RELATIVES AND COPULAR STRUCTURES

Paola Benincà
Università di Padova[*]

This paper presents some evidence showing that copular sentences and locative constructions are an important ingredient of a recently identified class of relative clauses (see Berizzi 2001, Benincà 2012). This new type of relative clauses have been labelled "kind-defining relative clauses (KDRels)"[1].
In Benincà & Cinque (forthcoming) a theoretical analysis is outlined; I will examine here in more detail some descriptive aspects of this class of relatives, dwelling in particular upon some related structures, which are the typical context in which they appear.
Among the features that characterize KDRels, it emerges that their head "needs not" to be referentially identified. The name chosen to label them makes reference to the fact that the function of the relative is that to characterize the antecedent (whose reference is not at issue) in order to put it in a certain class. Despite the fact that they seem at first sight restrictive relatives, they do not have the function of narrowing down the reference of the head noun, which can remain undetermined, but that of providing the features which characterize the class they belong to.

2.   Contact relatives in English.

In this section I will indirectly characterize some aspects of KDRels by exploring the constraints on the contact-strategy of relative clause formation.

2.1.   Standard English.

As is probably well known, in Standard English a relative clause either on the object or on the subject can be introduced by a complementizer *that* (as in (1, 2)), or a *wh*-pronoun, distinct for [+ human] (3a, 4a) or [-animate] (3b, 4b); they can also be without any introducer (the so-called zero or contact relatives), but this option is only open to relatives on the object (5a, b), and relatives on the subject in Standard English are in any case excluded (see

1 In Benincà (2012) I use the label 'relative definitorie', for Italian.

(6a, b); a Ø marks the left boundary of the relative clause, the point where a complementizer or a *wh* pronoun appears):

(1) a   The man that John saw (is my brother).
    b   The book that John read (is interesting).
(2) a   The man that will arrive today (is my brother).
    b   The book that will arrive today (is interesting).
(3) a   The man who(m) John saw (is my brother).
    b   The book which John read (is interesting).
(4) a   The man who will arrive today (is my brother).
    b   The book which will arrive today (is interesting).

 (5) a   The man Ø John saw (is my brother).
    b   The book Ø John read (is interesting).
 (6) a   *The man Ø will arrive today (is my brother).
    b   *The book Ø will arrive today (is interesting).

2.2. English dialects.

However, the pattern just illustrated is valid for Standard English only; contact relatives on the subject are attested in various English dialectal area. The basic context, apparently shared by all the recorded varieties of English, is that in which the relative and its antecedent form the predicate of a copular structure (Berizzi 2010: 161-163 puts together data from various direct and indirect sources); in the Tyne area, north-eastern England, the construction is apparently only possible in this context, exemplified in (7)::

(7) a   Leck is a young boy Ø was coming home from school.
    b   That's another place Ø is called after the Isle, Ilminster, you see.

In the Manchester County (England, (8a), from Berizzi 2001) and in the Appalachian region (USA, (8b), from Tortora) the structure appears also in the predicate of a locative copular sentence:

(8) a   There's a train Ø goes without stopping (Great Manchester County)
    b   There was a snake Ø come down the road (Appalachian County)

Other structures have to be interpreted as hidden locative predications,[2] as the following with *have*, from Herrmann (2003, 33):

(9) a   We had this French girl Ø came to stay
   b   My friend's got a brother Ø used to be in the school

Herrmann (2003, pp. 35-36) has finely reflected on other relative structures (exemplified in (10)), which she interprets as containing a locative-existential predicate; for example *to know*, or *to see* are to be analysed as "[there in the mind / in the sight] is [DP [relative clause]]":[3]

(10) a   I know two or three Ø went over. ("I know two or three persons that...)
    b   I seen a chap at Broughton Moor, Ø got his leg took off.

An apparently different kind of structures is also exemplified by Herrmann, who characterizes them as having a "lexically empty" antecedent; I interpret this expression as meaning "a non-referential lexical element" (as in (11a), or a sort of classifier (as in (11b)):

(11) a   anybody Ø used to come in our house on a weekend, they always thought there was a party.
    b   Leonard up here would be the only person Ø goes to the bog

I think that, as the description of Herrmann suggests, all these contexts include in their abstract representation a copular structure whose predicate is formed by a KDRel and its antecedent.
But this pattern is not restricted to dialectal varieties. Harris & Vincent (1981) present and discuss some aspects of this construction, asserting that it

---

2 Arguments in favour of the interpretation of have as locative + be have been widely discussed and analysed by Freeze (2002), Kayne (2003); in various languages, locatives also appear "predisposed" to become subjects of predication: see Parry (2011), in particular sect. 6, for a very interesting sample of analysed cases from old Italian vernaculars illustrating the subject functions of locative arguments.
3 It is interesting to compare these reflections with a phenomenon of some central and southern Italy dialects, where the verb 'to know' is accompanied by a locative+object clitic cluster when it has a sentential object, as in the following example, from the dialect of Rome:

(i)   ce lo so che viene
       there.it.I-know that he comes "I know that he is coming"

belongs to normal conversational English grammar. I have elicited interesting data on colloquial English from a Northern England speaker. She accepts the structures above as belonging to normal spoken northern English, while she judges unacceptable examples as the following:

(12) a *I met the boy Ø has arrived yesterday.
     d *I will read Ø the book has arrived yesterday.
     b *The man Ø will arrive today is my brother.
     c *The book Ø will arrive today is interesting.

The sentences in (12) are ungrammatical because they cannot be interpreted as KDRel, but only as restrictive relative clauses; their function with respect to the antecedent is that of narrowing the range of its possible referents and of identifying the unique entity that the speaker meant to refer to. The relative clauses on the subject that admit the contact construction seen above have not this function, even though they seem restrictive; the referential features of the antecedent are already assigned, substantially generic, and the relative asserts a characteristic of the semantic class it belongs to.

2.3.   Middle English.

This pattern is also found in Middle English, but with a double constraint (Viel 2001, p. 159): not only the governing clause, as we have seen for the modern varieties, but also the relative itself had to contain a copular or an existential predicate:

(13) a I know no knyght in this contrey Ø is able to macche ("defeat") hym
     b Adam ben kinge and Eue queen of alle þe þinge Ø in werlde ben
        "Adam was (lit. *were*) king and Eve queen of all the things in the world were"

A short digression: interestingly, the contact structure was used first- and more widely attested - for relatives on the subject; only later, in the 16th-17th Century, for relatives on the object. This observation reminds me of a comment made by Kortmann (2002); while illustrating contact relatives (together with other phenomena of dialectal English, collected for the *Freiburg Corpus of English Dialects*) he observes that in fact the pattern of Standard English contact relatives clearly violates the Keenan and Comrie hierarchy. The hierarchy implies that if a relativisation strategy in a language is open to a certain Case, we expect that it is also open to Cases which have a higher position in the hierarchy. Since the object is lower than the subject, the contact strategy should be open first to relatives on the subject, which in

Standard English is not the case. Thus the dialects and the diachrony of English respect the hierarchy and middle English evolutionary steps confirm it: contact relatives on the subject are attested earlier than relatives on the object. One could conclude that the ban against contact relatives on the subject in Standard English is not genuinely grammatical, but possibly derives from rational directions of normative grammarians: a contact relative on the subject – in particular in writing – can easily be not explicit enough and produce obscurity in a text.[4]

2. KDRels between restrictive and appositive relatives.

We have occasionally said above that KDRels resemble restrictive relatives, but they are not. Let us consider in detail a comparison of KD with restrictive relatives on the one hand, and appositives on the other. We will use Italian and some Italian dialect data, because in these languages some features appear more clearly. We will see that KDRels have some characteristics that are typical of restrictive relatives, and other that are typical of (a subclass of) appositives.

2.1. Colloquial Modern Italian varieties.

In colloquial Italian, in the informal – perhaps regionally marked - register, the antecedent of appositive relatives can be copied by a clitic; this is impossible in restrictive relatives. We can see this fact only in relatives on the object, because Italian has no subject clitics:

(14) a   Mario, che (lo) conosci già, verrà a cena.
           Mario, that (him).you-know already, will come to dinner
     b   Il ragazzo che (*lo) conosci già verrà a cena.
           The boy that (*him) you.know already will come to dinner.
(15) a   Il libro di Umberto, che non (l') avevo ancora letto, è sparito.
           The book by Umberto, that not (it).I-had yet read, has disappeared.
     b   Il libro che non (*l')avevo ancora letto è sparito
           The book that not (*it).I-had yet read has disappeared.

---

4 Contact relatives on the subject are found in Old Italian too, with very interesting differences that need to be described in more detail. They are part of a general phenomenon of 'complementizer deletion (see Today they are only allowed for relatives on the object, and only appositives; in the past only restrictive relatives were admitted. A comparison between the two languages could be very interesting.

If we consider Paduan, a Northern Italian dialect with subject clitics, we see that this distinct behaviour of appositive relatives on the object can be observed in relative on the subject as well:

(16) a   Mario, che **el** vien a sena stasera, te lo conossi zà.
        Mario, that **he**.comes to dinner tonight, you him.know already.
  b   El tozo che (***el**).vien a sena stassera, te lo conossi zà
        The boy that (***he**).comes to dinner tonight, you know him already.
  c   El libro de Umberto, che **el** zè sparìo, no lo gavevo gnancora lèto
        The book by Umberto, that **it.**has desappeared, I hadn't read it yet.
  d   El libro che (***el**) ze sparìo no lo gavevo gnancora leto.
        The book that (***it**) has disappeared I hadn't read it yet.

With respect to the possibility of having a subject clitic copying the *wh*-pronoun, both in Italian (17a-b) and in Paduan (17 c-d), KDRels behave like appositives, even though at first sight they resemble restrictive relatives:

(17) a   Mario è un ragazzo / quel tipo di ragazzo che tutti (**lo**) vorrebbero avere come amico.
        Mario is a boy / that kind of boy that everybody (**him**).wanted to have as a friend.
  b   Mario è un ragazzo che (**lo**) puoi convincere facilmente
        Mario is a boy that (**him**).you-can convince easily.
  c   Mario ze un tozo che tuti voria vere / ver**lo** par amico
        Mario is a boy that everybody (**him**.)wanted to have him as a friend.
  d   Mario ze un tozo che (**el**) ghe iuta volentieri a chi che ga bisogno
        Mario is a boy that (**he)** helps willingly whom is in need.

Although the relative clauses in (17) seem to restrict the reference of the head, they in fact characterize the class of "boys" which the referent belongs to. They all admit a clitic copying the *wh*-pronoun.

2.2. Old Italian and modern Florentine.

In Old Italian (Florentine, 13th C) restrictive relatives show very regularly the characteristics of a *wh*-construction, and a resumptive clitic never shows up; the few cases found where a clitic appears in a relative clause are first of all clear instances of appositive relatives, such as the following:

(18) ... cioè monsignore messer Lancialotto del Lac, che già no **'l** seppi tanto pregare d' amore ch' elli avesse di me mercede. (*Novellino*, 82).

...I mean mylord sir Lancelot du Lac, that not **him.**I-could enough pray for love that he had on me mercy

The same possibility characterizes relative clauses that are similar to the ones we are dealing with here (Noordhof 1937, Benincà & Cinque 2010):

(19) a   pane nero, azemo e duro, che no l rosecara l cane (Jacopone, Laude 3)
        brown bread, dry and hard, that not **it**.would-gnaw the dog
    b   un figlio ordenato che Dio **l'**ha fabrecato (Jacopone, Laude 22)
        an ordered son that God **him**.has made
    c   e vidi cosa *ch'*io avrei paura (..) di contar**la** solo (Inf. 28, 114)
        and I-saw thing that I would have fear to tell **it**

Noordhof (1937) himself compares the structure with modern Florentine (19th C, Collodi's *Pinocchio*):

(20)   È un conto facilissimo, - rispose la Volpe, - un conto che puoi far**lo** sulla punta delle dita.
        It is a very easy calculation," replied the Fox, "a calculation that you can make **it** on the   ends of your fingers.

2.2.1. Colloquial English.

We can now briefly turn to English. In colloquial English, too, it is possible to insert a pronominal copy of the antecedent of a relative clause if the relative belongs to Kind-Defining class. My informant, from the northern England area, accepts as perfectly grammatical a sentence like the following (notice that the relative is introduced by a complementizer, not a *wh*-pronoun):

(21)   He is one of those directors that I always wanted to work with **him**.

In this variety, as well as in Standard English, a pronominal copy of the antecedent is impossible both in restrictive and in appositive relative clauses, introduced by a complementizer or a *wh*:

(22) a   Mike Leigh, who(m)/that I always wanted to work with (***him**), will arrive tomorrow
    b   *The director who(m)/that I always wanted to work with (***him**) will arrive tomorrow

The partial overlapping of appositives and KDRels we see in Italian is then linked to features that are present in Italian appositives, and absent in English appositives. Looking for other differences between the two languages in this regard, we can notice, for example, that English appositives require a real *wh*-pronoun, with different restrictions with respect to Italian *wh*-pronoun *il quale*, which is also stylistically marked, as shown below.

2.2.2. The Italian relative pronoun *il quale.*

The *wh*-pronoun *il quale* "the which" is only admitted in appositives, and only with subject function; in the following examples, *il quale* in sentences *b, c, d* is ungrammatical, either because they are restrictive (b, d) or because they are on the object (c, d):

(23) a Mario, il quale arriverà più tardi, porterà notizie.
　　　Mario, *il quale* will arrive later, will bring news.
　　b *L'assistente il quale arriverà più tardi, porterà notizie.
　　　the assistant *il quale* will arrive later will bring news.
　　c *Mario, il quale abbiamo sollecitato, arriverà pure lui in ritardo.
　　　Mario, *il quale* we have urged, will arrive late too.
　　d *L'assistente il quale abbiamo sollecitato, arriverà pure lui in ritardo
　　　The assistant *il quale* we have urged will arrive late too.

KDRels as the following admit *il quale* with subject function, and are less acceptable with *il quale* with object function:

(24) a Mario è un assistente il quale arriva sempre in ritardo, nonostante l'abbiamo più volte　　　sollecitato.
　　　Mario is an assistant *il quale* always arrives late, even though we hare often urged him.
　　b ??Mario è un redattore il quale abbiamo più volte sollecitato, ma tuttavia arriva sempre in　　　ritardo.
　　　Mario is an assistant *il quale* we have often urged, and nevertheless he always arrives late.

This kind of relatives also admits – at a quite high stylistic level - the repetition of the N head together with *il quale* (as noticed by Diego Pescarini, p.c.); again, this is possible in appositive (25a) and in KD (25c), and impossible in restrictive relatives (25b):

(25) a Trovarono infine la magica sostanza, dalla quale sostanza si poté ricavare un rimedio   universale. (*appositive*)
They finally found the magic substance, from which they could extract a universal remedy.

   b *Hanno distrutto la magica sostanza dalla quale sostanza avevamo ricavato un rimedio   universale. (*restrictive*)
They have destroyed the magic substance from which they had extracted a universal remedy.

   c Cercavano una sostanza dalla quale sostanza si potesse ricavare un rimedio universale.   (*KDRel*)
They were looking for a magic substance from which substance one could extract a universal remedy.

In this section, we have collected evidence showing that KD relative clauses share some syntactic features with appositive relatives (the form of the *wh*-pronoun, the clitic copy, etc.), even though they differ from appositives very sharply; apart from intonation, they are similar to restrictives from a semantic point of view, since they provide a restriction regarding the characteristics of a not-defined nominal head. The head, though, does not need to be further defined.
In the next section, we will observe some other aspects which have to do with Mood and presuppositions, and point to the same direction.

3. Modality, presuppositions, and agreement.

3.1. Epistemic modality in relative clauses.

In Italian, only appositive relatives admit epistemic interpretation of the modal:

(26) a Il ragazzo che deve partire presto la mattina arriva sempre stanco (*restrictive: deontic interpr. only)*
The boy that has to leave early in the morning always arrives tired.

   b Un ragazzo che deve partire presto la mattina arriva sempre stanco. (*restrictive: deontic interpr. only)*
A boy that has to leave early in the morning always arrives tired.

   c Mario, che deve partire presto la mattina, arriva sempre stanco (*appositive: both epistemic and deontic interpret.)*
Mario, who has to leave early in the morning, always arrives tired.

In a restrictive relative clause, such as (26 a-b), independently from the definite or indefinite article, the epistemic interpretation of the modal *deve* "has to" is blocked; it is instead perfectly possible in an appositive relative clause, as in (26c).

If we insert an apparently restrictive clause in a DP which is the predicate of a copular structure (as in (27)), the epistemic interpretation becomes possible (or obligatory, as in (26b), for semantic reasons):

(27) a   Mario è un uomo che deve alzarsi molto presto la mattina
        (*KDRel:epistemic or deontic interpretation*)
        Mario is a man that has to weak up very early in the morning
   c   Un ragazzo che deve alzarsi molto presto di mattina è Giorgio Rossi.
        (*KDRel:epistemic or deontic interpretation*)
        A boy that has to wake up early in the morning is G.R.
   b   Mario è un uomo che deve amare molto i suoi figli. (*KDRel: epistemic only*)
        Mario is a man that has to love his children very much.

In (28) the copular structure is of the identificational type. This type of copular structure connects a subject and a nominal predicate which have to be both referentially defined. As a consequence, the relative can only be a proper restrictive, and the only possible interpretation of the modal is deontic:

(28)   Mario è l'uomo che deve alzarsi molto presto la mattina (*deontic only*)
        Mario is the man that has to wake up very early in the morning.

3.2. Negative polarity *mica* in appositives, restrictives, and KDRels.

As first shown by Cinque (1976), the postverbal negative polarity element *mica* carries presuppositions that render it ungrammatical in some syntactic structures which entail themselves a presupposition; restrictive relatives are one of the contexts where the postverbal negative element is not possible, because in the restrictive relative the event is presupposed (even though one argument is a kind of variable); the idea is that this presupposition conflicts with the presupposition conveyed by *mica*:

(29) a   *Ti regalerò i libri che non ho mica letto.
        I will give you the books the I have not *mica* read.
   b   *Ho invitato il ragazzo che non conosci mica.

I have invited the boy that you don't *mica* know.

While the restrictive relative presupposes the truth of the predicate, the appositive doesn't (the predicate is asserted); appositive relatives admit indeed *mica*:

(30) a   Ti regalerò questi libri, che non ho mica letto.
         I will give you these books, which I haven't *mica* read.
     b   Ho invitato Mario, che non conosci mica.
         I have invited Mario, whom you don't *mica* know.

Interestingly, in my regional Italian, the presence of *mica* renders the clitic copy of the relative (on which see above sect. 2.1.) more natural:

(31) a   Ti regalerò questi libri, che non **li** ho mica letti.
         I will give you these books, which I haven't *mica* read **them**.
     b   Ho invitato Mario, che non **lo** conosci mica.
         I have invited Mario, whom you don't *mica* know **him**.

With respect to this property KDRels again behave like appositives:

(32) a   Questi sono libri che non ho mica letto.
         These are the books that I haven't *mica* read.
     b   Mario è un uomo che non esita mica a rischiare.
         Mario is a man that doesn't *mica* hesitate to risk
     c   Ho conosciuto un ragazzo che non esita *mica* a rischiare
         I have met a boy that doesn't hesitate to risk

3.3. An Appendix on Verb-Subject Agreement.

Finally, in Old Italian, we can observe an interesting phenomenon concerning agreement of the verb of the relative contained in the predicate of a copular sentence. In this context, the verb agrees not with the subject of the relative but with the subject of the copular sentence. In the following examples the copula is in the 1st or 2nd person sing. and the verb of the relative has the same verbal agreement, even though the subject of the relative is a 3rd sing. (Noordhof 1937):

(33) a   Or se' tu quel Virgilio e quella fonte che spandi di parlar sì largo
         fiume? (Dante, *Inferno*, 1)

> now are you that Virgil and that source that you-spread of speech
> such-a wide river

  b   io son colui che tenni ambo le chiavi del cor di Federigo (Dante,
       Inferno, 8, 36)
       I am the-one that I-kept both keys of the heart of Federigo[5]

  c   Io son colei che sì importuna e fera chiamata son da voi... (Petrarca,
       Trionfi)
       I am the one that so tiresome and fierce called I-am by you

  d   e' son quella che non trovo riposo (Rustico Filippi, *Rime*, sonetto 56)
       I am the one that I-not find rest

A possibly related fact can be noticed in modern Italian in infinitival
relatives (see Cinque 1988, 2010); a reflexive pronoun can agree in person
with the subject of the copular sentence, while the the corresponding version
with inflected verb requires agreement of the reflexive with its subject, as in
(34b)[6]:

(34) a   Sono stato il solo ad accorgermi / accorgersi di questo.
       I-was the only one to make aware.myself/himself of this. ("I was the
       only one to realize this")

---

5 Boccaccio, in his Esposizioni sopra la Comedia di Dante, paraphrases this passage
of the Comedia reproducing, in a less high style, the same agreement structure:

(i)   E vuole in queste parole dire: io son colui il quale, con le mie
       dimostrazioni, feci dire sì e no allo 'mperadore di   qualunque cosa.
       "He (Dante) with these wants words say: I am the one who, with my
       demonstrations, I-made the Emperor say   yes and no about everything."

6As pointed out to me by Cinque (see also Cinque 2010), there are reasons to
conclude that the two versions exemplified in (34a) correspond to two distinct
structures. A clear difference appear when we try to extract a wh- out of the relative,
as in (i): if the reflexive pronoun in the relative clause agrees with the subject of the
main clause, as in (ia), the Complex NP constraint – which blocks wh-extraction out
of a relative clause - can be violated:

(i) a   Di quale imbroglio sei stato il solo ad accorgerti?
       Which trick have-you been the only-one to make-yourself aware of?

   b   *?Di quale imbroglio sei stato il solo ad accorgersi?
       Of which trick have-you been the only-one to make-himself-aware?

This means that only the relative clause where the reflexive clitic agrees with the
antecedent (ib) is an island, sensitive to the 'complex NP constraint as is generally
the case with relative clauses. The relative clause in (ia) is not an island, and wh-
extraction is possible.

    b   *?Sono stato il solo che mi sono accorto di questo.
            I was the only one that I-realized this
    c   Sono stato il solo che si è accorto di questo.
            I was the only one that he-realized this.

4. Conclusions

We have examined evidence that there exists a class of relative clauses – the kind-defining relatives – characterized by a series of properties that say that they must share some important features with non-restrictive relatives. From a semantic point of view, these relatives do not have the function of narrowing down the reference of the head noun, which can remain undetermined, but that of providing the features which characterize the class they belong to.

In Italian, kind-defining and non-restrictive (appositive) relative clauses share some syntactic phenomenon; from the semantic point of view, they have in common precisely the fact that the function of the relative clause has nothing to do with the referential features of the Noun head: the non-restrictive is headed by a referential noun, and the kind-defining does not need to identify the reference of the head. In Italian, both kind-defining and non-restrictive relatives have the option of having a clitic copy of the *wh*-pronoun; this means that they can have two different constructions: one is similar to restrictive relative clauses, with a 'full' *wh*-pronoun connecting the two arguments of the main and of the relative clause; as for the other, we can hypothesise that not a *wh* but a light (abstract) anaphoric element is involved, which is connected with theta and Case assignment positions through a clitic or a pro, depending on the kind of argument (the construction is presumably related to Left Dislocation). The non-realis modality, the lack of presupposition, are probably connected with this semantic property.

The basic context of kind defining is that of a post-copular relative clause, which forms, together with the head noun, the predicate of a copular structure. Following interesting reflections made by English dialectologists such as Herrmann, this assumption has permitted us to recognize copular predicates incorporated into the thematic structure of verbs such as *find, see, know,* and the like. This descriptive step can be a contribution to understand other constructions, shedding light on the syntactic contexts that can appear casual or heterogeneous.

Finally, comparing phenomena characterizing the various classes, we have been led to conclude that non-restrictive (appositive) relatives have basically different properties in Italian and in English.

Other properties of this class of sentences are still very mysterious, as, first of all, the fact that they are the only context admitting contact relatives on the subject, or the peculiar agreement of the verb in Old Italian (and modern dialects). These properties seem related - in some still obscure way - to the type of referential features the head is endowed with.

Bibliography

Where not otherwise indicated, data of Old Italian come from the OVI *Opera del Vocabolario Italiano* data-base.

P. BENINCÀ 2012, "Frasi relative e strutture copulari". In V. Orioles & P. Borghello (ed.), *Per Roberto Gusmani. Studi in ricordo*, Udine, Forum Editrice.

P. BENINCÀ e G. CINQUE 2010, *La frase relativa*, in *Grammatica dell'Italiano Antico*, a cura di G. Salvi e L. Renzi, Il Mulino, Bologna, pp. 469-507

P. BENINCÀ e G. CINQUE (forthcoming), "Kind-defining relative clauses in the diachrony of Italian", unpubl. ms., Univ. of Padua, Univ. of Venice.

M. BERIZZI 2001, *The theory of relative clauses and the dialects of English*, Tesi di Laurea, Università di Padova,.

M. BERIZZI 2010, *Interrogatives and relatives in some varieties of English*, Doctoral Thesis, University of Padua.

G. CINQUE 1976, *"Mica": note di sintassi e pragmatica*, "Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Padova", 1, pp. 101-112 [rist. in G. Cinque, *Teoria linguistica e sintassi italiana*, Bologna, Il Mulino, 1991, pp. 311-323].

G. CINQUE 1988, *La costruzione relativa infinitiva*, in *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione*, a cura di L. Renzi, G. Salvi, A. Cardinaletti, Bologna, Il Mulino, vol I, IX.1.1.5.

G. Cinque 2008, "Two Types of Nonrestrictive Relatives", in O.Bonami and P.Cabredo Hofherr (eds.) *Empirical Issues in Syntax and Semantics 7*. 99–137. Paris: CNRS. (http://www.cssp.cnrs.fr/eiss7)

G. CINQUE 2010, *On a selective "violation" of the Complex NP Constraint*, in *Structure Preserved. Studies in Syntax for Jan Koster*, ed. by J.-W. Zwart & M. de Vries, Amsterdam, Benjamins, pp. 81-90

R. FREEZE 1992, *Existentials and other locatives,* "Language" 68, pp. 553-595.

The Freiburg Corpus of English Dialects (Sampler) (2000-2005), English Dialects Research Group, Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, available at: http://www2.anglistik.uni-freiburg.de/institut/lskortmann/FRED/

A. GROSU & F. LANDMAN 1998, *Strange Relatives of the Third Kind*, "Natural Language Semantics" 6.2, pp. 125-170.

R. HACKENBERG 1972, *A sociolinguistic description of Appalachian English,* PhD Dissertation, Georgetown University,.

M. HARRIS AND N. VINCENT 1980, "On Zero Relatives" *Linguistic Inquiry* 11, pp. 805-807

T. HERRMANN 2003, *Relative clauses in dialects of English. A typological approach*, Ph.D Thesis, Freiburg i.Br., Albert-Ludwig University.

T. HERRMANN, B. KORTMANN, L. PIETSCH AND S. WAGNER 2004, *A Comparative Grammar of English Dialects: Agreement, Gender, Relative Clauses*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

R. KAYNE 1993, *Toward a modular theory of auxiliary selection, "*Studia Linguistica" 47, pp. 3-31 [rist. in R. Kayne, *Parameters and Universals,* Oxford & New York, Oxford University Press, 2000, pp. 107-130].

B. KORTMANN 2002: "New Prospects for the Study of Dialect Syntax: Impetus from Syntactic Theory and Language Typology." In: S. Barbiers, L. Cornips and S.van der Kleij (eds.) *Syntactic Microvariation*. Amsterdam: SAND, pp. 185-213.
http://www.meertens.knaw.nl/ projecten/sand/ synmic

M. MONTGOMERY & J. HALL 2004, *A Dictionary of Smoky Mountain English,* Knoxville, University of Tennessee Press.

H. NOORDHOF 1937, *La construction relative en italien,* Proefschriftter verkrijging van der Graad van Doctor, La Haye, van Haeringen.

M. PARRY 2010, "Non-canonical subjects in the early Italian vernaculars", *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 95, pp. 190-226.

M. SCORRETTI 1981, *Complementizer ellipsis in 15th Century Italian,* «Journal of Italian Linguistics», 6/1, pp. 35-47.

C. TORTORA 2006, *On morpho-syntactic variation in English dialects*, handout of a Seminar, Università di Padova, 26 October – 3 November.

C. TORTORA 2008, *The comparative morpho-syntax of Appalachian English*, talk presented at the "European Dialect Syntax" III meeting, Venezia, 18-20 Settembre.

V. VIEL 2001, *The grammar of relative clauses in Old and Middle English,* Tesi di Laurea, Università di Padova.

D. WANNER 1981, *Surface complementizer deletion,* «Journal of Italian Linguistics», 6/1, pp. 47-83.

W. WOLFRAM & D. CHRISTIAN 1976, *Appalachian Speech,* Arlington, VA, Center for Applied Linguistics.