

Cecilia Poletto and Emanuela Sanfelici

## 22 Relative clauses

**Abstract:** In this chapter we present an overview of the relative clause system in Romance languages and offer a number of cross-linguistic descriptive generalizations. We will make use of both diachronic and geographical variation, viewing them as two sides of the same coin, which both reveal the type and number of syntactic processes active in relative clauses. The empirical domain we take into consideration includes three different aspects: the paradigm of lexical relativizers, the presence of resumption, and the lack of lexical relativizers in both restrictive and appositive relative clauses. The aim of this article is not to provide new analyses for these phenomena, but to show how cross-linguistic variation can direct our research towards precise generalizations, which in turn have their theoretical relevance for syntactic theories.

**Keywords:** relative clauses, Romance languages, complementizers, resumption, zero relativization, syntax, diachronic and geographical variation

### 1 Introduction

In this work we provide an overview of the relative clause system in Romance languages and dialects and try to systematize our observations on the basis of general factors involved in the variation within this linguistic domain. Relative clauses are defined here as subordinate clauses or clause-like constructions that provide some kind of specification about a nominal which has a semantic and syntactic role in both the main clause as well as the subordinate clause (along the lines proposed in Lehmann 1984; de Vries 2002; Cristofaro 2003). Being subordinate, relative clauses can be finite clauses, infinitival clauses or reduced structures, i.e. participial or adjectival structures. Here we will concentrate on finite relative clauses, leaving the other types aside. Usually, finite relative clauses are introduced by various elements, here labeled with a pretheoretical term as “relativizers”, which signal the syntactic role played by the modified nominal in the relative clause.<sup>1</sup>

Although several authors (see Grosu/Landman 1998) have shown that there are various types of relative clauses, we will discuss the properties of relative clauses

---

<sup>1</sup> A few methodological remarks are in order. The label “relativizer” is used here as a hyperonym for what is usually defined as complementizers, *que/che*-type relativizers, and relative pronouns, *lequel/il quale*-type ones. We will use “relativized element” and “head noun” as synonymous to refer to the noun phrase that is modified by the relative clause (more generally, to the head noun to which the relative clause refers). For a cross-linguistic classification of relativizers we refer the reader to De Vries (2002).

following the two main types standardly assumed in the literature, i.e. appositive and restrictive relatives: the former adds additional information to the reference of the head noun; the latter restricts the reference of the head noun. Due to the wide empirical domain considered and the amount of possible variation, this article cannot be exhaustive, but only present the general picture of relative clauses in Romance in broad brushstrokes, leaving a detailed description of single phenomena and single languages to the cited literature. Nevertheless, we will see that there are clear recognizable tendencies throughout Romance and phenomena which present themselves with an astonishing uniformity especially with respect to the sensitivity to factors influencing the choice of the relativizer. In detail we will show that although in many cases relativizers are sensitive to the grammatical function of the head noun according to the Accessibility Hierarchy proposed by Keenan/Comrie (1977), their form as well as the series of phenomena we deal with ultimately depend on the categorial nature of the relativized element, i.e. nominal or prepositional phrase, and on the syntactic-semantic type of relative clause, i.e. restrictive or appositive.

The chapter is structured as follows: we first present the distribution of two main classes of relativizers (i.e. agreeing and non-agreeing ones) in restrictive and appositive relative clauses (Section 2). Then, we discuss two types of relativizers, adverbial and possessive relativizers and we will show how their different forms interact with the type of antecedent and the type of relative clause.

In this context, we analyze a phenomenon typical of Romance, namely the possibility to double the head noun inside the relative clause through a clitic pronoun, which primarily occurs with non-agreeing relativizers, but can marginally be found also with agreeing ones (Section 3). We then concentrate on so-called ‘zero relativization’, i.e. the absence of a relativizer introducing the relative clause, which is possible under some specific conditions (Section 4). Finally, in Section 5 we conclude by recapping all the empirical generalizations formulated in the previous sections.

## 2 The paradigm of lexical relativizers

Relative clauses in Romance languages can be introduced by four types of elements: (a) the same invariable form that introduces complement clauses, such as Fr./Sp. *que*, It. *che*; (b) interrogative elements, Fr. *où*/It. *dove*/Sp. *donde*; (c) pronominal elements which show agreement with the relativized noun, such as Fr. *lequel*/It. *il quale*/Sp. *el cual*; (d) pronominal elements which appear only in relative clauses and only in some argumental functions but differently from (c) do not show any overt agreement with the head noun, such as Fr. *dont*/It. *cui*/Sp. *cuyo*.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> On the French item *dont* ‘of whom/which’ we refer the reader to Godard (1989), Jones (1996, ch. 10.5.8). The status of this relativizer is difficult to determine. Since it does not inflect for gender and

While the Classical Latin system had pronominal agreeing relativizers with specialized forms throughout the whole paradigm, as shown in Table 1, the various Romance languages have all evolved towards systems that do not mark agreement on the relativizer and use the same invariable element introducing complement clauses, namely the form *que/che* (which we will refer to as *k*-, since the vowel is probably only a word marker) also in restrictive and appositive relative clauses.<sup>3</sup>

**Table 1:** Relative system in Classical Latin

	Singular			Plural		
	Masculine	Feminine	Neuter	Masculine	Feminine	Neuter
Nom.	quī (quei)	quae	quod	quī (quei)	quae	quae
Acc.	quem	quam	quod	quos	quas	quae
Gen.		cuius <sup>4</sup> (quoius)		quorum	quarum	quorum
Dat.		cui (quoi)			quibus (quis)	
Abl.	quō	quā	quō		quibus (quis)	

There exist Romance varieties which have reached the final point of this evolution, i.e. the only possible relativizer is always the invariable *k*-form in both restrictive and appositive relatives. This is the case of colloquial Italian, where forms of the *il quale* type and of the *cui* type are non-existent (Fiorentino 1998) and the *k*-form is often accompanied by a clitic pronoun inside the relative clause (see Section 3 for a discussion of the distribution of clitics).

(1) a. Subject

It. La donna **che** pulisce le scale oggi è malata.  
 the woman **REL** cleans the stairs today is sick  
 ‘The woman who/that cleans the stairs is sick today.’

number and it is insensitive to the semantic properties of its antecedent, it can be considered a ‘relative adverb’. However, *dont* indicates the syntactic function of the constituent it relativizes, i.e., complements or adjuncts introduced by *de*. On this topic, see Stark (2009).

<sup>3</sup> The inflection of relative pronouns was greatly leveled already in Late Latin (Vineis 1994; Pinkster 2012). In Vulgar Latin the forms of interrogative and relative pronouns were interchangeable and the masculine relative *qui* took the place of the interrogative *quis* as well as of the feminine relative *quae* (Grandgent 1907; Pompei 2011). On the diachronic changes in the inflection of the relative pronoun from Vulgar Latin to early Romance we refer to Folea (1961) and Pompei (2011).

<sup>4</sup> The form of the neuter relative pronoun can also be: Gen. Sg. *cuius rei*, Dat. Sg. *cui rei*, Abl. Sg. *qua re*; Gen. Pl. *quarum rerum*, Dat. and Abl. Pl. *quibus rebus*.

## b. Direct Object

It. Il ragazzo **che** ho incontrato ieri era  
 the boy **REL** have.1SG met yesterday was  
 il fratello di Maria.  
 the brother of Maria  
 ‘The boy that I met yesterday was Maria’s brother.’

## c. Indirect Object

It. Il mio amico **che gli** parlo tutti i giorni  
 the my friend **REL him.DAT** speak.1SG all the days  
 verrà a trovar=mi in estate.  
 come.3SG.FUT to visit.INF=me in summer  
 ‘My friend, to whom I talk every day, will come to visit me in summer.’

## d. Possessive

It. Il professore **che** conosco bene i **suoi** lavori  
 the professor **REL** know.1SG well the **his.PL** works  
 parlerà alla conferenza.  
 speak.3SG.FUT at.the conference  
 ‘The professor whose works I know well will give a talk at the conference.’

## e. Temporal

It. L’ anno **che** sono nato ha nevicato moltissimo.  
 the year **REL** am born has snowed a-lot  
 ‘The year when I was born it snowed very much.’

A tendency to generalize the *k*-form to all relativized functions, both with and without resumptive expressions, is also reported in studies on spoken Modern French, Spanish and Portuguese (Lefebvre/Fournier 1978; Bouchard 1982; Schafroth 1995; Fiorentino 1998; Cresti 2000; Stark 2009; 2016).

Contrary to non-standard varieties, the system of most standard Romance languages still presents a mixed system of agreeing and non-agreeing forms. Most Romance standard languages display relativizers that agree with the head noun in gender and number, cf. (2a), (3a), (4a), as well as invariable ones, usually the *k*-form, cf. (2b), (3b), (4b).

- (2) Fr. a. Laure, **laquelle** a 48 ans, a une fille  
 Laure the.which:REL.F has 48 years has a daughter  
 qui est mon amie.  
 REL is my friend  
 ‘Laure, who is 48 years old, has a daughter who is my friend.’  
 b. Le chien **que** j’ ai vu est à mon voisin.  
 the dog **REL** I have seen is at my neighbour  
 ‘The dog that I saw is my neighbour’s.’

- (3) Sp. a. Cerré la puerta, detrás de **la cual** la  
 shut.PST.1SG the door behind of the.F which:REL the  
 fiesta continuaba.  
 party continued  
 ‘I shut the door, behind which the party continued.’
- b. La mujer **que** vive allí es mi tía.  
 the woman REL lives there is my aunt  
 ‘The woman that/who lives there is my aunt.’
- (4) Pt. a. O ator sobre **o qual** falei é muito  
 the actor over the.M which:REL talked.1SG is very  
 talentoso.  
 talented  
 ‘The actor whom I talked about is very talented.’
- b. O homem **que** encontramos ontem é meu amigo.  
 the man REL met.1PL yesterday is my friend  
 ‘The man whom we met yesterday is my friend.’

Differently from the other Romance languages, Romanian has been claimed to lack invariable relativizers and to use only the relative pronoun *care* (Dobrovie-Sorin 1990; 1994), which agrees in number and gender with the extracted noun in oblique relatives.

- (5) Rom. a. Copilul **care** plânge e nepotul meu.  
 child.the REL cries is nephew.the mine  
 ‘The child who is crying is my nephew.’
- b. Fata **pe**<sup>5</sup> **care** am întâlnit=<sup>6</sup> e o fostă  
 girl.the *pe* REL have.1SG met=3SG.F.ACC is a former  
 studentă.  
 student  
 ‘The girl who(m) I have met is a former student.’
- c. Femeia **căreia** i=am vorbit ieri  
 woman.the REL.DAT.SG.F 3SG.DAT=have.1SG talked yesterday  
 e actriță.  
 is actress  
 ‘The woman to whom I talked yesterday is an actress.’

<sup>5</sup> On the accusative case-marking preposition *pe* we refer to Horvath/Grosu (1987) and Dobrovie-Sorin (1994).

<sup>6</sup> In Romanian the relativized element is marked by the presence of a ‘doubling’ Accusative or Dative clitic pronoun within the relative clause (see =*o* in (6b)), which is independently found with non-displaced noun phrases under special circumstances. On this topic we refer to Dobrovie-Sorin (1990; 1994) and von Heusinger/Gáspár Onea (2008).

The relative system in Romanian can be then seen as more conservative than the ones instantiated by the other Romance languages. However, on closer inspection, it turns out that Romanian also displays the double relative system typical of the other Romance languages. For instance, a more archaic use of the language allows for restrictive relative clauses to be introduced by the uninflected relativizer *de*, as in (6).

- (6) Rom. Cina            **de**    ai            gătit=o            ieri  
 dinner.the    **REL**   have.2SG   cooked=SG.F.ACC   yesterday  
 a    fost    delicioasă.  
 has   been   delicious  
 ‘The dinner that you cooked yesterday was delicious.’

Furthermore, Grosu (1994) notes that contemporary non-literary standard Romanian displays *ce* instead of *de* in subject and direct object relatives: *ce* being homophonous with the *wh*-element *what*, but insensitive to the [+/-human] distinction that is on the contrary present in interrogatives, where [-human] is expressed by *ce* ‘what’<sup>7</sup> and [+human] by *cine* ‘who’.

- (7) Rom. a. Am            citit    cartea    **ce**    a            publicat-o  
 have.1SG   read    book.the    **REL**    has    published=SG.F.ACC  
 Paul   anul    trecut.  
 Paul   year.the   last  
 ‘I read the book that Paul published last year.’  
 b. Fata            **ce**    a            venit    e            actriță.  
 girl.the    **REL**   has   come   is            actress  
 ‘The girl that came is an actress.’

We then conclude that the pattern shown by all Romance languages, at least in their standardized form, is to have a mixed system of relativizers including both invariant and agreeing forms.

As for the features expressed on the agreeing relativizer, we saw that the typical features in Romance are number and gender:

- (8) Fr.    a. Voilà    la            piscine    dans    **laquelle**            je    nage.  
 here.is the   pool    inside   the.which:**REL.F.SG** I    swim  
 ‘This is the pool in which I swim.’

<sup>7</sup> Whether *ce* corresponds to forms like *che/que* or *cosa* is an issue we leave to etymological research.

- b. La dame pour **laquelle** je travaille est très sévère.  
 the woman for the.which:REL.F.SG I work is very severe  
 ‘The woman for whom I work is very severe.’

However, in some languages relativizers can also reflect a distinction in terms of animacy, i.e. some relativizers can only be used with animates like the Spanish *quien*:<sup>8</sup>

- (9) Sp. He leído dos cuentos **que /los cuales**  
 have.1SG read two stories REL /the.M.PL which:REL.M.PL  
**/\*quien** me han divertido mucho.  
 /which:REL.AN me have enjoyed a\_lot  
 ‘I read two stories that I enjoyed very much.’

The question is then whether the distribution of invariant and agreeing forms of the relativizer can be described by specific rules. Abstracting away from animacy, we will show that the distribution of agreeing relativizers and non-agreeing ones is determined by two factors: i) the grammatical function of the head noun in the relative clause (subject, direct object, possessive, etc.) and ii) the syntactic-semantic type of relative clause (i.e. if the relative clause is appositive or restrictive).

## 2.1 The function of the head noun

In general, morphologically more complex relativizers tend to co-vary with the grammatical function of the relativized noun:

- (10) Fr. a. la fille **\*laquelle** /**que** tu connais  
 the girl the.which:REL.F.SG /REL you know  
 ‘the girl that you know’  
 b. la fille avec **laquelle** **/\*que** tu dances  
 the girl with the.which:REL.F.SG /REL you dance  
 ‘the girl with whom you dance’

The above examples show that French agreeing relativizers are generally found when the relativized noun is the complement of a preposition, since *que* is not compatible with prepositions, and that on the other hand the invariant form occurs when the element is a direct object (or a subject, in which case it takes the form *qui*). The same

<sup>8</sup> French *lequel* occurs with animates or inanimates, while *qui* is in general only animate when it is combined with a preposition, but not when it refers to the subject.

is true in Italian, but not for instance in **modern** Portuguese or Spanish, where the element *que* is compatible with prepositions (11).<sup>9</sup>

- (11) Pt.    para    o    outro    dia    **em**    **que**    se    matavam  
           for    the    other    day    in    **REL**    REFL.3    killed.3PL  
           ‘for the other day in which they killed themselves.’

Galician displays a different pattern: whereas the simple *que* is used to relativize subjects and direct objects, *que* must be combined with other elements, such as adpositions, articles, or personal pronouns, which signal the syntactic role, gender and number of the antecedent when the relativized element is the complement of a preposition (Cristofaro/Giacalone Ramat 2007, 72–73):

- (12) Gal.    a    rapaza    **co-a**                    **que**    viaxamos  
           the    girl            **with-the.F.SG**    **REL**    travel.1PL  
           ‘the girl with whom we travel’

Hence, similarly to French and Italian, when the relativized noun is the complement of a preposition, Galician must resort to the presence of the agreeing relativizer.

Although this is only a tendency and not a fixed rule, as (11) shows, using agreeing relativizers when the relativized noun is the complement of a preposition might be seen as an instance of the well known Accessibility Hierarchy proposed by Keenan/Comrie (1977), namely that relativizers are sensitive to the grammatical function of the head noun. The lower the function is in the scale in (13), the more morphologically complex the relativizer will be:

- (13) Accessibility Hierarchy (Keenan/Comrie 1977)  
       Subject > Direct Object > Indirect Object > Oblique > Genitive > Object of comparison

However, the implicational scale in (13) does not really capture the distribution of agreeing/non-agreeing relativizers in Romance languages. As Cinque (1978; 1982) and Stark (2016) clearly showed, the distribution of agreeing or non-agreeing relativizers

---

<sup>9</sup> This observation also holds for older stages of Italian and Spanish. For instance, see (i), an example in Old Florentine (see Sanfelici/Poletto 2015).

(i) Mostrami la lancia **con che** Cristo fu ferito nel fianco.  
       ‘Show me the lance with which Christ was wounded in his side.’  
       (*Cronica fiorentina*, 911)

Notice, however, that in Spanish and Portuguese the possibility of a preposition occurring with the relativizer *que* is lexically restricted. On the conditions licensing its occurrence see Brucart (1992) and Veloso (2013).



depends on the distinction between nominal vs prepositional relativized arguments. While the former usually occurs with *che* (the *k*- form), the latter tends to occur with the morphologically complex relativizer. Indeed, relative clauses with predicative and temporal adverbials as antecedents, which should be placed after Oblique or even Genitive in the scale, are necessarily introduced by the non-agreeing form of the relativizer. This is exemplified in (14) with an Italian relative clause having the temporal adverbial *domani* ‘tomorrow’ as the antecedent.

- (14) It.    a. Domani    **che**    sarò            in    ferie        mi            riposerò.  
               tomorrow    REL    be.FUT.1SG    in    holidays    REFL.1SG    rest.FUT.1SG
- b. \*Domani    **il**            **quale**        sarò            in    ferie  
               tomorrow    **the.M.SG**    which:REL    be.FUT.1SG    in    holidays  
               mi            riposerò.  
               REFL.1SG    rest.FUT.1SG  
               ‘Tomorrow when I will be on holiday I will rest.’

We can thus formulate the first empirical generalization:

Generalization 1:

PP complements tend to appear with agreeing relativizers while subject and object relatives, predicative complements and nominal adverbials are rather expressed by non-agreeing ones.

The distribution of agreeing/non-agreeing relativizers is more intricate, especially in subject relative clauses. An apparent exception to the generalization above is the standard French subject relativizer *qui*, which is more complex than *que*, the one used in object relatives. This means that in French, a special form is found with the case that is in the highest position on Keenan and Comrie’s scale, which is unexpected under Generalization 1. In any case, the form *qui* does not agree with the head noun in gender, number or animacy (contrary to Spanish *quien*), when it represents the subject.

- (15) Fr.    a. l’homme/la fille **qui**/**\*que** est venu(e)  
               the man/the girl REL/REL is come  
               ‘the boy/the girl that came’
- b. l’homme/la fille **\*qui/que** tu connais  
               the man/the girl REL/REL you know  
               ‘the boy/the girl that you know’

The semantically neutral *qui* is generally analyzed as a positionally triggered allomorph of the relativizer *que* ‘that’ (as it cannot appear after prepositions, has a phonetically reduced form and also occurs in subordinate sentences with subject extraction other than relative clauses, the so-called ‘*que-qui* rule’; cf. Kayne 1976;

Jones 1996, 507; Taraldsen 2001; Rizzi/Shlonsky 2005; Sportiche 2011). We can conclude that French *qui* only encodes a nominative feature and thus does not represent a real exception to Generalization 1. On the contrary, a true counterexample to our first empirical generalization is represented by some North-western Old Italian varieties which have special relativizers for the subject that are sensitive to animacy and the gender of the head noun (Sanfelici/Caloi/Poletto 2014). For instance, the relativizer form introducing subject relative clauses is sensitive to the animacy of the head noun in Old Ligurian as the following pattern shows: *chi* appears only when the relativized element is animate (16a), otherwise *cue* is found (16b).

(16) Old Ligurian

- a. questa femena **chi** m' à spanyunto questo inguento  
 this woman **REL** me.DAT has spread this unguent  
 adosso  
 on.back  
 'this woman that spread this unguent on me'
- b. Receveyva tuto zo **che** era dayto a Criste.  
 received.3sg all that **REL** was given to Christ  
 'He received all that was given to Christ.'
- (Old Ligurian *Passione* 28)

The fact that a highly specialized form surfaces with the case which is at the beginning of the scale is unexpected under (13) and Generalization 1 and might be interpreted as an indication that Keenan and Comrie's Accessibility Hierarchy as well as our first generalization are the result of the combination of different factors, one of which singles out the subject with respect to all other grammatical functions and the other which can indeed be formalized as the co-variation of the morphological complexity of the relativizer and the complexity of the syntactic function of the head noun in the relative clause encoded by Case. That subject relatives are special with respect to object relatives and to all other relatives has been shown for several languages, including French, Spanish, Portuguese, Romanian and Italian on the basis of psycholinguistic tests on adults and acquisition experiments on children (e.g., Pérez-Leroux 1995 for Spanish; Guasti/Cardinaletti 2003 for French; Utzeri 2007 for Italian; Costa/Lobo/Silva 2011 for Portuguese; Gavarró/Cunill/Muntané/Reguant 2012 for Catalan; Bentea 2012 for Romanian).

In this perspective, the phenomenon of Old Ligurian *chi* is not surprising at all, it is simply the morphological evidence that the nominative subject has to be singled out from all other arguments.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> That subject relatives have a special status is a claim grounded on robust empirical evidence. Indeed, in the last forty years linguists have dedicated a lot of attention to the issue of the asymmetry

This could explain the following empirical generalization, for which we have found no counterexamples:

Generalization 2:

If a language has three different forms of relativizers, one will be dedicated to subject relativization.

This means that subject relatives are special, and languages like Old Italian varieties provide a very clear indication of this.

## 2.2 The relative clause type

Besides the grammatical function of the relativized element, the other factor ruling the distribution of agreeing relativizers is the type of relative clause. Setting aside free relatives,<sup>11</sup> most studies in the literature take the dichotomy between restrictive and appositive relative clauses for granted, although there clearly exist other relative types, notably kind-defining relatives (see Benincà/Cinque 2014), which cannot be placed in either of the two main categories. Here we will focus only on restrictive and appositive relative clauses (cf. Alexiadou et al. 2000, 1–52; Bianchi 2002a,b for a theoretical overview on the types of relative clause). Restrictive relative clauses are defined as predicates denoting properties that combine with the meaning of the nominal head they are attached to in an intersective way. As such, they restrict the set denoted by the nominal expression they modify (Partee 1973; Heim/Kratzer 1998). In

---

between subject and other relatives, with subjects being easier to comprehend and process and acquired earlier than all the other relatives. A variety of accounts has been proposed throughout the decades to individuate the cause(s) at the origin of the special status of subject relatives and a considerable amount of data supporting different theories has been provided. Most accounts can be grouped into two different classes. One group argues that the asymmetry stems from fundamental structural properties of subjects and objects and has therefore to be investigated in a syntactic-cartographic perspective (e.g., Relativized Minimality, cf. Rizzi 1990; 2004). The second group claims that the asymmetry is actually related to enhanced processing difficulties for object relatives, and that questions on the role of components such as working memory and the information integration process in the processing of relative clauses have therefore to be addressed (e.g., the Active Filler Strategy, Clifton/Frazier 1989). We refer to Sanfelici/Caloi/Poletto (2014) for a summary of the various theoretical accounts on the topic.

**11** Free Relatives (FRs) in general are definite descriptions that denote maximal entities (Jacobson 1995; Caponigro 2003): (i) It. *non conosco* [<sub>FR</sub> *chi è stato invitato a cena*] ‘I do not know who was invited to dinner’. FRs are embedded clauses with a gap in an argument or adjunct position and a clause initial *wh*-element. Two types of FRs are individuated in the literature (Munaro 2000; Benincà 2010; 2012): (a) FRs without an overt lexical head as in (i); and (b) FRs headed by a light head, usually a pronoun (*ciò/quello* ‘it/that’) as in (ii) It. *non conosco* [*quello* [<sub>FR</sub> *che è stato invitato a cena*]] ‘I do not know the one that was invited to dinner’.

semantic terms, restrictive relative clauses act like intersective modifiers, such as adjectives or predicates (Heim/Kratzer 1998; von Stechow 2007, among others). With respect to their semantic type, restrictives appear to be simple predicates of the type  $\langle e, t \rangle$ , like intransitive verbs or common nouns (Heim/Kratzer 1998).

Appositive relatives do not combine directly with the denotation of a nominal head, rather they convey additional information about the referent of the DP they relate to and they contain an element that stands in a discourse anaphora relation to the NP they modify (Sells 1985). The interpretation of appositives is similar to a subsequent independent sentence of the type  $\langle t \rangle$  (Sells 1985; Demirdache 1991; Del Gobbo 2003). The semantic difference between restrictives and appositives has been syntactically captured by proposing that restrictive relative clauses are attached at the nominal phrase level, whereas appositives are attached at the determiner phrase level (Partee 1973; Jackendoff 1977; Demirdache 1991; Cinque 2013, among many others).<sup>12</sup>

A general tendency found across Romance is that agreeing relativizers (i.e. morphologically more complex forms) tend to surface with appositive rather than with restrictive relative clauses. For instance, French can use *lequel* for subject and, though rarely, direct object in appositive relatives (17a), but not in restrictive relative clauses (17b) (Damourette/Pichon 1983/1927–1940):

- (17) Fr.    a. Marie, **laquelle**                    tu connais  
               Marie    the.which:REL.F.SG    you know  
               ‘Marie, whom you know’  
               b. la fille    \***laquelle**                    tu connais  
               the girl    the.which:REL.F.SG    you know  
               ‘the girl that you know’

The same distribution based on the type of relative clause is found for Spanish *quien* and *el cual*, as well as for *il quale* in Italian (see Cinque 1978; Brucart 1992; Benincà/Cinque 2010): the agreeing relativizer is found in appositives but not in restrictives:

- (18) Sp.    a. ?el bolígrafo, **el**                    **cual**                    no escribe bien  
               the pen            the.M.SG    which:REL.M.SG    not writes well  
               ‘the pen, which does not write well’  
               b. \*el bolígrafo    el                    cual                    no escribe bien  
               the pen            the.M.SG    which:REL.M.SG    not writes well  
               ‘the pen which does not write well’

---

<sup>12</sup> In recent decades a lively debate has developed concerning the proper syntactic analysis of relative clauses. Due to space limits, we cannot summarize the different approaches (for an overview, see the introduction in Alexiadou et al. 2000; Bianchi 2002a,b; De Vries 2002).

If morphological and semantic complexity go hand in hand as suggested by Keenan and Comrie's generalization, then this points towards the conclusion that appositive relative clauses involve semantically more complex operations than restrictive relatives (see Potts 2005). Not only do appositives differ from restrictives in terms of their semantics, but they also involve an additional operation that is not present in restrictives. Von Stechow (2007) proposes that appositives are similar to restrictives in being predicates of the type  $\langle e, t \rangle$ , but that in addition to restrictive relatives, they have a further modification rule that expresses a presupposition on the reference of the head noun. Del Gobbo (2007) assumes that at LF appositives are moved and interpreted outside the matrix clause as an independent utterance.

Given the more complex semantic operations involved in appositives, we may conclude that this complexity is reflected in the use of morphologically complex relativizers.

It is nonetheless the case that appositive clauses can also be introduced by the *k*-form. The alternation between agreeing and *k*-forms in appositives is an issue too complex to be dealt with here. We simply mention that Cinque (2008) identifies at least two types of appositive relative clauses: (a) integrated ones, which are integrated in the DP projections as adjectives are, thus having a derivation similar to that of restrictive relatives, and which occur with the *k*-form, and (b) non-integrated ones, which are not integrated in the DP projections but linked to the antecedent at the discourse level and which generally occur only with agreeing relativizers, such as *il quale* but never with the *k*-form. Hence, the possibility to have more than one type of relativizer in appositive relative clauses might be related to the fact that appositive relatives are most probably not a unitary type and each subtype requires a different relativizer (cf. Del Gobbo 2007 and subsequent work).

### 2.3 Other forms of the relativizer: relative adverbials and possessive relativizers

Further support for the claim that the distribution of the type of relativizer depends on the categorial nature of the relativized element, i.e. whether it is nominal or the complement of a preposition as proposed in Generalization 1, can be found in relative clauses on temporal and locative adverbials. Cinque (2013, ch. 10) distinguishes three classes of temporal adverbials: (a) temporal adverbials that optionally take a preposition (19a), (b) adverbials that obligatorily take a preposition (19b), and (c) adverbials that never take a preposition (19c).

- (19) It.    a. La    proposta    Banfi    è    stata    discussa    (in)    quel    giorno.  
           the    proposal    Banfi    is    been    discussed    in    that    day  
           ‘Banfi’s proposal was discussed (on) that day.’

- b. La proposta Banfi sarà discussa \*(in) quella occasione.  
 the proposal Banfi be.FUT.3SG discussed in that occasion  
 ‘Banfi’s proposal will be discussed on that occasion.’
- c. Gianni sbaglia \*(in) ogni volta.  
 Gianni makes-mistakes in every time  
 ‘Gianni makes a mistake every time.’  
 (from Cinque 2013, 124)

Given our Generalization 1, we formulate the following predictions:

- (a) We should expect that, relativizing on an adverbial of class (a), the relative clause will be introduced either by a preposition plus a relativizer of the type *cui/il quale* or by *che*, depending on whether a preposition has been selected for the adverbial position in the relative clause, or not.
- (b) On the other hand, we should expect that, relativizing on an adverbial of class (b), the relative clause may never be introduced by *che* but will be introduced by prepositions plus a relativizer of the type *cui/il quale*.
- (c) We should expect that, relativizing on an adverbial of class (c), the relative clause will only be introduced by *che*, never by prepositions plus a relativizer of the type *cui/il quale*.

These predictions are borne out as shown in the examples under (20).

(20) a. Class (a)

It. il giorno **che/ in cui/ nel quale** è stata  
 the day **REL/ in REL.DAT/ in.the.M.SG** which:REL.SG is been  
 discussa la proposta Banfi  
 discussed the proposal Banfi  
 ‘the day (on) which Banfi’s proposal was discussed’

b. Class (b)

It. per l’occasione **\*che/ <sup>ok</sup>in cui/ <sup>ok</sup>nella quale**  
 for the occasion **REL/ in REL.DAT/ in.the.M.SG** which:REL.SG  
 si discuterà la proposta Banfi  
**CL.REFL** discuss.FUT.3SG the proposal Banfi  
 ‘for the occasion on which Banfi’s proposal will be discussed’

c. Class (c)

It. dalla volta **che /\*in cui /\*nella quale**  
 from.the:F.SG time **REL /in REL.DAT /in.the:M.SG** which:REL.SG  
 l’ ho conosciuta  
**CL:ACC** have:1.SG known  
 ‘since the time I met her’  
 (adapted from Cinque 2013, 125)

This shows that our first generalization (cf. Generalization 1) is descriptively more accurate than the Accessibility Hierarchy proposed by Keenan/Comrie (1977): the distribution of relativizers depends on the distinction nominal vs prepositional arguments.

Non-prepositional adverbials (classes (a) and (c)), both locative and temporal ones, can also be relativized by dedicated forms of the relativizers, such as Fr. *où* ‘where’, Cat. *quan* ‘when’, *on* ‘where’, Sp. *donde* ‘where’ or *cuando* ‘when’, Rom. *când* ‘when’ and *unde* ‘where’. These relativizers are interrogative non-agreeing forms, which can appear in both restrictive and appositive relatives. As claimed by Munaro/Poletto (2014) looking at many Italian varieties, locative and temporal adverbials are morphologically complex elements. For instance, the decomposition of the various formatives of the *wh*-item ‘where’ in Italian varieties has revealed that the relativizer *dove* ‘where’ is made up of at least three types of elements: (a) a prepositional formative, which can correspond to the preposition *in* ‘in’, *di* ‘of’ or *da* ‘from’ or a combination of them, (b) a vocalic formative *o/u* derived from the *u-* of Latin *ubi* (or possibly *unde*), which probably marks the *wh*-value of ‘where’, and (c) a deictic distal locative element of the ‘there’ type derived from various sources such as *illac*, *-nd* of *unde* and *-v* corresponding to the *b-* formative in Latin *ubi*.

We might think that Romance languages differ with respect to the number of formatives morphologically realized in the locative relativizer. For instance, in French the relativizer *où* lacks the lexical realization of the prepositional formative, which suggests that French *où* is less specified than Italian *dove*. That Italian *dove* and French *où* are different is shown by studies on acquisition. Indeed, it has been reported that French-speaking children produce subject and object relative clauses with the uninflected relativizer *où* more often and earlier than relative clauses with the relativizer *qui/que* (Guasti/Cardinaletti 2003). On the contrary, in no acquisitional study on Italian, Spanish and Romanian, languages in which the locative relativizer is morphologically richer, are children reported to resort to this strategy: children produce relative clauses introduced by the uninflected *que/che* (Pérez-Leroux 1995 for Spanish; Belletti/Contemori 2010 for Italian; Sevcenco/Avram/Stoicescu 2014 for Romanian). These results might be taken as evidence that French *où* is less specified than Italian *dove* and hence, it can appear in broader contexts.

Besides the grammatical role of the antecedent, the distribution of relativizers is also regulated by the relative clause type. This is shown by possessive relativizers. As seen in the case of adverbials, there are several options for expressing possession in a relative clause. Possessors are relativized by uninflected French *dont*, the genitive form of the relative pronoun *care* in Romanian, and the inflecting relativizers Sp. *cuyo* and It. *cui*. Besides these relativizers, possessors can also be introduced by the agreeing relativizer, It. *il quale*/Sp. *el cual*, usually preceded by the preposition *di/de* ‘of’. In spoken varieties, speakers tend to use an alternative construction, i.e. the uninflected relativizer *che/que* followed by the noun modified by the possessive determiner. The following word orders are attested within Romance languages, here

exemplified with examples from Spanish and Italian (Cinque 1978 for Italian; Suñer 1998 for Spanish).

(21) a. P + *cui/cuyo* .... N

It. il professore di cui conosco il figlio  
 the professor of REL.GEN know.1SG the son  
 ‘the professor of whom I know the son’

b. *cuyo/cui* + N

Sp. el padre cuyo hijo vino  
 the father REL.GEN son came  
 ‘the father whose son came’

c. N + P + *qual-/cual-*

Sp. el padre el hijo del cual vino  
 the father the son of.the.M.SG which:REL.M.SG came  
 ‘the father the son of whom came’

d. *que/che* + POSS + N

Sp. el padre que su hijo vino  
 the father REL his son came  
 lit. ‘the father that his son came’

e. *qual-/cual-* + POSS + N

Sp. el padre el cual su hijo vino  
 the father the.M.SG which:REL.M.SG his son came  
 lit. ‘the father who his son came’

Not all the word orders are grammatical in each Romance language. For instance (21a) is not attested in Spanish, whereas (21e) is not attested in Italian; Catalan only allows the strategy (21c) (see also Brucart 1999, 504–505; Dobrovie-Sorin/Giurgea 2013, ch. 6 and 10).<sup>13</sup>

As shown by Cinque (2008), it is only when the possessor is realized by the relativizer *qual-* that the noun can precede it. Indeed, a sentence like *\*il padre il figlio di cui arrivò* with the noun preceding the relativizer *di cui* leads to ungrammaticality. According to Cinque, strategy (21c) can only appear in a subclass of appositive relative clauses (cf. Cinque 2008), suggesting that when the possessor is relativized, the distribution of the type of relativizer may also depend on the type of relative clause.

<sup>13</sup> With a special intonation break before the N, in Colloquial Italian the word order P + *cui* + N may also be acceptable: *il professore di cui il figlio conosco* ‘the professor of whom the son I know’.



## 2.4 Cumulative effects

So far we have tried to provide evidence for the fact that two parameters are responsible for the alternation between uninflected and inflected relativizers, namely the categorial nature of the extracted element, i.e. DP or PP (see our first generalization (Generalization 1)) and the type of relative clause. However, in all Romance languages we observe an interaction between the two parameters: for instance, in Standard Italian the form of the agreeing relativizer found in appositive relative clauses as in (22a) is also found in oblique restrictive relatives selected by a preposition (22b).<sup>14</sup>

- (22) It.    a. Mario, il                quale            mi            piace    molto  
               Mario the.M.SG    which:REL    me.DAT    likes    a\_lot  
               ‘Mario, whom I like very much’  
               b. il    ragazzo    con    il            quale            ho            parlato    ieri  
               the boy        with    the.M.SG    which:REL    have.1SG    spoken    yesterday  
               ‘the boy with whom I spoke yesterday’

We can then formulate the third empirical generalization:

Generalization 3:

If a language has two forms of relativizers which are sensitive to the relative clause type, the one used in appositive relative clauses will also be used in restrictive relative clauses with prepositions.

This seems to indicate that complex morphology is sensitive to both factors singled out above; i.e. the relative clause type and the syntactic function of the head noun in the relative clause.<sup>15</sup> In other words, if we have at least two relativizers, they tend to realize both complements of prepositions and the more complex case of relatives, namely appositives with respect to restrictives. This can be interpreted as a reflex of a general principle, namely that a complex semantics and/or a complex syntax give rise to a more complex morphology.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> The same is true of written French, where appositive subject relatives can have *lequel* as their relativizer: *Elle était avec son mari, madame Homais et le pharmacien, lequel se tourmentait beaucoup sur le danger des fusées perdues* (Flaubert, *Mme Bovary*, II, 8).

<sup>15</sup> This suggests that there must be a structural link between appositive and restrictive oblique relative clauses. Whether they involve the same structure, the same derivation and/or the same type of movement will be our next research topic. On a proposal to unify their derivation see Cinque (1978; 1982).

<sup>16</sup> This could be seen as a loose version of Baker’s (1985) mirror principle, which states that morphology and syntax reflect each other, but it is most probably a condition suggesting that the various modules of grammar work in parallel, i.e. that the interface is not as complex as one might think. In our case, it is not the order of the syntactic projections that gives rise to the order of the morphemes; rather,

### 3 Doubling phenomena

The same two factors singled out above to account for the distribution of relativizers (i.e. the grammatical function and the relative clause type) also determine the distribution of doubling in Romance languages: doubling phenomena are in general more frequently found in the low oblique positions of the Accessibility Hierarchy and in appositive relative clauses.<sup>17</sup>

The doubling strategy is usually characterized in the literature as typical of non-standard relative clauses in Romance (cf. Schafroth 1993). Overall, relative clauses with resumptive pronouns are relatively rare both in the history of Romance standard languages (Schafroth 1993, 81–164) and in contemporary corpora of spontaneous speech (Stark 2009, 6) in French, Italian, Spanish and Brazilian Portuguese. In addition, doubling is a typical non-standard phenomenon (Stark 2009), since it is criticized as a redundancy by prescriptive grammarians. There is no agreement about the exact socio-stylistic marking of resumption in relative clauses.<sup>18</sup> As Stark (2016, section 4.4) states, using resumptives is most certainly not directly bound to informality, but perhaps to phonic communication (Alfonzetti 2002, 31; Stark 2009, 8 and 10).

Whereas no resumption tends to occur in the highest position of the hierarchy, resumptives are obligatory in all non-subject relative clauses in Romanian.

- (23) Rom. a. Arată=mi      pisica      (pe)      **care**      câinele      **o**  
                  show=me.DAT    cat.the                              **which:REL**    dog.the      **her.ACC**  
                  fugărește.  
                  chase.3sg
- b. \*Arată=mi      pisica      (pe)      **care**      câinele      fugărește.  
                  show=me.DAT    cat.the                              **which:REL**    dog.the      chase.3sg  
                  ‘Show me the cat that the dog chases.’

---

the existence of a complex morphology is justified by the existence of complex semantic and/or syntactic operations.

<sup>17</sup> Three types of resumptive pronouns with respect to their syntactic distribution are distinguished in the literature: optional, which occur in DP argumental positions; obligatory, occurring with PPs and in possessive positions; intrusive, allowed only in certain contexts, e.g., rescuing island violation (cf. Shlonsky 1992; Suñer 1998). Since the three types of resumptive pronouns behave quite differently and a characterization of their properties is beyond the scope of this work, we will limit ourselves to briefly deal with obligatory resumptive pronouns as in (24b,c) and optional ones, as in (24a). For a treatment and a theoretical account of resumption in relative clauses we refer to Bianchi (2011).

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Gadet (1995, 153) for French, Schafroth (1993, 303–306), Alfonzetti (2002, 162) for Italian, Suñer (1998) for Spanish, Blanche-Benveniste (1990, 324–325) for French, Spanish, and Portuguese.

In sub-standard Colloquial Italian, whereas in direct object relative clauses the resumptive pronoun is usually optional, in the lower oblique positions, resumptive pronouns tend to be obligatory.<sup>19</sup>

- (24) It. a. Mario, **che** (l') ho incontrato ieri è partito  
 Mario **REL CL.ACC** have.1sg met yesterday is left  
 per Milano.  
 for Milan  
 'Mario, whom (him) I met yesterday, left for Milan.'
- b. Mario, **che** \*(gli) ho parlato ieri è partito  
 Mario **REL CL.DAT** have.1sg talked yesterday is left  
 per Milano.  
 for Milan  
 'Mario, to whom (to him) I talked yesterday, left for Milan.'
- c. Mario, **che** \*(ne) ho parlato ieri, è partito  
 Mario **REL CL.GEN** have.1sg talked yesterday is left  
 per Milano.  
 for Milan  
 'Mario, about whom (of whom) I talked yesterday, left for Milan.'

However, older stages of Italian suggest that the link between resumption and the grammatical function according to the Accessibility Hierarchy is not so straightforward. It seems indeed that the emergence and spreading of resumptives in relative clauses does not properly follow the Hierarchy. For instance, in a corpus study of twenty-nine Old Florentine texts dated around the thirteenth century, the pattern *che* plus resumptive clitics appears in object relative clauses first (De Roberto 2008, 314–316). The situation is replicated in the fourteenth-century texts. For the arguments in the lower position of the hierarchy, such as indirect object, the relativizer *cui* (or *cui* preceded by a preposition) appears. This finding suggests that the generalization according to which resumptives follow the Accessibility Hierarchy is partial and that the interaction between resumption and relative clauses is governed by other factors, i.e. the relativizer paradigm, for instance, rather than only by the grammatical function of the relativized element.

As already shown in Section 2.1, subject relatives are special in many ways. Another phenomenon showing that they behave differently from other relatives is

---

<sup>19</sup> Evidently, the use of resumptive pronouns in relative clauses is crucially linked to the more general system of clitics and accordingly, their being obligatory or optional should also be seen in that perspective. This picture is simplified and all the claims should be intended as such. The phenomenon of resumption is indeed heterogeneous depending on the type of resumptive, i.e. obligatory, optional and intrusive (see fn. 17), the properties of the clitic system, the grammatical function and the syntactic context in which it appears.

doubling. For instance, some varieties of French, such as Quebec Colloquial French, display cases of subject relative clauses introduced not by the relativizer *qui*, but by *que*, obligatorily followed by a resumptive expression, either a clitic or a pronoun, coreferential to the antecedent (Auger 1993; 1994, 76–91).

- (25) Fr. J' étais pas une personne **que** j' avais beaucoup d' amis.  
 I was not a person **REL** I had a.lot of friends  
 'I was someone who didn't have a lot of friends.'  
 (from Auger 1994, 77)

The forms *qui* and *que* plus subject clitics seem to be in complementary distribution in Quebec Colloquial French. It can be hypothesized that the function of marking the subject relative is transferred from the relativizer itself to the clitic in Quebec Colloquial French, and this is probably also what happens in languages such as Venetian for the whole paradigm and not only for the subject (see Benincà/Vanelli 1982).<sup>20</sup>

Resumption is not a phenomenon linked only to the grammatical function of the relativized element: its distribution is also sensitive to the relative clause type. Resumption is indeed more often attested in appositive relative clauses (cf. Blanche-Benveniste 1990, 333 for French; Bernini 1991, 179 and Alfonzetti 2002, 69–96 for Italian; Brucart 1999, 405 for Spanish). Moreover, in certain northern Italian dialects (Venetian, Paduan), resumptive pronouns can optionally appear but only in appositives (26a), whereas they are excluded from restrictive relative clauses (26b).

- (26) Vto. a. Mario, che **LO** go visto ieri, ze partio.  
 Mario **REL** him.ACC have.1SG seen yesterday is left  
 'Mario, whom I saw yesterday, left.'  
 b. \*El fio che **LO** go visto ieri ze partio.  
 the boy **REL** him.ACC have.1SG seen yesterday is left  
 'The boy, that him I saw yesterday, left.'

The Venetian situation resembles the pattern identified for Old Florentine, which allows a clitic resumptive only in appositive relatives, but not in restrictive or in free relatives (Benincà/Cinque 2010).

On the basis of this evidence, we can formulate the following empirical generalization:

---

<sup>20</sup> Many (Gallo-)Romance varieties exhibit obligatory subject clitics in relative clauses, e.g., Picard, some Swiss Francoprovençal dialects, and northern Italian dialects other than Friulian (Cennamo 1997). See also Gadet (1995) for different regional and social French varieties.

## Generalization 4: First attempt

If resumption is allowed in restrictive relative clauses then it is also allowed in appositives.

Once again, this seems to suggest that appositive relative clauses may involve more complex processes either in the syntax or in the semantics or in both components.

At the same time, there is actually evidence that the implicational scale is more complex than what is stated in Generalization 4. Romance languages like Spanish or certain Italian dialects show that two types of restrictive relatives must be individuated on the basis of the possibility of allowing optional resumptives: only specific restrictive relatives allow for resumptive pronouns, while in non-specific relative clauses, e.g., those whose antecedent has a generic interpretation, resumptive pronouns cannot appear (cf. Bianchi 2011). This restriction is exemplified in (27) with Spanish examples:

- (27) Sp. a. ?Yo conozco un doctor **que él** gana mucho dinero.  
 I know a doctor **REL CL.NOM.3SG** earns much money  
 Lit. 'I know a doctor that he earns a lot of money.'
- b. Un doctor **que (\*él)** gana mucho dinero no puede  
 a doctor **REL CL.NOM.3SG** earns much money not can  
 ser honesto.  
 be honest  
 Lit. 'A doctor that he earns a lot of money cannot be honest.'  
 (from Bianchi 1999b, 93)

The same specificity effect is also attested in some northern Italian dialects: if the antecedent in a restrictive relative clause has a specific interpretation, then a resumptive clitic appears (28a); on the contrary when the antecedent is not specific, clitics are not allowed (28b).

## (28) Northern It. dialect (Dosolo, Lombardy)

- a. U vest an gat **ca l** gneva in ca' tua.  
 have.1sg seen a cat **REL CL.NOM.3SG** entered in house your  
 Lit. 'I saw a cat that he entered your house.'
- b. An gat **ca (\*l)** ven in ca mia l' è  
 a cat **REL CL.NOM.3SG** enters in house my **CL.NOM.3SG** is  
 fürtüna.  
 lucky  
 Lit. 'A cat that he comes into my house is lucky.'

The link between the presence of resumption and the specificity effects suggests that it is the resumptive that reflects the specific interpretation of the antecedent. In

conclusion, examples (27) and (28) show that optional resumption in relative clauses follows a more fine-grained implicational scale which identifies two types of restrictive relative clauses, specific and non-specific ones: appositive > restrictive specific > restrictive non-specific/maximizing.<sup>21</sup>

Generalization 4:

If resumption is allowed in specific restrictive relative clauses then it is also allowed in appositives.

We conclude that the distribution of doubling varies according to three factors: (a) the type of relative clause, (b) the grammatical function of the head noun in the relative clause, and (c) the nature, i.e. definiteness and/or specificity, of the nominal expression. Besides, resumption also varies according to specific conditions under which each argument enters doubling in each language, i.e., languages with differential object marking have a different syntax from those that do not have it, and languages where clitics are obligatory with all types of nominal expressions will also display them in relative clauses.<sup>22</sup>

The last point we would like to address here regards the link between resumption and the lexical type of relativizer. The typological literature has proposed the empirical generalization according to which in every language a relative pronoun – such as It. *il quale* – excludes a resumptive pronoun or clitic (Downing 1978; Lehmann 1984; De Vries 2002, among others). At first sight this seems to hold also in Romance. Indeed, in all the examples above the resumptive expression always occurs inside a relative clause introduced by the *k*-form and not by the agreeing relativizer. Although the tendency is clearly to use the resumptive expression with the *k*-form in all Romance languages, the presence of resumptive expressions with morphologically complex relative pronouns is nonetheless attested. This is the case, for instance, of sub-standard Modern Colloquial French:<sup>23</sup> in (29) the genitive form of the relative pronoun *dont* is doubled by the clitic *en* (Fiorentino 1999, 37).

---

**21** While the literature usually agrees in claiming that non-restrictive relative clauses can encode a variety of semantic relations and hence have different syntactic representations (on this topic we refer to Del Gobbo 2007), this may also be true for restrictive relative structures, which may also be a heterogeneous category among which different types can be singled out not only across different languages, but also within the same language (as already proposed by Aoun/Li 2003).

**22** For instance, in the Italian dialect spoken in Bassano, dative clitics are obligatory. Hence, the prediction will be to find dative clitics also in free relative clauses. This prediction is borne out: *Mi so a chi che te ghe ghè comprà i ociai* 'I know to whom you (to him) gave the glasses'. It then must be stressed that the implicational scale in (34) refers to optional resumptive expressions only.

**23** Note that (35) is marked as sociolinguistically extremely low, as a signal of lack of education (cf. Stark 2009).

- (29) Fr.    une chose **dont**        tu    peux **en**        être fier  
           a    thing **REL.GEN**    you can **CL.GEN** be    proud  
           Lit. ‘a thing of which you could be proud of it’

The same observation holds for Italian. In (30) the form of the relative introduced by the preposition is doubled by the resumptive clitic *ne*, both with *cui-* and *quale-* relativizers (Fiorentino 1999, 32).

- (30) It.    a. È il problema aldilà della modellizzazione **di cui**  
           is the problem beyond of.the modeling        of REL.GEN  
           ne abbiamo parlato.  
           CL.GEN have.1PL talked  
           Lit. ‘it is the problem beyond the modeling about which of it we talked.’  
           b. [...] dei            quali            nessuno naturalmente ne  
           of.the.M.PL which:REL.PL nobody obviously CL.GEN  
           parla.  
           talks  
           Lit. ‘[...] about whom nobody obviously talks of them.’

Instances like (29) and (30) are scarcely attested and are defined as cases of hypercorrection (cf. Stempel 1964; Godard 1989; Gadet 1995; Fiorentino 1998; Stark 2004, among others). However, these examples are enough to cast doubts on the universality of the empirical generalization and revise it as a tendency:

Generalization 5:

If there is a resumptive expression in the relative clause, the relativizer usually displays the non-agreeing form.

## 4 Zero relatives

The typological literature reports that relative clauses can also lack the lexical relativizer. Romance languages, however, have always been claimed to never instantiate such an option: indeed, the standard languages do not allow for any drop of the relativizer. Contrary to this observation, it is possible to find cases of zero relativizers (i.e. the lack of a relativizer at the beginning of the clause) in various Old and Modern Romance varieties. As seen for the phenomena discussed above, we see that the distribution of zero relativization also depends on the same two parameters, i.e. the grammatical function of the head noun and the type of relative clause.

For instance, in the older stages of Romance zero relativization most frequently occurred in non-subject relatives (e.g., in Old Italian, Old Spanish, Old Portuguese, cf. Scorretti 1991, and references cited therein). The Tuscan variety of the fourteenth and

fifteenth centuries studied by Benincà (1995) also allows for zero relativization, which is mainly found in restrictive object relative clauses (see also Bianchi 1999a, 237):

- (31) OIt. Ruppe una legge Ø aveano i Pistoiesi.  
 broke.3SG a law Ø had.3PL the Pistoiesi  
 ‘He broke a law that the Pistoiesi had.’  
 (Compagni, *Cronica*, I, XXV, p. 103)

Note that in (31) the lexical subject in the relative clause appears in a postverbal position. Usually in object- as well as in oblique-relative clauses, the subject is also a null pronominal element as in (32).

- (32) OIt. In capo non portano nulla, se no una corda lunga .x. palmi  
 on head not wear nothing if not a rope long X palms  
 Ø si volgono atorno lo capo.  
 Ø CL.3PL wrap around the head  
 ‘They wear nothing on their head, except a rope ten palms long that they put around the head.’  
 (Milione, XLV, 7, p. 62)

It seems that Old Florentine allows for zero relativization in non-subject relatives, but only under specific conditions: the subject in the relative clause must be a full lexical noun in postverbal position as in (31) or a silent pronoun as in (32).

Examples (31) and (32) confirm the observation by Downing (1978) and Comrie (1981) according to which zero relativization is avoided with subject relatives: subject relatives demand a sentence-initial relative element. Hence, these examples strengthen the observation that subject relativization should be singled out with respect to the relativization of all other grammatical functions (see Section 2.1 and example (25)).

Nevertheless, there exist languages that display zero relativization when the relativized element is the subject of the relative clause, hence this generalization is at most a tendency, not a universal ban against zero relativization in subject relatives (Lehmann 1984, 80–85; De Vries 2002, 37).<sup>24</sup> For instance, in Old Occitan (33), Old French (34) and Renaissance Florentine (35) the subject relative clause is not introduced by any lexical relativizer.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>24</sup> See Lehmann (1984, 80–85) on zero relativization in Appalachian English. Furthermore several languages even use zero relativization as a main strategy also in subject relative clauses, e.g. Lakota and Yucatecan.

<sup>25</sup> On the contexts in which zero relativizers are licensed in Old Romance languages we refer to Folena (1961), Alisova (1965), Lefebvre/Fournier (1978, 282), Wanner (1981), Jensen (1990), Kunstmann (1990), Buridant (2000) and Labelle (2006).



(33) OOc. No i aura un Ø no veia son arnes.  
 NEG there be.FUT one Ø not see.SBJV.3SG his equipment  
 ‘There will not be one who does not examine his equipment.’  
 (from Jensen 1986, 364)

(34) OFr. Mais il n’ a membre Ø ne li dueille.  
 but he NEG has limb Ø NEG him.DAT hurt.SBJV.3SG  
 ‘But he does not have a limb that does not hurt.’  
 (from Jensen 1990, 498)

(35) OIt. Fece venire Papa Eugenio tutti e’ dotti  
 made.3SG come.INF Pope Eugene all the educated  
 uomini Ø erano in Italia.  
 men Ø were in Italy  
 ‘Pope Eugene gathered all the educated men who were in Italy.’  
 (Bisticci da Vespasiano, *Le vite*, 15, 1, 17)

The other factor influencing the possibility of zero relativization is the type of relative clause: again, the typological literature (De Vries 2002; 2005) observes that zero relativization is found in restrictive but not in appositive relative clauses: “at least in the Romance and Germanic languages (and perhaps in any language) appositive relative clauses must be introduced by a relative element” (De Vries 2002, 226). This observation is supported by the overview in De Roberto (2008) on Old Florentine: only restrictives allow for zero relativization.

However, Benincà (1995) notes that **modern** Florentine does not tolerate zero relatives in restrictive relatives but does so in appositives.<sup>26</sup>

(36) Florentine  
 a. \*L’ ho detto al ragazzo Ø l’ ho visto  
 CL.ACC have.1SG said at.the boy Ø CL.ACC have.1SG seen  
 ieri.  
 yesterday  
 ‘I said that to the boy that I saw yesterday.’

---

<sup>26</sup> Since Cinque (2008) has shown that there are at least two types of appositive relative clauses, one might wonder whether zero relativizers are only possible in one subtype. We leave this problem to future research.

- b. L' ho detto a Mario, Ø l' ho visto  
 CL.ACC have.1SG said at Mario Ø CL.ACC have.1SG seen  
 ieri.  
 yesterday  
 'I said that to Mario, whom I saw yesterday.'

Furthermore, looking at the relative clauses in the ASIt database<sup>27</sup> on Italian varieties, we found ten instances of zero relativization and all of them were appositive relative clauses, as for example in (37). On the contrary restrictive relative clauses were always introduced by a lexical relativizer.

- (37) Calabrian Mario Ø mi imbattiu aieri  
 Mario Ø me.DAT met.1SG yesterday  
 stamattina partiu.  
 this.morning left  
 'Mario, whom I met yesterday, left this morning.' (Locri, Calabria)

Two further factors that seem to play a role in licensing zero relativization are the definiteness of the antecedent and the mood of the predicate in the relative clause. For instance, Romanian does not usually allow zero relativization, but under specific conditions the relativizer can be absent: (a) with an indefinite or negatively quantified antecedent, or (b) with the predicate in the relative clause inflected for subjunctive mood.<sup>28</sup>

- (38) Rom. Nu-i nimeni Ø să mă=ajute.  
 NEG-IS nobody Ø SBJV.MRK me-help.3SG  
 'There is nobody that helps me.'

For the time being, we are not in a position to propose any implicational scale with respect to the above mentioned factors that allow the occurrence of zero relativization. A larger corpus is needed to formulate empirically grounded hypotheses. What is crucial to underline is that the observations by Downing (1978) and De Vries (2002; 2005) must be revised and taken at most as a tendency: (a) subject relatives also allow for zero relativization and (b) both restrictive and appositive relatives allow for the lack of lexical relativizers.

<sup>27</sup> <http://asit.maldura.unipd.it/> (22.04.2016).

<sup>28</sup> In Quebec French the relativizer *que* can be deleted. The mechanisms behind this possibility are still under debate, as it is not clear whether *que*-deletion is induced by contact with English (cf. Martineau 1988).

In any case, we can conclude that the same factors, i.e. the syntactic function of the head noun in the relative clause and the type of relative clause, that are at work in the distribution of the different types of relativizers and in doubling phenomena are also found in the (few) cases of zero relativization existing in Romance.

## 5 Conclusion

In this brief overview of the relativizing system in Romance languages we concentrated on three aspects, namely the paradigm of lexical relativizers, the presence of resumption and the lack of lexical relativizers.

As for the paradigm of lexical relativizers we showed that Standard Romance languages exhibit a mixed system of both non-agreeing relativizers, usually the same element introducing complement clauses, and agreeing relativizers. Both the distribution of the forms of lexical relativizers, the presence of resumption and the (few) cases of zero relativization have been argued to be sensitive to the interplay of two factors: (a) the categorial nature of the relativized element and (b) the syntactic-semantic type of relative clause. On the basis of the data observed, we formulated five empirical generalizations repeated in what follows, which should be understood as tendencies more than rules.

The first three generalizations are related to the paradigm of relativizers and suggest that agreeing relativizers and non-agreeing ones co-vary with the categorial nature of the relativized element and the syntactic-semantic type of relative clause. This alternation can be formalized as the co-variation of the morphological complexity of the relativizer and the complexity of the syntactic/semantic function of the head noun in the relative clause encoded by Case on the one hand, and the semantic operation involved in the relative clause, on the other.

- Generalization 1:  
PP complements tend to appear with agreeing relativizers while subject and object relatives, predicative complements and nominal adverbials are rather expressed by non-agreeing ones.
- Generalization 2:  
If a language has three different forms of relativizers, one will be dedicated to subject relativization.
- Generalization 3:  
If a language has two forms of relativizers, which are sensitive to the relative clause type, the one used in appositive relative clauses will also be used in restrictive relative clauses with prepositions.

Two generalizations concern the presence of resumption and capture the fact that resumption is sensitive to the type of relative clause and to the nature of the nominal

expression. At the same time, resumptive expressions seem to be linked to the type of relativizer.

– Generalization 4:

If resumption is allowed in specific restrictive relative clauses then it is also allowed in appositives.

– Generalization 5:

If there is a resumptive expression in the relative clause, the relativizer usually displays the non-agreeing form.

Zero relativization is allowed in both restrictive and appositive relatives as well as with all types of grammatical functions of the head noun. In non-subject relatives, zero relativization exhibits the following pattern: in non-subject relative clauses the subject of the relative clause tends to always be either a silent pronominal element or a lexical noun in postverbal position. Further research is needed to understand the rules regulating the distribution of zero relativization.

Finally, Romance languages (and maybe all languages) have devices to single out the subject with respect to all other grammatical functions, at least in relative clauses (cf. the second generalization). Moreover, subject relatives are also different from other relatives with respect to resumption. In Quebec French, for instance, extracting a subject from the relative clause requires having a dedicated form of relativizer or a resumptive expression, which suggests that the subject position in the relative clause must be marked in some way.

In conclusion, we provided a brief overview of three phenomena related to relative clauses in Romance languages and dialects and we tried to systematize the data and our observations according to precise (when possible) generalizations or at least tendencies. Indeed, although this chapter is not meant to be exhaustive, we saw that there are clear tendencies and parallelisms throughout Romance in the phenomena investigated here which provide insights into and pieces of evidence for various syntactic theories of relative clauses. Although Keenan/Comrie's hierarchy can account for many phenomena related to relative clauses, we found exceptions and counterexamples which support the claim in Cinque (1978; 1982) that relativization strategies ultimately depend on the categorial nature of the relativized element, namely whether a nominal or prepositional phrase is relativized (see also Stark 2016). Finally, our overview highlighted that the semantics of relative clauses can have morphological and syntactic reflexes. This finding suggests a compositional approach to semantics as proposed in Del Gobbo (2007) and Bianchi (2011).

## 6 References

- Alexiadou, Artemis, et al. (edd.) (2000), *The Syntax of Relative Clauses*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins.
- Alfonzetti, Giovanna (2002), *La relativa non-standard – italiano popolare o italiano parlato?*, Palermo, Centro studi filologici e linguistici siciliani.
- Alisova, Tatjana (1965), *Relative limitative ed esplicative nell'italiano popolare*, *Studi di Filologia Italiana* 23, 299–333.
- Aoun, Joseph/Li, Yen-Hui Audrey (2003), *Essays on the Representational and Derivational Nature of Grammar. The Diversity of Wh-Constructions*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.
- Auger, Julie (1993), *On the history of relative clauses in French and some of its dialects*, in: Henning Andersen (ed.), *Historical Linguistics 1993. Selected Papers from the 11th International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Los Angeles, 16–20 August 1993*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins, 19–32.
- Auger, Julie (1994), *Pronominal Clitics in Quebec Colloquial French: A Morphological Analysis*, University of Pennsylvania, Ph.D. dissertation.
- Baker, Mark (1985), *The mirror principle and morphosyntactic explanation*, *Linguistic Inquiry* 16, 373–416.
- Belletti, Adriana/Contemori, Carla (2010), *Intervention and attraction: On the production of subject and object relatives by Italian (young) children and adults*, in: João Costa et al. (edd.), *Language Acquisition and Development*, Newcastle upon Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 39–52.
- Benincà, Paola (1995), *I dati dell'SIS e la sintassi diacronica*, in: Emanuele Banfi et al. (edd.), *Italia Settentrionale: crocevia di idiomi romanzi, Atti del convegno internazionale (Trento, ottobre 1993)*, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 131–141.
- Benincà, Paola (2010), *Headless relatives in some Old Italian varieties*, in: Roberta D'Alessandro/Adam Ledgeway/Ian Roberts (edd.), *Syntactic Variation. The Dialects of Italy*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 55–70.
- Benincà, Paola (2012), *Lexical complementisers and headless relatives*, in: Laura Brugè et al. (edd.), *Functional Heads. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures Volume 7*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 29–41.
- Benincà, Paola/Cinque, Guglielmo (2010), *La frase relativa*, in: Giampaolo Salvi/Lorenzo Renzi (edd.), *Grammatica dell'italiano antico*, vol. 1, Bologna, il Mulino, 469–507.
- Benincà, Paola/Cinque, Guglielmo (2014), *Kind-defining relative clauses in the diachrony of Italian*, in: Paola Benincà/Adam Ledgeway/Nigel Vincent (edd.), *Diachrony and Dialects. Grammatical Change in the Dialects of Italy*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 257–278.
- Benincà, Paola/Vanelli, Laura (1982), *Appunti di sintassi veneta*, in: Michele Cortelazzo (ed.), *Guida ai dialetti veneti IV*, Padova, CLEUP, 7–38.
- Bențea, Anamaria (2012), *Does “Case” matter in the acquisition of relative clauses in Romanian?*, BUCLD 36 Online Proceedings Supplement.
- Bernini, Giuliano (1991), *Frase relative nel parlato colloquiale*, in: Cristina Lavinio/Alberto A. Sobrero (edd.), *La lingua degli studenti universitari*, Firenze, Nuova Italia Editrice, 165–187.
- Bianchi, Valentina (1999a), *Consequences of Antisymmetry: Headed Relative Clauses*, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter.
- Bianchi, Valentina (1999b), *On resumptive relatives and the theory of LF chains*, *Quaderni del Laboratorio di Linguistica della Scuola Normale Superiore* 12/13, 79–99.
- Bianchi, Valentina (2002a), *Headed relative clauses in generative syntax*, *Glott International*, Part I, 197–204.
- Bianchi, Valentina (2002b), *Headed relative clauses in generative syntax*, *Glott International*, Part II, 235–247.

- Bianchi, Valentina (2011), *Some notes on the “specificity effects” of optional resumptive pronouns*, in: Alain Rouveret (ed.), *Resumptive Pronouns at the Interfaces*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins, 319–342.
- Blanche-Benveniste, Claire (1990), *Usages normatifs et non normatifs dans les relatives en français, en espagnol et en portugais*, in: Johannes Bechert/Giuliano Bernini/Claude Buridant (edd.), *Toward a Typology of European Languages*, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter, 317–335.
- Bouchard, Denis (1982), *Les constructions relatives en français vernaculaire et en français standard*, in: Claire Lefebvre (ed.), *La syntaxe comparée du français standard et populaire: approches formelle et fonctionnelle*, vol. 1, Québec, Gouvernement du Québec, Office de la langue française, 103–133.
- Brucart, José (1992), *Some asymmetries in the functioning of relative pronouns in Spanish*, *Catalan Working Papers in Linguistics* 1, 113–143.
- Brucart, José (1999), *La estructura del sintagma nominal: las oraciones de relativo*, in: Ignacio Bosque/Violeta Demonte (edd.), *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, vol. 1, Madrid, Espasa Calpe, 397–522.
- Buridant, Claude (2000), *Grammaire nouvelle de l’ancien français*, Paris, SEDES.
- Caponigro, Ivano (2003), *Free Not to Ask: On the Semantics of Free Relatives and Wh-words Cross-linguistically*, Los Angeles, CA, Ph.D. dissertation.
- Cennamo, Michela (1997), *Relative clauses*, in: Martin Maiden/Mair Parry (edd.), *The Dialects of Italy*, London/New York, Routledge, 190–201.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (1978), *La sintassi dei pronomi relativi “cui” e “quale” nell’italiano contemporaneo*, *Rivista di grammatica generativa* 3, 31–126.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (1982), *On the theory of relative clauses and markedness*, *The Linguistic Review* 1, 247–294.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (2008), *Two types of nonrestrictive relatives*, *Empirical Issues in Syntax and Semantics* 7, 99–137.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (2013), *Typological Studies. Word Order and Relative Clauses*, London/New York, Routledge.
- Clifton, Charles Jr./Frazier, Lyn (1989), *Comprehending sentences with long distance dependencies*, in: Gregory N. Carlson/Michael K. Tanenhaus (edd.), *Linguistic Structure in Language Processing*, Dordrecht, Kluwer, 273–317.
- Comrie, Bernard (1981), *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*, Oxford, Blackwell.
- Costa, João/Lobo, Maria/Silva, Carolina (2011), *Subject-object asymmetries in the acquisition of Portuguese relative clauses: adults vs children*, *Lingua* 121, 1093–1100.
- Cresti, Emanuela (2000), *Corpus di italiano parlato*, CD-Rom, Firenze, Accademia della Crusca.
- Cristofaro, Sonia (2003), *Subordination*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Cristofaro, Sonia/Giacalone Ramat, Anna (2007), *Relativization strategies in the languages of Europe*, in: Paolo Ramat/Elisa Roma (edd.), *Europe and the Mediterranean as Linguistic Areas: Convergences from a Historical and Typological Perspective*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins, 63–93.
- Damourette, Jacques/Pichon, Édouard (1983/1927–1940), *Des mots à la pensée: essai de grammaire de la langue française*, 7 vol., Genève, Slatkine.
- De Roberto, Elisa (2008), *Le proposizioni relative con antecedente in italiano antico*, Roma Tre/Paris IV-Sorbonne, doctoral dissertation.
- Del Gobbo, Francesca (2003), *Appositives at the Interface*, Irvine, CA, Ph.D. dissertation.
- Del Gobbo, Francesca (2007), *On the syntax and semantics of appositive relative clauses*, in: Nicole Dehé/Yordanka Kavalova (edd.), *Parentheticals*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins, 173–201.
- Demirdache, Hamida (1991), *Resumptive chains in restrictive relatives, appositives, and dislocation structures*, MIT, Cambridge, MA, Ph.D. dissertation.

- Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen (1990), *Clitic doubling, wh-movement and quantification in Romanian*, *Linguistic Inquiry* 21, 351–397.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen (1994), *The Syntax of Romanian: Comparative Studies in Romance*, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen/Giurgea, Ion (2013), *A Reference Grammar of Romanian*, vol. 1: *The Noun Phrase*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins.
- Downing, Bruce (1978), *Some universals of relative clause structure*, in: Joseph H. Greenberg (ed.), *Universals of Human Language*, vol. 4: *Syntax*, Stanford, CA, Stanford University Press, 375–418.
- Fiorentino, Giuliana (1998), *Clausola relativa debole e pronome relativo in italiano*, in: Paolo Ramat/Elisa Roma (edd.), *Sintassi storica. Atti del XXX congresso internazionale della Società di Linguistica italiana, Pavia, 26–28 settembre 1996*, Roma, Bulzoni, 215–233.
- Fiorentino, Giuliana (1999), *Relativa debole. Sintassi, uso, storia in italiano*, Milano, Angeli.
- Folena, Gianfranco (1961), *Filologia testuale e storia linguistica. Studi e problemi di critica testuale. Atti del Convegno di studi di filologia italiana nel centenario della Commissione per i testi di lingua*, Bologna, Commissione per i testi di lingua, 17–34.
- Gadet, Françoise (1995), *Les relatives non standard en français parlé: le système et l'usage*, in: Hanne L. Andersen/Gunver Skytte (edd.), *La subordination dans les langues romanes. Actes du colloque international, Copenhague, 5.5.–7.5.1994*, Copenhagen, Munksgaard, 141–162.
- Gavarró, Anna, et al. (2012), *The acquisition of Catalan relatives: structure and processing*, *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 57, 183–201.
- Godard, Danièle (1989), *Français standard et non-standard: les relatives*, *LINX* 20, 51–88.
- Grandgent, Charles Hall (1907), *An Introduction to Vulgar Latin*, Boston, D. C. Heath.
- Grosu, Alexander (1994), *Three Studies in Locality and Case*, London/New York, Routledge.
- Grosu, Alexander/Landman, Fred (1998), *Strange relatives of the third kind*, *Natural Language Semantics* 6, 125–170.
- Guasti, Maria Teresa/Cardinaletti, Anna (2003), *Relative clause formation in Romance child production*, *Probus* 15, 47–89.
- Heim, Irene/Kratzer, Angelika (1998), *Semantics in Generative Grammar*, Malden, MA, Blackwell.
- Heusinger, Klaus von/Gáspár-Onea, Edgar (2008), *Triggering and blocking effects in the diachronic development of DOM in Romanian*, *Probus* 20, 1–33.
- Horvath, Julia/Grosu, Alexander (1987), *On the notion “pseudo-head”: evidence from Romanian free relative and interrogative constructions*, *Theoretical Linguistics* 14, 35–64.
- Jackendoff, Ray (1977), *X' Syntax: A Study of Phrase Structure*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.
- Jacobson, Pauline (1995), *On the quantificational force of English free relatives*, in: Emmon Bach et al. (edd.), *Quantification in Natural Languages*, Dordrecht, Kluwer, 451–486.
- Jensen, Frede (1986), *The Syntax of Medieval Occitan*, Tübingen, Niemeyer.
- Jensen, Frede (1990), *Old French and Comparative Gallo-Romance Syntax*, Tübingen, Niemeyer.
- Jones, Michael Allan (1996), *Foundations of French Syntax*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Kayne, Richard (1976), *French relative “que”*, in: Marta Luján/Fritz Hensey (edd.), *Current Studies in Romance Linguistics*, Washington, D.C., Georgetown University Press, 255–299.
- Keenan, Edward/Comrie, Bernard (1977), *Noun phrase accessibility and Universal Grammar*, *Linguistic Inquiry* 8, 63–99.
- Kunstmann, Pierre (1990), *Le relatif-interrogatif en ancien français*, Genève, Droz.
- Labelle, Marie (2006), *Clausal architecture in Early Old French*, *Lingua* 117, 289–316.
- Lefebvre, Claire/Fournier, Robert (1978), *Les relatives en français de Montréal*, *Cahiers de linguistique* 8, 273–295.
- Lehmann, Christian (1984), *Der Relativsatz: Typologie seiner Strukturen, Theorie seiner Funktionen, Kompendium seiner Grammatik*, Tübingen, Narr.

- Martineau, France (1988), *Variable deletion of “que” in the spoken French of Ottawa-Hull*, in: David Birdsong/Jean-Pierre Montreuil (edd.), *Advances in Romance Linguistics*, Dordrecht, Foris, 275–287.
- Munaro, Nicola (2000), *Free relative clauses as defective wh-elements: evidence from the North-western Italian dialects*, University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics 10, 89–120.
- Munaro, Nicola/Poletto, Cecilia (2014), *Synchronic and diachronic clues on the internal structure of “where” in Italo-Romance*, in: Paola Benincà/Adam Ledgeway/Nigel Vincent (edd.), *Diachrony and Dialects, Grammatical Change in the Dialects of Italy*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 279–300.
- Partee, Barbara (1973), *Some transformational extensions of Montague Grammar*, *Journal of Philosophical Logic* 2, 509–534.
- Pérez-Leroux, Ana Teresa (1995), *Resumptives in the acquisition of relative clauses*, *Language Acquisition* 4, 105–138.
- Pinkster, Harm (2012), *Relative clauses in Latin: some problems of description*, in: Paula Da Cunha Corrêa et al. (edd.), *Hyperboreans: Essays in Greek and Latin Poetry, Philosophy, Rhetoric and Linguistics*, São Paulo, Humanitas CAPES, 377–393.
- Pompei, Anna (2011), *Relative clauses*, in: Philip Baldi/Pierluigi Cuzzolin (edd.), *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax*, vol. 3, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter, 427–547.
- Potts, Christopher (2005), *The Logic of Conventional Implicatures*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Rizzi, Luigi (1990), *Relativized Minimality*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.
- Rizzi, Luigi (2004), *Locality and left periphery*, in: Adriana Belletti (ed.), *Structures and Beyond. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures Volume 3*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 223–251.
- Rizzi, Luigi/Shlonsky, Ur (2005), *Strategies of subject extraction*, in: Hans-Martin Gärtner/Uli Sauerland (edd.), *Interfaces + Recursion = Language? Chomsky’s Minimalism and the View from Syntax-Semantics*, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter, 115–160.
- Sanfelici, Emanuela/Caloi, Irene/Poletto, Cecilia (2014), *Subject object asymmetries in relative clauses: an investigation into three new empirical domains*, in: Diego Pescarini/Silvia Rossi (edd.), *Atti della XIX Giornata di dialettologia*, Quaderni di lavoro ASIt 18, 127–160.
- Sanfelici, Emanuela/Poletto, Cecilia (2015), *On complementizers: insights from Italian restrictive relative clauses*, Paper presented at the 48th Congress of the Societas Linguistica Europaea, Leiden University.
- Schafroth, Elmar (1993), *Zur Entstehung und vergleichenden Typologie der Relativpronomina in den romanischen Sprachen. Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Substandards*, Tübingen, Niemeyer.
- Schafroth, Elmar (1995), *À propos d’une typologie panromane des relatifs “non normatifs”*, in: Catherine Bougy/Pierre Boissel/Bernard Garnier (edd.), *Mélanges René Lepelley. Recueil d’études en hommage au Professeur René Lepelley*, Caen, Musée de Normandie, 363–374.
- Scorretti, Mauro (1991), *Complementizers in Italian and Romance*, Amsterdam, doctoral dissertation.
- Sells, Peter (1985), *Restrictive and Non-restrictive Modification*, Stanford, CA, CSLI.
- Sevcenco, Anca/Avram, Larisa/Stoicescu, Ioana (2014), *Relative clauses: a linguistic marker of developmental dyslexia in Romanian*, in: João Costa et al. (edd.), *New Directions in the Acquisition of Romance Languages: Selected Proceedings of the Romance Turn V*, Newcastle upon Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 285–301.
- Shlonsky, Ur (1992), *Resumptive pronouns as a last resort*, *Linguistic Inquiry* 23, 443–468.
- Sportiche, Dominique (2011), *French relative “qui”*, *Linguistic Inquiry* 42, 83–124.
- Stark, Elisabeth (2004), *L’italiano parlato – varietà storica o variazione universale?*, in: Federico Albano Leoni et al. (edd.), *Il parlato italiano, Atti del convegno nazionale, Napoli, 13–15 febbraio 2003* (CD-ROM), Napoli, D’Auria Editore–CIRASS.



- Stark, Elisabeth (2009), *Romance restrictive relative clauses between macrovariation and universal structures*, *Philologie im Netz* 47, 1–15, <http://web.fu-berlin.de/phin/phin47/p47t1.htm> (28.02.2016).
- Stark, Elisabeth (2016), *Relative clauses*, in: Adam Ledgeway/Martin Maiden (edd.), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1029–1040.
- Stechow, Arnim von (2007), *Schritte zur Satzsemantik II*, *Script Einführung in die Semantik*, in: <http://www.sfs.uni-tuebingen.de/~astechow/Aufsätze/Schrittell.pdf> (28.01.2016).
- Stempel, Wolf Dieter (1964), *Untersuchungen zur Satzverknüpfung im Altfranzösischen*, Braunschweig, Westermann.
- Suñer, Margarita (1998), *Resumptive restrictive relatives: a crosslinguistic perspective*, *Language* 74, 335–364.
- Taraldsen, Knut Tarald (2001), *Subject extraction, the distribution of expletives and Stylistic Inversion*, in: Aafke Hulk/Jean-Yves Pollock (edd.), *Subject Inversion in Romance and the Theory of Universal Grammar*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 163–182.
- Utzeri, Irene (2007), *The production and acquisition of subject and object relative clauses in Italian*, *Nanzan Linguistics Special Issue* 3, 283–314.
- Veloso, Rita (2013), *Subordinação relativa*, in: Eduardo Paiva Raposo et al. (edd.), *Gramática do português*, Lisboa, Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, 2061–2136.
- Vineis, Edoardo (1994), *Latino*, in: Anna Giacalone Ramat/Paolo Ramat (edd.), *Le lingue indoeuropee*, Bologna, il Mulino, 289–348.
- Vries, Mark de (2002), *The Syntax of Relativization*, Utrecht, LOT.
- Vries, Mark de (2005), *The fall and the rise of universals on relativization*, *The Journal of Universal Language* 6, 1–33.
- Wanner, Dieter (1981), *Surface complementizer deletion, Italian “che” = ∅*, *Journal of Italian Linguistics* 6, 45–83.

---

## **Typological aspects**

