  
*ha?a*  
*jaci*  
*[maHačqala-jalda  j=ih-i-bu]*  
(Kibrik 1996,151)

I-OBL-AFF  see.PST  sister  Makhachkala.PLACE  FEM=live.PST-PRT

‘I saw (my) sister who lived in Makhachkala’

**Hindi** (Indo-Aryan - M&B,278; Singh 1977)

postverbal complement clauses:

*Ram ne kaha [ki Sita bimar he]*  
(Singh 1977,204)

Ram Agt said that Sita sick be

‘R. said that S. was sick’

postverbal adverbial clauses:

*Vo dhiire bol rahaa hai [kyon-ki us-ka gala kharaab hai]*  
(Anoop Mahajan, p.c.)

He softly talk progr be-pres why-that his throat bad be-pres

‘He is speaking softly because his throat is bad’

postnominal RCs:

*us aadmi ne [jo miir hai] ek makaan khariidhaa*  
(M&B,290)

that man erg Rel rich is a house bought

‘The man who is rich bought a house’

**Hittite** (Indo-European - M&B,278; Lehmann 1984,123ff; Luraghi 1997)

postverbal complement clauses:

*nu mahhan austa anda=kan [kuit hatkesnuwantes …]*  
(Luraghi 1997,59)

CONN when see-1sg-Pret into-PTC COMPL oppress-PART-NOM-PL

‘when I saw that they were being oppressed…’

postverbal adverbial clauses:

*nu É-ri= ssi anniskizzi [kuitman=as lazziyattat…]*  
(Luraghi 1997,66f)

CONN house-D/L POSS3sg-D/L work-3sg-ITER-PRES until-3sg-NOM recover-3sg-PRES

‘and (he) works in his house, until he (sc. the injured) recovers…’
postnominal RCs: (Luraghi 1997,39)

\[ GIS TUKUL=ma \ [kuin apiya harkun n= an] \ halissiyanun \]

weapon=Ptc Rel-Acc there have-1sg-Pret Conn=3sg-acc inlay-1sg-Pret
‘the weapon that I had there I had inlaid’

**Hopi** (Uto-Aztecan – Heath 1972\(^51\); Dryer 1980; Grune 1995)

postverbal complement clauses:

\[ Pas nî qa navota [fiŋ hiroro-ta-q’ö] \]

Very I Neg hear you snore-dur-sub,ds
‘I certainly didn’t hear you snore’

postverbal adverbial clauses:

\[ Pam waaya [nu' put tuwa-q'ö] \]

he ran-away I him see-(subject-switch)
‘He ran away when I saw him’

postnominal RCs:\(^52\) (Grune 1995,12; cf. also Heath 1972,238)

\[ nu' pookot [moosa kuukiqat] ngöyva \]

I dog(obj) cat(subj) biting-him(obj) chased
‘I chased the dog that the cat bit’

**Kabardian** (Northwest Caucasian – Colarusso 1992,189,190)\(^53\)

postverbal adverbial clauses:

---

\(^51\). To judge from Heath (1972), many other (Sonoran and Shoshonean) Uto-Aztecan languages show a situation comparable to Hopi (and Pima Bajo, Southern Paiute, and Yaqui below).

\(^52\). Hopi also has internally headed RCs (Jacobsen 1998,103).

\(^53\). In Kabardian, restrictive RCs ordinarily precede the N, and complement and adjunct clauses ordinarily precede the V (Colarusso, 1992, 187ff). However, as shown in the text, restrictive RCs can also follow the N, just as certain subordinate clauses can follow the V. In both cases, the clause takes a (suffixed) complementizer (-wa), glossed “pred” by Colarusso. Non-restrictive RCs are instead always postnominal (Colarusso 1992,190). It is however not clear whether Kabardian also allows for postverbal complement clauses (John Colarusso p.c.).
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I forest-obl 1-move-intr-past-aff berries 3-hor-I-pick-inf-pred
‘I went into the forest to pick berries’

postnominal RCs:
λ ’∂-r [a-tx ∂-r 0-q’a-z-tx∂-aγ-wa]
man-abs that-book-abs 3-hor-who-write-past-pred ‘the man who wrote that book’

Kairiru (Oceanic (Austronesian) – Ross 2002a)
postverbal complement clauses:
 ei o-wot [yieq qo-myai r’uon] (Ross 2002a,210)
3sg 3sg-say 2sg 2sg-come COMPL
‘He said that you had come’

postverbal adverbial clauses:54

postnominal RCs:
 moin nai [kyau u-rim] ceik e-rib (Ross 2002a,211)
woman that 1sg 1sg-see:3sg stringbag 3sg-carry
‘The woman I saw was carrying a stringbag’

Kuku Yalanji (Pama-Nyungan – Patz 2002)55
postverbal complement clauses:
child-Erg.pt(A) see-Past snake.Abs(S) kill-ltr-Sub
‘The child saw the snake being killed/how the snake was killed’

postverbal adverbial clauses:

54. Ross (2002a,215) states that clausal subordination is expressed by simple juxtaposition of clauses, which makes the correlation with relative clauses impossible to test.

ngayu  baya  waju-l,  [yundu  wumbul-ma-nka]  (Patz 2002,166)
1sg.Nom(A)  fire-Abs(O)  burn-NonPast  2sg.Nom(S)  warm-Inch-Purp
‘I light a fire so that you get warm’

postnominal RCs:  (Patz 2002,181)
buliman-angka  warru  karrba-ny,  [bayan  janjarri-l-janjarri-nya]
policeman-Erg.pt(A)  yg.man.Abs(O)  grab-Past  house.Abs(O)  snoop-l-Red-Sub
‘The policeman apprehended the chap (who was/while he was) snooping in the house’

**Latin** (Indo-European - Ernout et Thomas 1964)\(^{56}\)
postverbal complement clauses:
gaudeo  [te  interpellauj]  (Ernout et Thomas 1964,298)
I am glad  (I)  you-ACC  asked
‘I’m glad I’ve asked you’

postverbal adverbial clauses:
relegatus mihi videor  [ posteaquam in Formiano sum]  (Ernout et Thomas 1964,361)
exiled to me  (I)  appear since in my villa in Formia I am
‘I appear to myself an exile since the day I arrived in my villa in Formia’

postnominal RCs:
puellae  [quas  rogavi]  cras  respondebunt  (M&B,332)
girls.[fem].pl.nom  RelPro.fem.pl.nom.  ask-past.[1s]  tomorrow  reply.Fut.[3.pl]
‘The girls whom I asked will answer tomorrow’

**Manam** (Austronesian – Lichtenberk 1983)
postverbal complement clauses:
tamōata  i-pile  [mása  ɲa-dũma-ya]  (Lichtenberk 1983,556)
man  3sg.realis-say  indef.irrealis  3sg.irrealis-help-1sg.obj
‘The man said he would help me’

---

\(^{56}\). Latin also has correlative RCs (cf. Bianchi 1999, 86ff, and references cited there).
postverbal adverbial clauses:

\[ \text{tágo u-duma-í?o [biéy u-là?o-be]} \] (Lichtenberk 1983,548)

neg 1sg.realis-help-2sg.obj B. 1sg.realis-go-and

‘I did not help you because I went to Bieng’

postnominal RCs:

\[ \text{tamòata [tanépwa i-rá=ra-di]} \] ?u-?awat-á?idi? (Lichtenberk 1983,262)

man chief 3sg.realis-talk to=redupl-3pl.obj 2sg-know-trans-3pl.obj

‘Do you know the man the chief is talking to?’

**Marathi** (Indo-Aryan - M&B,281; Pandharipande 1997)

postverbal complement clauses:

\[ \text{Mohan mhanālā [kī madhū dillīla gelā]} \] (Pandharipande 1997, p.65)

Mohan say-past-3sm Comp Madhu Delhi-to go-past-3sm

‘Mohan said that Madhu went to Delhi’

postverbal adverbial clauses:57

\[ \text{tī gāte [dzēmwhā tī ānandī aste]} \] (Pandharipande 1997, p.105)

she sing-3sf when she happy is-3sf

‘She sings when she is happy’

postnominal RCs:

\[ \text{to mānūs [dzo iṭha śikawto] to mādzhā bhāū āhe} \] (Pandharipande 1997, p.79)

that man rel here teach-pres-3sm that poss-ms brother is

‘The man who teaches here is my brother’

**Nama** (Khoisan - M&B,279; Andrews 1975,58-61). Mallinson and Blake (1981,279) classify Nama (which they refer to as Hottentot) as SOV, and as having both pre- and postnominal RCs.58

---

57. While non-finite adverbial clauses and adverbial clauses followed by postpositions are preverbal, (temporal and because) adverbial clauses with initial subordinators are postverbal (cf. Pandharipande 1997,105ff).

58. Andrews (1975) also lists the language as having both pre- and post-nominal RCs. In addition to the example given in the text, Andrews (1975,60) also gives a prenominal RC, saying that ‘[w]hen the clause
postverbal complement clauses:

\[
Ti+ta \text{ ge } goro \#âi \ |i+b \ ne+pa \ ha \ ti| \quad (\text{Levi Namaseb, p.c.})
\]
I +me Ind Prog think Pron+He here+Loc be so
‘I thought that he was here’

postverbal adverbial clauses:

\[
Ti+ta \text{ ge } go i \ |i+b \ go \ !hasara \ te \ !khai+s \ !aroma|
\]
I + me Ind Past Circ. Past.left Pron+He Past insult me Fact+It therefore
‘I left because he insulted me’

postnominal RCs:

\[
\text{khoi-b, [ia go } //ari ha-b] \text{ gye mī...} \quad (\text{Andrews 1975,61})
\]
man-m.sg Rel Past yesterday come-m.sg Perf say
‘The man who came yesterday said…’

**Northern Paiute** (Uto-Aztecan – Thornes 2003)

Postverbal complement clauses:

\[
Ni \ u=supidakwatu \ [u-su \ kai \ i= bunni] \quad (\text{Thornes 2003,446})
\]
I 3=know 3-Nom Neg 1=see.Dur
‘I knew he didn’t see me’

postverbal adverbial clauses:

\[
Ni \ u=supidakwatu \ [ka \ u-su \ i=tiikwi] \quad (\text{Thornes 2003,461})
\]
I 3=know Ka 3-Nom 1=tell ‘I know because he told me’

postnominal RCs:

\[
ni \ ka=tihikva \ [o?o \ wini-di] \text{ punni} \quad (\text{Thornes 2003,428})
\]
I Obl=deer Dem stand.Sg-NML see.Dur
‘I see the deer (that is) standing out there’

follows the head it is introduced by a particle hīa/ia [], and when it precedes there is no introductory particle”:

(i) \[
nari \ \text{ta gye mū kho-b gye } -/-\text{gei te}
\]
today I Perf see man-m.sg Perf call me
“The man who I saw today called me.”
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Postverbal complement clauses:

*Mamaad fiker kewi* [CP tshi de Sur Gwel day khwaass dey]

Mamaad thought do COMP POSS Sur Gwel him like be

‘Mamaad thinks Sur Gwel likes him’

Postverbal adverbial clauses:

*asad wa nə gadedə [wale tse nājoɾa wa]* (Tegey and Robson 1996,228)

Asad prf not danced why that sick was

‘Asad didn’t dance because he was sick’

Postnominal RCs: (see also MacKenzie 1992,170, and Tegey and Robson 1996,219ff)

*hagheey hagha mayshem* [CP tshi uda dee] khkol krro

she DET baby [COMP sleep be] kiss do

‘She kissed the baby who is sleeping’

**Pech (Paya)** (Chibchan - Holt 1999b)

Postverbal complement clauses:

*tās-ma           kà-h-ir-t-á-ri?              [ tèʔ-k-er-pi-kán]* (cf. Holt 1999b,72)

I-Emph them-Aff-know-Neg-1s-Past2 come-3p-Fut-whether

‘I didn’t know/find out regarding whether they would come’

Postverbal adverbial clauses:

*apāskāʔ-té-pE?    [asòw(a)-rás]* (cf. Holt 1999b,69)

we.not.leave-Fut rain-because

‘We will not leave because it’s raining’

Postnominal RCs:


that-man-Emph work-Sem-Hab-Past2-Emph/Rel die- Past2

‘That man you used to work with died’
**Persian** (Indo-Iranian - M&B, 281,287f; Tabaian 1975; Mahootian 1997)

postverbal complement clauses:

\[fekr—mi-kon-æm \[(ke) \ ſiva \ emšæb mi-res-e]\]  
(Mahootian 1997,29)

thought-Dur-do-1s (that) Shiva tonight Dur-arrive-3s

‘I think (that) Shiva will arrive tonight’

postverbal adverbial clauses:

\[ba \ otobus \ ræft-im \ [cunke \ mašin \ næ-dar-im]\]  
(Mahootian 1997,40)

with bus went-1pl because car Neg-have-1pl

‘We went by bus because we don’t have a car’

postnominal RCs:

\[mašin-i \ [ke \ diruz \ xærid-æm]\]  
(Mahootian 1997,29)

car-Dem that yesterday bought-1s…

‘The car that I bought yesterday…’

---

**Pima Bajo** (Uto-Aztecan – Estrada Fernández 1996)

postverbal complement clauses:

\[ig \ hihik \ [ko-n \ huun \ hug-an]\]  
(Estrada Fernández 1996,37)

3s want(PERF) COMPL-1s corn eat-IRR

‘He wanted me to eat corn’

postverbal adverbial clauses:

\[aan \ am \ him-ia \ [timosa \ dud-an]\]  
(Estrada Fernández 1996,39)

1s LOC go-PROB although rain-IRR

‘I will go although it is raining’

postnominal RCs:

60. Pima Bajo also seems to have Head Internal RCs ((i)a), and extraposed postnominal RCs ((i)b):

(i) a. takav sigaar in-niar-kIk aan dIIn-im   (Estrada Fernández 1996,36)
yesterday cigar 1s-buy-Rel 1s smoke-Cont  ‘I am smoking the cigar I bought yesterday’

b. nui aan nlid ko daa   (Estrada Fernández 1996,36)
buzzard 1s see(Perf) Sub.Prt fly(Perf)  ‘I saw the buzzard that flew’
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Quencha (Ancash) (Quechuan - M&B, 282; Lehmann 1984, 55-58)
postverbal complement clauses:

Musya-: [punu-nka-nqa-n-ta] (Lehmann 1984, 57)
Know-1sg [sleep-Prog-Nominalizer.Real-3sg]-Acc
‘I know that he is sleeping’

postverbal adverbial clauses:

postnominal RCs:61
Kachi [qu-yku-ma-nqa-yki-ta] muna-n (Lehmann 1984, 58)
Salt [give-0-Obj.1-Nominalizer.Real-2]-Acc want-3
‘He wants the salt that you gave to me’

Sandawe (Khoisan - M&B, 282)62
postverbal complement clauses:

manaasi* [happu n/emesuts'i tl'ape iE]
manaa-si* happu n/emesu-ts'i*-i tl'ape ie--
know-1sg. you woman?-2sg. beat stay-and
‘I know you are beating a woman’

61. (Ancash) Quechua also has prenominal and internally headed RCs (cf. Lehmann 1984, 55-58, Cole 1987).

62. The Sandawe examples of complement and adverbal clauses were kindly provided by Helen Eaton of the Sandawe Project of SIL International, Dodoma (Tanzania), p.c. Also see the grammar sketch appearing in the Khoisan project website of the Department of Linguistics at Cornell University (http://ling.cornell.edu/khoisan/index.htm).
postverbal adverbial clauses:

haanga-sa [tl'wAgaa iE //'oosi'sa]
haang-sa tl'wA-aa ie~ //'oo-si'-sa
wake up rain (N)-nom. stay-and rain (V)-when-3f.sg.
‘she woke up [when it was raining]’

postnominal RCs:

hā:w lá?'mū: [kʰˈuːdēsː-gāʔ?] ?iːé
that goat who butted-3Pl give.him
‘and they gave him the goat which butted (the chicken)’

**Santali** (Munda (Austro-Asiatic) – Neukom 2001)\(^{63}\)

postverbal complement clauses: (Neukom 2001,183)

cekate am-do -m badae-kid-iŋ -a [iŋ -do -y marap -ge-a mente]
how you(s)-TOP-2sS know-PST:Act-1sO-IN D [I-TOP-1sS big-FOC-IND COMP]
‘How did you know about me that I am the big one?’

postverbal adverbial clauses: (Neukom 2001,196)

thir-thir-te bo lo -k’-me, [ji mɔ n alo-ko diso -me]
quiet-Red-Conv enter-MID-2sS in order PROH-3pS notice-2sO
‘Go in quietly that they may not take notice of you’

postnominal RCs:

ona dare [oka-m mak’-akat’]
that(Inan) tree which-2sS cut-PF:ACT
‘the tree you have cut’

**Sentani** (Papuan (Trans-New Guinea) - Hartzler 1994)

postverbal complement clauses:

nebei reyæ ubene nekaise [reyæ e-me-i]
that I thoughts I.think.them he neg-come-Nt
‘I think he will not come’

postverbal adverbial clauses:

63. Santali’s adverbial clauses precede the main clause, except for purpose clauses employing a conjunction (jɔmɔ n) borrowed from Indo-Aryan. Besides postnominal relative clauses, Santali has prenominal and correlative ones.
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ako næi holo-na mæi fafa-re a lækei helen sele eyæ kena ho
fathers their group-poss your children-to word strong much very don’t say, pos immediately
kena beko konaiyende bele-ne] (Hartzler 1994,59)
desire bad they.will.do.it not-because
‘Fathers, don’t speak strongly to your children, so that they will not want to do bad
things.’

postnominal RCs:
ëne anuwau [ere-i-me-i-en-le] eyæ kena okoikoi (Hartzler 1994,54)
that place see-Nt-come-Nt-3dsR-VE we want do not
‘We don’t want any of the places we have seen so far.’

Shipibo-Konibo (Panoan – Valenzuela 2003)
postverbal complement clauses: (Valenzuela 2003,491)
E-n-ra onan-ke [nato ochiti-nin bake natéshima-a]
1-Erg-EV know-CMPL this dog-Erg child.Abs bite.Neg-PP2.Abs
‘I know that this dog did not bite the child’

postverbal adverbial clauses: (Valenzuela 2003,497)
xontako-bo-ra jawen papa betan ik-ai [beno-ai kaman]
unmarried.girl-PL.Abs-EV Pos3 father COM do.I-INC marry_PP1 until
‘Young girls live with their parents until they get married’

postnominal RCs: (Valenzuela 2003,247)
jono [(ja) papa-n rete-ibat-a]-ra moa non-n keyo-ke
c.peccary 3.Abs father-Erg kill-Pst2-PP2-EV already 1p-Erg finish-CMPL
‘We already finished the collared-peccary father killed yesterday’

Skou ((Non-Austronesian) Papuan – Donohue 2004)
postverbal complement clauses: (Donohue 2004,432)
Ni=lúe=te mè=ong fa.
1SG=hear=DIR 2SG=deceive use
‘I know that you’re fooling (me).’

postverbal adverbial clauses:
Ni=re pâ=fue a pâle=ing a ni=fu-fu li. (Donohue 2004,482)
1SG=go house=the pig=the 1SG=see.f-RED do
‘I went to that house to look at the pig.’

postnominal RCs:

naké hòe-nì=ne ke=k-ang=ing a (Donohue 2004,271)
dog sago-1SG.GEN=1SG.DAT 3SG.NF=3SG.NF-eat=the
‘the dog which ate my sago’

Somali (Cushitic) (Antinucci 1981; Antinucci and Puglielli 1980; Svolacchia and Puglielli 1999)
postverbal complement clauses: (Svolacchia and Puglielli 1999,109)
wax-ay doonaysaa [in-ay bish-a dambe tagto ]
Thing-SCL want-Pres.3sgF that-SCL month-the next go-Subj.3sg
‘She wants to leave next month’

postverbal adverbial clauses: (Antinucci 1981,251)
Af Soomaaliga waan baranayaa [ maxaayeelay waxaan rabaa inaan
language Somali-the Foc.Prt-I am-studying because Foc.Prt-I want that-I
Soomaaliiya aadó] Somalia go
‘I am studying Somali because I want to go to Somalia’

postnominal RCs:

akhri buugagga [Cali kuu keenay] (Antinucci and Puglielli 1980,87)
read books-the Ali you-to bring.PAST
‘Read the books that Ali brought to you!’

Svan (Kartvelian – Tuite 1997)
postverbal complement clauses:

mi lo:kar {xw-le:kar}, [ere mëxar-iž an-qd-en-i-x] (Tuite 1997,40)
I S1-say-Aor that tomorrow-QT PV-come-Pass-Sm-Pl
‘I said that they would come the day after [lit. “they will come tomorrow”]’

postverbal adverbial clauses: (Tuite 1997,35)
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xexw-s  da:r  ž-a-hwed-da  [hawe mi moma  læ-m-(i)–maržw-
wife-Dat nobody-Nom  O2-ObjVers-give-Imperf  except  I  not  PV-O1sg-ObjVers-
æ:n]
help-Plpf
‘Nobody would have given you a wife, if I had not helped you’

turn-
æ:n
Postverbal adverbial clauses:

90

postverbal complement clauses:

Teribe (Chibchan – Quesada 2000)
postverbal complement clauses:  (Quesada 2000,160)
Woydë-r  [ga  pa worong]  pa  llëbo  shärío-no  bor  kong  owa  li  kí
Want –1sg CONN 2sg die  2sg thing  do-PERF 1sg to  bad REL because
‘I want you to die because of the bad things you did to me’

postverbal adverbial clauses:64
Yë-y  dlo  shko  [dan  wlo]  (Quesada 2000,164)
Put-1pl.INCL sun in  dry  PURP
‘We put it under the sun so it dries’

postnominal RCs:
Domer  [bor  i-ga  li]  (Quesada 2000,129)
Man  1sg see-ABIL  REL
‘The man who saw me’

Tol (Jicaque) (Hokan – Holt 1999a)
postverbal complement clauses:
ma  kelél  [ wa mó’o  hák-cʰa]  (Holt 1999a,50)

64. Also see the because-clause of the preceding example.
Neg Aux-want house into 3s.Pres.come-Imperf
‘S/he didn’t want to come into the house’

postverbal adverbial clauses:
?amá k’a way [ma hiśe mpes] (Holt 1999a,51)
land dry Cop Neg Pres.rain.3 because
‘The land is dry because it doesn’t rain’

postnominal RCs:
hiśe mpes nopʰ [ʔiśis way t’-y-inals] (Holt 1999a,52)
Pres.rain.3 because corn good Cop gr-Pres-ow.3s
‘Because it rains, corn that is good grows’

**Tùnen** (Bantu – Dugast 1971)
postverbal complement clauses:
m`eko lefkak [a se? ikity báka menyama y’ ingin] (Dugast 1971,311)
leopard thought that ram is an animal strong
‘The leopard thought that the ram is a strong animal’

postverbal adverbial clauses:
mé ngóka mungôl età’, [mbà bá s’ ibiły ka ton](Dugast 1971,321)
I will medicine take, so that they Neg the palm nut cut no longer
‘I will take the medicine so that they will no longer cut the palm nut’

postnominal RCs:
bùél [ò bóá nà bwxwù txkxgk]... (Dugast 1971,312)
thing that has us bothered...
‘The thing that bothered us…’

**Turkish** (Turkic – M&B,283; Andrews 1975; Veld 1993; Kornfilt 1997; Kural 1997).65

---

65. Normally RCs are non-finite and precede the noun, except for the (more literary) finite RCs introduced by the complementizer ki (borrowed from Persian), also introducing postverbal finite complement clauses (and one type of adverbial clause).
postverbal complement clauses:

isti-yor-um [ki yann ben-im-le sinema-ya gel-esin] (Kornfilt 1997,46)
want-Pr.Prog-1sg that tomorrow I-Gen-with cinema-Dat come-2sg.Opt
‘I want you to come to the movies with me tomorrow’ (Literally: “I want that you should come”)

postverbal adverbial clauses:

66 o kadar yorul-mu [ki konuş-ma-ya güç-ü yet-mi-yor-du-ø]
so much tired-perf-pst-3sg that talk-mE-Dat strength-3sg be.enough-neg-progr-pst-3sg
‘He was so tired that he could not speak’

postnominal RCs:

bir adam [ki çocuk-lar-ı sev-me-z] yalanız yaşa-mali-dir (Kornfilt 1997,60)
‘A man who does not love his children must live alone’

West Greenlandic (Eskimo-Aleut - Fortescue 1984)

postverbal complement clauses

ilisima-vaa [urni-ssa-giga] (Fortescue 1984,36)
know.3s-3s.ind. come-to future 1s-3s.part.
‘He knew I would come to him’

postverbal adverbial clauses:

(Fortescue 1984,95)

uqar-puq ikinninguti-ni irniinnaq tiki-ssa-sut [taku-juma-mmatigit]
say 3s-indic. friend his-refl.-pl right-away come fut 3p-part see want 3p-3p-caus
‘He said his friends would come right away because they wanted to see them’

66 Veld (1993, §7.3.3) and Kural (1997,505) give other cases of adverbial clauses in Turkish which can be postverbal (though, differently from those introduced by ki, need not be).

67 The ki relative clause can also appear extraposed:

(i) Ben-I unut-ma [ki san-a yardım et-i-m] (Lehmann 1984,144)
I-Acc forget-Neg [that you-Dat help do-Past-1s] “Don’t forget me, who helped you”
postnominal RCs:

*niviarsiaq* [kalaallisut *ilinnia-lir-suq]*...* (Fortescue 1984,49)
girl Greenlandic learn-begin-intr.part…
‘the/a girl who has begun learning Greenlandic…’

**Wichita** (Caddoan – Rood 1973; Dryer 1980)

postverbal complement clauses:

*tac-i?:khi::taw* [kiri-?i:s-?ir?i:sti-s] (Dryer 1980,131)
I-know neg-neg,3-steal-impf
‘I know that he did not steal it’

postverbal adverbial clauses:

person-past-horse-pl-stand-cause they graze
‘Someone took his horses to graze’

postnominal RCs:

woman sg.-man-see-come sg.-past-sleep
‘the woman who came to see the man slept’

**Xakas** (Turkic – Anderson 1998)

postverbal complement clauses:

*min* *xinminčam,* [anî  paribixanîna] (Anderson 1998,82)
I be.satisfied.w/-Neg-Pres.I.1 3-Gen go-Perf-Past.I-3.Dat
‘I wasn’t happy that he left’

postverbal adverbial clauses: (Anderson 1998,78)

kirleste *turyan,* [xažan orîs sem’yazî čaydapĉatxanda]
porch-Loc stand-Past.I when Russian family-3 approach-Pres.Loc
‘(he) stood on the porch when the Russian family was approaching’
A Note on Verb/Object order and Head/Relative clause order

postnominal RCs: (Anderson 1998,84)
ol tayyada, [xaydar pis taqda pararbis], anq daa xuzux taa köp
that taiga-Loc to.where we tomorrow go-Fut-1pl animal Emph nut Emph a lot
‘there are a lot of animals and nuts in the taiga we’re going to tomorrow’

Yaqui (Uto-Aztecan - Lindenfeld 1969,1973; Givón 1975,64-65; Song 2001)

postverbal complement clauses: (Lindenfeld 1973 – quoted from Dryer 1980,131)
aapo hunen hia [ke hu humut tutu ?uli]
he thus say COMP this woman pretty
‘He said that this woman is pretty’

postverbal adverbial clauses:
neé kaá pahkó bičá-k [bwe?ítúk ne kookwé] (Lindenfeld 1969,79)
I not fiesta see-Perf because I sick
‘I did not see the fiesta because I am sick’

postnominal RCs:
hu kari [in acai-ta hinu-k-a?u] wece-k (Song 2001,252)
this house my father-Dep buy-Pfv-Rel fall-Pfv
‘The house which my father bought fell down’

Zazaki (Indo-Iranian – Sandonato 1994)

postverbal complement clauses:
ez wazon [ké ì veng ne-khëre] (Sandonato 1994,134)
I-Dir want that you-Dir sound Neg-do.subj
‘I want you not to make noise!’

postverbal adverbial clauses:
Aε owa simitë [kε rew ìesan me-vo] (Sandonato 1994,135)
She-Obl water drank that early thirsty Neg-become.subj
‘She drank water so she wouldn’t soon get thirsty’

68. Also see the double complementizer example (21) above.
postnominal RCs:

\[ \text{Her-e } \ [k^k\varepsilon\text{ he\,gai}\ de\ tsk^h\varepsilon\text{en}\} \ seni^k\text{-i\ e} \ \]  

(Sandonato 1994,141)

Donkey-Ez that field in graze few-NO are

‘The donkeys that are grazing in the field are few’
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