11 *Postmodification and the structure of relative in Nêlêmwa and other Kanak languages of New Caledonia*

ISABELLE BRIL

1 Introduction

There are no relative pronouns in Kanak languages. What most commonly functions as relativisers are deictic or anaphoric determiners, or forms derived from definite or indefinite articles (as in Cemuhî, Rivierre:1980). This paper will concentrate on the construction of relative clauses and postmodification in Nêlêmwa,[1] with some comparative insights into a few other languages of New Caledonia.

In Nêlêmwa, all arguments and adjuncts may be relativised. Relative clauses are post-head relatives as is generally the case in verb-initial languages. This is consistent with the general pattern of determination which is left-headed, the determined term is followed by the determiner. There are no relative markers either in Nêlêmwa. The two main relative clause forming stategies make use of different types of linkers: *xe,* as in (1), or a post-head deictic or anaphoric determiner, as in (2) and (3). The choice of one of these two types depends on whether the relative determination is identifying or constitutes backgrounded determination.

(1) The connector *xe* is used when the determination is identifying as in (1), i.e. when it is first mentioned:

---

[1] Nêlêmwa (Bril 1994) is one of the 28 Kanak languages of New Caledonia, spoken in the far-north (around Poum and the neighbouring islands), it is an Oceanic language of the Austronesian family.

(1)   *Na fhe pwaxi-n   xe   i   khîlû.*
      1SG bring child-POSS.3SG   CONN   3SG be.ill
      'I am bringing his child, who is ill.'[2]

This may also be translated as a topicalisation:
'I am bringing his child, he is ill.'

The morpheme *xe* is associated with realis tense-aspect markers and declarative sentences, it may commute with the virtual/irrealis marker *o* (see §6).

(2) A posthead deictic or anaphoric marker is used when the determination constitutes backgrounded, already shared, preconstructed information, or when it is immediately recoverable deictically. It is postposed to the head and marked for number concord with it.

– Deictic marker:

(2)   *Na   fhe   pwaxi-n   **hleny**   khîlû   dame.*
      1SG   bring child-POSS.3SG   this.**DEICT**   be.ill   up.here
      'I am bringing here this child of his who is ill.'

– Anaphoric marker:

(3)   *Na   fhe   pwaxi-n   **bai**   khîlû   dame.*
      1SG   bring   child-POSS.3SG   that.**ANAPH**   be.ill   up.here
      'I've brought here that child of his who is ill.'

Backgrounded determination as in (2) and (3) requires a prior stage when the information is first mentioned and predicated, as in (1). In all cases, such markers are obligatory; they structure the relation between the head and the relative clause. This position cannot be empty.

2 *xe* as a multifunctional morpheme

Apart from its function as a relativiser, *xe* is also the left-dislocation/topic marker, and the complementiser of some verbs. All these functions of *xe* share a common denominator, *xe* introduces some form of postmodification, whether verbal complementation or nominal postmodification, which constitutes new information.

---

2   Abbreviations:

AGT	agent	DIR	directional	PREP	preposition
ANAPH	anaphoric	DUR	durative	PRES	present tense
ART	article	EXCL	exclusive	PRESENT	presentative
ASS	assertive	FUT	future	RECIP	reciprocal
ASSOC	associative	INACC	inaccusative object	REL	relator
ATTRIB	attributive	INDEP	independent pronoun	SM	subject marker
CAUS	causative	LOC	locative	STAT	stative
CLASS	classifier	NEG	negation	TR	transitive form
COLL	collective	NEG.PRED	negative predicate	VIRT	virtual
COMIT	comitative	NOM	nominalising prefix	3SG	third person singular
CONN	connector	PASS	passive	3DU	third person dual
CONT	continuous	PERF	perfective	3PL	third person plural
DEICT	deictic	POSS	possessive pronoun		

2.1 *xe* as the topic marker

As the topic marker, *xe* has discursive function and indicates the fronting of an argument or adjunct in topic position, thus reversing the neutral order (predicate/argument). What is to the left of *xe* is topical, what comes to its right is predicative.

2.1.1 Verbal predication

The unmarked order of Nêlêmwa is predicate-initial, followed by nominal arguments as in sentence (4); left-dislocation fronts any of the nominal arguments which are then marked by *xe* as in (5).

– Unmarked order:

(4)   *I   axi-e   a   thaamwa ena.*
       3SG   see.TR-3SG AGT   woman   this.DEICT
       'This woman sees him.'

The first argument *thaamwa* is marked as the agent by the agent morpheme *a*.

– Fronted nominal agent, marked order:

(5)   *Thaamwa ena   xe   i   axi-e.*
       woman   this.DEICT CONN   3SG see.TR-3SG
       'This woman, she sees him.'

When the agent is fronted, the agent marker disappears.

The morpheme *xe* signals a fronted topic which is then predicated on and determined. In Nêlêmwa, the fronted element may have various degrees of referential determinacy: it may be generic, referentially indefinite, or it may be referentially definite, as in (5).

The topic may be a whole proposition rather than a noun as in the following:

(6)   *I   khabwe xe   io   i   diya.*
       3SG   say   CONN   FUT   3SG   do
       'He said it, (so) he'll do it.' OR: 'He said that he'll do it.'

2.1.2 Non-verbal predication

The morpheme *xe* also marks a fronted argument in non-verbal predication.

– Neutral order of the predication: predicate/argument:

(7)   *Makue holeny.*
       taro   this.DEICT
       'This is taro.'

– Marked order: the argument is fronted (argument *xe* predicate):

(8)   *Holeny   xe   makue.*
       this.DEICT CONN   taro
       'This, it is taro.'

The fronted topic (*holeny*) is identified by the predicate (the noun *makue*).

2.2 *xe* as a complementiser or connector

Xe also introduces the complements of verbs such as *axe* 'see' or *kaxaak* 'be sure' and sometimes complements of the verb *khabwe* 'say' in reported speech (as in 'he says that...'). It is associated with declarative clauses.

(9)a. *I   axe   xe   xu   jeuk   tan.*
        3SG see   CONN PERF be.near night
        'He sees that the night is coming.'

   b. *Na   kaxaak xe   na   â   Pum.*
        1SG   be.sure CONN 1SG   go   Poum
        'I'm sure to go to Poum.'

It is also part of subordinating locutions. This function is actually derived from that of topic marker:

(10)a. *Hla horêân uya   da xe   taan.*
         3PL rest   arrive up CONN be.daylight
         'They rest until dawn.'

    b. *I   cêê biin   xe   puxe-t xe   i   cêê khîlû.*
         3SG very be.weak   CONN reason CONN 3SG very ill
         'He is very weak because he is very ill.' (lit. 'he is very weak, the reason is,
         he is very ill').

In (10)b there are two successive topics, the whole proposition '*i cêê biin*' is the first topic (as '*i khabwe*' is topical in (6)), and the noun *puxe-t* ('reason, origin, base'), which introduces the subordinate clause is the second one. Such facts point out the continuum between topicalisation, relativisation, complementation and subordination in Nêlêmwa.

3 *xe* as a relative marker

Relative clauses with *xe,* as in (1) and (11), introduce new information; they are similar to topic constructions, in that the term to the right is always a predicate.

(11)   *Fo   agu   xe   hla uya.*
         there.are people CONN 3PL arrive
         'There are some people who are arriving.' (OR: 'there are some people,
         they are arriving.')

An indefinite head is always associated with identifying relatives with *xe*; thus, in (11) *agu* is referentially indefinite; but the head may also be definite, as in (12).

(12)   *Kôôbwan xe   i   fawulu hliibai   thaamwa xe   hli   haga.*
         yesterday CONN 3SG speak.to those2.ANAPH woman   CONN 3DU   fish
         'Yesterday, he spoke to those two women who were fishing.'

These women have already been mentioned, they are thus determined by an anaphoric pronoun, but they are now identified as those who were fishing. In (12), two of the functions of *xe* appear, the first occurrence is the topic marker, and the second occurrence is the relative clause marker.

The degree of definiteness of the head is thus irrelevant. What matters is the type of relation that obtains between the head and the relative clause. If this relation is topical (first predicated) and identifies the head, it is marked by *xe*. If it is already shared information, it is backgrounded and marked by a deictic or anaphoric pronoun.

All the syntactic functions of the head may be relativised by *xe* as shown in sentence (13)a, and *xe* is compatible with any syntactic function of the relativised term, as shown in (13).

In sentence (13)a, the head is a locative noun: *na bwee-n* ('on top-her').

(13)a.　*Me　hli　khaayi　adaga na　bwee-n　　xe　i　　mago.*
　　　　and　3DU　take.off　comb LOC　top-POSS.3SG　CONN　3SG　sleep
　　　　'And they take the comb off her head (she) who is sleeping.'
　　　　(lit. 'from top-her who is sleeping')

　　b.　*Yo　axe　hleena　　　ââ-hî　　　　　xe　　hla　thivi.*
　　　　2SG　see　those.DEICT　seedlings-POSS.1DU　CONN　3PL　pull.out
　　　　'You see those seedlings of ours that they are pulling out.'

The morpheme *xe* only signals that the relation between the head and the relative is topical and identifying. Again, in examples (14) and (15), *xe* has both functions, as a left-dislocation marker and a relative marker:

(14)　　*Habwali-n　　　xe　　hooli　　　habwan xe　　hmwêên xa　foro.*
　　　　clothes-POSS.3SG CONN　that.ANAPH　clothes　CONN　be big　also　be.white
　　　　'Her clothes, they are the clothes that are big and white.'

The first occurrence of *xe* marks *habwali-n* as the topic; the second occurrence qualifies and identifies the noun *habwan*. But if the determination is backgrounded, as in (15), a post-head anaphoric pronoun *bai* appears and stands as the trace of the preconstructed determination:

(15)　　*Habwali-n　　　xe　　hooli　　　habwan **bai**　　　hmwêên*
　　　　clothes-POSS.3SG CONN　that.ANAPH　clothes　that.**ANAPH**　be.big

　　　　xa　foro.
　　　　also　be white
　　　　'Her clothes, they are the big and white clothes.'

What is more, qualifying stative verbs (adjective-like predicates, such as 'be white') are never used as attributive premodifiers and rarely as attributive postmodifiers in Nêlêmwa. They are predicates, and as such are constructed as postmodifying relatives marked by either *xe* or a deictic or anaphoric marker (as in (14) and (15)). Attributive (adjective-like) postmodifiers constitute a very limited set of lexicalised forms (such as *doo ulo* "red earth, laterite" (lit. 'earth red')). All the various functions of *xe* (left-dislocation, verb complementiser and relative marker) refer to one unique principle: it signals topical, identifying determination.

4　Backgrounded relative clauses with deictic or anaphoric determiners

When relative clauses are associated with deictic or anaphoric determiners, they refer to backgrounded determination.

4.1 Subject/actor relative clauses

The post-head deictic or anaphoric determiner is marked for number concord with the head, (*bai* is singular in (16) and *mahleena* is plural in (17)). Besides, the subject pronoun of the relative clause is optional (see (16) and (17)) when it refers back to the head.

A. Post-head anaphoric determiner:

(16)   *Na mwimwi agu   **bai**   **(i)**   tii   tiiwo hleny.*
       1SG know   person that.ANAPH (3SG) write letter this.DEICT
       'I know the man who wrote this letter.' (lit. 'I know that man (he) wrote the letter')[3]

'I know the man who wrote this letter', constitutes backgrounded determination and refers back to some prior mention or discursive identification, such as: 'I know a man, he wrote a letter/who wrote a letter', which would be marked by *xe* in Nêlêmwa.

B. Post-head directional or deictic determiner:

When the reference is situational, the marker is a deictic or a directional determiner.

(17)   *Na fawulu hulak   **mahleena** **(hla)** taabwa mwena.*
       1SG speak   old.people these.DEICT (3PL) sit   place.DEICT
       'I spoke to these old people who are sitting/are seated there.'

4.2 Object/patient relative clauses

In object/patient relative clauses (18), the subject pronoun of the relative clause is not optional as it is not coreferent with the head. Deleting it would result in a construction with passive and resultative meaning. Thus, deletion of the subject pronoun *i* in (18) would mean 'the coconuts which have been picked'.

(18)   *Na yovi   nu   **mahleena** i   nixi.*
       1SG gather coconut those.DEICT 3SG pick
       'I am gathering the coconuts she is picking.'

Constructions with *xe* bar the deletion of the subject pronoun in the relative clause; this is consistent with the fact that *xe* marks a process of identification. Only backgrounded relative determination with a post-head deictic or anaphoric marker allows such deletion. Compare sentence (20)a with (20)b which has resultative, non active meaning. The term 'non-active' is preferred to passive since the transitive suffix *-ri* (*yari*) is maintained as in an active construction. It is non-active semantically because of unexpressed agentivity, resulting from the deleted subject pronoun *hla*.

(19)   *Mwa-m   ho-iva?*
       house-POSS.2SG this-where?
       'Which is your house?'

---

3   A similar construction *I know the man wrote this letter* exists in some varieties of English.

(20)a.　*mwa*　**eli**　　　*hla ya-ri*　*o*　　*maaxi*
　　　　house　this.ANAPH　3PL roof-TR PREP thatch
　　　　'the house they roofed with thatch'

　　b.　*mwa*　**eli**　　　　*ya-ri*　*o*　　*maaxi*
　　　　house　this.ANAPH　roof-TR PREP thatch
　　　　'the house roofed with thatch'

5 Contrastive examples of relative constructions

The construction of relative clauses thus parallels the various steps by which determination is built in discourse:

- on the one hand, foregrounding (first mention), as an identifying process marked by *xe*; it is similar to the process of left-dislocation by which something is topicalised, predicated on and identified, as in sentence (21),

- on the other hand, backgrounded (preconstructed) determination associated with a deictic or anaphoric determiner, as in sentence (22).

A. Identifying determination with *xe*:

(21)　*Na tu　thaamwa aa-xiik　**xe**　i　yeenare vhaa Nêlêmwa.*
　　　1SG find　woman　CLASS-one CONN 3SG learn.TR　talk Nêlêmwa
　　　'I've met **a** woman who was learning the Nêlêmwa language.'

(The subject pronoun of the relative clause CANNOT be deleted.)

B. Backgrounded determination with an anaphoric or deictic marker:

(22)　*Na tu　thaamwa **bai**　　　(i)　yeenare　vhaa Nêlêmwa.*
　　　1SG find　woman　that.ANAPH　(3SG) learn.TR　talk Nêlêmwa
　　　'I've met **the** woman who was learning the Nêlêmwa language.'

(The subject pronoun of the relative clause is optional.)

6 Realis versus irrealis determination: *xe* and *o* in topical relative clauses

In interrogative, negative, hypothetical, or irrealis contexts, that is, when determination remains virtual, *xe* commutes with the irrealis marker *o*. This points out the grammaticised function of *xe* from its discursive function as the topic marker to that of a relativiser and complementiser.

6.1 Injunctive contexts

Xe is associated with assertive, realis mood, while the virtual/irrealis marker *o* is naturally associated with injunctive, hypothetical and negative utterances.

– Assertive:

> (23)   *Na îyûlî taraushi xe   tadalan.*
> 1SG buy   trousers CONN be.black
> 'I bought **a** black pair of trousers.' (lit. 'a pair of trousers which is black')

– Injunctive:

> (24)   *Na-me   orop o   ulo   shi-ny.*[4]
> give-DIR dress VIRT be.red side-POSS.1SG
> 'Give me **a** red dress.' (lit. 'a dress which is red')

Yet, if the existence of the term is unquestionable, *xe* may appear. In (25)a, *xe* points out that the speaker has no doubts about the existence of such a knife, whereas *o* points to its hypothetical existence:

> (25)a.   *Fhe-dume hele xe   caak.*
> bring-DIR knife CONN be.sharp
> 'Bring me **a/the**[5] sharp knife.' (lit. 'a knife which is sharp')

> b.   *Fhe-dume hele o   caak.*
> bring-DIR   knife VIRT be.sharp
> 'Bring me **a** sharp knife.' (lit. 'a knife which would be sharp')

The virtual morpheme *o* also appears in verbal complementation as well as in subordination with hypothetical meaning, as *xe* does in realis, assertive contexts. Thus, compare the irrealis mood of (26) with the realis mood of (10)a which is part of a narrative:

> (26)   *Io na xam gaa   shayailî me   uya da o   na kûûlî.*
> FUT 1SG ASS CONT work.TR AIM arrive up VIRT 1SG finish.TR
> 'I will be working at it until I finish it.'

The virtual marker is due to the presence of the future marker (*io*) in the main clause.

Complementation of verbs with irrealis meaning also makes use of *o*; this is the case with negative verbs or verbs with tentative meaning.

> (27)   *I   kuat o   i   yagei-e.*
> 3SG refuse VIRT 3SG help-3SG
> 'She refuses that he should help her.' (lit. 'she refuses if he helps her')

> (28)   *I   khaxac o   i   â.*
> 3SG hesitate VIRT 3SG go
> 'He is hesitating whether to leave.'

---

[4]   Compare with the backgrounded relative determination marked by the deictic determiner *-ena*:
> *Na   me orow-ena   ulo   shi-ny.*
> give DIR dress-that.DEICT be red side-POSS.1SG
> 'Give me **the** red dress.' (lit. 'the dress that is red')

[5]   The definite value is contrastive (and refers to that particular knife he has in mind). But as the person spoken to may not know about such a knife, as it is first mentioned, the determination is foregrounded and *xe* appears.

6.2 Negative contents

In a negative context, when the referentiality of a term or process is not asserted, the relative clause is also marked by *o*. This occurs in negative existential constructions with *kiya* and in negative sentences marked by *kio*. The negative existential predicate *kiya* ('there is not') bars any kind of referential identification, thus *o* is required:

(29)   **Kiya   agu   o   na   axi-e.**
         NEG.PRED   person   VIRT   1SG see-3SG
         'I did not see anybody.' (lit. 'there isn't any one I saw')

The case of the negative morpheme *kio* is more complex. The type of construction depends on the scope of the negation, and on which of the predicates (that of the main clause or the relative clause) is negated.

In sentence (30), the negation bears on the predicate of the main clause. Both constructions with *xe* and *o* are licensed, with different values, though *o* is by far the most common and semantically neutral marker. In the construction with *o* (30), the negation has scope on the whole sentence, the whole process is negated (= I did not see numerous dwellings).

Kio < main clause + relative determination >:

(30)   **Kio   na   axe awôlô   o   khoxo.**
         NEG 1SG   see dwellings VIRT be.many
         'I have not seen many dwellings.' (lit. 'dwellings that would be many')

(They may be numerous, but I haven't seen them.)

Khoxo 'be many' is a stative quantifying predicate which cannot be used as an attributive pre- or post-modifier (similarly to qualifying adjective-like stative predicates). Choosing the construction with *xe* in (30) would state the existence of a great number of houses and would only suggest that the speaker has not seen them; this would mean 'I have not seen **the** numerous houses'.

If the negation has scope only on the predicate of the relative clause, while the main clause is asserted, only *xe* may appear. What is negated in (31) is the quantifier predicate *khoxo*, not the process itself, thus allowing *xe*.

< main clause > < *kio* + quantifier predicate >:

(31)   **Na îyûlî pwâ-ciic xe   kio khoxo.**
         1SG buy   fruit-tree CONN NEG be.many
         'I have not bought many fruit.' (lit. 'I have bought fruit that are not many')

The main clause is topical, *xe* signals that the postmodification constitutes new information.

6.3 Interrogative contexts

Similarly, in interrogative contexts *o* is associated with irrealis and *xe* with realis mood. To some extent, the 'some'/'any' doublet in English interrogative sentences has a similar function ('do you want some/any...?'):

(32)   *Fo   aguk   o   i   taau-ri   wany?*
       there.is person VIRT 3SG wait-TR   boat
       'Is there anyone waiting for the boat?' (lit. 'who might be waiting for the boat?')

With *xe*, one just inquires for an indisputable fact to be confirmed. Thus (33) could be an echo question to (31):

(33)   *Co   îyûlî   pwâ-ciic   xe   cêê   khoxo?*
       2SG buy   fruit-tree CONN very   be.many
       'Have you (really) bought a lot of fruit?' (lit. 'You bought fruit that are
       numerous?' OR: 'You bought some fruit, are there a lot of them?')

7 Construction of relative clauses and resumptive traces

In Nêlêmwa, the morphemes which function as 'relativisers' (*xe*, deictic or anaphoric determiners) never mark the syntactic or case function of the relativised position in the relative clause, as relative pronouns 'who', 'whom' and 'whose' do in English. The syntactic function (argument or adjunct) of the relativised element in the relative clause is marked by resumptive traces *in situ* which allow the coreference necessary for both segments (main and relative clauses) to be linked. As has already been pointed out, there is no hierarchy of syntactic functions that may be relativised; all arguments and adjuncts are relativisable and recoverable by resumptive traces, whatever the type of relative clause. Not surprisingly, these traces are similar for all types of operations involving movement and deletion of terms in a sentence (such as left-dislocation, cleft construction and relative clauses). Those pronominal resumptive traces support Keenan's (1985:148) prediction that:

> RCs which express NPrel as a personal pronoun typically allow a greater range of
> positions to be relativised compared with RCs which do not use such pronouns.[6]

Here is an overview of the various resumptive traces *in situ* in both types of relative clauses in Nêlêmwa. Resumptive subject and object pronouns are specific to animates (inanimates are always zero-marked).

7.1 Subject/actor function

Resumptive subject pronouns only mark nominal animates. To sum up: (a) with the *xe* construction, the subject pronoun is the obligatory resumptive trace (21); (b) in the backgrounded construction (with a deictic or anaphoric marker), the subject pronoun is optional when it refers back to the head (22), and it is obligatory when it is not coreferent with the head, otherwise resulting in a non-active meaning; compare examples (20)a and (20)b.

---

[6]   RCs = restrictive relative clauses. NPrel marks the relativised position in the relative clause.

7.2 Direct object/patient function

The obligatory resumptive trace for nominal animates is an object pronoun suffixed to the verb of the relative clause (/Ø/ for inanimates):

(34)   *Na   mwimwi   agu   bai   yo axi-e   kôôbwan.*
      1SG   know   person that.ANAPH   2SG see-3SG   yesterday
      'I know the man you saw yesterday.' (lit. 'I know the man you saw
      him yesterday')

7.3 Traces of indirect objects and adjuncts

Indirect objects are marked by various case-marking prepositions. In relative clauses, such functions are recoverable *in situ* either by prepositional pronouns (for animates) or by anaphoric markers (for the locative or instrumental case which refer to inanimates).

7.3.1 Indirect objects referring to animates

An argument is marked as beneficiary or origin by the inalienable noun *shi-*[7] (+ possessive suffix) which is grammaticised into a case-marking morpheme: the beneficiary is marked by *shi-*, the origin by *na shi-* (36).

(35)   *Na   fawulu   agu   bai   co   îyû-lî   khoo-m   nok*
      1SG   speak   person that.ANAPH   2SG   buy-TR   food-POSS.2SG   fish

      na   shi-n.
      LOC   side-POSS.3SG
      'I spoke to the person you bought your fish from.'

Compare with:

(36)   *Na   îyû-lî   khoo-ny   nok   na   shi   agu   bai.*
      1SG   buy-TR   food-POSS.1SG   fish   LOC   side   person that.ANAPH
      'I bought my fish from that person.'

A comitative object is marked by *ma* which is both a coordination and the comitative case-marker ('and, with'):

(37)   *Ye   hî   thaamwa eli   pe-fââlâ-hli   ma   ye.*
      3SG.INDEP   this   woman   that.ANAPH   RECIP-way-POSS.3DU COMIT 3SG
      'Here is the woman he has travelled with.'

An associative object is marked by *vi* which is the grammaticised form of the verb *fhe* 'bring':

---

[7]   *Shi-n* is an inalienable noun meaning 'hand, member'; it also has a locative meaning ('side', 'at someone's place', 'among'). It is grammaticised as a preposition and marks the beneficiary or the origin case function in association with the locative *na*.

(38)   *Ye   hoona   âlô **eli**   io   i   mu   **vi**   ye*.
       3SG.INDEP this.DEICT child this.ANAPH FUT   3SG stay ASSOC 3SG
       'Here is the child he will adopt.' (lit. 'he will live with him')

7.3.2 *Locative case function*

The resumptive trace of most locative adjuncts is marked by the anaphoric locative pronoun *le*.

(39)   *I   uya   **ni** kuut pwa-giik **xe**   hla mu   **le***
       3SG arrive in bay CLASS-one CONN   3PL stay LOC.ANAPH

       hulak   mahleeli.
       aged   these.ANAPH
       'He arrives in a bay where these old folks live.'

7.3.3 *Traces of indirect inanimate objects marked by the preposition*
   o *or* nao

The preposition *o* (which is homophonous with the irrealis marker *o*), marks indirect inanimate objects with various meanings (cause, source, instrument, location). *Nao* is a locative preposition which also marks the indirect inanimate object of various verbs, among which are verbs of speech ('speak of, ask about'). The anaphoric resumptive trace of such prepositional arguments is also marked by *le*:

– Resumptive trace of indirect objects with causal, source meaning:

(40)   *Hla pe-faaxeen   o   foliik **bai**   hla xam pe-vhaa*
       3PL   RECIP-inquire PREP thing   that.ANAPH 3PL ASS   RECIP-discuss

       le.
       LOC.ANAPH
       'They ask each other what they are discussing about.'

The base construction would be: *hla pe-vhaa nao delek* 'they are discussing about land (rights)'.

– Resumptive trace of the instrumental case:

(41)   *Ehî   pânâât **bai**   na khiiboxa ko **le***.
       here.is stone   that.ANAPH 1SG hit   hen LOC.ANAPH
       'Here is the stone I hit the hen with.'

The base instrumental construction would be: *na khiiboxa ko o pânâât* 'I hit the hen with a stone.'

7.3.4 *Traces of a possessive determination*

When the possessor is the relativised term in the relative clause, the resumptive traces vary with the nominal class. They are either possessive suffixes, when it is a bound (inalienable)

noun, as in (42)a, or a preposition (*i, o*) + an object pronoun, if it is an independent, alienable noun (42)b.

(42)a.   *Na   mwimwi   agux-ena   aa-ru   pwaxi-n.*
      1SG   know   person-this.DEICT   CLASS-two   child-POSS.3SG
      'I know the man (who has) two children.'

    b.   *Co mwimwi   agux-ena   wa-du   loto   i   ye?*
      2SG know   person-this.DEICT   CLASS-two   car   PREP   3SG
      'Do you know the man who has two cars?'

8 Postmodification and aspect

Several variations have been noted so far, such as the variation between *xe* and *o* (realis versus irrealis mood, see §6). Some diathetic variations (active versus non active or resultative) are marked by the deletion of the subject pronoun in backgrounded relative clauses (see §4.2). Also, the construction of relative clauses also varies with aspect (mainly durative and resultative).

8.1 Nominalised resultative postmodification

Nominalisation is another possible strategy to express resultative postmodification bearing on a patient (compare with the constructions in §4.2). Two prefixes have such function in Nêlêmwa: *shâ-* and *hna-*; they constitute non finite juxtaposed postmodification. Moyse-Faurie (1995:45) and Osumi (1995:248) note similar constructions in Xârâcùù and Tinrin. Such nominalisations are reminiscent of participial constructions: the underlying agent of the process is marked as the possessive determiner of the nominalisation.

8.1.1 Prefix shâ-: collective, resultative postmodification

The form *shâ-* is a collective prefix (derived from *shaget* and expressing a container/ contained relationship, as in the 'crew' (of a boat), the 'inhabitants' (of a country), the 'catch' (at fishing and hunting). This prefix may nominalise verbs as in sentence (43) or it may be prefixed to nouns as in sentence (44). It always expresses resultative and collective meaning.

– Prefixed to a verb (as nominal derivation):

(43)   *Na   khu-xi   mugic   shâ-khîlî-wo   i   nyanya.*
      1SG   eat-TR   bananas   COLL-cook-COLL   PREP   Mummy
      'I have eaten the bananas cooked by Mummy.' (lit. 'I have eaten the
      bananas result of cooking of Mummy')

The nominalised verb (*shâ-khîlî-wo*) has an indirect possessive determiner (*i nyanya*) which encodes an underlying agent (*nyanya*), (e.g. the banana Mummy cooked). The determined head (*mugic*) is semantically a patient. Such juxtaposed nominalised postmodification is one of the various strategies by which backgrounded relative clauses are constructed, with a specific resultative meaning, preserving the topic continuity of the patient.

– Prefixed to a noun (composition):

(44)   *Na   khu-xi mugic   shâ-cela*[8]   *nyanya.*
        1SG eat-TR bananas COLL-cooking.pot.of Mummy
        'I have eaten the bananas cooked by Mummy.' (lit. '…the bananas
        contained by cooking-pot of Mummy')

Semantically, this type of nominalised stative/resultative postmodifying construction deactivates both process and agent. There being no passive voice in Nêlêmwa, such a construction has diathetic functions. It reverses the active perspective 'he is eating the bananas his mother cooked', towards the resultative, non-active meaning 'he is eating the bananas cooked by his mother' expressed as a possessive determination (lit. he is eating the bananas cooking of his mother). The agent is demoted to the function of possessive determiner.

In Xârâcùù, the nominalising prefix *êê-* (which may be related to the nominalising prefix *êrê-* 'consequence, result') is used in similar postmodifying determination.

(45)   *È   kê pwî   êê   mwata na   rè anyââ.*
        3SG eat banana PR.NOM grate   PAST DET Mummy
        'He is eating the bananas grated by Mummy.'   (Moyse-Faurie 1995:49)

Tinrin has a similar construction with the prefix *hêrrê-* 'content of'; compare examples (46)a and (46)b:

(46)a. *Nrâ nrêê harru nrâ kafe   ke fwi.*
        3SG taste good   SM coffee 2SG make
        'The coffee you made is good.'   (Osumi 1995:248)

    b. *Nrâ nrêê harru nrâ kafe   hêrrê   fwi   nrâ   nrü.*
        3SG taste good   SM coffee PR.NOM   make   REL.POSS 2SG
        'The coffee made by you is good.'   (Osumi 1995:248)

8.1.2 Prefix hna- ('place of'): resultative, locative postmodification

The nominalising locative prefix *hna-* is yet another way of expressing resultative/non-active meaning in backgrounded relative clauses bearing on a patient. In sentence (47), the indirect possessive determiner (*i hli*) of the nominalised postmodification (*hna-yuura-wo*) also encodes an underlying agent (*they have dug*).

(47)   *I   axe fwa mahleeli   hna-yuura-wo i   hli.*
        3SG see hole these.ANAPH place-dig-COLL PREP 3DU
        'He sees the holes they have dug.' (lit. 'he sees the holes place of their digging')

A similar construction is used in Nengone (Maré, Loyalty Islands):

---

8   *Cela* is the determined form of *cet* 'cooking-pot'; *cela nyanya* thus means 'Mummy's cooking-pot' (lit. 'cooking-pot of Mummy'.

(48)a. *Nidi seseko kore ciboretan **hna** iye   hnei   buic.*
       very true   ART news   PAST bring AGT-of 3PL
       'The news that they brought is very true.' (Ozanne-Rivierre, cited in
       Moyse-Faurie 1983:144)

    b. *Buic ci   a-ehNe-ni   ore ruace hne-i   buic **hna** rue.*
       3PL   PRES CAUS-be.visible-TR ART work AGT-of 3PL PAST do
       'They show the work they have done.' (Ozanne-Rivierre, cited in
       Moyse-Faurie 1983:144).

and in Drehu (Lifu, Loyalty Islands):

(49) *Ame la   uma **hna** dreuth hnei angeic.*
       here.is ART house PAST burn   AGT 3SG
       'Here is the house (that) he has burnt.' (Moyse-Faurie 1983:178).

Table 1: Summary of these constructions in Nêlêmwa

Type of determination	Ded head	Relative clause or postmodification
Active	Noun	+ subject pronoun + V (see (20)a)
Resultative	Noun	+ deleted subject pronoun + V (see (20)b)
Resultative, non-active	Noun	+ nominalisation (*shâ-, hna-*) + possessive determiner

8.2 Durative postmodification marked by *na*

The durative postmodification which is marked by *na* (derived from *hna* 'place of') only occurs with a relativised actor or agent. It requires the deletion of the subject of the postmodifying verb, under coreference with the head. Besides, a subject pronoun after *na* would lead to another interpretation, that of the homophonous *na* (the coordination 'but'); thus, *na hli haga* in sentence (50) would mean 'but they were fishing'.

(50) *Kôôbwan **xe**   i   fawulu hliibai   thaamwa **na**   haga.*
       yesterday CONN 3SG talk   these2.ANAPH woman   DUR fish
       'Yesterday, he talked to the two women (who were) fishing.'

Sentence (50) stresses duration of the process, but it is otherwise very similar to the construction with *xe* in (51) or in (12), which is new information:

(51) *Ni shade bai   **xe**   i   yaagei hliibai   thaamwa **xe***
       in week that.ANAPH CONN 3SG help.TR these2.ANAPH woman   CONN

       ***hli** thaxi mido.*
       3DU plant taro
       'Last week, he helped the women who planted/were planting taro.'

9 Construction of relative clauses in other Kanak languages

Most Kanak languages seem to have a double pattern, with various degrees of complexity. Cèmuhî (Rivierre 1980:176) also has linkers derived from deictic or anaphoric determiners: *ce* 'this' (near), *naa* 'that' (anaphoric), *li* 'that' (anaphoric, referring to past, known items). These deictic and anaphoric determiners are used in much the same way as in Nêlêmwa.

(52)a.   *a   pèii **cè**   úbwö*
         the stone this.DEICT big
         'this stone which is big' (Rivierre 1980:173)

    b.   *a   pèii **cè**   **naa**   pwájó*
         the stone this.DEICT that.ANAPH white
         'this stone which is white' (Rivierre 1980:176)

    c.   *li   apuliè **li**   lé   ábé*
         the people ANAPH 3PL come
         'the people who came' (Rivierre 1980:176)

    d.   *a-li ila **li**   é   lang*
         the   pot ANAPH it.is there
         'the cooking-pot which is there' (Rivierre 1980:174)

In Tinrin, Osumi (1995) notes the following:

> ...relative clauses are normally restrictive, since the non restrictive clausal modifier may usually be expressed in coordinate sentences...Relative clauses are expressed in two ways...The first makes use of *a* 'an attribute marker' ('one who') which has the same form as a nominaliser to indicate a habitual practitioner or person with a specific nature or qualification. (1995:265)

> ...*a* introduces a participial relative clause which applies only to subjects.[9]...They can also be linked with no specific relative pronoun or marking. (1995:268)

(53)   *saa bee-mwage   a   horro*
       one PR.NOM-play ATTRIB.MRK hard
       'a game that is hard' (Osumi 1995:267)

When no specific marker appears, relative clauses differ from coordinate sentences by intonation; finally a demonstrative (*rra*) may appear after the head NP.

Osumi (1995:240) states that some topicalisations are formally identical to relative constructions: *'the big tree that stands there'* can also be interpreted as *'the big tree, it stands there'*. But there is no topic marker in Tinrin (unlike Nêlêmwa), as "topic is expressed in a topic-shift construction" (Osumi 1995:239). Osumi notes that Tinrin's relative clause forming strategy seems to reflect Keenan and Comrie's (1977) accessibility hierarchy:

> ...only the subject position... can be relativised...with *a*. Relativised subject and direct object positions are marked by zero, whereas the possessor position, which has less accessibility, is marked by a pronoun. Oblique positions are split into two groups, with presumably the ones marked by zero having a higher accessibility for relativisation, and the ones marked by a pronoun having less. (Osumi 1995:274-275)

---

9   As in: 'people who always tell stories'.

There is no such hierarchy in Nêlêmwa, the two constructions (topical with *xe* and backgrounded with a deictic or anaphoric determiner), may apply indifferently to any syntactic function and their choice is linked to discursive strategies. Besides, all syntactic functions are marked by resumptive pronouns or traces.

There seems to be a fairly frequent pattern in relative clause forming strategy in Kanak languages. One of them makes use of a predicative marker (appearing in one of several forms: *a, ka, xe*) which is often associated with stative verbs or has identifying function; there are some variations according to languages. The second most common strategy makes use of a deictic or anaphoric determiner. Finally, there are non finite postmodifying constructions (usually nominalisations) which have specific aspectual or diathetic functions.

In Ajië (La Fontinelle 1976), relative clauses are introduced by *ka* (which is also a predicative marker) and by the demonstrative *rre* 'that'.

In Xâraâcùù, post-head deictic determiners such as *a* or anaphoric determiners such as *bwa* are used:

(54)a. *mîî pa   xûûchî a   pa   mwârâ*
        PL COLL child   DEICT COLL play
        'these children who are playing'   (Moyse-Faurie 1995:43)

   b. *Nâ pè mê nèké bwa   ke fè mênêî na.*
        1SG take DIR basket ANAPH 2SG leave forget PAST
        'I am taking the basket you forgot on leaving.'   (Moyse-Faurie 1995:58)

In Iaai, Loyalty Islands, (Ozanne-Rivierre 1976), active relative clauses may have no overt marker and are simply juxtaposed (as in (55)a) or they may be marked by a deictic or anaphoric determiner, mainly when the verb of the relative clause is in the past (as in (55)b).

(55)a. *Oge me   wɔ ito aa   kot aŋ.*
        1SG PROCESS see house 3SG.PERF hit wind
        'I see the house which the wind has struck.'   (Ozanne-Rivierre 1976:196)

   b. *Ogee   wɔ at ejii   aa   oo   eet.*
        1SG.PERF see man ANAPH 3SG.PERF arrive yesterday
        'I saw the man who arrived yesterday.'   (Ozanne-Rivierre 1976:197)

The deictic *ejii* ('down') has anaphoric function in such constructions.

The predicative marker *a* is also used as a relativiser in clauses with a stative predicate, as in the following:

(56)a. *Oge me   wɔ at a   e   møk.*
        1SG PROCESS see man CONN 3SG be ill
        'I can see the man who is ill.'   (Ozanne-Rivierre 1976:139)

   b. *Iɲ caa ke üɲa   hiŋat a   e   ti   xatəə-ɲa*
        1SG NEG one PRESENT old.man CONN 3SG very know-1SG

        üɲa   boŋon.
        PRESENT story
        'I am not an old man who knows the story very well.'
        (Ozanne-Rivierre 1976:183)

c. *Oge me   helɔɔm ke dok oge maa   laba hɲin*
    1SG PROCESS look.for one place 1SG INACC stay in

    a   e   sɔɔkoü ge   ta-wɛɛt.
    CONN 3SG be.far from man
    'I am looking for a place that is far away from men.'
    (Ozanne-Rivierre 1976:197)

The morpheme *a* is multifunctional; it is also used as the left-dislocation marker with stative verbs (57) and used as a predicative attributive morpheme in postmodifying relative clauses with stative predicates (58) and has identifying functions:

(57)a. *E   sehɲin   wanakat.*
      3SG be.happy   child
      'The child is happy.' (Ozanne-Rivierre 1976:133)

   b. *Wanakat a   e   sehɲin.*
      child   CONN 3SG be.happy
      'The child, he is happy.' (Ozanne-Rivierre 1976:133)

(58)a. *moomo a   e   hmanenaŋ*
      woman CONN 3SG be.beautiful
      'the beautiful woman' (lit. 'the woman who is beautiful')
      (Ozanne-Rivierre 1976:180)

   b. *U   at   a   u   biigaan.*
      2SG man CONN 2SG be.proud
      'You are a proud man.'   (Ozanne-Rivierre 1976:180)

In Drehu, Loyalty Islands, (Moyse-Faurie 1983) relative clauses may be introduced by a deictic or anaphoric determiner (59) or with no overt marker, as merely juxtaposed postmodification, as in (60). (In the following examples, *a* is the present/aoristic tense-aspect marker, *ka* the stative marker, *kola* the durative aspect marker):

(59) *Eni a   wang la   itre föe   la   ka   hu-ixöe.*
    1SG PRES watch ART PL woman this.DEICT STAT weave-mat
    'I am watching the women who weave mats.' (Moyse-Faurie 1983:179)

(60)a. *Angeic a   thel   la   nekönatr a   lep   la   kuli*
      3SG   PRES look.for ART child   PRES strike ART dog

      a   nyinyap.
      PRES run
      'He's looking for the child who's beating the dog who's running.'
      (Moyse-Faurie 1983:177)

   b. *Eni a   wang la   uma ka lolo.*
      1SG PRES watch ART house STAT beautiful
      'I am watching the beautiful house.' (lit. 'I am watching the house which is beautiful') (Moyse-Faurie 1983:177)

   c. *Eni a   thel   la   itre atr kola isi.*
      1SG PRES look.for ART PL man DUR fight
      'I am looking for the men (who) are fighting.' (Moyse-Faurie 1983:178)

There are also cases of juxtaposed postmodification expressing possession with the marker *kë*:

(61)   *atr   kë   nekön*
        man   POSS.CONN   child
        'a man who has children'   (Moyse-Faurie 1983:177)

Among the languages quoted (languages of the south, center-north and Loyalty Islands), only Tinrin (south) and Iaai (Loyalty Islands) seem to have relative clauses structured as topicalised clauses, and only Nêlêmwa seems to have grammaticised such a type, with the *xe* marker used both as a left-dislocation, a relative marker and a complementiser. It is interesting to note that *xe* also has some of the predicative functions of the *ka, a* markers of the other languages mentioned. As for deictic/anaphoric markers, their use is general.

10 Conclusion

(1) There is no such distinction as restrictive and descriptive relatives in Nêlêmwa. According to the discursive context, descriptive relatives such as 'this book, which the children do not like, is a good book' would be expressed either as a *xe* construction or with a deictic or anaphoric marker according to whether the determination is identifying or backgrounded. More simply, it may be translated as an independent, paratactic construction, as in (62).

(62)   *Va   perui   ma   aaru   thaamwa,   hlimaidu*
        1PL.EXCL   meet   COMIT   two   woman   these2.down.there[10]

        haga   mwamaidu.
        fish   down.there
        'I have met two women, those two who are fishing down there.'

When asked about constructions similar to descriptive relatives, informants generally feel they are very unnatural, and they fall back into one of those two structures, or a paratactic construction, with a certain bewilderment that the linguist should ask such odd, and unnecessary questions.

(2) Secondly, aspectual or modal values cause the possible commutation of *xe* and *o* (the irrealis marker) in topical, identifying relative clauses.

As for the active/non active contrast in backgrounded relative clauses, there are two possible constructions: one is by deletion of the subject pronoun, as in (20)b; the second makes use of nominalisations, in which case the underlying agent is coded as a possessor, as in (43) and (47).

(3) The double construction of relative clauses in Nêlêmwa – topical with *xe /o*, or backgrounded with an anaphoric or deictic marker – is evidence of the continuum between the construction of definiteness, relative determination and discursive organisation. As Givón puts it: "Relative clauses [...] partake in the grammar of anaphoric reference and referential identification" (Givón 1984:645).

---

[10]   The form *hlimaidu* is a dual directional pronoun.

Being part of the construction of reference, the construction of relative clauses reflects the various stages by which definiteness is encoded and the various discursive strategies according to which information is given.

Table 2: Summary table of Nêlêmwa relative clause constructions

Type of utterance	Identifying relative clause	Backgrounded relative clause or postmodification
Declarative (realis)	*xe*	anaphoric or deictic determiner
Unasserted (interrogative, negative, virtual mood)	*o*	*
Declarative, with resultative aspect	*	*shâ-; hna-* + patient/object
Declarative, with durative aspect	*	*na* + actor/subject
* marks a non-existent construction		

The link between topicalisation and relative clauses is often pointed out cross-linguistically. In many Austronesian languages, including Philippine languages, Indonesian languages, and Malagasy (Keenan 1976:265), only topics may be relativised. In Chamorro (Western Austronesian, Micronesia), topicalisation, question formation and relativisation are structurally similar:

> [...] a referent is first established as topic, question word or head of relative clause, and
> then expanded on.   (Wouk 1986:149).

Consequently, relativisation of an actor requires the 'Actor topic' construction and relativisation of a patient requires the 'Patient topic' construction, as in Philippine and Indonesian languages (for Tagalog, see Schachter 1976:500). In Palauan (Western Austronesian, Palau Islands, Micronesia), Hagège (1986) and Lemaréchal (1991) also point out the link between topicalisation and relative clause construction. Actor/subject and Patient/object relative clauses require different constructions. The relativised noun is marked by *(e)l*, but in an Actor/subject relative clause – i.e. with the actor as topic –, the "indicative" construction is used:

(63)a. *A   redíl   a s-il-seb-íi   a   blái.*
       ART   woman   burn-PERF-burn-3SG.OBJECT ART   house
       'The woman has burned the house.'   (Lemaréchal 1991:214).

     b. *A   redíl   **el**   s-il-seb-íi   a   blái*
       ART   woman   CONN   burn-PERF-burn-3SG.OBJECT ART   house

       a   m-l-ó   er a   kelebús.
        go   prison
       'The woman who has burned the house will go to prison.'
       (Lemaréchal 1991:115).

A Patient/object relative clause with the Patient/object as topic triggers the use of the "passive-hypothetic" construction ((64)b and (65)c) which is marked by a special paradigm of Actor/subject pronominal prefixes. The patient is left-dislocated, but a pronominal trace is left in its object position on the verb, so that the syntactic functions are preserved, only the position has changed, compare (63), (64)a, and (65).

(64)a. *A   blái a le-s-il-seb-íi*   *a   redíl.*
        ART house 3SG.PASS-burn-PERF-burn-3SG.OBJECT ART woman
        'The house was burned down by the woman.' (lit. 'the house, the woman
        burned it down')   (Josephs 1975:453, cited in Lemaréchal 1991:213)

  b. *a   blái el   le-s-il-seb-íi*   *a   redíl*
      ART house CONN 3SG.PASS-burn-PERF-burn-3SG.OBJECT ART woman
      'the house that the woman burned down'   (Lemaréchal 1991:214)

(65)a. *A   áad a mos-terir a   ngalek.*
        ART man   see-3PL   ART child
        'The man saw the children.'   (cited in Foley &Van Valin 1985:316)

  b. *A   ngalek a le-bos-terir   a   áad.*
      ART child   3SG.PASS-see-3PL ART man
      'The children were seen by the men.'   (cited in Foley &Van Valin 1985:316)

  c. *a   le-bos-terir   a   áad el   ngalek*
      ART 3SG.PASS-see-3PL ART man CONN child
      'the children which were seen by the men'   (cited in Foley &Van Valin
      1985:317)

Foley and Van Valin (1985:317) note that:

> The explanation for these Palauan data seems to be that a left-dislocation or
> topicalisation construction began to be used in relative clauses to meet the constraint
> that only topical NPs were relativizable. [...] It may also explain somewhat the situation
> in Tagalog and other Philippine languages. [...] the topic became the pivot for more and
> more of the syntactic processes [...].

Relative clauses, whether in the "passive-hypothetic" construction or the "indicative" construction, are marked by the multifunctional morpheme *(e)l* (a specifier or connector, Hagège 1986:116) which introduces attributive or predicative adjectives, relative clauses, and which is also a subordinator and complementiser (Hagège 1986:115-133; Lemaréchal 1991:114-139). Basically, this morpheme constructs various types of complementation (Lemaréchal 1991:131). This shows an interesting parallelism with the multifunctional morpheme *xe* in Nêlêmwa (left-dislocation marker, complementiser and relativiser).

Topicalisation (or 'focus') thus underlies relative clause construction in many Austronesian languages. Besides, topicalisation (or 'focus') is closely related to definiteness and referentiality: an indefinite, non-referential term cannot be chosen as a topic ('focus') and only topics may be relativised (Schachter 1976:514). Thus, the construction of relative clauses in Nêlêmwa with either *xe* or a deictic or anaphoric determiner, according to whether a term has already or not yet been determined, is a close parallel to topicalisation in Western Austronesian languages. The rule might be stated thus: if the relative determination is already referential, use an anaphoric or deictic as a linker; if it is new information, make it topical by using the topic marker *xe*. The only major difference in Nêlêmwa is that topicalisation is

discursive and linked to the construction of reference; it is not associated with diathesis as it is in Western Austronesian languages. Besides, there is no such syntactic and diathetic constraint on actor/patient relativisation as in Palauan, since both strategies (*xe* or an anaphoric/deictic determiner) can be used with any syntactic function in Nêlêmwa. Topicalisation and relativisation in Nêlêmwa are linked to the construction of reference in discourse, in a strikingly similar way to what Justus describes for Hittite where the relative construction is marked either by an inflected *ku-* marker (which is also a topic marker and indefinite marker[11]) or without a relative marker according to "the topic status of the shared noun phrase in the syntactic construction as a whole." (Justus 1976:216). The absence of a relative marker occurs when the shared noun is thematic (i.e. old information). The topic function of *ku-* is primary, it is secondarily a marker of subordination and indefiniteness (1976:225). The *ku-* introduced relative noun is new information (1976:235), so the indefinite, non anaphoric character of the relative *ku-* results from its function as focus marker introducing non anaphoric, new information (1976:238-239).

O'Neil (1977) (cited by Hopper & Traugott 1993:190) suggests similar developments in the history of relative clauses in English:

> [...] relative clauses started out essentially as adjuncts, that is, as paratactic clauses close to the end of the sentence. [O'Neil] hypothesizes that their path to integration within the matrix clause was via a stage of topicalisation which moved certain relative clause structures to the left of the sentence; this is a stage of hypotaxis. Finally, clauses came to be embedded as dependent clauses immediately associated with their head nouns.

At the paratactic stage, there being no relative pronouns in Old English, an uninflected connector (*þe*), which was both a relativiser and a subordinator, marked the clause boundary between main and relative clauses and connected them without indicating case.

(66)   &   *þa   men comon on East Engle þe*   *on þæm anum   scipe*
       and the men came   to East Anglia CONN on that one   ship

       wæron swiþe forwundode.
       were   very   wounded
       'And the men who were on that sole (surviving) ship came to East Anglia severely wounded.'
       (ChronA [plummer] 897.51; cited in O'Neil 1977:200, cited in Hopper & Traugott 1993:192).

---

11   "The special marker *ku* is a pronoun with a stem *kw-*, which like its Latin cognate *qui-* served as an inflectable relative-interrogative-indefinite pronoun stem. [...] Justus argues that the use of the relative-interrogative-indefinite pronoun *kw-* to mark the focal NP (i.e. introducing new information) in thematic clauses (i.e. containing old information) [...] is a characteristic of somewhat later Hittite texts. But even at this later stage, [...] *ku* functions as the indefinite marker of a noun phrase in an independent clause rather than a "relative pronoun". [...] what appears to be a correlative clause is in fact a topic clause that states a theme whose domain is not just the next clause but, potentially, several following clauses [...]. Eventually the *kw-* came to be understood as grammatically linking the theme clause to the following clause. [...] We have here an example of a relative clause construction which was originally not a grammatical entity but simply part of the way in which discourses are organised in a particular language coming to be grammaticalised as an embedded clause." (Justus 1976, quoted by Hopper & Traugott 1993:193-95).

Dependency and integration occur when relatives must be adjoined directly to the clause in which the head occurs, and furthermore, subject relatives are topicalised to the left of that clause.   (Hopper & Traugott 1993:192).

(67)   *Ure ieldran þa   þe   þas stowa ær   hioldon,*
         our   forbears those CONN these places previouly held

         hie   lufodon wisdom.
         they loved   wisdom
         'Our forbears who previously possessed these places, they loved wisdom.'
         (c. 880, CP LetWærf 31; cited in O'Neil 1977:202, cited in Hopper &
         Traugott 1993:192).

An anaphoric demonstrative pronoun bearing the case and number of the head noun may precede the connector *þe* (as in sentence (67)); thus pointing out that the two functions now conflated in the relative pronouns of Modern English, that of connector and anaphora, were dissociated in Old English. Again, the multifunctional feature of the connector crops up (*þe* is a relativiser, subordinator or complementiser), as the connector *that* is in modern English.

   Such parallels are not meant to suggest that relative clause forming strategies in New Caledonian languages represent an earlier stage of development that might lead to a similar evolution, but they help point out interesting crosslinguistic features in relative clause forming strategies, among which are the relation between topicalisation and relativisation and the multifunctional aspect of the 'relativisers' which construct it.

References

Bril, I., 1994, *La structure de l'énoncé dans la langue* Nêlêmwa. Thèse de doctorat, Université Denis Diderot, Paris 7.

Foley, W.A. and Van Valin, Robert D. Jr., 1985, Information packaging in the clause. In T. Shopen, ed., Vol. I: 197-242.

Givón, T., 1984, *Syntax. A functional-typological introduction*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamin.

Hagège, C., 1986, *La langue palau: une curiosite typologique*. Munich: Fink Verlag.

Hopper, P.J. and E.C. Traugott, 1993, *Grammaticalisation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Josephs, L.S., 1975, *Palauan reference grammar*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Justus, C., 1976, Relativisation and topicalisation in Hittite. In Li and Thompson, eds, 213-246.

Keenan, E.L., 1976, Remarkable subjects in Malagasy. In Li and Thompson, eds, 213-246.
    1985, Relative clauses. In T. Shopen, ed., Vol.II:141-170.

Keenan, E.L., and Comrie, B., 1977, Noun phrase accessibility and universal grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry*. 8:63-99.

La Fontinelle, J. de, 1976, *La langue de Houailou (Nouvelle-Calédonie)*. Paris: SELAF.

Lemaréchal, A., 1991, *Problèmes de sémantique et de syntaxe en Palau*. Paris: Editions du CNRS.

Li, C.N. and S.A. Thompson, eds, 1976, *Subject and topic: a new typology of language*. New York: Academic Press.

Moyse-Faurie, C., 1983, *Le Drehu, langue de Lifou (Iles Loyauté)*. Paris: SELAF.
      1995, *Le Xârâcùù. Eléments de syntaxe*. Peeters, LCP 10.

O'Neil, W., 1977, Clause adjunction in Old English. *General Linguistics*. 17:199-211.

Osumi, Midori, 1995, *Tinrin grammar*. Oceanic Linguistics Special Publication No.25,
      Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Ozanne-Rivierre, F., 1976, *Le Iaai, langue mélanésienne d'Ouvéa (Nouvelle-Calédonie)*.
      Paris: SELAF.

Rivierre, J.C., 1980, *La langue de Touho, phonologie et grammaire du Cèmuhî (Nouvelle-
      Calédonie)* Paris: SELAF.

Schachter, P., 1976, The subject in Philippine languages: topic, actor, actor-topic, or none of
      the above. In Li and Thompson, eds, 491-518.

Shopen, T., ed., *Language typology and syntactic description*. Cambridge: Cambridge
      University Press.

Wouk, F., 1986, Transitivity in Proto-Malayo-Polynesian and Proto-Austronesian. In
      P. Geraghty, L. Carrington and S.A. Wurm, eds, *FOCAL I: Papers from the 4th
      International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics,* 2:21-42. Canberra: Pacific
      Linguistics.