

# The Data Pattern of Relative Clauses in Nawdm

Daniel M. Albro

March 20, 1998

## 1 Purpose

This paper will attempt to lay out the fundamental characteristics of relative clauses in Nawdm—their distribution, internal order, morphological and phonological features. The goal will not be to explain these characteristics, as a detailed analysis of any of the characteristics of the data would preclude description of some other part of the data, for reasons of space. To be investigated are the possible sites for extraction of the heads of relative clauses, the distribution of resumptive pronouns and subject clitics in relative clauses, the distribution of “n” (a particle that appears in relative clauses), and the characteristics and distribution of relative pronouns.

## 2 Possible Sites for Extraction

Heads of relative clauses can be extracted from the object of a verb<sup>1</sup>:

- (6-21) dáw màndé wà?dègè dèndě:n wě: lògrá mà wàdègá  
man I-then hit yesterday he-specific take-perfect my book  
The man I hit yesterday took my book

In (6-21) “man” is extracted from the object position of the verb “hit.” Extraction from subject position is also possible<sup>2</sup>:

- (402) mà dé wà?(à)dègè dáw á dé bùgèdègè bòdòbòdò dèndě:n wí:  
I then hit-perf man he then burn-perf bread yesterday he-specific  
I hit the man who burned the bread yesterday

In (402) “man” is extracted from the subject position of the verb “burn.” Extraction from the object of a postposition is possible:

- (405) mà dé d(è)rá bòdòbòdò fèmbè ò dé kàdè ?ò dʒúgún ?ó:  
I then eat-perf bread fembe n then sit-imp it-bread above it-bread-specific  
I ate the bread on which the fembe was sitting.

Here “bread” is extracted from the object of the postposition “on” (*dʒugun*). There seems to be only one instance of a preposition in Nawdm: *n* (“with”). Unfortunately no attempt has yet been

---

<sup>1</sup>Examples numbered with an initial number, a dash, and a final number are taken from my session notes. For example, item (6-21) is the sentence numbered (21) in session 6.

<sup>2</sup>Examples numbered with a single number are taken from the class notes.

made to determine whether extraction is possible from the object of  $\eta$ . Extraction is also at least somewhat possible from adjuncts:

(407) ándé b̀ò:lè kófégà: tĩ: d̀è dzàrèngè má  
 he-n-then burn-perf village-the it-manner-specific then bother-perf me  
 The way he burned the village bothered me.

(410) ámbá: dz̀um b̀òdòb̀òdò l̄: mà b̀a: d̀en búgàd̀èḡem á kófégá  
 he-n-will eat bread it-time-specific I will den burn his village  
 While he is eating the bread I will burn his village.

(407) shows extraction from a manner adjunct, and (410) from a time adjunct. No equivalent data has been elicited for place adjuncts. In these examples there is no heads of the relative clauses, although there seem to be implicit heads (“the way” in (407) and “the time” in (410)). Either object of a ditransitive verb can be extracted:

(404) mà dé wàʔ(à)d̀ègè d̀aw ándé <sup>1</sup>tó b̀òdòb̀òdò wĩ:  
 I then hit-perf man he-n-then give bread he-specific  
 I hit the man to whom he gave the bread.

(8-5) mà dé búgàd̀ègè b̀òdòb̀òdò màndé tò sámbà ʔõ:  
 I then burn-perf bread I-n-then give Samba it-bread-specific  
 I burned the bread I gave to Samba.

(404) shows extraction of “man” from the indirect object position of “give,” and (8-5) shows extraction of “bread” from the direct object position of the same verb. Relative clause heads can be extracted from the object position in embedded questions and embedded statements:

(8-14) b̀òdòb̀òdò màṅ ḡbámá mà hén mĩ:nà béndé <sup>1</sup>bógàd̀ègè ʔũ: d̀è bé lè  
 bread I-n ask my self whether you-n-then burn it-bread-spec then be ?  
 m̀ègò  
 tasty

The bread I wonder whether you burned was tasty.

(577) búrúgú bèn dílá ná mà(n)dé tògàd̀ègè kũ: dz̀un móté  
 goat you-n think that I-(n)-then attach cl-spec eat-imp grass  
 The goat you think I attached is eating grass.

In (8-14) “bread” is extracted from “whether you burned,” and in (577) “goat” is extracted from “you think I attached.” Extraction is also possible from the subject position of embedded statements:

(9-13) d̀aw màn dé mì ná à tògàd̀ègè búrúgú w̄: bé h̀m  
 man I-n then thought that he attach goat cl-spec is nice  
 The man I thought attached the goat is nice.

Unfortunately there has been no test of whether extraction is possible from the subject of an embedded question. My guess based on the rest of the relative clause data is that it is not possible. Moving on, extraction is possible from a possessor:

- (409) mà dé wáʔ(á)dègè dáw màndé 'bó:lè à kóféngá wí:  
 I then hit man I-n-then burn-perf his village he-specific  
 I hit the man whose village I had burned.

There has been no direct test of the extraction of an object possessed by a single possessor, but I believe that this is not possible on the basis of the following example,

- (9-11) Can't say “these are the people I burned five villages of and two houses of.”

which shows that extraction is not possible from the object of conjoined possessors. This sentence is not ruled out on the basis of the conjunction, as extraction from the object of conjoined VPs is possible:

- (9-12) búríʔén énáʔ né màn dé wàʔàré ń tógé  
 goat-pl-n this-pl copula I-n then beat with attach

These are the goats I beat and attached (simultaneously).

- (9-12') búríʔén énáʔ né màn dé wàʔàré ń té tógédégé  
 goat-pl-n this-pl copula I-n then beat with later attach

These are the goats I beat and then attached.

- (9-14) búrígú màn dé tògàdègé ń téwàlègé fèmbè kò dzúgún kó: dzún mó:té  
 goat I-n then attach with put-on fembe it-goat on-to cl-spec eat grass

The goat I attached and put the fembe on is eating grass.

In (9-12) and (9-12') extraction is from the object position of two conjoined simple VPs, and in (9-14) one of the two VPs selects a prepositional phrase (actually, a postpositional phrase), and extraction there is from the object of that prepositional phrase. The final case where extraction is possible is parasitic gaps. That is, extraction can form parasitic gaps:

- (9-7) bòdòbòdó ʔónáʔà né màn bà: dé kà à bé bó:lè ʔo:  
 bread cl-this copula I-n would eat if he would-not burn cl-spec

This is the bread I would eat if he wouldn't burn (it).

In (9-7) “bread” is the object of both “eat” and “burn.” The pronoun ʔo (“it” referring to bread) is not allowed in either object position.

Extraction is not possible from the subject position of an embedded relative clause:

- (8-8) \* “I hit the man<sub>I</sub> I burned the bread <sub>t<sub>I</sub>/he<sub>I</sub></sub> ate”

It is also not possible from within the subject position of an embedded relative clause:

- (8-12) Cannot express “the dog<sub>I</sub> that the man with <sub>t<sub>I</sub>/it<sub>I</sub></sub> beat my mother ate the bread.”

It is also not possible to extract from two relative clauses simultaneously:

- (9-2) \* bodobodo ʔo ran pare ʔo: andε bole ʔo:  
 bread it comes-from Paris cl-spec he-n-then burned cl-spec  
 the bread from Paris that he burned.

Example (9-2) would literally mean “the bread that comes from Paris that he burned,” if it could be said. Finally, it is not possible to extract a DP from the object position of a clause where the subject is modified by a relative clause<sup>3</sup>:

<sup>3</sup>This example was elicited in class, but never written up.

(X) Cannot translate “I ate the bread that the evil man who beats fembes burned.”

### 3 Resumptive Pronouns and Subject Clitics

Nawdm employs resumptive pronouns in some, but not all, of the cases of extraction. As can be seen from example (6-21) above, it does not employ them in the case of object extraction. However, resumptive pronouns do appear when objects of postpositions are extracted, as in (405) (previous section) and in the following:

(8-11) búrúgú màndé lò fêmbè kó dzúgún kú: dzũn mórté  
goat I-n-then put Fembe it-goat on it-goat-spec eat-imp grass  
The goat I put the Fembe on is eating grass.

In (405) the resumptive pronoun was *ʔo*, referring to “bread”, and in (8-11) it is *ko*, referring to the goat. (8-11) more or less literally reads “the goat I put the fembe on it is eating grass.” (9-14) from the previous section shows that even when a noun is simultaneously extracted from the object position of a verb and the object position of a postposition, the resumptive pronoun only occurs in the object of the postposition.

Resumptive pronouns also occur when a possessor is extracted, as shown in example (409) from the previous section, which literally reads (adjusted for English word order) “I hit the man who I burned his village.” Finally, the case could be made that extraction from subjects leaves resumptive pronouns. Relative clauses from which the subject has been extracted always have pronominal subjects:

(399) mà dé wàʔ(à)dègè dāv á ɣkè búgódá bòdòbòdò wĩ:  
I then hit-perf man he usually burn-imp bread the-man-specific  
I hit the man who usually burns the bread.

(402) mà dé wàʔ(à)dègè dāv á dé bùgòdègè bòdòbòdò dèndè:n wĩ:  
I then hit-perf man he then burn-perf bread yesterday he-specific  
I hit the man who burned the bread yesterday.

(9-1) bòdòbòdò ʔó rán pàré ʔõ:  
bread it comes-from Paris cl-spec  
the bread from Paris

(9-13) dāv màn dé mì ná à tògàdègè bùrùgú wě: bé hòm  
man I-n then thought that he attach goat cl-spec is nice  
The man I thought attached the goat is nice.

Here (399) and (402) show resumptive pronouns in different tenses for extraction of animate subjects, (9-1) shows extraction of an inanimate subject, and (9-13) shows extraction from an embedded clause, all of which employ subject pronominals. However, the subject of relative clauses with object extraction can be a full DP,

(396) mà dé bòlé bòdòbòdò bà hó:là gõ: ñdé d(è)rè ʔõ:  
I then burn-perf bread dog black it-dog-specific n-then eat-perf it-bread-specific  
I burned the bread the big black dog ate.

so it is not the case that verbs in relative clauses must have pronominal subjects. On the other hand, there does seem to be an increased necessity for pronominal subjects in relative clauses to some extent. Second person singular subjects are normally dropped in main clauses:

- (80) jénà wé  
see-perf him  
You have seen him.

However, in relative clauses they are mandatory:

- (7-2) mà dé d(è)rà bùrùgú bèndé wáʔ(á)dègè kǒ: èn wágàbè:  
I then eat-perf goat you-n-then hit it-go-specific and snake-specific  
I ate the goat you attached and the snake.

It has been argued that there are syntactic similarities between possessor positions and subject positions. Thus, the fact that resumptive pronouns occur with extracted possessors lends support to the position that the pronouns in extracted subject positions are resumptive pronouns.

One instance in which subject pronouns in relative clauses (and in main clauses in the same way) appear to act as clitics (that is, they exhibit clitic doubling) rather than as resumptive pronouns is in the case of relative clauses with object extraction where the subject of the clause is a conjunction of two pronouns:

- (7-3) dé drà bòdòbòdó wé ñ má téndé bò:lè ʔǒ:  
then eat-perf bread he and/with I we-n-then burn-perf it-bread-specific  
You ate the bread he and I burned.
- (7-4) dé drà bòdòbòdó má né ñ wé téndé bò:lè ʔǒ:  
then eat-perf bread I ? and/with he we-n-then burn it-bread-specific  
You ate the bread I and he burned.

In (7-3) “he and I” is doubled as “we”, and similarly in (7-4) for “I and he.” However, if one of the conjoined subjects is a non-pronominal, clitic doubling does not occur:

- (7-12) kóféyǵá sámbà ñ mán dé bò:lè kǎ: bè nòʔ(ǝ)  
village Samba and I-n then burn-imp it-village-specific be close  
The village Samba and I burned is close.
- (7-13) kóféyǵá má né ñ sámbà ñ dé bò:lé kǎ: dè bè ná fémʔè  
village I ? and Samba n then burn it-village-specific then be na fembes’  
kálàmbèʔèǵá  
bad-place  
The village I and Samba burned was a bad place for fembes.

## 4 The Distribution of the Particle “n”

As can be seen from the examples of section 2, a particle pronounced as a consonantal nasal homorganic to the following consonant and defaulting to /n/ appears immediately after the subject of relative clauses in which any extraction other than subject extraction has taken place. This particle forms a phonological unit with pronominal subjects. That is, when preceded by pronominal

subjects, it always forms the coda of a syllable initiated by the pronoun by which it is preceded. In addition, it always bears the tone of the vowel immediately preceding it. Some examples will be necessary to show that the appearance of /n/ does not depend on tense, aspect, or whether the relative clause modifies the subject or object of the main clause.

(6-21) dǎw màndé wàʔdègè dèndè:n wě: lǒgrá mà wàdègá  
 man I-then hit yesterday he-specific take-perfect my book  
 The man I hit yesterday took my book.

(6-22) dèndè:n dé tǔgèdègè bùrùgú màndé lǒgrè kǔ:  
 yesterday then attach-perfect goat I-then take-perfect it-specific  
 Yesterday you attached the goat I took.

(6-21) and (6-22) show that the grammatical function of the head of the relative clause within the main clause is not relevant to the appearance of /n/.

(397) mà dé tǔgèdègè bùrùgú á ǐkè tǔgédá kú:  
 I then attach-perf goat he usually attach-imp it-goat  
 I attached the goat he usually attaches.

(400) mà ǐ dèrà bǒdòbòdò á ǐ bùgèdègè átòkǎrèn dènáʔ ʔó:  
 I recent-past eat-perf bread he n burn-perf morning this it-bread-specific  
 (This afternoon) I ate the bread he burned this morning.

In (397) and (400) there is no sign of /n/ even though an object has been extracted, but this is most likely due to the fact that the verbal auxiliaries employed in these sentences begin with nasals, thus rendering the /n/ particle impossible to detect.

(401) mà bà: dé bǒdòbòdò ámbá: búgédègè ʔǒ:  
 I will eat bread he-n-will burn it-bread-specific  
 I will eat the bread he will burn

(7-8) mà wáʔádá bùrùgú bèn tógódá bèlgá kǒ:  
 I hit-imp goat you-n attach-imp now it-goat  
 I am hitting the goat which you are attaching right now.

(7-9) mà wáʔádégé bùrùgú bèn tógódégé hóhó kó:  
 I hit-perf goat you-n attach-perf already it-goat-specific  
 I (have) hit the goat which you have already attached.

(7-10) mà hǔǐgè bùrù hólè gó màndâ: tógódá kó:  
 I forgot goat black “go” I-n-? attach-imp it-goat-specific  
 I forgot which black goat I was attaching.

(9-3) à dè bǒ:lé bǒdòbòdó màndâ: dzú ʔó:  
 he then burn bread I-n-habit eat-imp cl-spec  
 He burned the bread I usually eat.

(9-4) à bà: ʔbòlè bǒdòbòdó màndâ: dèn dzùm ʔó:  
 he will burn bread I-n will den eat-m cl-spec  
 He will burn the bread I will be eating.

- (9-5) mà lógérá bódòbódó àn dzúwà dzúró ?ò:  
 I take-perf bread he-n eat eat-? cl-spec  
 I have been taking the bread that he has been eating and eating.
- (9-6) mà dé dṛá bódòbódó án dā: bób(ə) dé ?ó: kó mám bè dé ?ò  
 I then eat-perf bread he-n would have eat cl-spec if I-n had-not eat it  
 I ate the bread he would have eaten if I hadn't eaten it.

Here (401) shows that /n/ appears in the future perfect, (7-8) in the present imperfect, (7-9) in the perfect, (7-10) in the recent past imperfect (although this case suffers from the same problems as (397) and (400)), (9-3) in the habitual, (9-4) in the future imperfect, (9-5) in the perfect continuative<sup>4</sup>, and (9-6) shows that it appears in the conditional. Thus it appears that tense and aspect do not discourage /n/ from appearing, and that /n/ always appears before any other verbal particles.

No tense or aspect allows /n/ to appear when subjects have been extracted, nor does the status of the head noun as subject or object of its main clause affect the non-appearance of /n/, as the following examples show:

- (402) mà dé wà?(à)dègè dāw á dé bṛgèdègè bódòbódò dèndè:n wí:  
 I then hit-perf man he then burn-perf bread yesterday he-specific  
 I hit the man who burned the bread yesterday.
- (403) dāw á dé bṛgèdègè kófèngà: wí: dé wà?(à)dègè má  
 man he then burn-perf village-the he-specific then hit-perf me  
 The man who burned the village hit me.
- (406) mà bà: wá?(á)dègè jídá á bá: búgádègè bódòbódò?ò wí:  
 I will hit person he will burn bread-specific he-specific  
 I will hit the man who will burn the bread.

In (402) and (403) the tense is distant past, perfective aspect, and in (402) the relative clause modifies the object, whereas in (403) the relative clause modifies the subject. In (406) the tense is future.

A small amount of speculation might be appropriate on the question of why /n/ has the distribution that it does. The same particle seems to appear in some conditional and subjunctive sentences outside of relative clauses, as in the part of (9-6) that translates to “if I hadn't eaten it.” My suggestion would be that /n/ is a verbal auxiliary indicating some sort of subordinating mood, and by virtue of its required placement within the syntactic structure, and the required placement of resumptive pronoun subjects, about neither of which I will speculate here, it is incompatible with resumptive pronouns in subject position, although it is not incompatible with full DP subjects or clitic subjects.

## 5 Relative Pronouns

From examples (6-21) and (6-22) in section 2, it can be seen that relative pronouns appear at the end of relative clauses, and that they correspond to the pronominal forms of the heads of the relative clauses. The following example seems to indicate that the relative pronoun is formed from the subject pronoun, as does (6-22):

<sup>4</sup>This term was used in Gimba's session notes.

- (7-12) kóféngá sámbà ìṅ mán dé bò:lè kě: bè nòʔ(ə)  
 village Samba and I-n then burn-imp it-village-specific be close  
 The village Samba and I burned is close.

On the other hand, (6-21) appears to use the object form. However, we has also occurred once or twice as a subject form, for example in (7-3), so it seems most likely that the relative pronoun is derived from the subject form. In cases of extraction from a time adjunct, as in (410), there is no head of the relative clause, and the relative pronoun is the non-specific pronoun “*le*,” as in the following<sup>5</sup>:

- (163) mán lé  
 I-copula it  
 it’s me.

I do not know the source of the pronoun used with manner extraction (example (407)).

When the head of a relative clause consists of conjoined DPs from different noun classes there is some confusion on the part of the speaker as to how to decide which relative pronoun to use. The first elicitation of examples with this characteristic yielded the following result:

- (412) mà dé d(è)rà bùrùgú ìṅ wág(ə)bé bèndé wáʔ(ə)dègè tī:  
 I then eat-perf goat and/with snake you-n-then hit them-goat-specific  
 I ate the goat and snake you hit.
- (413) mà dé d(è)rà wág(ə)bé ìṅ bùrùgú bèndé wáʔ(ə)dègè tī:  
 I then eat-perf snake and/with goat you-n-then hit them-goat-specific  
 I ate the snake and goat you hit.

The relative pronoun chosen, with some difficulty, was the plural form of the pronoun corresponding to “goat”, regardless of the order of “goat” versus “snake.” However, the consultant also indicated that the relative pronoun “ʔě?” (corresponding to “snake”) would be possible as well, although dispreferred. At the next consultation session, however, the consultant decided that the appropriate renderings of (412) and (413) should be as follows:

- (412') mà dé d(è)rà bùrùgú ìṅ wág(ə)bé bèndé wáʔ(ə)dègè bī:  
 I then eat-perf goat and/with snake you-n-then hit it-snake-specific  
 I ate the goat and snake you hit.
- (413') mà dé d(è)rà wág(ə)bé ìṅ bùrùgú bèndé wáʔ(ə)dègè kō:  
 I then eat-perf snake and/with goat you-n-then hit it-goat-specific  
 I ate the snake and goat you hit.

Here the relative pronoun is the same pronoun that would have been used if the head had just been the second conjunct. If both conjuncts of the head are from the same noun class, there is no difficulty. The plural form of the pronoun for that noun class is used:

- (7-1) mà dé d(è)rà bùrùgú ìṅ bà:gò bèndé wáʔ(ə)dègè tī:  
 I then eat-perf goat and/with dog you-n-then hit them-go-specific  
 I ate the goat and dog you hit.

---

<sup>5</sup>The pronoun “*le*” has been transcribed by different people as having either the vowel [ɛ] or the vowel [e], as has the corresponding relative pronoun.

In all these cases the relative pronoun is obligatorily present. However, when the relative clause modifies the subject of the main clause and the same problem occurs, the preferred solution is to omit the relative pronoun. If forced to include it, the solution of (412') and (413') is chosen:

- (7-5) búrúgú ñ wágàbè bëndé tógòdègè (bì:) dzún má  
 goat and/with snake you-n-then attach-perf (it-snake-specific) eat me  
 The goat and snake you attached are eating me.

Note that this choice imposes a new ambiguity. If the relative pronoun is included, (7-5) has the same form as the following:

- (7-7) búrúgú ñ wágàbè bëndé <sup>!</sup>tógòdègè bì: dzún(ə) má  
 goat and snake you-n-then attach-perf it-snake-specific eat me  
 The goat, and the snake you attached, are eating me.

In (7-5) both the goat and the snake were being attached, but in (7-7) only the snake is.

With the above examples in mind, some more, although not a lot more, can be said about when relative pronouns are required, when they are optional, and when they are banned. It is not certain exactly in which contexts relative pronouns are required—in almost all cases the consultant provided them, so it seems that they are usually required. All of the cases where the inclusion of a relative pronoun is optional or banned have to do with double extraction. The examples are as follows:

- (9-7) bòdòbòdó ?óná?à né màm bà: dé kè à bé bólè ?ö:  
 bread cl-this copula I-n would eat if he would-not burn it-the  
 This is the bread I would eat if he wouldn't burn it.

- (9-12) búrú?én éná? né màm dé wà?àré ñ tógé  
 goat-pl-n this-pl copula I-n then beat with attach  
 These are the goats I beat and attached (simultaneously).

- (9-12') búrú?én éná? né màm dé wà?àré ñ té tógédégé  
 goat-pl-n this-pl copula I-n then beat with later attach  
 These are the goats I beat and then attached.

In (9-7), where the head has been extracted from two non-conjoined clauses, the relative pronoun is optional, and in (9-12) and (9-12'), where the head has been extracted from conjoined VPs, the relative pronoun is banned. However, in the following example of extraction from conjoined VPs the relative pronoun is not banned<sup>6</sup>:

- (9-14) búrúgú màm dé tógèdègè ñ téwàlègè fèmbè kò dzúgún kó: dzún mó:té  
 goat I-n then attach with put-on fembe it-goat on-to cl-spec eat grass  
 The goat I attached and put the fembe on is eating grass.

Finally, when two relative pronouns would be adjacent, the second is banned:

- (411) ándé dzú bòdòbòdó màm dé bùgèdègè ?ö: mà dé wà?àn(é) á fèmbé  
 he-n-then eat bread I-n-then burn it-bread-specific I then beat his fembe  
 While he was eating the bread I burned I was beating his fembe.

<sup>6</sup>I do not know whether or not it is optional.

In (411) the relative pronoun “lě?” would normally be expected immediately after the relative pronoun “ʔǒ:.”

The specificity of a DP that includes a relative clause is marked on relative pronoun by lengthening it. As can be seen in all of the above examples, the head noun cannot be marked for specificity. However, the possessor of a head noun can be marked for specificity:

- (576) bá hólàʔe ènnòʔè: háyá ʔànòʔà ándé bò:lè ě: dè bé  
 dog<sub>1</sub> black-cl<sub>1</sub> cl<sub>1</sub>-five-cl<sub>1</sub>-spec house<sub>2</sub>-pl cl<sub>2</sub>-five-cl<sub>2</sub> he-n-then burn cl<sub>2</sub>-spec then be  
 mòlá  
 red-cl<sub>2</sub>

The five black dogs’ five houses he burned were red.

Oddly enough, a specific DP conjoined to a relative-clause-modified DP cannot be marked specific as well, as shown by example (7-7). It should be noted that specificity does not correspond exactly to where English would mark definite versus indefinite. For example, there is no difference in Nawdm between “a goat I attached” and “the goat I attached”—relative clauses are inherently specific:

- (397) mà dé tùgàdègè búrúgú á ńkà tógédá kú:  
 I then attach-perf goat he usually attach-imp it-goat  
 I attached the goat he usually attaches.
- (398) mà dé tùgàdègè búrúgú á ńkà tógédá kú:  
 I then attach-perf goat he usually attach-imp it-goat  
 I attached a goat that he usually attaches.

## 6 Summary

Thus, we have concluded that extraction can take place from the subject and object of verbs, from the object of postpositions, from adjuncts, from indirect objects and direct objects of ditransitives, from objects of embedded questions, from subject and objects of embedded statements, from objects of conjoined VPs, from parasitic gaps, and from possessors, but not from possessed objects, from two simultaneous relative clauses, from the object position of a relative clause where the subject of that clause is modified by a relative clause, or from the subject position of an embedded relative clause. We have also determined that a particle pronounced as a nasal consonant appears after the subject of relative clauses with any extraction other than from subject position, and that extraction from possessors and objects of postpositions produces resumptive pronouns. We argued that subject extraction also produces resumptive pronouns. Finally, we have characterized the relative pronoun as being derived from the subject pronominal form of the head of the relative clause and discussed when it is obligatory and when not.