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1. Introduction

In this article, I venture to offer an in-depth analysis of the structure of Old Nubian relative clauses (henceforth, rcs), in an attempt to reorganize and consolidate the observations made in Gerald M. Browne’s *Old Nubian Grammar,* Helmut Satzinger’s earlier article “Relativsatz und Thematisierung im Altnubischen,” and Marianne Bechhaus-Gerst’s *The (Hi)story of Nobiin.* Satzinger’s article, our first extensive source for the grammatical analysis of Old Nubian rcs, was written in response to a series of grammatical observations by Browne in *Studies in Old Nubian.* However, this response was unfortunately never fully incorporated into *Old Nubian Grammar,* where Browne discusses rcs in §§4.4–6. In these few dense and somewhat confusing paragraphs, Browne organizes Old Nubian rcs mainly based on word order, without clearly marking out syntactical relations, thus losing much of the insights of Satzinger’s more structured approach. Bechhaus-Gerst offers the most recent analysis of Old Nubian rc constructions in *The (Hi)story of Nobiin,* in an attempt to integrate the approaches of Satzinger and Browne, but remarks that “a thorough analysis […] would go beyond the scope,” of her study. During the preparation of this article we have also consulted comparative material from related contemporary Nile

---

* I would like to thank Issameddin Awad, Angelika Jakobi, and Giovanni Ruffini for their comments and suggestions during the various stages of writing this article.

1 Browne, *Old Nubian Grammar.*

2 Satzinger, “Relativsatz und Thematisierung im Altnubischen.”

3 Bechhaus-Gerst, *The (Hi)story of Nobiin,* esp. pp. 207–11. Glossing has been occasionally adjusted to match the set of abbreviations listed in fn. 16.

4 Browne refers to Satzinger’s approach as a “somewhat different orientation” (Browne, *Old Nubian Grammar,* p. 83, fn. 99).

5 Browne further combines relative constructions with temporal and adverbial subordinate clauses in *Old Nubian Grammar,* §4.7, which I will not consider here. However, I touch upon conditional and final clauses in “A Note on the Old Nubian Morpheme -a in Nominal and Verbal Predicates.” See also Bechhaus-Gerst, *The (Hi)story of Nobiin,* pp. 105–10.

6 Bechhaus-Gerst, ibid., p. 207.
Nubian languages; the dissertation of Isameddin Awad on subordination in Nobiin [fia], an article by Abdel-Hafiz Sokarno for Kenzi/Kunuz Nubian data [xnz], and recent work by Angelika Jakobi and El-Shafie El-Guzuuli on rcs in Dongolawi/Andaandi [dgl].

The present paper, glossing and methodically expanding the analyses of the examples adduced by Browne and Satzinger, aims to consolidate the sometimes divergent interpretations offered by Satzinger, Browne, and Bechhaus-Gerst, in an attempt to integrate Old Nubian rcs in a general syntactic framework and to harmonize their analyses with insights from contemporary syntactic theory and comparative material from closely related Nubian languages. This will hopefully allow us to make finer distinctions between the different types of Old Nubian rcs and discuss several pertinent overarching themes, such as leftward movement and extraposition, which owing to relatively marginal penetration of contemporary syntactic theory in Old Nubian studies have so far received little attention.

2. Brief overview

We will start with an overview of attributive rcs in §3, divided between coreferential (the subject of the rc is coreferential with the antecedent of the rc) in §3.1 and non-coreferential (the subject of the rc is not coreferential with the antecedent of the rc) in §3.2. Non-coreferential rcs are further subdivided into those with overt subjects (§3.2.1) and those without overt subjects (§3.2.2). As we will see, the presence or absence of an overt subject influences the morphology of the verb in the rc. For both coreferential and non-coreferential rcs I will also discuss exceptions to the general pattern in which rcs are seemingly postnominal. Section 3.1.1 treats coreferential rcs that have moved leftward and only allow for a restrictive reading. In §3.3.1 we will treat several exceptions with non-coreferential rcs that seem to be generated prenominally, and rcs of time, place, and manner (§3.3.2). Finally, §3.4 deals with constructions in which non-coreferential rcs show an anaphor coindexed with the antecedent. Free rcs, those without an overt antecedent, are treated in §4 according to their grammatical function in the main clause, starting with subject clauses (§4.1) and object clauses (§4.2), which also include different types of complement clauses (§4.2.1–2). Section 4.3 deals with free rcs in other, secondary positions. A specific section (§5) is devoted to rcs in combination with the so-called pred-
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icative suffix -ⲁ, including nominal predicates (§5.1), complex verbal predicates, also called periphrastic constructions (§5.2), RCs in vocative or appellative contexts (§5.3), and adjunctive/appositional clauses, which usually feature only a bare -ⲟ suffix without any additional tense morphology (§5.4). Sections 5.5–7 deal with a series of more complex syntactical constructions, including the topicalization through -ⲥⲓⲛ of the antecedent of an RC (§5.5), RCs in the scope of quantifiers (§5.6), and finally quantifier raising through -ⲥⲓⲛ (§5.7). Section 6 treats with two different types of extraposition, in which (part of) the RC appears to have moved to the right of the clause, motivated by the heaviness of the RC. We have distinguished two types of extraposition, depending on whether the non-coreferential RC shows verbal agreement (§6.1) or not (§6.2). Finally, §7 deals with preterite tense morphology in RCs, which appears to be distributed according to whether the RC is coreferential or not. An concluding overview is given schematically in §8.

3. Attributive relative clauses

Attributive RCs are full clauses showing tense morphology, and may feature an overt subject and be introduced by a relative pronoun. An RC is embedded with the main clause, connected through an antecedent that has a syntactical function both in the embedded and in the main clause. If the subject of the RC coincides with its antecedent, we speak of a coreferential attributive RC. If this is not the case, the attributive RC is called non-coreferential. The distinction between coreferential and non-coreferential attributive RCs in Old Nubian is reflected in the syntax, whence Satzinger labels coreferential attributive RCs as “Type A,” and non-coreferential ones as “Type B.” Bechhaus-Gerst broadly follows Satzinger’s categorization, whereas Browne makes no descriptive distinction between the two types, lumping both under the heading “adjectival conversion.”

Old Nubian is an sov language, like Japanese, Turkish, Dutch, or the other Nile Nubian languages. This generalization allows us to make several predictions about its general syntactic structure. First we expect all phrasal heads to align on the right side. This seems to be generally the case when we inspect verb inflection, which consistently appears on the right edge, and nominal inflection (case and determiner). Also note the fact that Old Nubian has postpositions instead of prepositions. This generalization implies that any syntactical construction that on the surface does not follow this general principle will be suspected of movement. Within Nubian languages, whose NP structure is generally very stable and predictable,
neutral or default position for attributive rc’s, whether coreferential or non-coreferential, seems to be postnominal. As we will see below, the majority of Old Nubian examples in the extant literature shows this order, which is corroborated by contemporary Nile Nubian languages.\textsuperscript{15}

Ex. 1a shows a non-coreferential attributive rc in Nobiin. The antecedent man buru does not correspond to the subject of the rc, which is the genitive-marked subject iriin.\textsuperscript{17} The entire subject is, as would be expected in an sov language, marked at its left edge by first the complementizer -ee and then the nominative case marker ii. Ex. 1b

\section*{List of sigla:}

\section*{List of abbreviations:}


\textsuperscript{17} (Nearly) all subjects in non-coreferential relative clauses in Nile Nubian are marked with the genitive case, see §3.2.
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shows a coreferential attributive rc in Kenzi, with the rc marked by the complementizer -l. In both examples, the rc follows the antecedent. In both Kenzi and Nobiin, the rc marker (-ee in ex. 1a; -l in ex. 1b) changes based on whether the rc is coreferential or not. As Old Nubian rc's do not feature any distinctive marking on the right edge, such morphological variation has not been observed.18

In strictly sov languages such as Turkish and Japanese, rc's, like all other modifiers, are prenominal.19 In order to account for rc's that seem to be postnominal in sov languages, such as Dutch and Nubian languages, the so-called head-raising analysis of rc's posits that antecedents originate within the rc and move leftward to a position preceding the rc,20 leaving a gap or trace in the rc, marked by t.21

\[ \text{[rel } \text{tod eengi jomel]} \rightarrow \text{tod, [rel } \text{t, eengi jomel]} \]

The movement illustrated in ex. 2 itself is subjected to certain constraints, as we will find in §3.4. For the remainder of this paper we will mostly assume this movement, and for reasons of simplicity not indicate it in the examples unless necessary. In certain Nubian languages, including Old Nubian, rc's can also appear prenominally. The motivation here is always semantic. Whereas Abdel-Hafiz does not provide any other type of constituent order, Awad provides us with examples of attributive rc's that precede the antecedent.

\[ \text{[rel ir-iin doll-ee-n buru ii}} \]
\[ \text{2sg-gen love-comp1-gen girl nom} \]
\[ \text{tan-juti-li} \]
\[ \text{3sg.poss-niece-cop2.prs.3sg} \]

“The girl you love is his niece”

The postnominal rc in ex. 1a differs in two aspects from the prenominal rc in ex. 3. First, the rc is marked by the genitive case, suggesting that it has moved into the position where normally the genitive-marked possessor would appear; second, Awad indicates that buru can no longer be preceded by the demonstrative man, supposedly because all possessed nouns are by definition determinate. We will see in §3.1.1 that also in Old Nubian, leftward movement of a rc is accompanied by different morphology in the rc and is motivated by semantics. Awad also presents headless rc's as a third possibility, which we will discuss in §4 as free rc's.

18 However, there seems to be a specific distribution of the two preterite tense morphemes in attributive relative clauses. See §7.
19 Cf. Payne, Describing Morphosyntax, p. 327.
20 See, for example, Kayne, The Antisymmetry of Syntax, pp. 86ff.
21 Following Comrie’s classification, Old Nubian rc’s are of the gap type. See Comrie, Language Universals and Linguistic Typology, p. 151.
3.1 Coreferential attributive relative clauses

Coreferential attributive relative clauses without an object basically correspond to adjectival constructions with a participle, such as in English “the singing man,” in the sentence “the singing man walks on the street,” which may alternatively be rendered as “the man that sings walks on the street.” The subject of the participle “singing” corresponds with the subject of the main verb “walks,” i.e., “man.” In Old Nubian, these constructions can only be formed by means of a participial form consisting of at least a verbal root, tense/aspect suffix, and the determiner -(e/i)ⲉ, which, however, is dropped before overt case marking. Coreferential attributive relative clauses generally appear after the noun, and, as a rule, number, case marking, and any other type of right edge suffix (conjunctions, focus, etc.) only appear on the right edge of the entire noun phrase that contains the relative clause.

We find the following general pattern for coreferential attributive relative clauses:

4  [... Antec- ... Verb-Tense/Asp]-Det/Num/Case

5  ṭⲱ ⲱⲩⲱ ⲯⲟⲩⲣⲟⲩ ⲱⲟⲩⲧⲁⲕⲟⲩ
is-lo    pi-na   [ ioudaio-gou-n  ourou-ou
inter-LOC exist-PRS.2/3SG Jew-PL-GEN king-J
[, oumm-outak-o]]-l
bear-PASS-PTI-DET
"Where is the born king of the Jews?"

The relative clause, formed by the single embedded verb ⲱⲟⲩⲧⲁⲕⲟⲩ- “born,” follows the antecedent noun phrase ⲱⲟⲩⲣⲟⲩ ⲱⲟⲩⲧⲁⲕⲟⲩ “king of the Jews,” which is also its antecedent. Note that the antecedent ⲱⲟⲩⲣⲟⲩ ⲱⲟⲩⲧⲁⲕⲟⲩ ends in what I usually refer to as a juncture vowel, whereas Satzinger calls it an “Appositiv”) and Browne the “annective,” “an anaptyctic juncture vowel (’Bindevokal’) inserted between two words that closely cohere.” The same juncture, or epenthetic vowel may be observed in adjectival constructions and should not be confused with a case ending such as accusative or genitive, as it is purely a noun phrase-internal phenomenon.

22 Cf. SATZINGER, “Relativsatz und Thematisierung im Altnubischen,” p. 186. Browne and Satzinger refer to participles as “verbids.”

23 See VAN GERVEN OEI, “The Old Nubian Memorial for King George,” pp. 256–62. The precise distribution between the vowels e and i when following a consonant is still uncertain. In Andaandi the different vowels indicate perfective and imperfective aspect, and this may also be the case in Old Nubian. See JAKOBI & EL-GUZULI, “Relative Clauses in Andaandi,” p. 91.

24 I have left nominative case marking, which is -0 in Old Nubian, unglossed throughout.

25 SATZINGER, “Relativsatz und Thematisierung im Altnubischen,” p. 186 et passim; BROWNE, Old Nubian Grammar, §3.6.5.

26 The same juncture vowel appears sometimes on personal pronouns, e.g. ex. 32. Its precise distribution, which seems to be of a morphosyntactic nature, has not yet been adequately described.
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“In this example, in which the final word ⲧⲟⲩⲣⲓ remains unaccounted for, the RC under the antecedent ⲧⲓⲧⲓ ⲧⲣⲟⲩ consists of a single verb ⲧⲓ ⲧⲩ ⲧⲣⲓ, without overt tense marking (and therefore by default present tense) and no determiner -λ due to the presence of the genitive case marking at the end of the noun phrase ⲧⲓⲧⲓ ⲧⲣⲓ, which is attributive to ⲧⲩⲧⲑ: “into the hand(s) of the living God.”

Satzinger is correct to interpret the Ⲩⲧⲧ in the RC not as a relative pronoun, but rather as a deictic element referring to the emended noun ⲧⲧⲧ- “time.” He suggests, contra Browne, that overt complementizers only appear in non-coreferential attributive clauses, which seems to be confirmed by our survey of the extant Old Nubian material. In ex. 7 we again find all nominal inflectional material on the right edge of the noun. The double determiner before and after the plural suffix is a common occurrence (see also exx. 8, 34, 35, 49, 72, 74). Also note the truncated predicative plural -ⲧⲧⲧ, where we would, according to Browne, expect -ⲧⲧⲧⲧ. Perhaps it was dropped because of the initial e- of the copula. In the lines following this example, the verb ⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧ is repeated several times with different adjectival predicates marked by predicative -ⲧⲧ, except K. 23.4 ⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧ- “ungrateful,” ending with the privative adjective marker -ⲧⲣⲧ, which seems to be directly connected to the verb, and the irregular predicative plural of K. 23.8–9 ⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧ- “liars.”

The case marking in the embedded phrase is not always complete:

In Browne, Old Nubian Dictionary, p. 59, Browne gives the Greek gloss φοβερὸν τὸ ἐμπεσεῖν for ⲉⲩⲁⲥⲛ̄ ⲉⲓⲛⲛⲁⲥ̄ⲛ ⲧⲗ̄ⲗⲟⲩ ⲁ̄ⳡⲛ̄ ⲉⲗⲁ ⲇⲉⲓⳟⲁⲣⲁ ⲧⲟⲩⲣⲓ. It is possible that we are dealing here with a complementizer. Angelika Jakobi (p.c.) suggests that it is an unknown form of the verb ⲧⲣⲓ- “to enter,” contributing to the meaning “fall into.”

See also Van Gerven Oei, “The Old Nubian Memorial for King George,” p. 260.
Browne, Old Nubian Grammar, §3.5.2.
And the seven angels who had seven trumpets readied themselves to sound the trumpet

The attributive rc in this example clearly shows how the juncture vowels basically appear inside the noun phrase as a placeholder where we would otherwise expect number and case marking to appear, which, however, no matter how heavy the noun phrase, always appears only at the right edge of the rc. The rc has two peculiar features. First, the accusative case marking that we would expect on has been dropped (cf. ex. 20, below). Perhaps this is a scribal error because the author conflated it with the initial kappa of the verb, or perhaps we should interpret the absence of the accusative case with the verb “to have” as an intermediate stage between an active verb with an object in the accusative case, and as an adjectival suffix, which is well attested elsewhere. The second curiosity is the appearance of the determiner behind the verbal root and before the preterite 1 suffix (Browne marks it with a “sic”). Although a determiner in this position has been regularly attested in case of, for example, modal suffixes (e.g. in the above example), its appearance directly preceding a tense suffix is exceedingly rare.

3.1.1 Leftward movement: semantic restriction
Whereas in exx. 5–8, the rc followed the antecedent, it may also precede it, as in Nobiin ex. 3. There are a few examples present in the Old Nubian corpus that show this inverse order; as is clear from the morphology, we are dealing here with a type of leftward movement that seems to be semantically motivated, and that is restricted to coreferential attributive rcS. This is also suggested by the Nobiin exx. 1 and 3, where ex. 3 has a restricted meaning.

Let us inspect this first example:

31 Browne, Old Nubian Grammar, §3.4.2. According to Jakobi (p.c.), in Andaandi the accusative case marker may sometimes be dropped in the context of the verb ko.
32 Isameddin Awad, p.c.
Here the RC ⲧⲗ̄ⲗⲕ̄ ⲟⲩⲛⲛⲟⲗ, which supposedly translates the common epithet “Theotokos,” has as its antecedent and subject ⲙⲁⲣⲓⲁⲛ ⲉⲓⲅⲟⲛⲗ̄ⲗⲉ ⲅⲟⲩⲇⲁⲗⲁ ⲕⲓⲁ, which itself is attributive to ⲉⲓⲅⲟⲛ- ⲙⲁⲣⲓⲁⲛ, marked with the genitive -ⲛ. Based on our observations in the previous section, we would expect a construction like *ⲙⲁⲣⲓⲁ ⲧⲗ̄ⲗⲕ̄ ⲟⲩⲛⲛⲟⲛ. In this case, however, the entire RC has moved upward and supposedly adjoined to the determiner phrase. The question is what would motivate such movement. First of all, we may observe that in the current configuration, ⲙⲁⲣⲓⲁⲛ- is in the scope of ⲧⲗ̄ⲗⲕ̄ ⲟⲩⲛⲛⲟⲗ instead of the other way around. ⲧⲗ̄ⲗⲕ̄ ⲟⲩⲛⲛⲟⲗ therefore restricts the meaning of ⲙⲁⲣⲓⲁⲛ-; we are not dealing here with a Mary who happened to give birth to God, but rather with the God-bearing Mary. The leftward movement of the RC may therefore be semantically driven. Satzinger suggests that the position of these RCs left of the noun is comparable to adjectival constructions such as εἴκοσι ημια “Saint Mina,” although the juncture vowel -ογ cannot appear on verbal forms. This however seems to be contradicted by the existence of a separate class of examples such as άς εἰς υ/ πας ειπεργογκα “the sins that I said” (ex. 20) and ετέκογι ιηςογι κριστοσικα “Christ whom you sent” (ex. 21), which clearly show a juncture vowel instead of a determiner (see §3.3.1 below). The movement observed in ex. 10 should therefore have an analysis distinct from adjectives or RCs ending in a juncture vowel.33

The same type of movement may be observed in the following, slightly more complicated example:

“Let us beseech these four incorporeal, glorious animals that they may abide in love”
If we disregard the initial material in the phrase εἰν γαλκυφεὶ γοοκ κονδιλ αψελ κεμκιω-, and focus our attention on the phrasal element γοοκ κονδιλ αψελ, we find a pattern similar to ex. 10. γοοκ κονδιλ has moved leftward and adjoined to the determiner phrase. As in the previous example, the motivation may have been semantic in nature, restricting the meaning of αψελ: the “glory-having creatures” instead of the non-restrictive “the creatures that have glory.” We will have to leave the grammatical analysis of εἰν, γαλκυφεϊ, and κεμκιω- aside for the moment, but let me briefly say that relative pronouns always appear in the topmost position of the determiner phrase, and numerals such as κεμκιω- always appear phrase final. Note further that the suffix -αλ in εικελαλδακιωδ here should be interpreted as the transitivizer -αρ with regressive assimilation preceding the pluractional suffix -δ. If it had been the future suffix -αλ, it would have followed the pluractional suffix.

### 3.2 Non-coreferential attributive relative clauses

Non-coreferential attributive rcs are rcs in which the subject of the rc does not coincide with the antecedent. In Old Nubian, we can distinguish two subcategories, namely those in which the subject of the rc is overtly expressed (Satzinger’s “Type B1”), and those in which it is not (Satzinger’s “Type B2”). Whereas these rcs behave similarly when in situ, we will discover that under extraposition this difference becomes morphologically explicit (§6). Also differently from coreferential attributive rcs, non-coreferential ones may feature a relative pronoun, either εἰν “this” or μαν “that.”

Another difference is that non-coreferential attributive rcs cannot move to the left of the antecedent, as described in §3.1.1.

#### 3.2.1 Non-coreferential with an overt subject in rc

In case the subject of the rc is overtly expressed, it nearly always appears in the genitive case, whereas the verb usually shows no agreement, therefore appearing similar to the embedded verbal forms found in coreferential attributive rcs.

[... Antec-1 [εἰν (Rel) [Subj-GEN Verb-Tense/Asp]]]-Det/Num/Case

13 Κούμπο εἰν ταν’ na κυκλ δουμαλ δούτραπ αὐραγα

[ koumpou [ειν [ tan-na kip-s]]-il

egg REL 3SG-GEN eat-PT2-DET
doumal doutrap an-θ-aj-a

suddenly fowl live-TR-INCH-PRED

“The egg that he had eaten suddenly coming to life as a fowl”

34 See Payne, Describing Morphosyntax, p. 333. I have been unable to find any semantic or syntactic constraint on their distribution.
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We find here a non-coreferential attributive RC with a relative pronoun ⲙⲏⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ in the topmost position. The subject of the RC Ⲧⲁⲛ ⲡⲥ Ⲧⲛ ⲥⲕⲥ, Ⲧⲁⲛ, is marked with the genitive case, and the entire clause is marked on the right edge with a determiner -ⲗ. Note also that the juncture vowel that we expect after ⲟⲩⲥⲗⲱ has been dropped after -ⲙⲣ. 
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The verb of the RC ⲉⲕⲇⲣⲟⲩ- shows agreement marking, as the subject “we” is not overtly expressed, and the indirect object of the ditransitive ⲉⲣⲓⲓⲣⲟ-ⲉⲕⲇⲏ, is marked with the accusative case. The verb phrase ⲉⲕⲇⲣⲟⲩ ⲉⲕⲁ in the main clause consists of the verb ⲉⲕⲇⲣⲟⲩ- “to shine,” which, together with the causative suffix is usually translated by “to reveal.” The verb ⲉⲕⲭⲛ- here functions as a benefactive or applicative, adding the semantic role of the indirect object ⲉⲕⲁ “to us.”

Like ex. 16, we find here a non-coreferential attributive RC, with the antecedent ⲃⲣⲟⲩⲑⲟⲩ, without a juncture vowel, perhaps because we are dealing here with a loanword from Greek, or because of the phonologically unstable nature of -ⲉⲕⲣⲟⲩ. The RC ⲉⲕⲃⲏⲓⲓ ⲉⲕⲟⲣⲟⲩ- has as its subject a non-overt third person plural, as can be determined from the morphology on the verb. The object of the verb ⲉⲕⲟⲣⲟⲩ- is the antecedent ⲃⲣⲟⲩⲑⲟⲩ.

This example is syntactically rather complex, as it seems that the scribe attempted to imitate the Greek word order of Psalm 46:5 in this bilingual fragment: ἐξελέξατο ἡμῖν τὴν κληρονομίαν αὐτοῦ, τὴν καλλονὴν ᾿Ιακώβ, ἣν ἠγάπησεν (P. Q. I 2 13.ii.23–26, the Septuagint reads as follows: ἐξελέξατο ἡμῖν τήν κληρονομίαν αὐτοῦ, τήν καλλονὴν ᾿Ιακώβ, ἣν ἠγάπησεν). The interpretation of the sentence

For an overview of the benefactive/applicative in Old Nubian and Nobiin, see Bechhaus-Gerst, The (Hi)story of Nobiin, pp. 142–7.

depends on whether the attributive RC ỉⲧⲡⲟⲩⲛ ⋯ ⲗⲟⲩⲝⲧⲛⲕⲏⲙ ⋯ can only be read as an object to the verbal root ⲙⲧ- “inherit,” with possibly the nominalizing predicative plural suffix -ⲧⲧⲧ, causative, and predicative suffix. The interpretation of the attributive construction itself is straightforward. The RC ⲫⲧⲧⲧ is dependent on the antecedent ỉⲧⲡⲟⲩⲛ ⲁⲧⲧⲧ, here without a juncture vowel because of the presence of the clause-initial relative pronoun ⲧⲧⲧ.

In a few rare cases, we find that both the genitive subject and person morphology on the verb may be overt in the RC:

\[
\begin{align*}
elon-de-eeion & \text{ dek-kigir-men-dre-lo} \quad [\text{neei-ou } \text{ein}]
\end{align*}
\]
\begin{align*}
\text{now-C-C} & \quad \text{conceal-CAUS-NEG-FUT.ISG.PRED-FOC thing-J REL} \\
\text{1PL.EXCL/2PL-GEN} & \quad \text{1SG-ACC ask-PRS.1/2PL-ACC-C}
\end{align*}

“And now also I will not conceal the thing that you asked me”

The RC, indicated by the relative pronoun ⲧⲧⲧ has as its antecedent ⲧⲧⲧ, ending in a juncture vowel, and the entire attributive RC is the object of the verb ⲧⲧⲧ. What is curious about the RC is that it features both an overt subject ⲧⲧⲧ in the genitive case and the verb ⲧⲧⲧ, with overt person morphology. Satzinger suggests an interpretation of this double occurrence of overt subject and agreement marking by supposing a disambiguation strategy, mistakenly assuming that ⲧⲧⲧ is exclusively the genitive-marked pronoun for the second person plural, which is not the case. So neither the overt subject, nor the overt person marking disambiguates the other; it is the indirect object ⲧⲧⲧ that makes a reading “the thing that we (EXCL) asked myself” rather implausible.

3.3 More on the left
There are several examples of non-coreferential attributive clauses appearing in a position that precedes the antecedent. In these cases we are dealing with two patterns. In the first pattern, RCS seem to have been generated in situ, and are marked with the juncture vowel that we normally find on the antecedent when it precedes the RC, whereas the antecedent is marked with the customary number and

37 Browne, Old Nubian Grammar, §3.5.2e.
case marking (§3.3.1). In these cases, the RC seems to appear in the position of the adjective. The second pattern, which only occurs in the case of RCs of time, place, and manner, the RC is either generated in the position of the possessor, or is moved there, being marked by the genitive case (§3.3.2).

3.3.1 Preceding non-coreferential attributive RCs

As we have seen in §3.1.1, preceding coreferential attributive RCs are the result of movement driven by semantics. These clauses also show a specific morphological pattern, always being marked by the determiner -ⲗ. There is, however, also a small class of examples that feature a non-coreferential RC preceding its antecedent, which seems to be constructed in a way similar to phrases such as ⲋⲓⲛⲟγ ⲟⲩⲧⲥⲟⲩ Ⲟⲧⲥⲟⲩ ⲟⲩⲧⲥⲟⲩ, where the adjective precedes the noun.

This complex example from one of Griffith’s graffiti contains several RCs which we will inspect in more detail below in ex. 62. Note here, however, the attributive relative construction ⲑⲓ ⲉⲓⲁ/ ⲡⲉⲥⲥⲓ ⳟⲁⲡⲉⲅⲟⲩⲕⲁ, the object of ⲧⲟⲕⲁⲣⲁ. It seems to be the case that the non-coreferential ⲑⲓ ⲉⲓⲁ/ ⲡⲉⲥⲥⲓ precedes its antecedent ⲡⲉⲥⲥⲓ ⳟⲁⲡⲉⲅⲟⲩⲕⲁ. Moreover, unlike the examples in §3.1.1, it is marked by a juncture vowel -ⲓ and not by a determiner, and its subject appears in the nominative instead of in the genitive case. Another example shows a similar pattern:

Again this is an example taken from a larger, more complex sentence (ex. 79). But as in ex. 20 we may notice the non-coreferential attributive RC ⲇⲛⲕⲟⲧⲓⲟγ preceding its antecedent Ⲡⲧⲥⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲕⲓⲟⲩⲗⲓ. In both cases, an explanation as in §3.1.1 seems unlikely, in the sense that the marking of the RCs and antecedents follow exactly the same pattern as in exx. 5–8, albeit with RC and antecedent in reverse order. Also the fact that the RC in ex. 20 shows a nominative subject,
suggests that we are dealing here with a different type of construction. However, there is not enough Old Nubian data and an absence of comparative data from modern Nile Nubian languages to allow for a full explanation.

3.3.2 Non-coreferential relative clauses of time, place, and manner
As already suggested by Browne and Satzinger in their respective treatments of rc's, expressions of place and time follow a different template, in which the rc is marked with a genitive case and always precedes its antecedent.

The attributive relative construction could also be literally translated as “to the place of Jesus’s staying,” and is otherwise grammatically unremarkable. The following examples provide further illustration:

Note that in this example the genitive -n has merged with the tense/person marker -can.

38 This example contains a free relative clause, see §4.
As in the Old Nubian examples above, the antecedent agar follows the RC iriin koraga bataree-n, which is marked by a genitive. Note, however, that this pattern, which in Old Nubian is only found in case of RCS of place and time, seems to have been generalized in later stages of language development until the attributive RC construction of RC + genitive preceding the antecedent became a commonly accepted pattern for all restrictive RCS (cf. Nobin ex. 3).

In the same context, Awad’s discussion of RCS of manner in Nobiin also allows us to shed light on an otherwise obscure construction in what Browne identifies as the Old Nubian version of a homily attributed to St. John Chrysostom:

"Don’t consider God alone, nor only the order in which he became flesh, but both as made one."

The syntax of this fragment is complicated, as there is only one main verb, ἀνακίνησις, with object τὰλκ and its apposition ἀναργυρίακα. In the second part of the sentence the same verb is implied, with the entire clause ἀνακίνησις ἀκ[.querySelectorAll("strong").forEach(function(element) { return element.textContent; })] ἀναργυρίακα as object. In the third part the object of the implied verb is ἀλλάκανθογιακα. ὁγιείας- here is technically not an extraposed RC (see §6), but rather an apposition just like ἀναργυρίακα, in a construction “consider x as y.” The form ἀνακίνησις in the second part of the clause, however, seems more puzzling. If we followed Browne and translate ἀνακίνησις ἀκ[.querySelectorAll("strong").forEach(function(element) { return element.textContent; })] ἀναργυρίακα- as “construction that became flesh” (his Greek retrotranslation has οἰκονομίαν for ἀκ[.querySelectorAll("strong").forEach(function(element) { return element.textContent; })] ἀναργυρίακα- we would not expect to find a coreferential attributive RC to precede with this type of complex morphology: no agreement ought to be present in coreferential attributive clauses (cf. §3.1.1), and the -ὴ suffix would remain completely unexplained. If we would apply our observations thus far, we would conclude that ἀνακίνησις must be a non-coreferential attributive
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RC, and Browne’s translation of ⲁⲕ[ⲇ]ⲧ⳿- as “construction” and subject of ⲣⲓⲧⲗⲉⲧⲓⲧⲓⲧⲓⲧⲓ is incorrect. Moreover, it follows none of the patterns observed in §3.3.1; in that case we would expect something like *gadasesi akdatt-. The only remaining option is that we are dealing with some type of RC of place, time, or manner, which ends in a genitive and precedes its antecedent. This assumption allows us to explain the agreement suffix -ⲛ (the RC is non-coreferential without explicit subject), the subsequent genitive -ⲛ (RC of time, place, or manner), and its position in front of the antecedent. However, the -ⲛ would remain unaccounted for; in exx. 22–5 the genitive case always appeared as -(i)ⲛ. If we observe the following example from Nobiin, however, it becomes clear that we are dealing here with a predicative -ⲣⲛ, which may have been preserved in Nobiin in RCs of manner as a same-subject converb:

man ideen aaw-ee-n a kir
Dem.Dist woman 1SG.Poss-mother do-compi-gen SSC way
jelli-ga aaw-i
job-ACC do-prs.3SG

“The woman does her job in the same way as my mother does”

We may observe here that the RC aneen aaween-a preceding the antecedent kir is marked by both the genitive and a, here glossed as same-subject converb. However, recall that one of the functions of the Old Nubian predicative suffix -ⲛ is precisely marking verbs with the same subject. I suggest that the same is the case in ex. 27, and that consequently the translation of ⲁⲕ[ⲇ]ⲧ⳿- in ex. 26 as “construction” is erroneous. In his Old Nubian Dictionary, Browne rightly observes that we are probably dealing with some type of nominalized form with -ⲧ of the habitual verb ⲁⲕ-, or its derivative ⲁⲕⲇⲁⲕ- “to set up,” which already suggests a mode or manner of doing things. The suggested Greek retrotranslation οἰκονομίαν suggests something similar. I have therefore opted here tentatively for the neutral translation “order” while suggesting that just like in Nobiin ex. 28 we are dealing with a RC of manner.

3.4 Anaphors

According to the head raising analysis of RCs, antecedents of an RC are originally generated within the RC and subsequently move up to a higher (in the case of Old Nubian, leftward) position. Without delving into the technical details, this movement may explain the appearance of the juncture vowel that we mentioned before, and the fact that the neutral position of attributive clauses seems to be

39 Cf. also Awad, The Characteristic Features of Non- Kernel Sentences in Nobiin, ex. 633.
following the noun, rather than preceding it. It also predicts that there are certain syntactic positions within the rc, organized on a hierarchical scale,\textsuperscript{40} that do not allow for relativization, such as possessor and postposition phrases. Old Nubian seems to conform this generalization: subjects and objects can be relativized (also called extracted), whereas other syntactic functions cannot.\textsuperscript{41} In case relativization is impossible, we find an anaphor – also called PRO or “resumptive pronoun”\textsuperscript{42} – which in Old Nubian is always a form of the third person singular pronoun τάπ.

\textit{Blessed is the man whose sins the Lord will not remember} (Ps. 31:2)

\textit{This is the man whose leg was dislocated}

Ex. 29a follows the pattern of non-coreferential attributive clauses discussed in §3.2.1, but this time we find an anaphor τάν “his” indexed with the antecedent εττογ, as possessor phrases do not allow extraction. The same occurs in Andaandi in ex. 29b, where we find the anaphor θενν in a similar position. Anaphors also appear in the case of oblique phrases such as locatives:

\textit{I will [guide (vel sim.) you] on the path on which you go} (Ps. 31:8)

\textit{This is the country before which you go}

\textsuperscript{40} See Keenan & Comrie, “Noun Phrase Accessibility and Universal Grammar.”

\textsuperscript{41} Owing to a lack of examples, it is unclear whether indirect objects can be extracted, that is, can become an antecedent to an rc in which its syntactical function would be that of an indirect object, e.g. “the person John wanted to give a present to.”

\textsuperscript{42} Jakobi & El-Guzuuli, “Relative Clauses in Andaandi,” p. 97.
“This is the country to which I came before”

Just like ἐπὶ in ex. 29a, ἦς cannot be extracted from a postpositional phrase in the RC, which is the reason why we find the locative-marked anaphor τὰριο. Browne’s suggestion that ἦς is here a postponed “regular” demonstrative pronoun is erroneous; demonstrative pronouns in Old Nubian never follow nominal heads. The same construction can be found in Andaandi, ex. 30b. A similar anaphor construction is found in the next example, which however cannot be faithfully rendered in English:


Finally, anaphors also appear in contexts in

n which raising is impossible due to intervening constituents, such as adjectival phrases:


In this example, the adjective οοκκολ intervenes between the antecedent άστανε and the RC τάλλακω ταρούν άιτακκά, hence the appearance of the anaphor τάρογ.

The strategies of exx. 31 and 32 may also appear together:


“You will find a colt that is bound, one upon which no one among men has yet sat” (Mk. 11:2)
In this example, καδικα is coindexed with both ταλαισυγ and ταλαδω in the RC dependent on it, in the first case because of the intervening RC υπ ανασ, and in the second case because ταλαδω is an inaccessible postpositional phrase. Note also that the accusative case ending on καδικα is unexpected. Owing to a lack of comparative evidence I am unable to suggest an explanation, but see the commentary to ex. 89 for further discussion.

4. Free relative clauses

Free or headless RCs have no overt antecedent, but are otherwise syntactically similar to the coreferential and non-coreferential examples discussed in §1. Whereas Satzinger does not discuss them separately, and subsumes them under his main types “A” and “B,” Browne treats them separately in Old Nubian Grammar, §4.7.1. Headless RCs may further be subdivided into subject clauses (§4.1); object clauses (§4.2), which include different types of complement clauses (§4.2.1–2); and free RCs in other, oblique positions (§4.3). Unlike non-coreferential attributive clauses, free RCs are never introduced by a relative pronoun.

4.1 Subject clauses

Subject clauses are RCs that in their entirety, i.e., without antecedent, form the subject of a sentence.

Satzinger includes this example as a “Type A” RC, interpreting ΑγεθελαδουγΙα as an antecedent, but when compared to ex. 29 it becomes clear that we are dealing here with a subject clause, that is, a free RC without antecedent. The entire RC ιρη Γογλα Δογλου- is the subject of the adjectival predicate ΑγεθελαδουγΙα, which agrees in number with the subject. The same holds for the following example quoted by Satzinger as an attributive RC, which in fact appears to be a coordinated subject clause:

ειι εκσαλα γαρφιτι ειγονκα Δογκαγουγι ταν ταλει εικων τεν κοφι τηνατταδω εττολουγι
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“Those have been the ones who worship the image of the beast, who received the sign of his name upon their forehead.” (Rev. 14:9)

Just like the previous example, the interpretation here is straightforward. The subjects of \( \text{ⲉⲥ̄ⲥⲁⲛⲁ} \) are two subject clauses coordinated by the suffix -\( \text{ⲟⲛ} \) in the noun phrase \( \text{ⲧⲁⲛ ⲧⲁⳟⲥⲛ̄ ⲉⲇ̄ⲕⲟⲛ} \). Both subject clauses are fully marked with a plural suffix and the double determiner construction we have seen previously.

A final example is slightly puzzling, in the sense that we are not strictly dealing with a subject sentence, but rather with a sentence that as a whole seems to have been nominalized:

\[
\text{ⲉⲛ̄ⲛⲛ̄ⲕⲁ ⲟⲩ[ⲇ]ⲅⲓⲗⲉ ⲡⲉⲥⲇⲉⲣⲗ̄}
\]

“(The fact that) I say these things to you” (Jn. 16:33)

To take \( \text{ⲉⲛ̄ⲛⲛ̄ⲕⲁ} \) here as the antecedent of the RC \( \text{ⲧⲁⲛ ⲧⲁⳟⲥⲛ̄ ⲉⲇ̄ⲕⲟⲛ} \) makes no sense, as it would not be marked with the accusative case (but cf. \( \text{ⲙⲁⲧⲑⲧⲉ} \) in ex. 33); it can be nothing but the direct object of \( \text{ⲧⲁⲛ ⲧⲁⳟⲥⲛ̄ ⲉⲇ̄ⲕⲟⲛ} \). However, this leaves the occurrence of the determiner -\( \text{l} \) unexplained. Perhaps the scribe was attempting to render the perfect tense found in the Greek (\( \text{ταύτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν} \)) by nominalizing the entire sentence. Again, lack of comparative evidence prevents further speculation.

4.2 Object clauses
Object clauses follow the same pattern as subject clauses, but are obviously marked by the accusative case -\( ϸ \), sometimes preceded by the determiner -\( \lambda \). As yet it remains unclear in which contexts the determiner may precede the accusative suffix.
37  
τῇλι ταεςδρο αγογόγε κούρπαλο αγογόδκαω  
[Ø [rel till-in taaj-il-do auou-j-ou]]-ka  
God-gen name-det-in do-plact-prs.2pl.acc  
kourran-lo auou-j-anasō  
joyful-loc do-plact-imp.3pl  
“Do the things you do in God’s name joyfully”

The free RC τῇλι ταεςδρο αγογόγε is here the object of αγογόδκαω. Note that the implicit antecedent of the RC is plural, as signified by the pluractional marker -ơ on both the embedded verb αγογόγε and the main verb αγογόδκαω.

38  
eihi [Ø [rel ou-n eiar-i doll-is]]-il-ka ouk-ka  
lo 2sg-gen know-pred? want-pt2-det-acc 2sg-acc  
eair-il-gas-se-sin  
know-det-caus-pt2.1sg.pred-emp  
“Lo, I have informed you about what you wanted to know.”

Observe that in ex. 38 we find two instances of a determiner that are relatively rare, the first preceding the accusative case in δολιςκε (cf. ex. 25, 31 δοωκ[κα] and ex. 32 ετακκκα) and the second directly following the verbal root in ειαργρασσει (cf. ex. 8 κοιλογγουλη). As for the curious form ειαρ, with either a phonologically reduced predicative suffix or a juncture vowel, cf. ex. 21 ειαρ.

39  
παππαβδα γαλλα· ελακκα· εττερειν ααίναλα·  
[Ø [rel pappajja jal-da eid-is]]-ka eit-ere-sin  
Pappajja son-com send-pt2-acc take-prs.1sg.pred-emp  
dippi-la  
village-dat  
“I take what was sent with the son (of) Pappajja to the village”

Ruffini’s translation is different here, analyzing ελακκα as a serial verb consisting of εττ- “to take” and ε- “to take, bring” with the accusative case, rendering it with “receipt.” However, it seems to me that an analysis as a free RC, just like ex. 38, is more likely. I also take ελα- to be a rare instance of the verb ελα- “to send?,” but obviously “to take” remains a valid option as well.

4.2.1 Complement clauses with verbs of reporting and desiring  
Object clauses are a subcategory of complement clauses which may appear with verbs of reporting and desiring such as “believe,” “say,” “wish,” “think,” “write,” and so on. Grammatically speaking, Old
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Nubian complement clauses do not differ from regular object clauses, or non-coreferential RCs in general. The subject of the complement clause, if overtly expressed, will appear in the genitive case, and the entire clause will be marked by the accusative case. As with regular non-coreferential attributive RCs, there is a complementary distribution between overt subject and the presence of agreement morphology.

Here we find a complement clause dependent on the verb \textit{pistē-εis-ana}, with a genitive subject and an embedded verb solely marked for tense. There is no overt agreement marking because the subject is explicit. The object clause \textit{eιn ȃik eitr-εs} is marked with the accusative case as an object of the main verb \textit{pistē-εis-ana}. Cf. also L. 107.4–5 \textit{kōsɔcιa ȃ[ƙkɔn]nɔ̃x ȃin ȃik eitr-εs} (sic) “So that the world knows that you sent me.”

In this example we find explicit person marking on the embedded verb owing to the absence of explicit subject. The object clause \textit{oʊ̃kə eia-r-il-gad-j-ad-en]-ka} is marked with the accusative case as the object of the main verb \textit{doll-immo}.

If there is an explicit subject in the complement clause, it is marked by the accusative case.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{mɛctɛy[ei]-cana}: eιn ȃik eitr-ɛska \textit{L. 107.11–12} \textit{ONG §4.7.1.2a} \textbf{31}
\item \textit{pistē-εis-ana}: [\textit{ein ai-k eitr-es}-ka} \textit{TR-PT2-ACC} \textit{ONG §4.7.1.2b} \textbf{40}
\item \textit{eiar-il-gad-j-ad-en]-ka} \textit{ong §4.7.1.2} \textbf{41}
\item \textit{ai-on [\textit{eik-ka} tar-tr-o-]kɔn sipitor ann-eika} \textit{P. QI 4 91.1–6–7} \textbf{42}
\end{itemize}
The subject of the complement clause ḫ̄ⲕⲀⲛ is here marked by the accusative. Ruffini translates slightly differently here, choosing to render ḫ̄ⲕⲁ as “for you.” This example shows several curious features, such as the absence of tense and agreement morphology in the verb of the complement clause ṉⲣⲙⲉⲛⲧⲧⲏⲡ. Observe also the so-called copulative suffix -ⲙⲁ on the main verb, with the element -ⲙ that otherwise appears in emphatic environments such as the affirmative and vetitive. Finally, note the inverse order of possessed and possessor in ⲟⲟⲧⲓⲣ ⲛⲧⲓ ⲉⲕⲁ, with the genitive ⲛⲧⲓ- following ⲟⲟⲧⲓⲣ.

In ex. 43 we find a double object construction, with indirect object ḫ̄ⲕⲀⲛ and complement clause ⲙⲧⲇ ⲉⲕⲁ. The double object construction is supported by the applicative verb ṉⲣ-, usually translated with “to give.”

For comparison, observe the following two examples from Nobiin, respectively with an intransitive and transitive verb in the complement clause, which feature a similar construction with genitive-marked subject and accusative marker on the complement clause:

4.2.2 Complement clauses with verbs of ability
Other types of complement clauses have been attested in combination with variants of the verb ṉⲣ- “to be able,” which, just as the verbs of reporting in §2.2.1, takes a complement clause marked by the accusative case. The two following examples show such a complement clause construction embedded under ṉⲣ-.
The complement clause ⲇⲓⲣⲓⲱ ⲧⲁⲕⲕⲁ ⲁⲩⲟⲩⲗⲟ̄ⲥⲕ̄ is the object of the verb ⲉⲓⲣ and therefore marked with the accusative -ⲕ̄. The entire free RC ⲇⲓⲣⲓⲱ ⲧⲁⲕⲕⲁ ⲁⲩⲟⲩⲗⲟ̄ⲥⲕ̄ ⲉⲓⲣⲗ̄ⲅⲓⲗⲗⲉ is then marked with a determiner and directive suffix: “to whom is able to save him (away/completely) from death.” According to Bechhaus-Gerst, the suffix -ⲟ̄ⲥ in ⲁⲟⲩⲗⲟ̄ⲥ should be interpreted as a “movement away from a […] deictic center,”46 which can also carry the meaning of fully completing a certain action, in casu the saving.

The main verb ⲑⲧⲁⲧⲡⲓⲰa here shows the compounding of the two negative suffixes -ⲡⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧ and -ⲡⲡ, which is only attested with the verb Ⲝ̄- “to be able” and ⲇⲧ- “to die.”47 Again note the absence of person morphology in the negative verb, as observed in ex. 42 ⲧⲣⲃⲛⲕ. Assuming, with Browne, that we are dealing here with the introduction to a question “Is (he) not able to…?,” the clause Ⲝ̄ⲧⲡⲇⲡⲚⲡ ⲑⲧ铗 ⲡⲝⲩⲏ Ⲫⲣⲕⲁ is a complement to ⲑⲧⲁⲧⲡⲓⲰa, marked by the accusative case -ⲕⲁ. The subject of ⲑⲧⲁⲧⲡⲓⲰa is formed by the subject clause ⲑⲧⲩⲧ ⲡⲝⲩⲏ […] ⲧⲧⲣⲁⲧ ⲡⲝⲩⲏ ⲧⲧⲣⲁⲧ ⲡⲝⲩⲏ ⲧⲧⲡⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧ “the one who opened the eyes of this blind man.” ⲑⲧⲩⲧ should not be interpreted as a relative pronoun, as these never appear in free RCs.

Again we find a similar construction in Nobiin:

[comp ay sirig-ka kay-inan]-ga esk-ir-i
1SG boat-ACC make-INF-ACC be.able-PRS-1SG
“I am able to make a boat”

4.3 Other free relative clauses

Except for subject and object positions, free RCs may also appear in other positions in the sentence.

The free RC here is άλλαλογιάκα άλλαγιγιάλα άλληνεν τάλογ τακκα αγολκα δειράλο·

“If anyone does not sing with those who sing Alleluia, he insults the God who made him”

This example contains two free RCs, the first γενέκτικα· οικέλ· απία· τάλλι· οψφτάλαμα· πελά· οψφρασί· εινάδι· as subject of the sentence and the second τάλλι· οψφτάλαμα· πελά as a genitive belonging to οψφρασί. Satzinger suggests an “unexpected” interpretation of the suffix -ί in πελά as third person singular morpheme, whereas the fact that the RC precedes its antecedent and the presence of the verb πελά-, which besides “to be” can also mean “to come out,” suggest here a genitive case.

We are now able to analyze a complicated sentence such as the complete verse of Heb. 6:7, which contains a number of embedded RCs:

48 Browne writes άλλαγιγιάλα.
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[ iskt-ou [rel [app nedian-no [arru [rel tad-dō jōn-a earth-J often-LOC rain 3sg-upon strike-pred soukk-o]-l-ka sirip-a et-a tor-a] descend-pred ACC drink-pred take-pred enter-pred] des ess-ou [rel el-takk-ou]-l-ka crop green-J obtain-PASS-PTI-DET-ACC [0 [rel ein [tak-ka torpak-k]]]-l-gou-ka REL 3SG-ACC harvest-CONSUET-DET-PL-ACC ppei-a os-a tij-j]-il-de produce-pred come.out-pred give.2/3-PLACT-DET-C till-illo-jōa taoue-ka et-ara-goue-lo God-LOC-through blessing-ACC receive-PTI-PRED-PL-PRED-FOC “And the earth which, drinking up the rain that often strikes upon it, produces obtained green crops for those who harvest it, received blessing(s?) from God” (Heb. 6:7)

The subject of the verb at the end of the sentence, ἐταρά- is the entire clause ἔκτος τῶν ὅπως τᾶδολα “and the earth which produces....” The RC ending in the verbal complex ὅπως τᾶδολα- has as its object ἐκτός τῶν ὅπως τᾶδολα- “obtained green crops,” with a slightly curious verb ἐκτάδολα-. I have opted here to interpret the morpheme -ος as a variant of the preterite 1 morpheme, both because it is a coreferential attributive RC (cf. §7 below) and an interpretation as an agreement suffix would make no sense. The indirect object, supported by the applicative verb τᾶ-κ-, is the free RC εἰν τᾶκκα ὑπὲρ “for those who harvest it.” All of this is preceded by a lengthy apposition ἔκτος γῆν ὅπως τᾶ [τὰ(?)] “drinking up the rain that often strikes upon it,” which in turn contains a coreferential attributive RC with antecedent ἔδραο. Note that both ὅπως τᾶ and ἐκτάδολα retain the determiner before the accusative case.

5 Relative clauses and predicative -Λ

As Satzinger points out, in case the antecedent of an RC is marked with the predicative, both the RC and its antecedent will feature the predicative suffix. The predicative -Λ therefore behaves differently from genuine case markings such as the accusative -ΚΑ and genitive -ΝΑ, which only appear at the right edge of the noun phrase. The precise syntactic structure underlying the assignment of the predicative case, however, still lacks clarification. What follows will therefore be a description of the different types of RCs that we have
encountered in the previous sections in the different contexts in which a predicative suffix appears. 49

5.1 Nominal predicates
The predicative suffix -ⲁ first of all indicates the main verbal or nominal predicate of a sentence. In case the nominal predicate is accompanied by a RC, it is also marked with the predicative.

Katapetasma ououka-lo pala kalbon / Gayeira ecce[igo]na eccaldal oktakhad /

[θ [rel katapetasma ouou-ka-lo pal-a kil]]-l-on
veil second-acc-foc come.out-pred come-det-c
[ŋaueir-a [rel ŋiss-igou-na ŋiss-a-a-lo
tent-pred holy-pl-gen holy-pred-quote-foc ok-tak-n]]-a
call-pass-prs.2/3sg-pred

“And that which comes after the second veil is the tabernacle, which is called the Holy of Holies” (Heb. 9:3)

The subject of the nominal predicate Gayeira is a subject clause Katapetasma ououka-lo pala kalbon, and it is accompanied by the attributive RC ecce[igo]na eccaldal oktakhad. As we expect, both the nominal predicate and the RC are marked by the predicative suffix.

5.2 Complex verbal predicates
What Browne calls “periphrastic” constructions are in fact not essentially different from the complement clauses we have discussed above in §4.2.1–2, namely a full sentence embedded under a verb. In most instances of such constructions, 50 the main verb is a copula without any overt tense marking, whereas the RC is marked with the predicative, like a regular nominal or verbal predicate. The embedded verb can either appear with or without agreement morphology. I will just give a number of representative examples.

Tar-on mir-a ag-ende
3sg-c be.barren-pred remain-neg
[[ounn-ar]-a men-n]-a-lo
bear-pto1-pred neg-prs.2/3sg-pred-foc

“And she, remaining barren, did not bear”

49 I follow here the observations made in “A Note on the Old Nubian Morpheme -ⲁ in Nominal and Verbal Predicates.”
50 I include here only what Browne refers to as “predicative” and “indicative” periphrastic constructions (Browne, Old Nubian Grammar, §§s.9.14-15).
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**tikkīn-/copula/ non**  disobe-dience-LOC cease-IMP.3PL
never-the-less-c

**imjirk-il**  [[ deiar-ka ⲇⲉⲓⲁⲣⲕⲁ ⳟⲉⲅⲣⲁ ⲉ̄ⲛⲉⲛⲛⲉⳝⲟⲩⲛ

disobe-dience-det death-ACC produce-PRS-PRED

en-en]-nejoun be-PRS.2/3SG-because

“But nevertheless cease disobedience, because disobedience pro-
duces death”

**ἀριθτακκαἰον εἶλνα εἰγάλει τιάφόνῳκελλο’**

[[ armis-tak-k]-a-eion ein-d-n]-a

judge-PASS-PRS-PRED-c be-FUT-PRS.2/3SG-PRED
eig-il-de tiaf-il-dekel-lo

fire-det-c sulphur-det-c-loc

“And he will be judged in fire and sulphur” (Rev. 14:10)

In this example, the copula εἶλνα contains the modal suffix -α, giv-
ing the entire verbal complex a future sense. Note also the pro-
gressive assimilation of the present (or neutral) tense marker -ϧ after
-tak in ἀριθτακκαἰον.

As we have observed above, agreement morphology appears in
the embedded verb at the moment the subject of the embedded verb
is not coreferential with the subject of the copula:

**αἰειν ὅτι ἐνενον πρῶτος Ἰησοῦν αἰῶνα’**

ale-sin  [[ ounn-r-e en-en]-non

truly-emp bear-PRS-1SG-PRED be-PRS.2/3SG-c

khristianos-αγ-αδ-ίμμε

Christian-inch-FUT-AFF.1SG-PRED

“If I give birth, I will become a Christian”

**δούρικα ημιαλ ἱμαλ ἥμιλη δούρις ὅτι περιπατεῖες**

[-jouri-ka mindi mindi-lo pes-in]-a

-about-ACC individually-LOC say-PRS.2/3SG-PRED
doum-men-ess-in

exist-NEG-PT2-2/3SG

“... about ... it is impossible to speak individually” (Heb. 9:5)

Browne analyzes the verb here as doum-men-es-sin, with the em-
phatic marker -ο. However, the positioning of a verb marked with
this suffix at the end of sentence is unexpected, and with the begin-
ing of the sentence missing no definitive grammatical analysis can
be given.
Complex verbal predicates can of course in turn be embedded, such as in the following example:

\[
\text{dogd-ri-gou-l mašalosk-lo tar-a ierousalm-io}
\]

\[
\text{magus-PL-PL-DET east-LOC come-PRED Jerusalem-LOC}
\]

\[
\text{ki-s-an-a [rel [pes-r]-a-goue ein]-il}
\]

\[
\text{come-PT2-3PL-PRED say-PRS-PRED-PL-PRED be-DET}
\]

“The magi, coming from the east, arrived in Jerusalem, and said: ...”

The RC necrāgoγ[ε] is attributive to dogd in spite of its distance. And although it is nominalized with the determiner -il, the internal structure of the clause remains the same: the copula ein preceded by an RC marked by the predicative suffix, as well as number agreement with its antecedent.

5.3 Vocative or appellative contexts

The predicative -α appears also in vocative or appellative environments, where someone is called or called upon.

\[
\text{ontakragoγĕke}
\]

\[
[0 [rel on-tak-r]]-a-goue-ke
\]

\[
\text{love-PASS-PRS-PRED-PL-PRED-2PL}
\]

“You, beloved”

Both examples contain a free RC which is marked by a predicative -α, with plural predicative suffix -γε, and in both cases a special vocative suffix that refers to the second person plural “you,” -ke. Otherwise the RC seems to behave grammatically like the ones discussed above, such as marking the subject with a genitive case.

Other examples are grammatically a bit more complex:
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We are dealing here with regular non-coreferential attributive RC in which both the antecedent ⲓⲟⲕⲕⲟⲣⲁ and RC ⲭⲣⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥⲛ̄ ⲙⲧⲩⲣⲟⲥⲟⲩ ⲙⲏⲛⲁⲛⲁ ⲁⲩⲥⲁⲗⲱ are marked with the predicative -ⲧⲏ. The RC shows no agreement marking, as the subject is overtly expressed, with a genitive suffix. The example in question is the first sentence of the text known as the Miracle of St Mina (or Menas) and as such functions as a type of an announcement or caption for the entire story.

This vocative-like usage of the predicative suffix also appears in other contexts, for example in one of Griffith's graffiti. I give here an extensive fragment:

“Peter, who has the keys of the seventh heaven, who has forgiven the sins that I have spoken, give, do not cause my affliction to consume me in the days of my life”

Peter, the one who is called upon here by the author of the graffito, is qualified by two coreferential attributive RCs, both ending in the predicative suffix -ⲧⲏ. The first coreferential attributive RC shows the pattern we have seen before, whereas the second one contains an additional non-coreferential attributive RC ⲑⲰ ⲟⲩ ⲁⲫⲛⲡⲱ, with the antecedent ⲉⲫⲡⲱ (see ex. 20 for discussion). This lengthy appellation to Peter is then followed by an imperative Ⲯⲛⲁ ⲡⲓⳡⲉⲛ ⲇⲓⲛⲉⲥⲱ and a vocative ⲫⲉⲧⲣⲟⲥⲓ̈ Ⲩⲁⲣⲙⲓ Ⲍⲧⲛ̄ ⲧⲉⲣⲉⲅⲟⲩⲕⲁ ⲕⲟⳡⳝⲣⲁ· ⲁⲓ ⲉⲓ⸌ⲁ⸍ ⲡⲉⲥⲓ ⳡⲉⲅⲟⲩⲕⲁ ⲇⲓⲛⲉⲥⲱ· ⲛⲛⲁ ⲁⳡⲉⲛ ⲟⲩⲕⲟⲩⲣⲣⲱ· ⲉⲓⲕⲁ ⲙⲧⲧⲁⲕⲁ ⲕⲓⲡⲣⲁ ⲅⲧ̄ⲧⲁⲙⲓⲥⲱ·

Peter, the one who is called upon here by the author of the graffito, is qualified by two coreferential attributive RCs, both ending in the predicative suffix -ⲧⲏ. The first coreferential attributive RC shows the pattern we have seen before, whereas the second one contains an additional non-coreferential attributive RC ⲑⲰ ⲟⲩ ⲁⲫⲡⲱ, with the antecedent ⲉⲫⲡⲱ (see ex. 20 for discussion). This lengthy appellation to Peter is then followed by an imperative Ⲯⲛⲁ ⲡⲓⳡⲉⲛ ⲇⲓⲛⲉⲥⲱ and a vocative ⲫⲉⲧⲣⲟⲥⲓ̈ Ⲩⲁⲣⲙⲓ Ⲍⲧⲛ̄ ⲧⲉⲣⲉⲅⲟⲩⲕⲁ ⲕⲟⳡⳝⲣⲁ· ⲁⲓ ⲉⲓ⸌ⲁ⸍ ⲡⲉⲥⲓ ⳡⲉⲅⲟⲩⲕⲁ ⲇⲓⲛⲉⲥⲱ· ⲛⲛⲁ ⲁⳡⲉⲛ ⲟⲩⲕⲟⲩⲣⲣⲱ· ⲉⲓⲕⲁ ⲙⲧⲧⲁⲕⲁ ⲕⲓⲡⲁ ⲅⲧ̄ⲧⲁⲙⲓⲥⲱ·

51 Browne, “Griffith’s Old Nubian Graffito 4,” p. 19, translates “O Peter, you who have the keys of the 7 heavens, forgive me for the sins that I uttered. Cause me not to eat tribulation in the time of my life,” interpreting ⲑⲰⲕⲁ as an imperative and ⲑⲡ as the object of ⲫⲉⲧⲣⲟ ⲧⲉⲣⲉⲅⲟⲩⲕⲁ instead of ⲑⲡ.
5.4 Adjunctive/appositional clauses

Satzinger gives a few other examples in which the predicative \-ⲕⲆ appears. These, however, are not proper \rcs, i.e. with a fully developed clausal structure including tense and subject and/or agreement morphology, but rather embedded verb phrases without any higher projection, without possible subject, and without ever featuring a relative pronoun. Needless to say, all of them are coreferential.

5.5 Topicalization of the antecedent

There are a few recorded cases of \rcs with an antecedent marked by the predicative suffix that seems to have moved to a more leftward position. In all of these cases we are dealing with a topicalized antecedent, as signaled by the appearance of the “emphatic” suffix -ⲕⲋ and the predicative suffix. However, as predicative morphology is not always present in the \rc itself (as in exx. 52–62), it may be the case that this assignment only takes place after movement of the antecedent. In all examples below, the movement is not visible on the surface. The intuition that leftward movement is involved derives from 1) the fact that -ⲕⲋ does not always appear in these contexts and that its presence must be linked to a specific syntactic position in the sentence, and 2) the abundant presence of -ⲕⲋ in contexts of quantifier raising, which in other languages explicitly features leftward movement (see §5.6). This type of -ⲕⲋ-topicalization is allowed from both coreferential and non-coreferential attributive clauses.

52 There is no room here for a full discussion of the -ⲕⲋ morpheme, which has been analyzed by SATZINGER, "Relativsatz und Thematisierung im Altnubischen," pp. 195ff; BROWNE, Old Nubian Grammar, §3.10; BROWNE, Old Nubian Dictionary: Appendices, pp. 28–37, esp. p. 31 "Predicative + -ⲕⲋ as Antecedent"; and Bechhaus-Gerst, The (Hi)story of Nobiin, pp. 103–4.
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stauros-il adnike-r-a-lo till-a-sin

cross-det life.giving-PRS-PRED-FOC God-PRED-EMP

[t, gad-lo tad-dō oll-o] l-loj̄-a

flesh-LOC 3SG-upon hang-PT1-DET-because-PRED

“The cross is life-giving, because of God who hung upon it in the flesh”

In this example, τάλας̄ has apparently moved to the left, and has been marked by the emphatic suffix -cū. Note that the RC God-τάλας̄ ολολόοδω is marked with the predicative -ʌ.

God-a till-a ou-na

Lord-PRED God-PRED 1PL.EXCL-GEN

ou-n aeil-gou-na-eion esoggi-der-a

1PL.EXCL-GEN heart-PL-GEN-C release-NMLZ-PRED

ai-a-gou-e-sin, Ṽape-lo toukm-a

heart-PL-PRED-EMP sin-LOC stink-PRED

[t, kor-ka et-o] l-gou-na-eion iatoros-a

wound-ACC receive-PT1-DET-PL-GEN-C doctor-PRED

“God, our Lord, and deliverance of our hearts, and doctor of wounded hearts, stinking in sin”

This series of appeals to God contains one RC korkā ἐτολγουνᾶς̄, with the antecedent άξιγογές̄, which clearly has moved out of genitive construction into a higher position in the phrase, where it has been marked with the emphatic marker -cū, and the predicative marker -ʌ. More clear than ex. 66, this example is perhaps evidence of cū-topicalization as both the predicative -ʌ and -cū are assigned in the target position, whereas the RC is not marked by the predicative, but rather with the genitive, as attributive to ἰκτορόςα.

Christian-pl-gen woman.pl-pl-det talk-prs.3pl hear-pred

[t, hēss-ou mēna-na

miracle-PRED-PL-PRED-EMP holy-J Mina-gen

mareōt-in kisse-la au-j]] il-gou-ka

Mareotis-gen church-dat do-plact-det-pl-acc

“Hearing the women of the Christians talk about the miracles that Saint Mina performed in the church of Mareotis”
This is another example in which the antecedent τῷ ἀγγέλῳ has moved leftward and become marked with the predicative and emphatic markers. Again the RC is not marked with the predicative -α, but with the accusative.

This final example first shows a complement clause ἄριστα dependent on the verb of ability εἰριστήλαω (see §4.2.2), followed by the antecedent ἑσσεγούς of the RC ἀγγελον. As in ex. 67, the antecedent has moved out of a possessor phrase, here dependent on the object of ἐπίκα, ἐπίκα. Note that the analysis of -ιν in ἑσσεγούς is uncertain. Because the subject of the RC ἀγγελον is explicit, we normally do not expect to find agreement morphology. The only other option is that we are dealing here with an assimilated form of the determiner -ιν, which, however, never seems to appear before the genitive case.

5.6 Relative clauses within the scope of quantifiers
A special instance of attributive RCs marked with the predicative suffix are those whose antecedents are the quantifiers ἅμωμα “all” and οὐκ- “any” which mark constituents within their scope with the predicative -α. Apart from featuring this additional marker, the RCs have also moved into the scope of the quantifier and are therefore structurally similar to coreferential RCs with a restricted reading as discussed in §3.1.1.53

“And also all who lived in her house were barren”
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This example features a coreferential attributive RC embedded under the antecedent ṭⲙⲣⲗⲣⲁ- and therefore marked with the predicative. Although Satzinger follows Browne in claiming that because of this predicative marker before ṭⲙⲣⲗⲣⲁ- “es steht Prädikativ statt Verbid, und Indikativ statt Subjunktiv,”54 such a statement is meaningless in a descriptive context in which we attend to Old Nubian morphology, under the assumption that it is more an agglutinative rather than a synthetic language.55 Note also the complex verbal predicate with copula and predicative-marked ṭⲉⲕⲕⲁ- (cf. §5.2).

The grammatical analysis of this sentence, with no less than four accusative marked constituents, does not appear straightforward, and it is helpful to look at the Textus Receptus from Jn. 17:2, which Browne identifies as the verse that is translated here. In Greek we read ἵνα πᾶν ὃ δέδωκας αὐτῷ δώσῃ αὐτοῖς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, and at first sight it seems that the Old Nubian follows the Greek original rather faithfully, perhaps to the detriment of its own grammatical coherence. The purposive construction ἵνα [...] δώσῃ “in order to, so that you give” is translated in Old Nubian by the (emended) final verb form [ⲕⲉⲧⲁⲗⲉⲛⲕⲁ], whose indirect object αὐτοῖς is rendered with the accusative ⲉⲕⲉⲧⲁⲗⲉⲛⲕⲁ and direct object ζωὴν αἰώνιον with ⲉⲕⲉⲟⲫ ⲫⲊⲏⲛ ⲫⲊⲟⲩⲱⲱⲡⲓ ⲤⲖⲁⲃⲏ. The translation of the Greek phrase πᾶν ὃ δέδωκας αὐτῷ, with πᾶν “everything, all” in the accusative case and rendered in Old Nubian ⲉⲛ ⲧⲁⲕⲕⲁ ⲧⲓⳝⳝⲓⲥⲛⲁ̄ ⲙⲷϣⲷⲥⲛⲁⲛ ⲕⲉⲧⲁⲗⲉⲛⲕⲁ, is somewhat less intuitive. Note both the genitive subject ⲉⲛ and agreement marking on ⲧⲓⳝⳝⲓⲥⲛⲁ̄ are explicit, to avoid any ambiguity. The King James Bible translation of the Textus Receptus gives the rather fluent “that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him,” whereas Browne translates the Old Nubian with “in order that, as for all you have given him, he may give eternal life to them,” with an inexplicable “as for.” Yet in both translations, ⲉⲛ ⲧⲁⲕⲕⲁ ⲧⲓⳝⳝⲓⲥⲛⲁ̄ ⲙⲷϣⲷⲥⲛⲁⲛ and πᾶν ὃ δέδωκας αὐτῷ δώσῃ are appositions to ⲕⲉⲧⲁⲗⲉⲛⲕⲁ and αὐτοῖς
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respectively. Also note that the plural object marker -‘i in ⲧⲓⲥⲛⲁⲛ refers to the antecedent ⲙϣⲛⲛⲛⲛ-.

5.7 Quantifier raising
Satzinger points out that it is “remarkable” that the construction with -‘i as discussed in §5.3 often appears in the context of the quantifiers ⲙϣⲛⲛⲛⲛ- “all” and ⲙⲙⲙⲛ- “everyone.” This fact, however, seems to support our initial intuition that a constituent marked by predicative and -‘i has moved out of its original position to a higher position (cf. §5.4). This type of movement in the scope of quantifiers in commonly referred to as “quantifier raising,” a result of the interaction between semantics and syntax levels of representation. I repeat here the examples given by Satzinger, which are otherwise grammatically akin to the examples adduced in the previous sections.

<Examples from Satzinger>

72
K. 22.4–9
Rta 53

ⲉⲓⲧⲁ ⲙϣⲛⲛⲛⲛ ⲧⲗⲗⲗⲗⲗ ⲧⲁⳟⲥⲗⲇⲟ ⲁⲩⲟⲩⲗⲅⲟⲩⲗ ⲁⲓ̈ⲟⲩⲗⲉⲛ· ⲧⲗⲗⲗⲗⲟ̄ⲣⲟ ⲟⲩⲉⲕⲅⲛⲐⲛⲉⲛ·

“_all men who act in God’s name, when grudging(?), will obtain nothing from God”

73
P. QI 1 4.12–13
Rta 54

ⲧⲉⲛ ⲙϣⲛⲛⲛⲛ ⲡⲥⲧⲉⲩⲛ ⲇⲓⲙⲉⲧⲁⲗⲟ ⲉⲗⲗⲉⲛⲅⲟⲩⲗⲟ ⳟⲝⲗⲛ ⲇⲟⲩⲇⲛⲛⲛⲛⲑⲛ·

“All living beings who believe in me do not die until eternity” (Jn. 11:27)

74
St. 3.3–8
Rta 57
Ong §4.6a

ⲧⲉⲛ ⲙϣⲛⲛⲛⲛ ⲡⲥⲧⲉⲩⲛ ⲇⲓⲙⲉⲧⲁⲗⲟ ⲉⲗⲗⲉⲛⲅⲟⲩⲗⲟ ⳟⲝⲗⲛ ⲇⲟⲩⲇⲛⲛⲛⲛⲑⲛ·

“And everyone who believes in the cross with their entire heart will stand under (it)”
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In all three examples we find that the constituent including the quantifier has moved to the first position in the clause, leaving behind the rc. Note that we have observed in §5.5 that in a neutral environment rcs always precede a quantifier. In exx. 72–4, however, we find that they all have moved and have been marked by the predicative marker -ⲧ and the emphatic marker -ⲧⲧⲧ.

Whereas exx. 72–4 all showed subjects containing a quantifier, the following examples all feature an object containing a quantifier. In each case the quantifier has moved up to the left edge of the constituent.

Note here the presence of both an overt subject ⲯⲁⲟⲩⲇⲁⲓⲟ̄ⲥⲓⲣⲓ̈ ⲙⲁⲙⲥ̄{·}ⲕⲁⲉⲓⲅⲟⲩⲛⲁ and agreement morphology in the embedded verb ⲁⲩⲉⲓⳝⲥⲁⲛ - (cf. ex. 69), and also observe the curious presence of the nu before the accusative -ⲧⲧⲧ, which unfortunately remains unexplained.

“Oh Peter, my friend, and you, my brothers, you know all the things that the unjust Jews did to me”

And also protect everyone who hopes in his cross”
Van Gerven Oei

I would like to emphasize again that in all above examples of εἰς-topicalization, the topicalized antecedent cannot move out of its constituent, but only moves to its leftmost position, as in above example. This only makes sense under the assumption of head raising movement, a possible interpretative framework for Old Nubian rc5 that I have referred to earlier. This becomes clear when we contrast exx. 72–7 with an example in which the constituent that is topicalized by εἰς is not the antecedent of an attributive rc.

Superficially, this example is similar to ex. 61, functioning as a sort of captioning to the text that follows, in this case a sermon on the four creatures. There are however, notable differences. First of all, it features the suffix -ςιν, which we are by now acquainted with. Furthermore, it seems that the verb has moved out of its original position at the end of the clause. Observe also that the verb has person morphology, while the subject of the clause τὰλην [...] εὐσεβοκλῆς is simply marked with a determiner, as we would expect in a regular sentence. So it seems that we are not dealing with an extraction of an antecedent from an rc, as is suggested by Satzinger, but rather with a different kind of inversion, based on a regular sov sentence; the translation with a passive in English therefore only imitates the word order, but not the morphology. What we are dealing with is...
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starting out as an object of inchoative-, within the usual sov order of an Old Nubian sentence, but which is subsequently topicalized with the predicative and -CHN, moving to the leftmost position in the sentence. What the head raising analysis of RC predicts, is that this type of long-distance movement would be impossible for antecedents in an RC. This seems to be confirmed by exx. 72–7.

6 Extraposition

Old Nubian is an sov language, meaning that modifiers in general precede heads. We have already seen that most attributive RCs, except for certain non-coreferential attributive RCs (§3.3.1), RCs of time, place, and manner (§3.3.2), and RCs in the scope of quantifiers (§5.6), do not follow this pattern. This situation can be accounted for through the head raising analysis of RCs, an analysis that is empirically supported by the existence of anaphors (§3.4), and the constraints on -topicalization and quantifier raising (§5.7). However, in some cases we find that material is transported to the right edge of the clause, usually in a position following the main verb of the sentence. We speak of extraposition when a constituent is partially or fully moved to the right edge of the main clause, therefore appearing after the main verb in its original position.56 Extraposition regularly happens in case of “heavy” constituents, such as coordinated noun phrases, as can be noticed from the following examples. Extraposition only seems to appear in the case of non-coreferential RCs.

The extraposition of the second part of the coordinated noun phrase that is the object of εἰδὴ, is straightforward, as it is moved to the right edge of the main clause. The extraposed clause εἰτόκως ϊἱος Χριστοῦ- itself contains a RC without, however, an explicit subject, as

56 Verbs marked by -λο or with affirmative or imperative case marking often move to a position higher up in the sentence. See also the commentary to ex. 80.
we would expect. Perhaps the fact that the subject is very obvious (i.e., God), allows for it to remain implicit. The interpretation of the verb \textit{ⲉⲭⲣⲓ} is less straightforward. Browne rightly indicates a parallel, if fragmentary, passage in L. 106.18, where again we find \textit{ⲉⲭⲱⲣⲓ} \textit{ⲧⲛ ⲉⲓ}. Scribal error therefore seems to be unlikely. The parallel Textus Receptus of Jn. 17:3 has the regular active form \textit{γινώσκωσιν}. Considering the fact that the entire phrase \textit{ⲉⲣⲟⲩ} \textit{ⲭⲣⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥⲓⲕⲁ} is an apposition to the predicate \textit{ⲁⳡⳝ ⲉⲗⲉⲛ ⲕⲉⲧⲁⲗⲉⲛ}, the expected morpheme would be a predicative -\textit{ⲁ}. Perhaps we are dealing here with a weakening of -\textit{ⲁ} > -\textit{ⲇ}. This intuition seems to be supported by ex. 38, in which we find \textit{ⲉⲭⲣⲓ ⲇⲟⲗⲓⲥⲗ̄ⲕⲁ}, again with an iota instead of an alpha.

Browne translates this sentence with “The Lord will say in the writing: ‘The people and the rulers of these who are born here.’” The issue with this translation is that it fails to account for the genitives on both \textit{ⲧⲟⲩⲣⲁⲛ} and the auxiliary verb \textit{ⲓⲛⲛ̄ⲅⲟⲩⲛ} depending on \textit{ⲧⲏⲧⲖⲧⲁ}, with the heavy noun phrase \textit{ⲟⲛ⳿ ⲉⲓⲛⲛ̄ⲅⲟⲩⲛ} extraposed to the right edge of the sentence. The actual translation is therefore much closer to the Greek of Ps. 86:6 ἐν γραφῇ λαῶν καὶ ἀρχόντων… than Browne’s rendering suggests. The question however remains why the Old Nubian here uses the auxiliary verb \textit{ⲓⲛⲛ̄}. Perhaps this again has to do with the weight of the noun phrase “of the people and the princes who are born there.” Note also that unlike the previous ex. 79, the conjunction \textit{ⲟⲛ⳿} is left behind in the first part of the coordinated noun phrase. Note also that the verb \textit{ⲙⲛⲁⲃⲙ̄ⲙⲁ} has moved leftward, as can be also seen in other examples, such as exx. 32, 41, 77, 87. This leftward verb movement is supposedly related to the presence of the affirmative suffix -\textit{ⲡⲁⲧⲫⲷ}. This type of extraposition appears to happen with certain RCs, where the entirety of the attributive RC is extraposed to the right edge of the main clause, that is, after the main verb. There seems to
be a difference between extraposition of RCs that contain an overt subject and those who do not. Whereas the former do not repeat the case marking of their antecedent on the right edge, the latter do. It remains unclear, however, why this difference exists.

6.1 Relative clauses without overt subject/with agreement

In this example, the long RC with the incomplete subject …]ⲙⲧⲁⲡⲁ “tabernacle” as its antecedent is extraposed and placed after the main verb ⲁⲕⲇⲁⲕⲧⲁⲕⲁⲣⲁ̀ ⲥⲛ̄ with an emended emphatic suffix ⲥⲛ̄. The RC itself includes both a subject in the genitive case and verb with person marking. The noun ⲇⲟⲩⲥⲕⲟⲩⲣⲧⲛ̄⸌ⲅⲟⲩⲗ⸍ⲉⲕⲉⲛⲛⲁ contains a double genitive case marking both before and after the conjunctive suffix -ⲉⲕⲉⲛ “and” (with regressive assimilation) with the plural -ⲅⲟⲩⲗ written on top of it, which I have tentatively inserted before -ⲉⲕⲉⲛ, although we cannot be certain whether this is the correct position. In this and other examples in which the extraposed RC contains a verb with person marking, case marking is not repeated.

The entire clause ending in ⲧⲉⲣⲉ ⲅⲁⳝⲕ̄ⲕⲟⲗ is dependent on ⲙⲑⲉ from the previous page is a case of quantifier raising (§5.7). The verb form ⲧⲉⲣⲉ, from ⲧⲉⲣⲟⲩ-ⲧⲉⲣⲓ- “to bless, praise” is supposedly marked by the predicative, with the common -ⲓ + ⲝ > ⲝ.$^{58}$ The RC ⲇⲟⲩⲥⲕⲟⲩⲣⲧⲛ̄⸌ⲅⲟⲩⲗ⸍ⲉⲕⲉⲛⲛ刑侦, with a repeated verb, is extraposed from the noun phrase ⲙⲛ ⲥⲥⲡⲉ, and is, as in the previous example, not additionally marked for the accusative case.

$^{58}$ Cf. ibid., §3.9.6.1b.
We see in this example a construction that is essentially similar to the previous one, save for the clause on Ꞝⲧⲓⲙⲛⲉ on Ꞝⲧⲓⲙⲟⲩ, which is extraposed completely to the right edge of the sentence, after the main verb Ꞝⲧⲓⲙⲛⲉ in a construction that is similar to ex 80. Note that although Ꞝⲧⲓⲙⲟⲩ, with a diacritical on the iota indicating a new syllable, is indexed as separate hapax adjective, it definitely looks like the verb Ꞝⲧⲓⲙ- with a preterite 2 suffix -ⲇⲓ. In any case, the placement of a possible adjective Ꞝⲧⲓⲙ- after predicative-marked Ꞝⲧⲓⲙⲉ would be curious, and something like *gouea toullisa would be expected. Perhaps a predicative suffix has been lost here before Ꞝⲧⲓⲙ, cf. Ꞝⲧⲓⲙⲉⲧⲓⲙⲉ, whose suffix -ⲇⲉ I cannot explain. Ꞝⲧⲓⲙⲉ and possibly Ꞝⲧⲓⲙⲉ are complex verbal predicates as discussed in §5.2.

6.2 Relative clauses with overt subject/without agreement
In contrast with the examples from §6.1, in case the verb in the extraposed RC is not explicitly marked for person, it carries the same case marking as its antecedent. Just like regular RCs, these extraposed RCs may feature a relative pronoun. As yet it is unclear why an overt subject and/or the absence of agreement marking triggers the repetition of the case marking on the extraposed RC. Perhaps we are in these cases not dealing with extraposition proper as in §6.1, but rather with a full clause adjoined to the right edge of the main clause, in which the case marking signals which constituent the RC is coindexed with.

The extraposed RC Ꞝⲧⲓⲙⲉ on Ꞝⲧⲓⲙⲉ, moved to the right edge of the verb Ꞝⲧⲓⲙⲉ, is marked with the accusative case, just
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like its antecedent in the main sentence εικα. The following two examples both show a relative pronoun:

\[
\text{ㄏⲉⲛ̄ⲕⲁ} \text{ like its antecedent in the main sentence εικα}.
\]

The extraposed RC ⲉⲛ̄ⲕⲁ, extraposed to the right edge after the main verb εικα, is here marked with the same accusative case as its antecedent, 闳ⲉⲛ̄ⲕⲁ, and introduced by a relative pronoun ⲉⲛ̄. A similar extraposition can be found in the following example:

\[
\text{When he saw that egg that he had put away and forgotten}.
\]

The pattern of this example follows the previous one, with an extraposed RC on the right side of _mEπανατο, marked with an accusative case, just like the object of the main verb.

Sometimes the antecedent is extraposed together with the RC:

\[
\text{When he saw that egg that he had put away and forgotten}.
\]

In this example, the complement clause ειφ εικα, dependent on the verb πιστευαγε, “I believe,” is marked as expected with the accusative case -ειφ εικα, although the subject ειφ appears in the nominative and the embedded verb is marked for person. The nominal predicate χριστοςε θεοςκοςς κρολ, which otherwise contains a well-
behaved attributive RC, is extraposed in its entirety to the right edge of the main clause. According to Browne, the clitic тα should be interpreted as an “intensifying prefix.” Its status, however, is uncertain.

Bechhaus-Gerst notes that similar constructions exist in Nobiin, where the antecedent is carried together with the RC to the right edge of the main verb. She gives two examples:

88a  
gelb-on [idea [rel aaw-o]]-ka tiiraa
look.around-pst.3sg woman do-pst.ptcp-acc to
and he looked around to the woman who had done this

88b  
kuñir-oos-on [turba [rel mulee-l finda-fi-i]]
bury-compl-pst.3sg tomb hill-in quarry.out-stat-ptcp
one-in
he buries him in a tomb which had been hewn out in the rock

A final example recapitulates the antecedent in the RC through a personal pronoun, combining extraposition with an anaphor:

84  
ed-d-rō kaj-ka [rel ein [dig]]-el
find-fut-prs.2pl colt-acc rel bound-det
[rel eil tad-ou [ei-gou-la oven-na tad-dō ak-imis-s]-ika]
now 3sg-j man-pl-dat one-gen 3sg-upon sit-NEG-pt2-acc
“You will find a colt that is bound, one upon which no one among men has yet sat” (Mk. 11:2)

The entire extraposed clause ἔλαφῳ καφκα ἔλι δίγι: ἐλ ταλαος εἰγογλα [ο]γεννα ταλαος ακινήσια is marked with the accusative case, just like the object of ἔλαφῳ, καφκα. The border between an extraposed RC and an right-adjoined clause is vague here, because grammatically speaking the antecedent of εἰγογλα [ο]γεννα ταλαος ακινήσι- is not καφκα, but ταλαος. We should however note the other attributive RC in this example, καφκα ἔλι δίγι, which is exceptional both because of the case marking on καφκα instead of on the RC and the presence of a relative pronoun ἔλι, which is unusual in coreferential clauses; we would expect either something like *kajou digika or *digel kajka. It may be posited provisionally that the curious placement of the accusative case and the appearance of the complementizer are related, but for the moment I am unable venture a syntactical explanation.
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7 Preterite tense morphology

In his Old Nubian Grammar, Browne suggests that the distinction between the preterite 1 and preterite 2 forms of the verb is to be found in the broad realm of aspectual difference. However, he makes a cursory remark that the preterite 2 forms are always found when the subject is marked with the genitive case, and that in other cases the preterite 1 form is used.\(^6\) We recall here that a genitive subject only appears in non-coreferential attributive clauses. Therefore we could tentatively reformulate Browne’s casual observation more rigorously: In order to express the past tense, preterite 1 suffixes are used within coreferential attributive clauses, whereas preterite 2 suffixes are used within non-coreferential attributive clauses.

Please consider the following typical examples:

1. \(\text{ⲥ̄ⲗⲟ ⲡⲓⲛⲁ ⲓ̈ⲟⲩⲇⲁⲓⲟⲥⲅⲟⲩⲛ ⲟⲩⲣⲟⲩⲟⲩ ⲟⲛⲛⲟⲩⲧⲁⲕⲟⲗ}\)  
   \(\text{is-lo pi-na [ ioudaios-gou-n ourou-ou [ rel ounn-outak-o]-l bear-pass-PT1-DET}}\)  
   “Where is the born king of the Jews?” (coreferential)

2. \(\text{ⲁⲩⲩⲧⲣⲁⲡ⳿ ⲁ̄ⳡⲣⲁⳟⲁ ⲉⲛ̄ ⲧⲁⲛ⳿ ⲕⲡ̄ⲥⲗ̄ ⲇⲟⲩⲙⲁⲗ}\)  
   \(\text{eυ tan-nta kpios doumal doutrap an-r-aj-a suddenly fowl live-TR-INCH-PRED}}\)  
   “The egg that he had eaten suddenly coming to life as a fowl” (non-coreferential)

The first example shows a coreferential attributive clause \(\text{ⲟⲩⲛⲛⲟⲩⲧⲁⲕⲟⲗ}\), with a preterite 1 suffix -\(l\), whereas the second example features a non-coreferential attributive clause \(\text{ⲉⲛ̄ ⲧⲁⲛ⳿ ⲕⲡ̄ⲥⲗ̄}\), with a preterite 2 suffix -\(s\). This distinction holds for all previously cited examples.

The morphological distinction between these two classes of attributive RCs with preterite/past tense morphology may still be found, albeit sometimes morphologically or phonologically reduced (and glossed differently), in Nobiin:

---
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8 Conclusions

In this article I have given an overview of Old Nubian RCS based on a thorough investigation of the examples and explanations in extant scholarly literature, complemented with new material, both from Old Nubian and modern Nile Nubian languages. As I have shown, comparative evidence from modern languages is at several instances of invaluable assistance for formulating the right analyses for Old Nubian grammar.
Based on our observations as regards Old Nubian rc's, we could summarize our findings as follows, split along the three types originally described by Satzinger as “A,” “B1,” and “B2.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative pronoun</th>
<th>Coreferential rc (“A”)</th>
<th>Non-coreferential rc with overt subject/ without agreement (“B1”)</th>
<th>Non-coreferential rc without overt subject/ with agreement (“B2”)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anaphoric construction Extrapolation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prenominal rc</td>
<td>Yes, with doubled case morphology</td>
<td>Yes, without doubled case morphology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marked with deteminer -ⲓⲗ and with restrictive meaning (left dislocation)</td>
<td>Marked with juncture vowel -ⲟⲩ, subject possibly in nominative case(?)</td>
<td>Marked with juncture vowel -ⲟⲩ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topicational with -ⲓⲩ</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preterite tense morphology</td>
<td>Preterite 1 (-ⲓ/ⲏ)</td>
<td>Preterite 2 (-ⲓⲓ/ⲓⲓ)</td>
<td>Preterite 2 (-ⲓⲓ/ⲓⲓ)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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