# *PROMOTION VS. MATCHING IN THE ANALYSIS OF RELATIVE CLAUSES IN ROMANIAN*

**Alina RESCEANU**
**University of Craiova**

***Abstract:*** *Relative constructions have received a great deal of attention in recent years largely owing to Kayne's (1994) revival of the promotion analysis of relative constructions, in comparison to the prevailing adjunction analysis widely adopted since Chomsky 1977. The promotion analysis was originally proposed by Schachter (1973) and by Vergnaud (1974). An early form of the wh-movement analysis was labeled the matching analysis by Schachter (1973), referring to an analysis where the derivation of a relative clause involves the deletion of a nominal expression in the relative clause under identity with the base-generated Head. In addition to differing proposals for deriving the Head by movement or base-generation, different structures have been entertained: the relative construction involves an adjunction structure as in Chomsky (1977) or a complementation structure as in Kayne (1994).*

***Key words***: *relative clauses, minimalism, contrastivity.*

In this paper, we take into consideration the debate on whether one of the analyses suffices or not. Although both the promotion analysis and the matching analysis have been pursued, it has widely been assumed that one analysis suffices (see, e.g., GROSU and LANDMAN 1998). However, a detailed investigation of restrictive relative constructions in Aoun & Li (2003) revealed the need to distinguish different types of relative constructions within as well as across languages. The authors claim that this state of affairs can be accommodated only if both analyses are adopted.

## 1. Promotion versus Matching (Operator Movement)

Relative constructions, especially those of English, have been studied quite extensively. Essentially, two lines of research have been pursued.

### *1.1. The Promotion Analysis*

In the early 1970s, the significant observation was made that the Head of a relative clause can be interpreted as if it is in the gap position inside the relative clause (reconstruction effects). This led to the proposal that the Head is moved from within the relative clause—the so-called promotion analysis (SCHACHTER 1973; VERGNAUD 1974). This analysis has received much renewed attention since the advent of Kayne's (1994) Antisymmetry approach to word order and phrase structures, which in principle rules out any right-adjunction structures in the grammar of natural languages. In essence, according to Kayne (1994) and Bianchi (1999), the promotion analysis involves the following complementation structure and the Head movement process:

(1) *The promotion analysis*

$[_{DP}$ D $[_{CP}$ NP/DP$_i$ [ C $[_{IP}$ ...t$_i$...]]]]

Important empirical generalizations support the raising of the Head to its surface position (Head raising) in deriving the relative construction. Consider English and Romanian relative constructions, for instance. There is evidence for Head raising based on the distribution of idiom chunks, binding, and scope properties, that is, reconstruction effects.

*Idiom chunks*

First, regarding idioms, it has been shown that part of an idiom can occur as the

Head of a relative clause that contains the other part of the idiom. Consider the [V + O] idioms in (2), for instance. In Bianchi's view, these are idioms with a variable determiner (nonfrozen) allowing the restrictive relativization of the object.

(2) a.The headway that John made was remarkable.
b. Omagiul pe care ti l-a adus a fost deosebit.
c.Grija pe care ti-o port este nemasurata.
d. *dorul pe care ti l-am dus (< *a duce dorul*)
e. * pieptul pe care l-am tinut (< *a tine piept)*

The O part can be the Head of the relative clause and the V part is the verb of the relative clause. Given that the parts of an idiom need to be generated as a unit, such examples argue that movement is involved.

On the other hand, there are idioms with frozen determiners. Since restrictive relativization belongs to the class of A' dependencies, it only allows idiom chunks with nonfrozen determiners. Consider again the examples in (2) and the way (2a-c) constrast with (2d-e). This constraint can be recast in Kayne's analysis by disallowing a frozen determiner to select a restrictive relative CP (cf. BIACHI 1999, 44-45).

Second, reconstruction effects are also illustrated by the binding possibilities in the following examples from Cinque (2004):

*Bound anaphors:*

(3) The picture of himself (that) John likes best is the first one he took.

Moreover, the distribution of bound pronouns also exhibits reconstruction effects (CINQUE 2004, AOUN & LI 2003).

*Bound pronominals:*

(4) a. The letter to his boss that each of them signed never reached him.
b. Scrisoarea catre seful lor pe care fiecare dintre ei a semnat-o nu a ajuns niciodata la el.
c. We admired the picture of his mother that every student, painted in art class.
d. *Am admirat portretul mamei lui pe care fiecare student l-a pictat in ora de desen.

Third, certain examples illustrating scope interaction argue for the availability of reconstruction: the head nominal can be interpreted as having narrow scope with respect to another quantifier within the relative clause. The following examples are the English and the Romanian counterparts of the Italian examples provided by Bianchi (1999, 45-46, 122-123):

(5) a. Each doctor will examine two patients.
b. Fiecare doctor va examina doi pacienti.
(6) a. Each doctor will examine the two patients.
b. Fiecare doctor va examina (pe) cei doi pacienti.

The indefinite objects in (5a) and (5b) is in the scope of the universally quantifier subject and allow for distributive reading (namely there may be two different patients for each doctor). In (6a) and (6b), on the contrary, the definite objects denote a set with exactly two members, and the distributive reading is impossible.

Consider now the restrictive relatives in (7) and (8) corresponding to (5) and (6):

(7) a. I phoned the two patients that every doctor will examine tomorrow.
b. Le-am telefonat celor doi pacienti pe care fiecare doctor ii va examina maine.
(8) a. I phoned two patients that every doctor will examine tomorrow.

b. (?) Am telefonat la doi pacienti pe care fiecare doctor ii va examina maine.

Bianchi (1999) argues for reversed judgments with respect to the examples in (5) and (6): this time the distributive reading is available in (7a) and (7b), where the head is introduced by a definite determiner, but not in (8a) and (8b). Interestingly, in (7a) and (7b) the relativized nominal (the) two patients / celor doi pacienti can be interpreted as in (5a) and (5b), that is, as having narrow scope with respect to the subject QP in the relative clause (AOUN & LI 2003).

This fact indicates that the Head can be interpreted in the direct object position in English and indirect object position in Romanian, and hence that it must have been raised from that position

In brief, there is ample evidence that reconstruction takes place in relative constructions in English; that is, the promotion analysis adequately accounts for the relative construction in English.

***1.2 The Matching Analysis (wh- movement)***

Chomsky (1977) suggests that, like wh-interrogatives, relative clauses are derived via wh-movement (as are clefts, comparatives, topicalizations, easy-to-please constructions, etc.). Citing similarities among the many constructions mentioned above, he argues that they share the properties listed in (9):

(9) a. The construction contains a gap.
b. Long-distance relations are available.
c. Island constraints are relevant.

(10) and (11) illustrate these properties. (10) illustrates the existence of a gap, which, moreover, can be related to the relative pronoun who across clause boundaries (a long-distance relation). In such a structure, the relative pronoun is interpreted with the Head *boy* via a predication rule or agreement relation (CHOMSKY 1977; BROWNING 1987), which is also a matching relation between the Head and the relativized wh-phrase. The examples in (11) illustrate the relevance of island conditions. This analysis is labeled the *matching analysis* .

(10) the boy$_i$ [who$_i$ Mary thinks [t$_i$ is the smartest]]
(11) a. *the boy$_i$ [who$_i$ I like the teacher [who has taught t$_i$]]
b. *the boy$_i$ [who I will be happy [if you like t$_i$]]
c. *the boy$_i$ [who$_i$ I wonder why [John has taught t$_i$]]

Schematically, the matching analysis can be represented as follows, according to Chomsky (1977):

(12) The matching analysis
[$_{NP/DP}$ [$_{HEAD}$ NP/DP$_i$…][$_{RelativeCP}$ *wh*$_i$ [$_{IP}$…..t$_i$…]]]

Cinque (2004) offers evidence for the matching derivation:

- Evidence from the non obligatory reconstruction of the Head (Principle C) in (13) vs. the obligatory reconstruction of interrogative wh-phrases and relative clause internal wh-phrases in (14a,b) and (15a, b):

(13) The pictures of Marsden$_i$ which he$_i$ displays prominently are generally the attractive ones.

(14) a. *Which pictures of Marsden$_i$ does he$_i$ displays prominently?
b *I respect any writer whose depiction of John$_i$ he$_i$.'ll object to.

(15) a. *The headway on Mary$_i$'s project that she$_i$ made pleased her boss.
b The letters by John$_i$ to her$_k$ that he$_i$ told every girl$_k$ to burn were published.

In (14a-b), the violation of Principle C arises because the R-expression is

coindexed with a pronoun that c-commands it.

- Evidence from lack of reconstruction of the Head in *der*- vs. *som*-relatives (Norwegian - AFARLI 1994), in indefinite vs. definite (yalli) relatives (Lebanese Arabic - AOUN & LI 2003); *which*- vs. *that*- relatives (AFARLI 1994, AOUN and LI 2003). Cf. also BIANCHI (1999).

- *Full repetition of the Head inside the relative clause:*

(16) a. Non hanno ancora trovato una **sostanza** [dalla quale **sostanza** ricavare un rimedio contro l'epilessia] (Italian,Cinque 1978,88)

'They have not found a substance from which to obtain a remedy against epilepsy'

b. … împăratul face un **ospăţ** foarte mare în cinstea nepotului său, la care **ospăţ** au fost poftiţi cei mai strălucişi oaspeţi (Creangă, cf. CORNILESCU 1996, 129).

c. … şi după **curentul** vremii, care **curent** al vremii în generaţiile acestea noi duce către generalizări pe care eu le cred pripite. (Nicolae Iorga, cf. CORNILESCU 1996, 129).

vs.

(17) a. ***Quale sostanza** credi **quale sostanza** abbiano ricavato?

b ***Quale sostanza** credi abbiano ricavato **quale sostanza**?

Which substance do you think they obtained which substance?

- *Negative Polarity Licensing:*

(18) a. I don't think he could trust anyone.

b. *I don't think everyone could trust anyone.

(19) Nobody found a picture of anyone which everybody liked.

## 2. The Promotion Analysis and the Matching Analysis in Headed Relative Clauses: A Comparison

The promotion analysis and the matching analysis differ in two major respects. One difference concerns reconstruction effects. Under the promotion analysis, the Head is derived by direct movement and reconstruction is possible. Under the matching analysis, the Head is base-generated. A wh-operator is moved to a position close to the Head (i.e., the peripheral position of the relative CP) and bears a predication or agreement relation to the Head. Since the Head does not undergo direct movement according to this analysis, reconstruction of the Head does not occur.

The other difference concerns structures. The matching analysis has an adjunction structure: the relative CP is adjoined to the Head. The Head-initial word order in English means the relative clause is right-adjoined to the Head, under this analysis. However, such a right-adjunction structure is not allowed if phrase structures are to be understood in terms of Antisymmetry as Kayne (1994) proposes. Consequently, Kayne suggests that the structure does not involve adjunction. Instead, he claims that it involves a complementation structure: the D of the complex nominal takes a CP as its complement, as illustrated in (1), repeated here:

(1) $[_{DP}$ D $[_{CP}$ NP/DP$_i$ [ C $[_{IP}$ ...t$_i$...]]]]

The differences between the two analyses can be summarized as follows:

(20)

| | *Structure* | *Derivation* |
|---|---|---|
| Promotion analysis | complementation | Head derived by movement |
| Matching analysis | adjunction | Movement of an operator in predication/ agreement relation with a base-generated Head |

In the version of the promotion analysis proposed by Kayne (1994), the Head occupies the Spec of the relative CP and the CP is a complement to D—the complementation structure. There is important evidence to support the complementation

structure, as shown below.

According to the complementation structure, the following properties hold:

(21) a. Because the relative CP is the complement of D, the presence of a relative CP entails the presence of D.

b. A selection relation exists between D and CP.

c. D does not form a constituent with the Head NP, which is in the Spec of CP.

All these characterizations are supported empirically.

*2.1 The Obligatoriness of a DP Structure*. (22a) indicates that the presence of a relative clause entails a DP projection. The following coordination facts show the relevance of a DP projection in relative constructions. Generally, English allows *and* to conjoin DPs, NPs, and NPs modified by adjectives. Compare the following examples from Aoun & Li (2003, 101):

(22) a. He saw [[an actor] and [a producer]]. (DP coordination)

b. He is an [[actor] and [producer]]. (NP coordination)

c.He is a [[great actor] and [brilliant producer]]. (Adj + NP coordination)

Note that, when relative clauses occur in coordinate relative constructions, a determiner must occur in each conjunct, suggesting that what is conjoined must be DPs. The relative clause in (23c) must modify both of the conjuncts, not just one of them, whereas the relative clause in (23d) can modify only one conjunct.

(23) a.*He is an [[actor that wants to do everything] and [producer that wants to please everyone]].

* El este un [[actor care vrea să facă tot] şi [producător care vrea să mulţumească pe toată lumea]].

b. He is [[an actor that wants to do everything] and [a producer that wants to please everyone]].

El este [[un actor care vrea să facă tot] şi [un producător care vrea să mulţumească pe toată lumea]].

c. He is an [[actor] and [producer]] that wants to please everyone.

El este un [[actor] şi [producător]] care vrea să mulţumească pe toată lumea.

d. He is [[an actor] and [[a producer] that does not know how to produce]].

El este [[un actor] şi [un producător] care nu ştie cum să producă]].

This follows straightforwardly from the necessity of a DP projection when a relative clause occurs.

*2.2 Selection Relation between D and CP*. There is a very close dependency relation between the relative clause and the determiner (BIANCHI 1999; ALEXIADOU et al. 2000). The D and the CP must co-occur in the following expressions:

(24) a. the Paris * (that I knew) (VERGNAUD 1974)

b. the three books of John's *(that I read) (cf. KAYNE 1994, 86)

c. the four of the boys *(that came to dinner)

d. patru dintre băieţii *(care au venit la cină)

The examples in (24) are not well-formed nominal constituents without the relative clause; this confirms the idea that in the relative structure the determiner and the following nominal expression are generated independent of each other.

In (24a), in Kayne's analysis, the definite determiner does not select the NP headed by the proper name, but the whole restrictive CP. In the genitive structure of (24b), the genitive preposition *of* realizes the head $D^0$. $D^0$ selects an inflectional head that assigns the genitive case to the possessor in its Spec. The complement of this

inflectiona head is the indefinite NumberPhrase *three books*, which raises to SpecDP. Since the genitive preposition instantiates the head $D^0$, this structure cannot be introduced by another determiner. However, the definite determiner selects the relative CP and the DP *three books of John's* and corresponds to the raised head.

Other examples illustrating the same close D/CP dependency can be found in Schmitt (2000, 311-312). They include type expressions (25), measure expressions (26), resultatives (27), and *with* expressions (28). The co-occurrence of a definite article in such expressions is made acceptable by the use of a relative clause.

(25) a. I bought one type of bread.
b. *I bought the type of bread.
c. I bought the type of bread you like.
(26) a. Maria weighs forty-five kilos.
b. *Maria weighs the forty-five kilos.
c. Maria weighs the forty-five kilos Susana would love to weigh.
(27) a. John painted the house a nice color.
b. *John painted the house the nice color.
c. John painted the house the nice color his girlfriend liked.
(28) a. Mary bought a house with windows.
b. *Mary bought a house with the windows.
c. Mary bought a house with the windows that she liked.

The same conclusion can be drawn from Romanian data, comparing the Romanian examples corresponding to the English ones just mentioned above. In these cases, the definite article is either the enclitic *–(u)l* or *–a*, or the demonstrative *cel*:

(29) a. Am cumparat un sortiment de paine.
b. * Am cumparat sortimentul de paine.
c. Am cumparat sortimentul de paine care-ti place.
(30) a. Maria cantareste 45 de kilograme.
b. *Maria cantareste cele 45 de kilograme.
c. Maria cantareste cele 45 de kilograme cat si-ar dori si Susan sa cantareasca.
(31) a. Ion a vopsit casa intr-o culoare frumoasă.
b. *Ion a vopsit casa in culoarea frumoasă.
c. Ion a vopsit casa in culoarea frumoasă care i-a placut prietenei lui.
(32) a. Maria a cumparat o casă cu ferestre.
b. *Maria a cumparat o casă cu ferestrele.
c. Maria a cumparat o casă cu ferestrele care-i placeau.

To conclude, such examples illustrate a close relation between D and the relative CP.

*2.3 External Determiner.* Postnominal relative clauses must be generated as complements to some functional category, namely the determiner (KAYNE 1994, 87). In addition, Aoun& Li (2003) have argued that structurally, the definite determiner *the* lies outside the relative CP (the external determiner hypothesis). The structure can be represented as in (33):

(33) $[_{DP}\ D^0\ CP]$

Their arguments are based on facts demonstrating that *the* cannot have occurred inside the relative clause, as discussed by Bianchi (1999, 43-48). First, the trace of the relativized nominal is not interpreted as definite. (34 a-b), for instance, which involve the existential *there* construction, show that the relativized trace is indefinite because it occurs in a context that typically disallows a definite expression,

indicating that the determiner *the* cannot be part of the relativized nominal itself (Aoun & Li 2003, 102-103).

(34) a. *There were the men in the garden.
b. The men that there were t in the garden were all diplomats.

A second argument is based on the fact that *the* occurs in a relativization structure even when the relativized nominal generally cannot co-occur with *the*. The contrast between the pairs of expressions in (35), for instance, shows that *the* cannot occur with certain idioms but is allowed when a relative clause co-occurs.

(35) a. *They made the fun of me.
* Ei au facut hazul de mine.
b. the fun that they made of me
hazul care l-au facut de mine
c. *We made the headway on that problem. (BROWNING 1987)
* Noi am facut progresul in aceasta problema.
d. the headway that we made on that problem
progresul pe care l-am facut in aceasta problema

A third argument concerns scope assignment under reconstruction, as illustrated by the interpretation of sentences involving QPs such as those in (5), (6) and (7), repeated here.

(5) a. Each doctor will examine two patients.
b. Fiecare doctor va examina doi pacienti.
(6) a. Each doctor will examine the two patients.
b. Fiecare doctor va examina (pe) cei doi pacient.
(7) a. I phoned the two patients that every doctor will examine tomorrow.
b. Le-am telefonat celor doi pacienti pe care fiecare doctor ii va examina maine.

As mentioned earlier, the object QP *two patients/ doi pacienti* in (5a-b) can have a narrow scope interpretation. Examples (6a-b), whose object contains a definite article, have only the reading according to which a total of two patients are examined by the doctors. Importantly, (7a-b), where the relativized nominal is preceded by a definite article, has the same interpretation as (5), not (6). (7)'s similarity to (5), not (6), indicates that the relativized trace behaves like a nominal phrase without a definite article. In other words, the definite article is not part of the relative CP (cf. BIANCHI 1999, AOUN & LI 2003, CINQUE 2004).

*2.4. DP*. An additional property of such a complementation structure needs to be clarified: the relation between the external D and what is moved to the Spec of CP. According to Kayne (1994), what is moved can be an NP. Moving an NP means the trace is an NP. However, this NP trace occurs in a position where one would expect a DP. Note that an NP cannot occupy an argument position.

(36) *Bill liked picture.

In addition, the trace behaves like a DP because it can bind a pronoun, obey the binding principles, control a PRO, license a parasitic gap, and occur in a Case-marked position.

(37) a. the man that $t_i$ thought $he_i$ saw a UFO
b. the man that $t_i$ tried $PRO_i$ to fool everybody
c. the book that Bill criticized $t_i$ without reading a $page_i$
d. *the man that it seems t to know the answer

Accordingly, Bianchi (1999, 2000) proposes that what is moved is not an NP, but a DP with an empty D. The empty D needs to be licensed; its licenser is the external

D of the relative construction, *the* in (38).

(38) $[_{DP}[_{D}$ the] $[_{CP}[_{DP}$ Ø man] $[_{C'}$ that $[_{IP}$ came here]]]]

Moreover, the Head DP (D being empty) in the CP-peripheral position provides an NP that is necessary for the interpretation of the external D. That is, the relation between the external D and the Head DP in the Spec of the relative clause is double-edged: the external D licenses the internal empty D of the DP in the Spec of the relative CP, and the external D has an NP to be interpreted with.

Following Bianchi (1999) again, the licensing of the internal D by the external D is achieved by incorporating the former to the latter. The incorporation is possible for the external D to be interpreted with the NP selected by the internal D. After incorporation, the external D and the external D in a sense have become one unified entity. Accordingly, the relation between the internal D and the NP it selects is the relation between the external D and this NP.

The relation between the Head DP and the external D can be summarized as follows:

(39) a. In the relative construction $[_{DP}$ D $[_{CP}$ $DP_i$ [C $[_{IP}$.. $e_i$ ...]]]], the DP in the Spec of CP (the Head) contains an empty D (the internal D).

b. The empty internal D needs to be licensed.

c. The external D needs to be interpreted with an NP.

d. The empty internal D is licensed by the external D.

e. The external D is interpreted with the NP selected by the internal D.

f. (d) and (e) are achieved by incorporating the internal D to the external D.

g. Incorporation takes place when the two Ds are adjacent to each other, as in the configuration in (a).

***Conclusions***. We have shown that relative constructions exhibit reconstruction effects and that a close relation exists between the external D and the relative clause. The reconstruction effects argue for the promotion analysis, where the Head is moved to its surface position, not base-generated there as in the matching analysis. The close relation between the external D and the relative clause supports the complementation structure, which is the structure adopted by the promotion analysis as in (1), not by the matching analysis as in (12).

The question is what analysis should be adopted in the structure and the derivation of the relative clauses. Cinque (2004) (relying on Carlson 1977, Heim 1987, Afarli 1994, Grosu and Landman 1998, Aoun and Li 2003) sustains the apparent need for both. Aoun & Li (2003, 106) argue that a more appropriate description of the generalizations regarding various types of relative constructions requires that not to adopt the two analyses as they stand. Instead, the promotion analysis (1) and the matching analysis (12) should be deconstructed into the sub-parts in (40) and (41).

(40) a. Complementation structure: the relative clause is a complement to D

b. Adjunction structure: the relative clause is adjoined to the Head

(41) In cases where a relative clause contains a trace, two analyses are available.

a. Head raising/Promotion: The nominal to be relativized moves to the Head position; that is, the trace in the relative clause is derived by movement of the Head.

b. Head base-generation/operator movement: The Head is base-generated in its surface position and interpreted with the relative clause via a wh-operator moved to the Spec of the relative CP: that is, the trace in the relative clause is derived by operator movement. An important consequence of (41a-b) concerns the availability of reconstruction.

(42) a. The Head-raising analysis allows the Head to be reconstructed,

b. The Head base-generation/operator movement analysis does not allow the Head to be reconstructed.

Aoun & Li (2003, 107) further argue that languages do not exclusively apply either Head raising (41 a) or operator movement (41b) to derive their relative constructions, but that both derivations are available. The choice of either option is based on morphosyntactic properties of the relative construction and other general conditions of the grammar.

***BIBLIOGRAPHY***


Aoun, J., and Li, A., *Essays on the Representational and Derivational Nature of Grammar. The Diversity of wh-Constructions*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass, 2003

Bianchi, V., *Consequences of Antisymmetry: Headed Relative Clauses*, Mouton de Grutyer, Berlin-New York, 1999

Browning, Marguerite, *Null Operator Constructions*, Doctoral Dissertation,e MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass, 1987

Carlson, G., *Same and Different: Some Consequences for Syntax and Semantics*, Linguistics and Philosophy 10: 53 1:565, 1987

Chomsky, N., *On wh-movement*, in "Formal syntax", edited by P. Culicover, T. Wasow and A. Akmajian, 71-132, New York Academic Press, 1977

Chomsky. N., *The Minimalist Program*, Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press, 1995

Cinque, G, *The Prenominal Origin of Relative Clauses*, Vilem Mathesius Lecture Series 19, Prague, 2004

Cinque, G., *Types of A-bar Dependencies*, Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press, 1990

Cornilescu, A, *Complementation in English*, Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti, Bucureşti, 2003

Cornilescu, A., *Montague Grammar and the Analysis of Relative Clauses*, Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti, Bucureşti, 1996

Cornilescu, A., *Concepts of Modern Grammar*, Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti, Bucureşti, 1996.

Dikken, Marcel den, *On the Syntax of Wh-movement*, CUNY, New York, 2001

Dobrovie-Sorin, C., *The Syntax of Romanian. A Comparative Study in Romance*, Mouton de Grutyer, Berlin-New York, 1994.

Grosu, A. and F. Landman, *Strange Relatives of the Third Kind*, ms., Tel Aviv University, 1996

Grosu, A., *Three Studies in Locality and Case*, Theoretical Linguistics, Routledge, New York and London, 1994

Heim. I., *Where does the deliniteness restriction apply? Evidence from the definiteness of variables*. *The representation of (in)definiteness*, Edited E. J. Reuland & A.G. B. der Meulen, 21-42, Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1987

Kayne, R.S., *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1994

Pesetsky, D., *Phrasal Movement and its Kin*, MIT, 1998

Rizzi, L., *The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery*, Manuscript, University of Geneva, 1994

Schachter, P., *Focus and Relativization*, in Language, vol. 49, p. 19-46, 1973

Schmitt, C., *Some Consequences of the Complement Analysis for Relative Clauses, Demonstratives and the Wrong Adjectives*, in *The syntax of Relative Clauses*, edited by A. Alexiadou, P. Law, A. Meinunger and C. Wilder,Berlin, Linguistic Aktuell Series, 2000.

Siloni, T., *Noun Phrases and Nominalizations. The Syntax of DPs*, Kluwer Academic Publisher, Dordrecht, 1997

*The Syntax of Relative Clauses*, edited by A. Alexiadou, P. Law, A. Meinunger and C. Wilder,Berlin, Linguistic Aktuell Series, 2000

Vergnaud, J.-R., *French Relative Clauses*, Doctoral Dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass, 1974

Zwart, J-W., *A Head Raising Analysis of Relative Clauses in Dutch*, in *The syntax of Relative Clauses*, edited by A. Alexiadou, P. Law, A. Meinunger and C. Wilder,Berlin, Linguistic Aktuell Series, p. 349-384, 2000.