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1.0. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this paper is to study the nature of the internal relative clause (IRC) in Tenyidie, a dialect of Angami Naga, especially as it concerns the interplay between hierarchical order and constituent word order. We attempt to show that, although in most of the cases hierarchical as well as linear order plays a crucial role in the interpretation of an IRC in Tenyidie, there is an instance where neither plays any role at all. In support of the occurrence of an NP as the head of an IRC we provide two pieces of evidence: (i) the position of occurrence of the constituents in the embedded internal relative clause, and (ii) the presence as well as the absence of overt lexical case markers with the constituent that is being relativized.

We shall show that a constituent that is not lexically case-marked in Tenyidie can head an IRC, unlike the situation in the Quechua group of
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The transcription used in this paper is broad.

List of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABL</th>
<th>Ablative</th>
<th>IRC</th>
<th>Internal relative clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>Locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGR</td>
<td>Agreement marker</td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>Nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUX</td>
<td>Auxiliary</td>
<td>NOMZ</td>
<td>Nominalizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>Comitative</td>
<td>OB</td>
<td>Other benefactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Conjunctive participial</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>Oblique object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>Postpositional phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF</td>
<td>Definite</td>
<td>PRES</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>Diminutive</td>
<td>PRES HAB</td>
<td>Present habitual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Deictic marker</td>
<td>PROG</td>
<td>Progressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>Direct object</td>
<td>PST</td>
<td>Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAB</td>
<td>Habitual</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>Singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Second person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>Indirect object</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Third person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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languages (Cole et al. 1982). Although the DO that occurs with monotransitive verbs is not lexically case-marked in Tenyidie, it can still head an IRC. We shall also demonstrate that in instances involving potential ambiguity of the DO vis-à-vis other constituents (such as IO, locative PP, ablative PP), it is the DO which has hierarchical precedence over the other constituents in heading an IRC, whereas the comitative and instrumental PPs which occur as the second constituent in the embedded S have precedence in interpretation over the DO, indicating that linear precedence in constituent word order plays an important role in the interpretation of a constituent as head of an IRC. We shall also show that there is a single instance where neither the hierarchical precedence nor the linear order of constituents plays any role at all in the interpretation of an IRC. We shall demonstrate that IRCs are unmarked in Tenyidie, since the comitative permits only the IRC and no corresponding external relative clause is permissible. In the final section we hint at a way an internally headed NP is case-checked under the case and agreement theory of Chomsky 1995.

2.0. TYPOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS

Tenyidie is more generally known as Angami. It is a verb-final language and it is left-branching in the unmarked word order. It has postpositions, and a postsentential complementizer occurs to the right of the embedded sentence. The auxiliary verb follows the main verb. As in other verb-final languages, such as Japanese, Korean, Telugu, Malayalam, etc., the genitive precedes the governing noun and the marker of comparison follows the standard of comparison. Time adverbs precede place adverbs (Subbarao 1984). Just as in many other verb-final languages, it has postverbal negatives. A relative-correlative construction also occurs.

However, Tenyidie exhibits certain non-verb-final language characteristics as well. The direct object precedes the indirect object in the unmarked word order, when the lexical dative case marker ki is not overtly present with the indirect object of ditransitive verbs such as tso ‘give’, petha ‘teach’, tshu ‘talk to’, and pesi ‘inform’. With ditransitive verbs such as ketse ‘send’, pu ‘tell, mention, report’, ketso ‘ask’, and fon chu ‘telephone’, where the lexical dative case marker ki occurs with the indirect object, Tenyidie conforms to the expected order in verb-final languages, namely, IO preceding DO. Based on evidence from internal relative clauses, we argue that the IO-DO order is the unmarked order in Tenyidie as in other verb-final languages. Adjectives, demonstrative adjectives and numerals follow the noun. Although word order is relatively free, there are certain instances where scrambling is prohibited (cf. Subbarao and Kevichüsa, in prep.).
3.0. RELATIVIZABLE POSITIONS OF INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL RELATIVE CLAUSES IN TENYIDIE

According to Keenan 1985, IRCs are found only in those languages whose basic word order is SOV. Tenyidie, too, has IRCs that contrast with external relative clauses in their syntactic behavior.

Cole et al. 1982 refer to internal relatives as "headless relatives" because the head (the NP that is being relativized) does not occur in the matrix clause, but only in the embedded sentence. They provide two pieces of evidence to show that relative clauses in the Quechua group of languages are headless. These arguments are based on word order and case marking. Imbabura Quechua is a verb-final language. The relativized noun phrase appears in situ "in the normal position for a direct object within a relative clause, that is to say between the subject and verb" (Cole et al. 1982:118). For example:

(1) [runa alcu-ta jatu shea] ali
    man dog-ACC sell-PAST NOMZ good dog

    alcu-mi
    VALIDATOR

    'The dog that the man sold is a good dog.'

The head NP occurs in the embedded clause, and the matrix sentence does not have a corresponding occurrence of the identical NP.

3.1. Case roles of the heads of internal relative clauses

In Tenyidie, too, the NP that is being relativized occurs in the embedded sentence and not in the matrix sentence. The embedded verb occurs in the infinitival form with the infinitival (nominalizing) marker ke following the verb. Both the deictic marker ci and the definite marker (which agrees in number and gender with the NP occurring internally) occur to the right of the infinitival marker ke. First we provide examples of IRCs with direct object, instrumental, locative, goal, ablative and comitative PPs as heads. As the relativization with an indirect object differs from that of the other positions, we will then provide an analysis of the internal and external relative clauses with an indirect object as head.
**Direct Object as Head**

(2) no lešida phr₁-ke-c₁-0₁-u vi
2sg book read-NOMZ-DM-0-DEF good

'The book that you read is good.'

**Instrumental PP as Head**

(3) no kutari pie nhasi le
2sg knife INST fruit cut

ke-c₁-0₁-u puo⁺ vi se
NOMZ-DM-0-DEF sharpness good very

'The knife with which you cut the fruit is very sharp.'

**Locative PP as Head**

(4) no mi⁺₁ gi lešida khapieba
2sg table on book keep

ke-c₁-0₁-u si pie ch⁺
NOMZ-DM-0-DEF wood INST do

'The table on which you kept the book is made of wood.'

**Goal as Head**

(5) no lie₁ nu tsu-ya-ke-c₁-0₁-u
2sg field to go-PRES HAB-NOMZ-DM-0-DEF

peetse se
far very

'The field you go to is very far.'

**Ablative PP as Head**

(6) no dzikhu nu nu dz₁-t sevč r
2sg well from water-fetch brought

ke-c₁-0₁-u su se
NOMZ-DM-0-DEF very deep

'The well from which you brought the water is very deep.'
Comitative PP as Head

(7) $\text{no miepuo}_1$ ze vɔr ke-c1-01-u  
 2sg person with came NOMZ-DM-0-DEF  
puo cha cha se  
height 3sg long very  
‘The person you came with is very tall.’

In sentences (2)-(7) the head NP in bold occurs in the embedded relative clause. The 0 in bold indicates the position of the identical NP in the matrix clause.

There are corresponding external relative clauses in which the head occurs in the matrix clause for all the positions, namely, direct object (8), instrumental (9), locative (10), goal (11), and ablative (12):

Direct Object as Head

(8) $\text{no } 0_1$ phr1-ke-c1 lešida$_1$-u vi se  
 2sg read-NOMZ-DM book-DEF good very  
‘The book that you read is very good.’

Instrumental as Head

(9) $\text{no } 0_1$ nhasi le-ke-c1 kutar1i-u  
 2sg fruit cut-NOMZ-DM knife-DEF  
puo1 vi se  
sharpness good very  
‘The knife with which you cut the fruit is very sharp.’

Locative as Head

(10) $\text{no } 0_1$ lešida khapieba-ke-c1 miz1i-u  
 2sg book kept-NOMZ-DM table-DEF  
si pie ch1  
wood INST do  
‘The table on which you kept the book is made of wood.’
Goal as Head
(11) no 0i tsu-ya-ke-c+ 2sg go-PRES HAB-NOMZ-DM
lieq-u petse se field-DEF far very
‘The field you go to is very far.’

Ablative as Head
(12) no 0i de-t-sevor-ke-c+ dzikhuq-u 2sg water-fetch-brought-NOMZ-DM well-DEF
su se deep very
‘The well from which you fetched water is very deep.’

The comitative as the head does not permit an external relative clause, as example (13) illustrates:

Comitative as Head
(13) no vor-ke-c+ miepuo-u puo 2sg came-NOM-DM person-DEF 3sg
cha cha se height long very
‘The person you came with is very tall.’

The fact that an IRC is permitted in all positions discussed above—namely, direct object, instrumental, locative, goal, ablative, and comitative—whereas an external relative clause is permitted in all the positions except for the comitative, indicates that IRCs are more natural than external relative clauses and are thus unmarked in Tenyidie.

3.2. IO-DO order in a simple sentence

Before we discuss the nature of internal and external relative clauses with the indirect object as head, we should add a brief note on the order of the indirect and direct objects in a simple sentence, and their lexical case markings.
Internal relative clauses in Tenyidie (Angami)

Although the unmarked order of the indirect object and the direct object in verb-final languages such as Japanese, Korean, and the Dravidian and Indo-Aryan languages is IO-DO (Greenberg 1966), Tenyidie permits both orders (IO-DO and DO-IO). Therefore it is difficult to ascertain which order is unmarked. As we shall see, it is relativization which provides conclusive evidence in support of the IO-DO order as the unmarked order, as in other verb-final languages.

There are four distinct patterns that emerge with regard to the IO-DO order in Tenyidie simple sentences.

**Pattern 1a**

An IO which is marked with the dative case marker ki ‘to’ or la ‘for’ precedes the DO. The DO in such cases is not lexically case-marked. Thus, the order obtaining in Tenyidie is:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{IO-ki-DO} & \quad \text{IO-to-DO} \\
\text{IO-la-DO} & \quad \text{IO-for-DO}
\end{align*}
\]

(14a) puo-e a-ki leši puo ketse št
3sg-NOM me-to letter one sent OB

‘(S)he sent a letter to me.’

(14b) puo-e a-la dži-hie puo sevər št
3sg-NOM me-for water-mug one brought OB

‘(S)he brought a glass of water for me.’

**Pattern 1b**

The IO and DO can be scrambled, giving the following order:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{DO-IO-ki} & \quad \text{IO-to-DO} \\
\text{DO-IO-la} & \quad \text{IO-for-DO}
\end{align*}
\]

(15a) puo-e leši puo a-ki ketse št
3sg-NOM letter one me-to sent OB

‘(S)he sent a letter to me.’

(15b) puo-e dži-hie puo a-la sevər št
3sg-NOM water-mug one me-for brought OB

‘(S)he brought a glass of water for me.’
Pattern II

Both IO and DO are lexically case-marked and the DO precedes the IO, as in (16):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{DO-pie-IO-ki} & \quad \text{DO-ACC-IO-DAT} \\
(16) & \begin{tabular}{l l l l l l l}
puo-e & le-šį & puo & pie & a-ki & ketse & šį \\
3sg-NOM & letter & one & ACC & I-DAT & send & OB \\
\end{tabular} \\
&(\text{‘(S)he sent a letter to me.’})
\end{align*}
\]

When IO and DO are both lexically case-marked, scrambling is not permitted, so that IO cannot precede DO. Thus, the following order is not permissible:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{*IO-ki-DO-pie} & \quad \text{*IO-DAT-DO-ACC} \\
\end{align*}
\]

For example:

\[
\begin{align*}
(17) & \begin{tabular}{l l l l l l l}
*puo-e & a-ki & lešį & puo & pie & ketse & šį \\
3sg-NOM & me-to & letter & one & ACC & sent & OB \\
\end{tabular} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Pattern IV

With verbs such as tsį ‘give’, petha ‘teach’, and pesi ‘inform’, the DO invariably precedes the IO; the DO is lexically case-marked with pie but the IO cannot be case-marked. Thus, the following order obtains:

DO-pie-IO

The scrambling of DO-IO in such cases is not permitted:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{*IO-DO-pie} \\
\end{align*}
\]

For example:

\[
\begin{align*}
(20) & \begin{tabular}{l l l l l l l}
mhasi-e & lešida & puo & pie & abuno & tsį & šį \\
Mhasi-NOM & book & one & ACC & Abuno & gave & OB \\
\end{tabular} \\
&(\text{‘Mhasi gave a book to Abuno.’})
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(21) & \begin{tabular}{l l l l l l l}
puo-e & tenidie & pie & a & petha & šį \\
3sg-NOM & Tenyidie & ACC & me & teach & OB \\
\end{tabular} \\
&(\text{‘(S)he taught me Tenyidie.’})
\end{align*}
\]
(22) puo-e mhapuo pie hiekɔ pesi št
3sg-NOM something ACC us informed OB
‘(S)he informed us about something.’

4.0. INDIRECT OBJECT RELATIVIZED

We shall now examine whether Patterns I, II, III, and IV permit external as well as IRCs with IO as head.

Pattern 1a

IO-ki-DO ‘IO-to-DO’
IO-la-do ‘IO-for-DO’

An IRC is permitted with IO as head.

IRC with IO as Head

(23) no miepuo ki lešt thu št
2sg person to letter wrote OB

ke-ct-u-e puo cha cha se
NOMZ-DM-DEF-MON 3sg height long very
‘The person you wrote a letter to is very tall.’

(24) no miepuo la dzɔ sevor št
2sg person for water brought OB

ke-ct-u-e puo cha cha se
NOMZ-DM-DEF-NOM 3sg height long very
‘The person you brought the water for is very tall.’

An external relative clause is not permitted with IO as head.

External Relative Clause with IO as Head

(25) *no lešt thu št ke-ct
2sg letter wrote OB NOMZ-DM

mieuxnu-u-e puo cha cha se
person-DEF-NOM 3sg height long very
Thus, we observe that when the IO is lexically case-marked and precedes the DO, only the IRC is permitted and not the external relative clause.

**Pattern 1b**

When IO and DO are scrambled as in Pattern 1b, an IRC is not permitted with the IO as head:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(27a)</th>
<th>*nc</th>
<th>leš+</th>
<th>miepuo</th>
<th>ki</th>
<th>ketse</th>
<th>š+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2sg</td>
<td></td>
<td>letter</td>
<td>person</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>sent</td>
<td>OB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ke-c+u</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOM-DM-DEF</td>
<td>3sg</td>
<td>height</td>
<td>long</td>
<td>very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(27b)</td>
<td>*nc</td>
<td>leš+</td>
<td>miepuo</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>ketse</td>
<td>š+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sg</td>
<td></td>
<td>letter</td>
<td>person</td>
<td>for</td>
<td>sent</td>
<td>OB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ke-c+u</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOM-DM-DEF</td>
<td>3sg</td>
<td>height</td>
<td>long</td>
<td>very</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since even an IRC with the IO as head is not permissible when there is scrambling of IO-DO, the order of occurrence of IO-DO is crucial for relativisation; the IO cannot be relativized when the DO precedes it.2

**External Relative Clause with IO as Head**

Since in an external relative clause the head NP occurs to the right of the embedded sentence, while the DO stays in situ, an IO cannot head an external relative clause, as the ungrammaticality of example (28) illustrates:

---

2We shall show below that an internal relative clause with the IO as head is also not possible in patterns III and IV, where DO precedes IO.
Internal relative clauses in Tenyidie (Angami)  

(28a)  *no lešt thu št ke-cu  
2sg letter wrote OB NOMZ-DM  
miepuo-u-e puo cha cha se  
person-DEF-NOM 3sg height long very

(28b)  *no lešt thu št ke-cu  
2sg letter wrote OB NOMZ-DM  
miepuo-u-e puo cha cha se  
person-DEF-NOM 3sg height long very

Pattern II

In the pattern

DO-pie-IO-ki,

neither an IRC nor an external relative clause with IO as head is permitted, as the ungrammaticality of sentences (29) and (30) illustrates:

IRC with IO as Head
(29)  *puo-e lešt puo pie miepuo ki  
3sg-NOM letter one ACC person to  
ketse št ke-cu-u mhani se  
sent OB NOMZ-DM-DEF rich very

An external relative clause is also not permitted when scrambling of IO and DO takes place.

External Relative Clause with IO as Head
(30)  *puo-e lešt puo pie ketse št  
3sg-NOM letter one ACC sent OB  
ke-cu miepuo-u mhani se  
MONZ-DM person-DEF rich very

Just as in Pattern Ib, the non-permissibility of either an internal or an external relative clause is due to the order in which IO-DO occur. In this
pattern, too, since IO follows the DO, neither an internal nor an external relative clause is permissible, even if the IO is lexically case-marked with ki.\(^3\)

**Pattern III**

In this pattern,

\[ \text{DO + participial form of the ditransitive verb + pie (ACC) + IO + light verb + AUX,} \]

it is the DO that carries the accusative case marker pie, and the IO is not lexically case-marked. The participial form of the embedded verb occurs with the DO and a light verb that carries the AUX occurs with the IO.

In this pattern, too, neither the IRC nor the external relative clause with IO as head is permissible:

**IRC with IO as Head**

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\text{(31)} & *n\text{-e} & \text{lešt} & \text{thu} & \text{pie} & \text{miepuo} & \text{ts}^t \\
& 2sg-NOM & \text{letter} & \text{wrote} & \text{ACC} & \text{person} & \text{give} \\
& \text{š}^t & \text{ke-c}^t & \text{mhani} & \text{se} \\
& \text{OB} & \text{NOMZ-DEM-DEF} & \text{rich} & \text{very} \\
\end{array}
\]

**External Relative Clause with IO as Head**

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\text{(32)} & *n\text{-e} & \text{lešt} & \text{thu} & \text{pie} & \text{ts}^t & \text{š}^t \\
& 2sg-NOM & \text{letter} & \text{wrote} & \text{ACC} & \text{give} & \text{OB} \\
& \text{ke-c}^t & \text{miepuo-u} & \text{mhani} & \text{se} \\
& \text{NOMZ-DM} & \text{person-DEF} & \text{rich} & \text{very} \\
\end{array}
\]

Just as in Patterns Ib and II, here the IO follows the DO, causing the non-permissibility of either an internal or an external relative clause. We observe once again that the order in which IO and DO occur is crucial for relativization in Tenydie.

**Pattern IV**

**DO-pie (ACC)-IO**

In this pattern the DO is marked by the ACC case marker pie, and the IO follows the DO. The IO in such cases also does not carry any lexical case

\(^3\)We shall demonstrate later that this non-permissibility is due to the relative hierarchical precedence of the DO over the IO.
marker. As one would predict, the IO cannot head either an internal or an external relative clause because it is the DO that precedes the IO. We have already observed in Patterns Ib, II, and III that in cases where DO precedes IO, the IO cannot head either sort of relative clause.

**IRC with IO as Head**

(33) *no-e leš† puo pie miepuo ts†

2sg-NOM letter one ACC person gave

š† ke-c†-u ziešuo se

OB NOMZ-DM-DEF ugly very

(34) *no-e leš† puo pie ts† š†

2sg-NOM letter one ACC gave OB

ke-c† miepuo-u ziešuo se

NOMZ-DM person ugly very

The nonoccurrence of either type of relative clause with IO as the head when the DO precedes the IO convincingly shows that (i) word order plays a crucial role in relativization and (ii) the unmarked order of DO-IO in Tenyidie is IO preceding DO. Let us consider the significance of word order first. For an IO to qualify as head of an IRC it should occur in the second position of the embedded relative clause. Since subject is the NP of S and DO cannot precede an IO if an IO is the head of an IRC, we see that the second position can be occupied only by an IO if it heads an IRC.

The above discussion concerning relative clauses with IO as head can be summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PATTERNs</th>
<th>INTERNAL</th>
<th>EXTERNAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ia</td>
<td>IO-ki-DO</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ib</td>
<td>DO-IO-ki</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>DO-pie-IO-ki</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>DO-participial form of ditransitive verb-IO-light verb</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>DO-pie-IO</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Furthermore, the facts that only IRCs are permissible with a comitative NP as head (sentence 7), or with an IO as head (sentences 23 and 24; repeated as 35-37 below for convenience), and that the corresponding external relative clauses are not permissible, as in sentences 13, 25, and 26 (repeated as 38-40 below for convenience), clearly show that IRCs are unmarked and that external relative clauses are marked in Tenyidie.

**IRC**

*COM PP as Head*

(35) \( \text{nc miepuo} \text{ ze vor ke-c-t-0}_l-u \)

2sg person with came NOMZ-DM-0-DEF

puo cha cha se

height 3sg long very

'The person you came with is very tall.'

*IO as Head*

(36) \( \text{nc miepuo ki leš}_t \text{ thu š}_t \)

2sg person to letter wrote OB

ke-c-t-u-e puo cha cha se

NOMZ-DM-DEF-MON 3sg height long very

'The person you wrote a letter to is very tall.'

(37) \( \text{nc miepuo la dz}_t \text{ sevor š}_t \)

2sg person for water brought OB

ke-c-t-u-e puo cha cha se

NOMZ-DM-DEF-NOM 3sg height long very

'The person you brought the water for is very tall.'

**External Relative Clause**

*COM PP as Head*

(38) \( \text{nc vor-ke-c}_t \text{ miepuo-u puo} \)

2sg came-NOM-DM person-DEF 3sg

cha cha cha se

height long very

'The person you came with is very tall.'
*IO as Head

(39) *no leš† thu Š† ke-c†
 2sg letter wrote OB NOMZ-DM

miepuo-u-e puo cha cha se
person-DEF-NOM 3sg height long very

(40) *no dz† sevor Š† ke-c†
 2sg water brought OB NOMZ-DM

miepuo-u-e puo cha cha se
person-DEF-NOM 3sg height long very

In the following section we shall show that the linear position of occurrence of a constituent as head (DO, IO, comitative, instrumental, ablative, locative, or goal) in an IRC plays a crucial role in its interpretation.

5.0. POSITION OF THE HEAD IN AN INTERNAL RELATIVE CLAUSE

In an IRC a subject that occurs in the initial position of an embedded sentence cannot be the head. It is always a constituent other than the subject in the embedded sentence that may head an IRC. Thus, in sentence (2) it is the DO, the head of the internal relative clause, that immediately follows the embedded subject. In sentence (3) it is the instrumental PP which is the head of the internal relative clause that immediately follows the embedded subject. In sentences (4), (5), (6), and (7) it is the locative, goal, ablative, and comitative PPs respectively that are the heads of the IRC, and all these immediately follow the embedded subject. Thus, we can tentatively claim that it is the second constituent in the embedded sentence that heads an IRC.

Thus, if it is the DO that is the head of an IRC, the DO occurs as the second constituent in the embedded sentence immediately to the right of the embedded subject, as in example (41):

(41) no ga kutari pie le ke-c†-u
 2sg vegetable knife INST cut NOMZ-DM-DEF

vi se
good very

‘The vegetable you cut with the knife is very good.’

*‘The knife with which you cut the fruit is very good.’
If it is the instrumental PP that is the head, then the instrumental PP occurs as the second constituent in the embedded sentence, as in (42):

(42) no kutari pie ga le ke-c1-u
     2sg knife ACC vegetable cut NOMZ-DM-DEF
     vi se
good very
‘The knife you cut the vegetable with is very sharp.’
*‘The vegetable which you cut with the knife is very good.’

Thus it appears that precedence in linear order of a constituent plays a crucial role for an NP/PP to qualify as the head of an IRC. However, we shall demonstrate below that the relative hierarchy of an NP takes precedence over linear hierarchy. We shall show that DO has precedence in the interpretation of a specific constituent as the head of an IRC.

6.0. PRECEDENCE OF THE DO OVER THE OTHER CONSTITUENTS

In cases involving potential ambiguity between a DO and a non-DO as the head of an IRC, it is the DO which takes precedence over the IO, locative or ablative PPs irrespective of its linear position in the embedded clause (cf. §§ 6.1 and 6.2.1 below). However, the DO does not have hierarchical precedence over the comitative and instrumental PPs as heads (cf. § 6.2.2 below). We shall first consider the DO and IO as potential candidates to head an IRC.

6.1. DO and IO as Potential Candidates to Head an Internal Relative Clause

In example (43) both IO and DO qualify to head the IRC, since the VP of the matrix sentence can assign the theta role of goal to miepuo ‘person’ or theme to leši ‘letter’:

(43) no miepuo ki leši thu ši ke-c1-01-u
     2sg person to letter wrote OB NOMZ-DM-0-DEF
     ziešuo se
ugly very
‘The letter you wrote to the person is very ugly (distasteful).’
*‘The person you wrote a letter to is very ugly.’
Theta role assignment to the subject compositionally by the VP of the matrix sentence requires the following mechanism. The subject of the matrix S is an empty operator and it can theoretically be coindexed with any argument of the embedded clause, since any argument can be a potential head of the IRC. The linking of the empty operator with an argument of the embedded sentence can be done by chain formation. Thus, the VP of the matrix S can theoretically assign a theta role to any argument of the embedded sentence. Though both IO and DO can head the IRC in (43), it is the DO which takes precedence over the IO. It is also significant that the position of occurrence of the DO as the third constituent in the embedded sentence is not crucial. That is, linear order is not relevant; it is the structural dependence in terms of the relative hierarchy of the DO versus non-DOs that is crucial in the interpretation of the head of a Tenyidie IRC.

6.2.1. DO and OO (LOC or ABL) as Potential Candidates to Head an IRC

In sentences where either a DO or an OO (locative, ablative) can be potential candidates to head an IRC, it is the DO which takes precedence over the OO, irrespective of its linear position of occurrence, as illustrated below.

**LOCATIVE PP**

In sentence (44), although the locative PP occurs in the second position immediately to the right of the subject of the embedded sentence, it is the DO, and not the locative PP, that which is interpreted as the head.

(44) no mízi gi lešīda khapieba ke-c+-01-u
2sg table on book kept NOMZ-DM-0-DEF

3a se
big very

**ABLATIVE PP**

In example (45), although the ablative PP occurs as the second constituent immediately to the right of the subject of the embedded sentence, it is the DO, and not the ablative PP, that is interpreted as the head of the IRC.
(45) no dz+i-khu nunu dz+i-I sevɔr
2sg well from water-fetch brought
ke-c+i-0;i-u rhu se
NOMZ-DM-0-DEF dirty very
'The water which you brought from the well is very dirty.'
*‘The well from which you brought water is very dirty.’

6.2.2 DO and OO (COM or INST) as Potential Candidates to Head an IRC

The DO does not have relative hierarchical precedence over comitative or instrumental PPs. When a comitative or instrumental PP occurs as the second constituent in an IRC and the DO occurs as the third constituent, it is only the comitative or instrumental PP that is interpreted as the head, and the DO does not have any hierarchical precedence over the PP.

COMITATIVE PP

In example (46), although the DO lešida 'book' as well as the comitative PP midpuo ze 'person with' are potential candidates to head an IRC, it is only the comitative PP miepwo ze 'person with' that is so interpreted.

(46) no miepwo ze;i lešida phr+-ba-ke-c+i-0;i-u
2sg person with book read-PROG-NOMZ-DM-0-DEF
3a se
big very
'The person you are reading a book with is very big.'
*‘The book that you are reading with the person is very big.’

INSTRUMENTAL PP

In example (47), although the DO nhasi 'fruit' and the instrumental PP kutari pie 'knife with' are potential candidates to head an IRC, it is only the instrumental PP that qualifies as head.

(47) no kutari pie;i nhasi le ke-c+i-0;i-u
2sg knife INST fruit cut NOMZ-DM-0-DEF
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3a se
big very
‘The knife with which you cut the fruit is very big.’
*‘The fruit which you cut with the knife is very big.’

We shall now examine the interpretation of a constituent when there are three potential candidates for head of the IRC.

6.3.1. DO, IO, and OO (ABL or LOC) as Potential Candidates to Head an IRC

In a sentence in which a DO, an IO, and an OO (ablative or locative) are all potential candidates to head an internal relative clause, it is the DO which takes hierarchical precedence over the IO and the OO, even though the OO occurs as the second constituent in the embedded sentence.

In sentences (48a) and (48b), although either the DO, the ablative PP, or the locative PP, could theoretically head the IRC, it is only the DO dz1 ‘water’ that can actually do so, and not the for-dative NP miepuo ‘person’ or the ablative PP dzikhu nunu ‘from the well’. It is crucial to note that the DO occurs not as the second constituent immediately to the right of the embedded subject, but as the fourth constituent in the embedded sentence.

Sentences such as (48a-b) once again clearly demonstrate that hierarchical precedence is stronger than linear precedence:

ABLATIVE PP

(48a) no dzikhu nunu miepuo la dz1-+
2sg well from person for water-fetched
sevor št ke-c-t-či-u rhu se
brought OB NOMZ-DM--DEF dirty very

‘The water that you fetched from the well for the person is very dirty.’
*‘The well from which you brought the water for the person is very dirty.’
*‘The person for whom you brought the water from the well is very dirty.’

LOCATIVE PP

(48b) no n-zibbu nu ba di miepuo ki
2sg your-room in sit CP person to
lešt₁i  thu  št₁  ke-c₁₀₁-u  ziešuo  se
letter  write  OB  NOMZ-DM-DEF  ugly  very

‘The letter which you wrote sitting in your room to the person is very ugly.’

6.3.2. DO, IO, and OO (INST) as Potential Candidates to Head an IRC

In a sentence in which a DO, an IO, and an OO (instrumental) are all potential candidates to head an IRC, it is the OO (instrumental) that is interpreted as the head:

(49) no  miepuo  ta  kutari  pie₁  nhasi  le
2sg  person  for  knife  with  fruit  cut
ke-c₁₀₁-u  vi  se
NOMZ-DM-0-DEF  good  very
‘The knife with which you cut the fruit for the person is very good.’
= INST PP as head
*‘The person for whom you cut the fruit with a knife is very good.’
= *for-Dat as head
*‘The fruit which you cut with the knife for the person is very good.’
= *DO as head

Though the IO miepuo ‘person’ in example (49) occurs in the second position, it does not get interpreted as the head of the IRC. Sentences such as this show that an instrumental PP has precedence over an IO. The IO which has the thematic role of the benefactive is higher in thematic hierarchy than the instrumental OO. The IO in sentence (49) fulfills two requirements:

(i) it is thematically higher than the OO, and
(ii) it occurs in the second position of the embedded sentence in an IRC.

However, in spite of fulfilling these two requirements, the IO does not qualify to be the head of an IRC.

Let us now consider the status of the DO vis-à-vis the OO (INST). Although the DO (patient) is higher in thematic hierarchy than the instrumental OO, the DO also does not qualify to head the IRC by virtue of its occurrence in
the fourth position in the embedded relative clause. However, if the DO occurs in the second position, it alone qualifies to be the head.

A comparison of sentences (44) and (45) with (49) indicates that it is the nature of the PP (locative and ablative *versus* instrumental) that is crucial. Neither the position of occurrence of an IO or an OO (locative or ablative) nor the hierarchical precedence of the IO has any role to play at all. Thus, sentences such as (49) show that hierarchical precedence and linear precedence are both violated. As a result, neither the locative PP in sentence (44) nor the ablative PP in sentences (45) and (48a) qualifies to head an IRC, even though they occur in the second position in the embedded sentence.

The above discussion can be summarized as follows (“A” numbers refer to examples in the appendix):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituent in 2nd Position</th>
<th>Constituent in 3rd/4th Position</th>
<th>Head of an IRC</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>IO</td>
<td>DO</td>
<td>15, 16, 18-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>DO</td>
<td>DO</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>OO (ABL/LOC)</td>
<td>DO</td>
<td>A1a, A1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OO (ABL/LOC)</td>
<td>DO</td>
<td>DO</td>
<td>44, 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>OO (INST/COM)</td>
<td>DO</td>
<td>A2a, A2b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OO (INST/COM)</td>
<td>DO</td>
<td>OO (INST/COM)</td>
<td>46, 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OO (ABL/LOC)</td>
<td>IO-DO</td>
<td>DO</td>
<td>48a, 48b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OO (ABL/LOC)</td>
<td>DO-IO</td>
<td>DO</td>
<td>A3a, A3b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>OO (ABL/LOC)-DO</td>
<td>DO</td>
<td>A4a, A4b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>DO-OO (ABL/LOC)</td>
<td>DO</td>
<td>A5a, A5b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>OO (ABL/LOC)-IO</td>
<td>DO</td>
<td>A6a, A6b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>IO-OO (ABL/LOC)</td>
<td>DO</td>
<td>A7a, A7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>OO (INST)-DO</td>
<td>OO (INST)</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>DO-OO (ISNT)</td>
<td>DO</td>
<td>A8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OO (INST)</td>
<td>IO-DO</td>
<td>OO (INST)</td>
<td>A9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>IO-OO (INST)</td>
<td>DO</td>
<td>A11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>OO (INST)-IO</td>
<td>DO</td>
<td>A12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.0. HIERARCHICAL PRECEDENCE OF COM AND INST PP’S OVER DO

The question that now arises is the following: Why doesn’t the DO have hierarchical precedence over the comitative PP and the instrumental PP, just as it did in the case of other PPs (locative and ablative)?
Let us first consider the comitative PP. It might be recalled that the comitative NP cannot head an external relative clause, as the ungrammaticality of sentences (50) and (51) illustrates:

(50) *nɔ vɔr ke-ç‡ miepuo-u puo
2sg came NOMZ-DM person-DEF 3sg
cha cha se
height long very
*‘The person with whom you came is very tall.’

(51) *abuno kegi ke-ç‡ miepuo-u azemie
Abuno fought NOMZ-DM person-DEF my friend
*‘The person with whom Abuno fought is my friend.’

The fact that a comitative PP permits only an IRC and no other strategy for relativization such as an external relative clause or a relative-correlative construction might provide an explanation. Every language requires a mechanism to modify each position of the noun phrase accessibility hierarchy (NPAH) proposed in Keenan and Comrie 1977, no matter whether the strategy involves a full-fledged relative clause or a participial clause. Logically, to communicate different possible situations or events, it should be possible to relativize every position in the NPAH. However, since an external relative clause is not possible with a comitative PP, the only other means of relativizing a comitative PP is the IRC, and therefore an IRC with a comitative PP takes precedence in interpretation, as illustrated in example (52):

(52) nɔ miepuo ze lešida phrš-ba-ke-ç‡-u
2sg person with book read-PROG-NOMZ-DM-DEF
za se
big very
‘The person you are reading a book with is very big.’

Another question still remains to be answered. Why does an instrumental PP have precedence over the DO and IO? It might be recalled that an instrumental PP permits an IRC as well as an external relative clause, as in sentences (3) and (9), respectively. The functional explanation we provided
above for the comitative PP does not hold for the instrumental PP. We do not at present have any explanation for the precedence of the instrumental PP over the DO. We leave this issue open for further research.

The following table provides a summary of the positions and permissibility of internally and externally headed relative clauses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>INTERNAL RC</th>
<th>EXTERNAL RC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO (with lexical case marker)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO (no lexical case marker)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABL</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.0. TIME EXPRESSIONS AS POTENTIAL HEADS OF AN IRC

The next issue with which we are concerned is time expressions as potential heads of IRCs. We focus our attention on the position of occurrence of the time expression.

A time adverb that is a PP cannot head an IRC, as the ungrammaticality of sentences (55) and (56) illustrates:

(53) no-e c+z+ re-pa
    2sg-NOM that-night went-out
    'You went out that night.'

(54) no-e c+nhie kiya
    2sg-NOM that-day married
    'You got married on that day.'

(55) *no z+ re-pa ke-c+u le se
    2sg night went-out NOMZ-DM-DEF hot very
    *'The night you went out was very hot.'
(56) *no nhie kiya ke-c+t meku se  
2sg day married NOMZ-DM-DEF cold very  
*‘The day you got married was very cold.’

The only strategy that is available is the external relative clause:

(57) no re-pa ke-c+t z+i le se  
2sg went-out NOMZ-DM night hot very  
‘The night you went out was very hot.’

(58) no kiya ke-c+t nhie meku se  
2sg married NOMZ-DM day cold very  
‘The day you got married was very cold.’

Note that the definite marker -u cannot occur in sentences (57) and (58):

(59) *no re-pa ke-c+t z+i-u le se  
2sg went-out NOMZ-DM night-DEF hot very

(60) *no kiiya ke-c+t nhie-u meku se  
2sg married NOMZ-DM day-DEF cold very

It might be worth recapitulating that the head of an IRC is the second constituent in the embedded sentence, occurring immediately to the right of the subject. Since a time expression occurs immediately to the right of the embedded subject in Tenyidie, the question that arises is this: can it be counted as a constituent at all for determining the relative position of the head of the IRC? Since the time adverb cannot head an IRC, it cannot be counted as a constituent when the position of the head of an IRC is being determined. The following examples are illustrative:

(61) no ndu miepuo ki leš+t thu  
2sg yesterday person to letter wrote  
š+t ke-c+t-u mhani se  
OB NOMZ-DM-DEF rich very  
‘The person to whom you wrote a letter yesterday is very rich.’
(62) no ndu kutari pie ga le
2sg yesterday knife INST vegetable cut
ke-c1-u puö+ vi
NOMZ-DM-DEF sharpness good
‘The knife with which you cut the vegetable yesterday is sharp.’

In sentence (61) the head of the IRC is miepuö ‘person’ and not ndu ‘yesterday’. In sentence (62) it is kutari ‘knife’ that is the head, and thus the position of the adverb does not count when the relative position of the head of an IRC is determined.

9.0. CASE MARKING IN IRCs

The second argument of Cole et al. 1982 concerns case marking. Noun phrases in Quechua are lexically case-marked. In an IRC, the NP that is relativized retains the lexical case marker in contrast to an NP in an externally headed relative clause that lacks a case marker. In sentence (1) from Quechua (repeated below as example 63), the accusative case marker ta is overtly present, which clearly demonstrates that the NP does not belong to the matrix clause.

(63) [runa alcu-ta jatu shea] ali
     man dog-ACC sell-PAST NOMZ good dog

alcu-mi
VALIDATOR
‘The dog that the man sold is a good dog.’

If the NP is case-marked in a simple sentence in Tenyidie, the marker is retained in the IRC. In sentence (52), where an NP with a comitative case marker is relativized, in sentence (61), where an IO is relativized, and in sentence (62), where an NP with an instrumental case marker is relativized, the case markers are retained.

The case of the direct object in IRCs deserves special mention. The accusative marker is zero in Tenyidie in a sentence with monotransitive verbs:

(64) abunö-e lešida-0 phr1-ba
    Abuno-NOM book-ACC read-PROG

‘Abuno is reading a book’
Thus, in IRCs modifying the direct object, there is no overt lexical case marker, as in (66):

(66) abunɔ-e leš†da-0 phr†-ba ke-c†-u
    Abuno-NOM  book-ACC  read-PROG  NOMZ-DM-DEF
    vi    se
    good  very
    ‘The book which Abuno is reading is very good.’

Thus, a DO can head an IRC whether it is lexically case-marked or not, unlike Quechua where a case marker (ta) must occur with the DO.

However, in a Tenyidie sentence with a ditransitive verb, a direct object that is not otherwise case-marked in a sentence with a monotransitive verb requires the case marker pie, as in sentences (67) and (68):

(67) abunɔ-e leš†da puo pie khrisa-yo
    Abuno-NOM  book  one  ACC  young man-DIM
    ts†   Š†
gave   OB
    ‘Abuno gave a book to the young man.’

(68) *abunɔ-e leš†da puo-0 khrisa-yo
    Abuno-NOM  book  one-ACC  young man-DIM
    ts†   Š†
gave   OB

In an IRC in which the direct object is relativized, the accusative case marker pie is retained, as in sentence (69). Sentence (70) is ungrammatical, since the DO is not case-marked.
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(69) abuno-e lešida-pie khrisa-yo ts+ Abuno-NOM book-ACC young man-DIM gave

š+ ke-c+u 3a se
OB NOMZ-DM-DEF big very

‘The book which Abuno gave to the young man is very big.’

(70) *abuno-e lešida-0 khrisa-yo ts+ Abuno-NOM book-ACC young man-DIM gave

š+ ke-c+u 3a se
OB NOMZ-DM-DEF big very

Sentence (66) illustrates that a non-case-marked NP can head an IRC, while sentence (68) shows that a case marker cannot be deleted in an IRC if it was originally present in a simple sentence.

In the following section we shall briefly hint at the phenomenon of case checking of an NP in the AGR-based case theory of Chomsky 1995.

10. CASE CHECKING

In the Minimalist framework, each NP has to be checked for case features by functional heads such as Agr S, Agr DO, etc. In IRCs, we have observed that each NP requires a case marker except a DO with a monotransitive verb. According to Chomsky 1995, NPs which are lexically case-marked need not be moved to the SPEC of a functional head for case checking, since they are assigned case by the adposition. The embedded verb can assign case to the DO of the internally headed relative clause after it raises to the SPEC position of Agr DO, and Agr DO subsequently assigns case to the DO in its SPEC position. The precise mechanism of case assignment in IRCs in Tenyidie remains to be clearly worked out.
APPENDIX

ABLATIVE PP
(1a) no dz i dz i k hu nun u + se v o r
2sg water well from fetched brought
ke-c-t-u rhu se
NOMZ-DM-DEF dirty very
'The water that you fetched from the well is very dirty.'

LOCATIVE PP
(1b) no leš i da pie miz+ gi kha-ba
2sg book ACC table on kept
ke-c-t-u 3a se
NOMZ-DM-DEF big very
'The book that you kept on the table is very big.'

INSTRUMENTAL PP
(2a) no nhasi kutari pie le ke-c-t-u
2sg fruit knife INST cut NOMZ-DM-DEF
vi se
good very
'The fruit that you cut with the knife is very good.'

COMITATIVE PP
(2b) no leš i da miepuo ze phr+ ba
2sg book person COM read PROG
ke-c-t-u 3a se
NOMZ-DM-DEF big very
'The book you are reading with the person is very big.'
ABLATIVE PP
(3a) no dzตกhu nunu dzఁ miepuo la ↑
2sg well from water person for fetched
sevర ke-cఁ-u rhu se
brought NOMZ-DM-DEF dirty very
‘The water that you fetched from the well for the person is very dirty.’

LOCATIVE PP
(3b) no nzఃbu nu ba di leఃం puo thu pie
2sg room in sit CP letter one wrote ACC
miepuo tsఁ šఁ ke-cఁ-u zieఃంuo se
person give OB NOMZ-DM-DEF ugly very
‘The letter you wrote sitting in your room to the person is very ugly.’

ABLATIVE PP
(4a) no miepuo la dzตกhu nunu dzఁ ↑
2sg person for well from water fetched
sevర ke-cఁ-u rhu se
brought NOMZ-DM-DEF dirty very
‘The water that you fetched from the well for the person is very dirty.’

LOCATIVE PP
(4b) no miepuo ki nzఃbu nu ba di leఃం
2sg person to room in sit CP letter
puo thu šఁ ke-cఁ-u zieఃంuo se
one wrote OBJ NOMZ-DM-DEF ugly very
‘The letter you wrote sitting in your room to the person is very ugly.’
ABLATIVE PP
(5a) nə miepuo la dzį dzįkhu nunu FileSync
2sg person for water well from fetched
sevor ke-c1-u rhu se
brought NOMZ-DM-DEF dirty very
'The water that you fetched from the well for the person is very dirty.'

LOCATIVE PP
(5b) nə miepuo ki leš Ł puo nzibu nu ba
2sg person to letter one rom in sit
di thu št ke-c1-u ziešuo se
CP wrote OBJ NOMZ-DM-DEF ugoy very
'The letter you wrote sitting in your room to the person is very ugly.'

ABLATIVE PP
(6a) nə dzį czįkhu nunu miepuo la FileSync
2sg water well from person for fetched
sevor ke-c1-u rhu se
brought NOMZ-DM-DEF dirty very
'The water that you fetched from the well for the person is very dirty.'

LOCATIVE PP
(6b) nə leš Ł puo nzibu nu ba di miepuo ki
2sg letter one rom in sit CP person to
thu št ke-c1-u ziešuo se
wrote OBJ NOMZ-DM-DEF ugly very
'The letter you wrote sitting in your room to the person is very ugly.'
ABLATIVE PP

(7a) \( \text{nɔ} \ \text{dzʰ} \ \text{miepuo} \ \text{la} \ \text{dzʰkhu} \ \text{nunu} \ ^{+} \)
2sg water person for well fetched

sevɔr ke-cʰ-u rhu se
brought NOMZ-DM-DEF dirty very

‘The water that you fetched from the well for the person is very dirty.’

LOCATIVE PP

(7b) \( \text{nɔ} \ \text{lešʰ} \ \text{puo} \ \text{miepuo} \ \text{ki} \ \text{nzʰbu} \ \text{nu} \ \text{ba} \)
2sg letter one person to rom in sit

di thu šʰ ke-cʰ-u ziešuo se
CP wrote OBJ NOMZ-DM-DEF ugly very

‘The letter you wrote sitting in your room to the person is very ugly.’

INSTRUMENTAL PP

(8) \( \text{nɔ} \ \text{miepuo} \ \text{la} \ \text{nhasi} \ \text{kutari} \ \text{pie} \ \text{le} \)
2sg person for fruit knife INST cut

ke-cʰ-u vi se
NOMZ-DM-DEF good very

‘The fruit which you cut with the knife for the person is very good.’

(9) \( \text{nɔ} \ \text{kutari} \ \text{pie} \ \text{miepuo} \ \text{la} \ \text{nhasi} \ \text{le} \)
2sg knife INST person for fruit cut

ke-cʰ-u vi se
NOMZ-DM-DEF good very

‘The knife with which you cut the fruit for the person is very good.’
(10) no **kutari** pie nhasi miepuo la le
2sg knife INST fruit person for cut
ke-c1-u vi se
NOMZ-DM-DEF good very
'The knife with which you cut the fruit for the person is very good.'

(11) no **nhasi** miepuo la **kutari** pie le
2sg fruit person for knife INST cut
ke-c1-u vi se
NOMZ-DM-DEF good very
'The fruit which you cut with the knife for the person is very good.'

(12) no **nhasi** kutari pie miepuo la le
2sg fruit knife INST person for cut
ke-c1-u vi se
NOMZ-DM-DEF good very
'The fruit which you cut with the knife for the person is very good.'
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