Free Relative Clauses in Teramano[*]

Iara Mantenuto and Ivano Caponigro

(California State University, Dominguez Hills and University of California San Diego)

1. Introduction

This paper investigates the main morphosyntactic and semantic properties of *free relative clauses* (henceforth, *FRs*) in Teramano, an Italian language from the Upper Southern group. FRs are embedded non-interrogative *wh*-clauses lacking the nominal head that characterizes headed relative clauses—this is why they have been labeled "free" and subsumed under the larger family of *headless relative clauses*.[1] Based on Caponigro (2003; 2004; 2021), we define FRs as follows:

(i) they are embedded clauses missing an argument or an adjunct (or with a resumptive pronoun instead)

(ii) they are introduced by a *wh*-expression (i.e., a *wh*-word or a whole *wh*-phrase)

(iii) they have a distribution and interpretation similar to nominals (DPs), prepositional phrases (PP) modifying VPs or higher functional layers in the clause, adverbial phrases (AdvP), or adjectival phrases (AdjP) acting as clausal predicates.

The structure of FRs can be schematized as in (1), with the coindexed trace signaling the missing constituent.

---

[1] See also van Riemsdijk (2017) for an overview on the syntax of FRs and relevant literature and Simík (2020) for an overview of their semantics and related work. See de Vries (2002: Ch. 2) for a comprehensive discussion of the typology and terminology concerning relative clauses, including headless relative clauses and FRs. Also, see Cinque (2013: Ch. 17, 2020) for a new unifying approach to all the main varieties of relative clauses.

(1)   [MATRIX CLAUSE … [FR WH-1 … t_1 …] …]

Examples from English are given by the bracketed strings in (2)a and (3)a.

(2)   a. Chavela sang [FR **what** Frida liked].
           b. Chavela sang [DP the song that Frida liked].

(3)   a. Martino left [FR **when** Niccolò left].
           b. Martino left [PP at the time Niccolò left].

Despite being full clauses, FRs exhibit the same distribution and interpretation as DPs or PPs in argument or adjunct positions. In (2)b, the FR in (2)a has been replaced and paraphrased with the bracketed complex DP, which consists of the definite D head *the*, the N head *song*, and the headed relative clause *that Frida liked* modifying the N head *song*. The FR in (2)a, instead, combines with no D head or N head. Similarly, in (3)b, the FR in (3)a has been replaced and paraphrased with the bracketed PP taking a complex DP (containing a headed relative clause) as its complement. This syntactic and semantic behavior is unlike that of other well-known kinds of embedded clauses. Embedded declarative or interrogative clauses in argument positions or typical adjunct clauses introduced by a subordinator have a different distribution from FRs and/or convey a different meaning—some form of propositional content. Headed relative clauses—another well-known kind of embedded clause—are associated with an overt nominal head whose meaning they restrict, as we see in (2)b and (3)b. This is a type of semantic behavior resembling that of nominal modifiers like attributive AdjPs or PPs, rather than that of full DPs, PPs modifying VPs or higher functional layers in the clause, AdvPs, or predicative AdjPs. On the other hand, FRs and headed relative clauses share the requirement for a constituent to be missing (or, sometimes, to be replaced by a resumptive pronoun). For instance, both the FR in (2)a and the headed relative clause in (2)b lack the object of the transitive predicate *liked*.

Although crosslinguistic investigation of FRs is still in its beginning stage, FRs have already been attested in Indo-European (Germanic, Romance, Slavic, Albanian, Modern Greek), Finno-Ugric (at least Estonian, Finnish, and Hungarian), Semitic (at least Modern Hebrew, Maltese, and Moroccan Arabic), and Haida (an isolate Native American language or a member of

the Na-Dene family according to some), as well as Mesoamerican language families like Mayan (at least Chuj, Ch'ol, K'iche', Q'anjob'al, Tseltal, Tsotsil and Yucatec Maya), Oto-Manguean (Matlatzinca, Me'phaa, Mixtec, Otomi), Uto-Aztecan (Náhuatl, Southeastern Tepehuan), and Mixe-Zoquean (Sierra Popoluca) (Caponigro 2003, Caponigro et al. 2013, Caponigro et al. 2021, Šimik, 2020, and references therein).

Besides FRs, another large class of headless relative clauses has been attested across languages: *light-headed relative clauses*. An example of light-headed relative clause in English is given in brackets in (4)a. The demonstrative D *those* acts like the "light head," introducing a relative clause (RC) without a nominal head. The light-headed relative (LHR) clause can be replaced and paraphrased with the complex DP containing a headed relative clause in (4)b.

(4)   a. Paola hired [_{LHR} **those** [_{RC} that Lea recommended].
         b. Paola hired [_{DP} those people [_{RC} that Lea recommended].

Light-headed relative clauses are extremely productive in Teramano, as described in detail in Mantenuto & Caponigro (2020).

Overall, our paper provides the first systematic in-depth description of FRs in Teramano and highlights similarities and differences with two related constructions in the language—*wh-* interrogative clauses and headed relative clauses—as well as with the closest equivalent constructions in Italian. Our paper also contributes to the typological study of FRs (and headless relative clauses in general), the methodology for their crosslinguistic investigation, and the study of microvariation among Italian and Italian languages (Poletto & Sanfelici 2018a, 2018b, 2019).

The paper is structured as follows: section 2 provides some background information on Teramano, with a focus on *wh-* interrogative clauses and headed relative clauses. Section 3 presents the two main varieties of FRs that are attested in Teramano—*maximal free relative clauses* and *existential free relative clauses*—and argues that Teramano lacks the third main variety of FR that is found across languages—*free choice free relative clauses.* Section 4 concludes.

2. Teramano basics

Teramano (ISO: ita) is a language[2] spoken in the province of Teramo in Abruzzo, a central eastern region in Italy on the Adriatic coast with slightly more than 300,000 inhabitants. It belongs to the Upper Southern group (Pellegrini 1977) of Italian languages, and most of its speakers are bilingual. Indeed, Italian is the official language of the area, and not all people who live in Teramo are in fact fluent speakers of Teramano. Yet this language is widely used in the region.

Teramano exhibits SVO word order and is head initial, with the specifier to the left of the head, as shown in (5).

(5) *Marie[3] vo*   *magnà*   *lu*   *timballe.[4]*
     Marie want.PRES.3SG   eat.INF   the.SG.M   timballo.SG.M
     'Marie wants to eat the timballo.'

In the next two subsections, we briefly introduce two constructions in Teramano that share morphosyntactic and/or semantic features with FRs: *wh-* interrogative clauses (§2.1) and headed relative clauses (§2.2).

2.1. Wh- interrogative clauses in Teramano

In this subsection, we sketch the main features of matrix and embedded *wh-* interrogative clauses in Teramano, with special emphasis on the set of *wh*-expressions that introduce them.

---

[2] We are going to refer to Teramano as "language" for consistency's sake, although we are aware that it has also been referred to as a "dialect."

[3] In Teramano, the last vowel of many multisyllabic words (and a few monosyllabic ones) is [ə] because of a diachronic neutralization rule (Hastings 1997). In the standard orthography, which we are using for our transcriptions, [ə] is represented with *e*, while [e] is represented by *è*.

[4] The data are reported in Teramano's orthography, which is largely based on Italian orthography. The following abbreviations were used in the glosses: 1: first person; 2: second person; 3: third person; COMP: complementizer; DAT: dative; F: feminine; FC: free choice; INF: infinitival; LHR: light headed relative clause; M: masculine; PAST: past; POSS: possessive; PRES: present; PROGR: progressive; PRON: pronominal; PTCP: participle; RC: relative clause; REFL: reflexive; SG: singular.

Wh- interrogative clauses will then be used as the baseline *wh-* construction for our investigation of FRs in §3 and the *wh*-expressions in *wh-* interrogative clauses will be compared with those introducing FRs (and headed relative clauses).

Like Italian, Teramano forms matrix and embedded *wh-* interrogative clauses by fronting their *wh*-expression and, in the case of matrix interrogative clauses, by adding a clause-final raising intonation. For example, *che* 'what' in (6)a occurs in sentence initial position, after moving from the object position adjacent to the verb. Interrogative clauses with *in situ wh*-expressions are not allowed, not even as echo-questions, regardless of the position of the subject or any other constituent, as shown in (6)b,c.

(6)   a. ***Che***   *magne*   *Marie?*
         what   eat.PRES.3SG   Marie
         'What is Marie eating?'
     b. **Magne*   *Marie* ***che?***
          eat.PRES.3SG   Marie   what
     c. **Marie*   *magne*   ***che?***
         Marie   eat.PRES.3SG   what

Table 1 lists all the *wh*-expressions used in Teramano, while sentences (7)–(15) exemplify the usage of each of those *wh*-expressions.

Table 1 *Wh*-expressions in Teramano

TERAMANO	TRANSLATION
ce[5]	'who'
che	'what'/{'what/which' + NP}
addue/due/ue[6]	'where'
quande	'when'
'nda[7]	'how'
quande	'how much'
pecca	'why'
quande[8]	'how much/many' (+ NP)

(7) **Ci'-a**   *chiamate*   *Marie?*

who-have.PRES.3SG   call.PTCP   Marie

'Who did Marie call?'

(8) [**Che**   *timballe*]   *a*   *cucinite*   *Marie*?

what/which   timballo.SG.M have.PRES.3SG cook.PTCP   Marie

'What/Which timballo did Marie cook?'

---

[5] Nowadays people also use *chi* for 'who' but it is probably borrowed from Italian. *Ce* is the historical wh-word for 'who' in Teramano (also reported as *ci* in Savini (1881)). Note that, whenever *ce* is followed by a vowel (for example, the auxiliary for the third person singular *a*), *ce* becomes *ci'* (ex. *ce->ci'-a* [t͡ʃə]->[t͡ʃa]).

[6] To the best of our knowledge, these different *wh*-words for 'where' can all be used in interrogative as well as relative clauses without syntactic or semantic differences.

[7] In addition to *'nda*, the borrowing from Italian *come* ('how') is used as well, without any distributional difference that we have been able to detect. In the remainder of the paper, we use and test *'nda* only.

[8] There is an alternation between [t] and [d]; they are probably in free variation.

(9) ***Addu'/du'/u'-a***   *cucinite*   *lu*   *timballe*   *Marie?*

where-have.PRES.3SG   cook.PTCP   the.SG.M   timballo.SG.M Marie

'Where did Marie cook the timballo?'

(10) ***Quand'-a***   *cucinite*   *lu*   *timballe*   *Marie?*

when-have.PRES.3SG cook.PTCP   the.SG.M   timballo.SG.M Marie

'When did Marie cook the timballo?'

(11) ***'Nd-a***   *cucinite*   *lu*   *timballe*   *Marie?*

how-have.PRES.3SG cook.PTCP   the.SG.M   timballo.SG.M Marie

'How did Marie cook the timballo?'

(12) ***Quande***   *pese*   *lu*   *timballe?*

how.much   weight.PRES.3SG   the.SG.M   timballo.SG.M

'How heavy is the timballo?'

(13) ***Pecc'-a***   *cucinite*   *lu*   *timballe*   *Marie?*

why-have.PRES.3SG cook.PTCP   the.SG.M   timballo.SG.M Marie

'Why did Marie cook the timballo?'

(14) [***Quande***   *timballe*]   *a*   *cucinite*   *Marie?*

how.much   timballo.SG.M have.PRES.3SG cook.PTCP   Marie

'How much timballo did Marie cook?'

(15) [***Quande***   *scrippelle*]   *a*   *fitte*   *Marie?*

how.many   scrippelle.PL.F have.PRES.3SG make.PTCP   Marie

'How many crepes did Marie make?'

It is particularly important to consider all the *wh*-expressions in Teramano (and in a language in general) when FRs are investigated. Crosslinguistic investigation clearly shows that varieties of FRs make use of a subset of *wh*-expressions that are attested in interrogative clauses

(Caponigro 2003, 2021). Which *wh*-expressions are used depends on the language and, within the same language, on the kind of FR. Restrictions on *wh*-expressions in different kinds of FRs in the same language is also a strong argument in favor of keeping those different kinds of FRs distinct, rather than trying to reduce them to just one kind.

Like Italian, Teramano does not allow for multiple *wh*- interrogative clauses, i.e., *wh*- clauses with more than one *wh*-expression. Multiple *wh*- interrogative clauses in Teramano are banned even as echo questions, as shown in (16)a. A sequence of single *wh*- interrogative clauses is used, instead, as in (16)b.

(16) a. ***Ci'-a***   *cucinite*   ***che/cose*?**
          who-have.PRES.3SG   cook.PTCP   what/what.SG.F
      b. ***Ci'-a***   *cucinite?*   ***Ch'-a***   *cucinite?*
          who-have.PRES.3SG   cook.PTCP   what-have.PRES.3SG   cook.PTCP
      'Who cooked what?' (Lit. 'Who cooked? What did they cook?')

Embedded *wh*- interrogative clauses look identical to matrix ones, including the obligatory fronting of the *wh*-expression, as shown by the bracketed strings in (17) and (18).

(17) *Nicole*   *vò*   *sapà*   [***ci'-a***   *fatte*
      Nicole   want.PRES.3SG know.INF   who-have.PRES.3SG   do.PTCP
      lu   *timballe*].
      the.SG.M   timballo.SG.M
      'Nicole wants to know who made the timballo.'

(18) *Je*   *ne*   *sacce*   [***quand'-armenute***[9]   *Nicole*].
      1SG   not   know.PRES.1SG   when-have.PRES.3SG.came.back.PTCP Nicole
      'I don't know when Nicole came back.'

---

[9] A common phonological phenomenon in Teramano is apocope: if two /a/ phonemes occur adjacent to one another in the underlying phonological representation, one of them is deleted.

To sum up, matrix and embedded *wh-* interrogative clauses in Teramano are always introduced by a *wh*-expression in clause-initial position and cannot contain more one *wh*-expression, regardless of the position of the *wh*-expressions. We have presented *wh-* interrogative clauses and their *wh*-expressions in Teramano in detail because, in the remainder of the paper, we use them as our baseline for embedded *wh-* clauses in Teramano and their inventory of *wh*-expressions.

2.2. Headed relative clauses in Teramano

In this section, we sketch the main features of headed relative clauses in Teramano, focusing on which *wh*-words can act as relativizers. Headed relative clauses will be later compared to FRs in order to highlight similarities and differences.

In Teramano, headed relative clauses always follow their nominal head, are marked by a relativizer in clause-initial position, and lack an argument or an adjunct. The relativizers are of two kinds: the complementizer *che* and a subset of the *wh*-words that are used in *wh-* interrogative clauses. The complementizer *che* is homophonous to the *wh*-word *che* 'what' (cf. (6)). It can introduce embedded declarative clauses like the bracketed one in (19).

(19) *Nicole a*   *datte*   *[ch'-a*   *cucinite*
     Nicole have.PRES.3SG   say.PTCP   COMP-have.PRES.3SG   cook.PTCP
     Marie].
     Marie
     'Nicole said that Marie cooked.'

The complementizer *che* is required in Teramano to introduce headed relative clauses missing a subject or a direct object, as in Italian. It is also needed for the relativization of an indirect object or a prepositional phrase, unlike Italian. The *wh*-word *ce* 'who' is completely unacceptable in these contexts, as shown in (20).[10] In the examples that follow, headed relative clauses are

---

[10] Since the declarative complementizer *che* is homophonous with the *wh*-word for 'what', it is hard to distinguish between the two.

represented within brackets with their relativizer (the complementizer or a *wh*-word) in bold, while their nominal head is underlined outside the brackets.

(20) *Nen   me   piace   la   <u>gende</u>   [**che**[11]/***ce***   fatije*
    not   to.me   like.PRES.3SG   the.PL.F   people.PL.F   COMP/who   work.PRES.3PL

    assì].
    a.lot

    'I don't like (the) people that work a lot.'

Headed relative clauses missing an indirect object require the complementizer to be followed by the resumptive pronoun—the form *-i-* in the example in (21).

(21) *'Lla   <u>fammene</u>   [(*a)   **ch'**-i-a   arrubite*
    that.SG.F   woman.SG.F   to   COMP-3SG.DAT-have.PRES.3SG steal.PTCP

    la   macchine   è   cugine-me.
    the.SG.F   car.SG.F   be.PRES.3SG   cousin-POSS.1SG

    'The woman from whom they have stolen the car is my cousin.'

The *wh*-words for 'where,' 'when,' 'how,' and 'why' can all act as relativizers and introduce headed relative clauses, often in alternation with the complementizer *che*, as shown in (22)–(25).[12]

---

[11] Unless otherwise indicated, the complementizer should always be considered obligatory when reported. For more detailed work on complementizers in Abruzzese refer to D'Alessandro and Di Felice (2015) and D'Alessandro and Ledgeway (2010).

[12] Emanuela Sanfelici (p.c.) reminded us of the intriguing semantic contrast Cinque (1982) noticed between adverbial relative clauses introduced by the complementizer *che*, as in (i), and those introduced by P+relative-pronoun/dove 'where'/quando 'when', as in (ii).

(i)   *La   settimana   che   sono   in   ferie.*
       the.SG.F   week.SG.F   COMP   be.PRES.1SG   in   vacation.F   Italian

(22) | Je | so | nate | a | lu | stasse | *pahase* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1SG | be.PRES.1SG | born.PTCP | at | the.SG.M | same | town.SG.M |

[*addu'-/du'-/u'-/ch-a*   nite   li   giniture

where/where/where/ COMP-have.PRES.3SG   born.PTCP   the.PL.M   parents.PL.M

a   mi].

a   POSS.1SG]

'I was born in the (same) town where my parents were born.'

(23) | Me | ne | so | ijte | a | 'llu | *mumende* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| me | of.it | be.PRES.1SG | go.PTCP | at | that.SG.M | moment.SG.M |

[*ch'-/quand'-a*   arrivite   Marie].

COMP-/when-have.3SG   arrive.PTCP   Marie

'I left at the moment when Marie arrived.'

(24) | Lu | so[13] | fatte | a | lu | stasse | *mode* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| it | be.PRES.1SG | do.PTCP | at | the.SG.M | same | way.SG.M |

[*che/'nda*   l-i   fatte   tu[14]].

COMP/ how   it-be.PRES.2SG do.PTCP   2SG

'I did it in the (same) way you did it.'

(ii) | La | settimana | in | cui/dove | sono | in | ferie. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| the.SG.F | week.SG.F | in | which/where | be.PRES.1SG | in | vacation.F |

'The week I am on vacation.'   Italian

[13] Teramano has a split auxiliary system, as attested in other varieties of Abruzzese (D'Alessandro & Roberts 2010). The term *Abruzzese* includes every linguistic variety spoken in the Abruzzo region.

[14] The second person singular nominative pronoun varies freely between the form *te* and the form *tu*.

(25) *Lu*   *sò*   *fatte*   *pe*   *lu*   *stasse* <u>*mutive*</u>

it   be.PRES.1SG   do.PTCP   for   the.SG.M   same   reason.SG.M

[**pecca/che**   *l-i*   *fatte*   *tu*].

why/COMP   it-be.PRES.2SG do.PTCP   2SG

'I did it for the same reason why you did it.'

The *wh*-word *quande* 'how-much', together with the clitic (*ni* 'of-it') replacing its nominal complement, can introduce a *wh*- clause modifying the amount component of a preceding nominal like *tande farine* 'much flour', as shown in (26). The same *wh*-word *quande* 'how-much' or the *wh*-word *'nda* 'how' can introduce a *wh*- clause modifying the preceding adjective *stracche* 'tired' and act as the modifier of an identical adjective (*stracche* 'tired') within the *wh*- clause, as shown in (27). Finally, *quande* 'how-much' or the *wh*-word *'nda* 'how' can introduce a *wh*- clause modifying the preceding adverb *veloce* 'fast', as shown in (28).

(26) *So*   *cumbrate*   <u>*tande*</u>   <u>*farine*</u> [**quande**   *n-i*

be.PRES.1SG buy.PTCP   as.much   flour how.much   of.it-have.PRES.2SG

cumbrate   *tu*].

buy.PTCP   2SG

'I bought as much flour as you did.'

(27) *Marie*   *aè*   <u>*stracche*</u>   [**quande/'nda**   *sò*

Maria   be.PRES.3SG   tired   how.much/how   be.PRES.1SG

stracche   *je*].

tired   1SG

'Maria is as tired as I am.'

(28) *Va*   <u>*veloce*</u> [**quande/'nda**   *vu*   *jì*   *tu*].

go.PRES.3SG fast   how.much/how   want.PRES.2SG go.INF 2SG

 'Go as fast as you want to go.'

The examples in (26)–(28) resemble comparative constructions in terms of their meaning and some of their morphosyntactic features. We will not investigate this connection further, since our paper focuses on FRs, rather than headed relative clauses or comparative clauses. The question marks in the column for 'how much/many' in Table 2 are meant to signal that this is an open issue.[15]

Finally, the complex *wh*-expression for 'what'/'which' + N cannot introduce headed relative clauses, as shown in (29).

(29) **So   pruvate   <u>la   pizze</u>   [**che   pizze***
       be.PRES.1SG   tast.PTCP   the.SG.F   pizza.SG.F   what   pizza.SG.F
       hi   fatte].
       have.PRES.2SG   do.PTCP
       'I tasted the pizza that you made.'

Table 2 summarizes our findings about the occurrence of *wh*-expressions in headed relative clauses in Teramano (we label the Teramano *wh*-expressions with their English translations in Table 2 and the subsequent tables).

Table 2 Distribution of *wh*-expressions in headed relative clauses in Teramano

Who	What	Where	When	How	Why	What+N /Which+N	How much/ How many	
							+N	+Adj
✘	✘	✓	✓	✓	✓	✘	?	?

In conclusion, headed relative clauses in Teramano can always be introduced by the declarative complementizer *che*. They allow for the complementizer to be replaced with a *wh*-expression only when the relativized constituent is different from the subject, the direct object, or the indirect object. The *wh*-expressions that can be used in (clear cases of) headed relative clauses

---

[15] But see Pancheva Izvorski (2000: Ch. 3) for an analysis of comparative clauses as headless relative clauses.

are the *wh*-words for 'where', 'when', 'how', and 'why'. This contrasts with Italian, which makes use of just one *wh*-expression in headed relative clauses: the *wh*-word for 'where.'

3. Free Relative Clauses

In this section, we describe the construction at the center of our investigation: FRs in Teramano. Three main kind of FRs are attested crosslinguistically (Caponigro 2003, 2021): (i) *Maximal* FRs, (ii) *Existential* FRs, and (iii) *Free Choice* FRs. We discuss the first two kinds in §3.1 and 3.2, respectively. In §3.3, we briefly touch on the third kind to argue that Free Choice FRs are not a genuine and productive construction in Teramano, but the result of contact with Italian.

3.1.Maximal Free Relative Clauses in Teramano

Maximal FRs are FRs that can be paraphrased with a definite DP (including a complex definite DP whose nominal complement acts as the head of a headed relative clause). Like definite DPs, Maximal FRs exhibit two main semantic properties: referentiality and maximality. Let us explain both by looking at a concrete example. The bracketed string in (30)a is Maximal FR introduced by the *wh*-word *ce* 'who'. It can be replaced and paraphrased with the bracketed definite DP in (30)b.

(30) a. *Nen   me   piace   [**ce**   te   piace]*.
     not   1SG.DAT   like.PRES.3SG who   2SG.DAT   like.PRES.3SG
     'I don't like {the one}/{those} you like.'

   b. *Nen   me   piace   [la   gente   che*
     not   1SG.DAT   like.PRES.3SG the.SG.F people.SG.F   COMP
     te   piace].
     2SG.DAT   like.PRES.3SG
     'I don't like {the one}/{those} you like.'

As with the definite DP, the Maximal FR also refers to those people the addressee does not like—the only difference being that the Maximal FR is unspecified for number. So (30)a would be appropriate both in a situation in which there is only one person the addressee does not like and

in a situation in which there are many people the addressee does not like. On the other hand, the collective noun *gente* 'people' in the definite DP in (30)b is felicitous only in a situation in which there is more than one person that the addressee does not like.

Besides being referential, Maximal FRs also exhibit maximality, which explains their label. In a situation in which the addressee does not like five people, the speaker can felicitously utter (30)a if she does not like all five people the addressee does not like. If the speaker does not like only two of them, then she cannot utter (30)a truly and/or felicitously. In other words, the Maximal FRs in (30)a can only refer to the maximal individual that has the property of not being liked by the addressee—the (unique) plural individual resulting from the sum of all five atomic individuals that the addressee does not like. Notice that the same property holds for the definite DP in (30)b. In fact, the seminal semantic analysis of Maximal FRs developed in Jacobson (1995) and Dayal (1996) builds on Link's (1983) analysis of definite DPs, which was based on the notion of the maximal individual of a set as the reference of a definite DP.

The following examples show other Maximal FRs in Teramano that are introduced by the *wh*-word for 'who' or other *wh*-expressions, with FRs in brackets and *wh*-expressions in bold.

(31) WHO

a. *Chiame*   [*ci'-a*   *cucinite*   *a*   *la*
   call.PRES.1SG   who-have.PRES.3SG   cook.PTCP   at   the.SG.F
   feste].
   party.SG.F
   'I will call {the one}/{those} who cooked at the party.'

b. *Tilifene*   [*a*   *ci*   *tilifene*   *tu*].
   call.PRES.1SG   to   who   call.PRES.3SG   2SG
   'I will [phone]call {the one}/{those} who you will [phone]call.'

(32) WHERE

    a. *Je*   *so*   *nate*   [***addu'-/du'-/u'-****a*   *nite*

     1SG   be.PRES.1SG   born.PTCP   where/where/where-have.PRES.3SG   born.PTCP

     li   *ginitur-a*   *mi*].

     the.PL.M   parent.PL.M-a   POSS.1SG

     'I was born where my parents were born.'

    b. *Sò*   *rijete*   [***addu'-/du'-/u'-****a*   *ci'-avam**e*

     be.PRES.1SG   gone.back.PTCP   where/where/where-a   REFL-have.PRES.1PL

     spusite].

     marry.PTCP

     'I went where we got married.'

(33) WHEN

    a. *Me*   *ne*   *sò*   *jite*   [***quand'-****a*   *arrivite*

     REFL   of.it   be.PRES.1SG   go.PTCP   when-have.PRES.3SG   arrive.PTCP

     Marie].

     Marie

     'I left when Marie arrived.'

    b. *Vaje*   *a*   *la*   *feste*   [***quande***   *Ann**e*

     go.PRES.1SG   to   the.SG.F   party.SG.F   when   Anne

     armore   *li*   *cannale*].

     turn.off.PRES.3SG   the.PL.F   candle.PL.F

     'I am going to the party when Anne blows the candles.'

(34) HOW

    a. *Lu sò*   *fatte*   [***'nda***   *l-i*   *fatte*   *tu*].

        it   be.PRES.1SG   do.PTCP   how   it-be.PRES.2SG   do.PTCP   2SG

        'I did it how you did it.'

    b. *Sò*   *cucinite*   *lu*   *suche*   [***'nda*** *faciave*

        be.PRES.1SG   cook.PTCP   the.SG.M   sauce.SG.M   how   do.PAST.3SG

        nonne].

        grandma.SG.F

        'I cooked the sauce how my grandma did it.'

(35) HOW-MUCH

     Sò   *fatijte*   [***quande***   *hi*   *fatijte*   *tu*].

     be.PRES.1SG   work.PTCP   how.much   be.PRES.2SG   work.PTCP   2SG

      'I worked as much as you did.'

(36) WHY

     Lu   *sò*   *fatte*   [***pecca***   *l-i*   *fatte*   *tu*].

     it   be.PRES.1SG   do.PTCP   why   it-be.PRES.2SG   do.PTCP   2SG

     'I did it for the same reason why you did it.' [16]

However, it is not possible for Maximal FRs in Teramano to be introduced by the *wh*-word for 'what,' as shown in (37)a. The demonstrative followed by the complementizer needs to be used, instead, as shown in (37)b. Such a construction is common among the Italian languages (Munaro 2000). It is a kind of light-headed relative clause that is discussed in detail in Mantenuto & Caponigro (2020).

---

[16] This example also admits a different "non-FR" reading which could be paraphrased as 'I did it because you did it' or 'I did it and the reason was that you did it.'

(37) WHAT

   a. *_Je_ _magne_   [**_che_** _sti_   _cucinì_].

      1SG eat.PRES.1SG   what stay.PRES.2SG cook.PROGR

   b. _Je_   _magne_   [**_qualle_**   **_che_** _sti_   _cucinì_].

      1SG eat.PRES.1SG   that.SG.M   COMP stay.PRES.2SG cook.PROGR

      'I'll eat what you are cooking.'

Maximal FRs cannot be introduced by the complex _wh_-phrase 'which/what' + N either.

(38) WHAT/WHICH + N

   *_Me_ _piace_   [**_che_**   **_vine_**   _piace_   _a_   _ta_].

   to.me like.PRES.3SG   what/which wine.SG.M   like.PRES.3SG to   you

   ('I like what/which wine you like.')

On the other hand, Teramano does not enforce an absolute ban on Maximal FRs introduced by complex _wh_-phrases. Simple and complex _wh_-phrases like 'how-much' or 'how-much' + N can productively introduce Maximal FRs (39), while those of the kind 'how-much'+ Adj/Adv are degraded (40), especially in comparison with the corresponding simple _wh_-word version like the one that was shown in (35).

(39) HOW-MUCH + N

   _Sò_   _bevute_   [**_quande_**   **_vine_**   _hi_   _bevute_

   be.PRES.1SG drink.PTCP   how.much   wine.SG.M   be.PRES.2SG drink.PTCP

   _tu_].

   2SG

   'I drank as much wine as you did.'

(40) HOW-MUCH + ADJ

   _Va_   [***_quande_**/*_**'nda**_   **_veloce_** _vu_   _jì_   _tu_].

   go.PRES.3SG how.much/how   fast   want.PRES.2SG go.INF 2SG

   'Go as fast as you want.'

Table 3 summarizes our findings about Maximal FRs in Teramano and the *wh*-expressions that can introduce them.

Table 3 Distribution of *wh*-expressions in Maximal FRs in Teramano

Who	What	Where	When	How	How much	Why	What+N/ Which+N	How much/ How many	
								+N	+Adj
✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗

If we compare Teramano with Italian, we notice some interesting similarities and differences. Neither language allows for Maximal FRs introduced by the *wh*-word for 'what' or the *wh*-phrase 'what/which' + N. Maximal FRs introduced by the *wh*-phrases 'how-much/many' + N, instead, are acceptable in both Teramano and in Italian, as shown below by the Italian counterpart of the Teramano example in (39).

(41)　*Ho*　　　　　　*bevuto*　　[***quanto***　*vino*　*hai*　　　　*bevuto*
　　　have.PRES.1SG　drink.PTCP　how.much　wine　have.PRES.2SG drink.PTCP
　　　tu].
　　　2SG
　　　'I drank as much wine as you did.'　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Italian

On the other hand, Maximal FRs introduced by the *wh*-word for 'why' are completely impossible in Italian (only the non-FR reading we mentioned in fn. 16 is available), while they are fully acceptable in Teramano. This is a true contrast that highlights an intriguing difference in Maximal FRs between *wh*-words that behave identically in interrogative clauses. Whatever the process is that is responsible for allowing *wh*-expressions in a language to also be used in non-interrogative clauses like FRs (see Caponigro & Fălăus 2018 for some speculation), it must also apply to each *wh*-expression individually rather than to the whole class of *wh*-expressions in a language, given the fact that not all *wh*-expressions in *wh*- interrogative clauses are attested in FRs and the gaps vary from the language to language. Teramano provides further support to this crosslinguistic conclusion. The *wh*-word for 'why' has extended to FRs in Teramano, while it has not in Italian. Across Romance languages (and not only), the Italian pattern is the most common

one. Still, Romanian, among Romance languages, and several Mesoamerican languages exhibit the same pattern as Teramano and allow for 'why' to introduce Maximal FRs (see Caponigro & Fălăuş 2018, Caponigro 2021, Caponigro et al. 2021).

Lastly, Maximal FRs in Teramano exhibit the so called "categorial matching effects": the *wh*-phrase introducing a Maximal FR has to satisfy both the syntactic requirements the FR imposes on its missing constituent (its *wh*-trace) and those the matrix clause imposes on the whole Maximal FR .[17] For instance, example (31)a above showed a Maximal FR with a missing DP subject that occurs in the object position of a matrix predicate selecting for a DP object. The *wh*- DP *chi* 'who' then satisfies ('matches') both the DP requirement for the subject of its own clause and the DP requirement for the object of the matrix clause. Example (31)b, instead, showed a Maximal FR and a matrix clause that make use of the same predicate—a predicate that selects for a PP complement with P *a* 'to'. The PP complement is missing in the Maximal FR and is realized by the whole Maximal FR in the matrix clause. The *wh*- PP introducing the Maximal FR *a chi* ('to who') is the right kind of PP to satisfy the PP complement requirements of both clauses. If such double satisfaction ('matching') is violated, the resulting sentence is unacceptable. This is shown in (42). The predicate of the bracketed Maximal FR, the same as in (31)b, selects for a PP complement, which is missing. The matrix predicate selects for a DP complement. The *wh*- PP *a chi* ('to who') satisfies the PP requirements of the missing constituent in its own clause but doesn't satisfy the DP requirements of the matrix clause. The overall sentence is judged degraded.

(42)　　*Nen　so　　　mai　incuntrate*　[[PP　*a　　ce*]
　　　　not　be.PRES.1SG　never　meet2.PTCP　　　　to　　who

　　　　vulije　　　telefunà].
　　　　want.PAST.2SG　call.INF

　　　　'I never met who you wanted to call.'

As we'll see in the next section, the other kind of FR that we have found in Teramano does not exhibit categorial matching effects, which is also the attested crosslinguistic pattern.

---

[17] See van Riemsdijk (2017) and references therein for a thorough discussion of matching effects in FRs.

3.2. Existential Free Relative Clauses in Teramano

Existential FRs are FRs that only occur as the complement of existential predicates/constructions and can be paraphrased with an indefinite NP. One common semantic approach to Existential FRs assumes that they denote a set of individuals over which the matrix predicate existentially quantifies, ensuring that the set not be empty (see Caponigro 2003, 2004, Šimík 2011, 2020, and the references therein).

Teramano has two main kinds of existential constructions. One is roughly equivalent to English *there is/are* and is formed by the locative *ce* 'there' and the verb *sta* 'to stay'. The other is formed with the verb *tenè* 'to hold' and is close to the construction with existential *have* in English. Affirmative and negative sentences do not differ in this function. With the exception of the *wh*-words for 'who', 'what', and 'where', no other *wh*-expression is able to introduce Existential FRs in Teramano, as shown in (43)–(52) below. This is the same pattern that is observed in Italian, including an intriguing restriction for the *wh*-word for 'what': it has to occur as the complement of a preposition, as shown by the contrast between (43)a and (43)b–d.

(43) WHAT

    a. **Ce*   *sta*   [***che*** *isce* *pò*   *magnà*].

         there   stay.PRES.3SG   what   3PL   can.PRES.3PL   eat.INF

         Intended: 'There's something they can eat.'

    b. *Nicole*   *tè*   [***de*** *che* *magnà*].

         Nicola   have.PRES.3SG   of   what   eat.INF

         'Nicola has something to eat.' (Lit. 'Nicola has what to eat.')

    c. *Nen*   *tè*   [***de*** *che* *magnà*].

         not   have.PRES.3PL   of   what   eat.INF

         'They don't have anything to eat.' (Lit. 'They don't have what to eat.')

    d. *Nen*   *tinge*   [***'nghe*** *fà* *da*   *magnà*].

         not   have.PRES.1SG   with.what   do.INF   of   eat.INF

         'I don't have anything to cook with.' (Lit. 'I don't have with what to cook.')

(44) WHO

a. *Nen   tinghe   [***'nghe ce***   *parlà*   *quande*   *sò*
   not   have.PRES.1SG with   who   talk.INF   when   be.PRES.1SG
   triste].
   sad

   'I don't have anyone with whom to talk when I am sad.'

b. *Ce   sta   [***ce***   *dice*   *simbre*   *de*   *scì*].
   there   stay.PRES.3SG who   say.PRES.3SG   always   of   yes

   'There is always someone who says yes.'

c. *Ce   sta   [***ce***   *m'-aguarde*   *li*
   there   stay.PRES.3SG who   to.me-look.after.INF   the.PL.M
   frichene   *quande*   *'n-ce*   *stinghe*].
   child.PL.M   when   not-there   stay.PRES.1SG

   'There is someone who takes care of the children when I am not home.'

(45) WHERE

a. *Nen   tinghe   [***addu'-/du'-/u'-****a*   *jì*].
   not   have.PRES.1SG where-a   go.INF

   'I don't have anywhere to go.'

b. *Ce   sta   [***addu'-/du'-/u'-****a*   *jì*].
   there   stay.PRES.3SG where-a   go.INF

   'There is somewhere to go.'

(46) WHEN

a. **Nen   tenave   [***quande***   *jir-le*   *a*   *truvà*].
   not   had.PAST.3SG   when   go.INF-him   to   visit.INF
   Intended: 'Non c'era/ non avevo quando andarlo a trovare.'

b. **Nicole   nen   tè   [***quande***   *legge*].
   Nicola   not   have.PRES.3SG when   read.INF
   Intended: 'Nicola does not have time to read.'

52

(47) HOW

Nicole *nen* *tenave* [*'nda* *fa* *lu* *timballe*].
Nicola not had.PAST.3SG how do.INF the.SG.M timballo.SG.M
Intended: 'Nicola doesn't have a way to make the timballo.'

(48) HOW-MUCH

Nicole *nen* *tenave* [*quande* *fa*].
Nicola not had.PAST.3SG how do.INF
Intended: 'Nicola doesn't have an amount to make.'

(49) WHY

Nicole *nen* *tè* [*pecca* *fa* *lu* *timballe*].
Nicola not have.PRES.3SG why do.INF the.SG.M timballo.SG.M
Intended: 'Nicola doesn't have a reason to make timballo.'

(50) WHAT/WHICH + N

Nicole *nen* *tè* [*che* *cane* *'nghe*
Nicole not have.PRES.3SG what dog.SG.M with.what
pazzià].
play.INF
Intended: 'Nicole doesn't have a dog that plays with him.'

(51) HOW-MUCH/MANY + N

a. *Nicole* *nen* *tè* [*quande* *timballe* *magnà*].
  Nicole not have.PRES.3SG how.much timballo.SG.M eat.INF
  Intended: 'Nicole doesn't have an amount of timballo to eat.'

b. *Nicole* *nen* *tè* [*quande* *libbre* *legge*].
  Nicole not have.PRES.3SG how.many book.PL.M read.INF
  Intended: 'Nicole doesn't have an amount of books to read.'

(52) HOW MUCH + ADJ

*Nen tenghe   [**quand**-a   pesande   fa   lu*

not   have.PRES.3SG how.much-a   heavy   do.INF the.SG.M

pacchette].

package.SG.M

Intended: 'I don't have an amount of heaviness for the package.'

Our findings about Existential FRs in Teramano are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4 Distribution of *wh*-expressions in Existential FRs in Teramano

Who	What	Where	When	How	How much	Why	What/Which +N	How much/many	
								+N	+Adj
✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗

It has been observed that Existential FRs across languages—at least those that have been studied so far—show a preference for infinitive or subjunctive marking on their predicates (see Grosu 2004, Šimík 2011 a.o.). Teramano requires the infinitive form in Existential FRs like in (43)-(45) above, but it requires the indicative present or past in Existential FRs like (53) and (54), respectively (see Caponigro et al. 2021 for other languages whose Existential FRs are not restricted to infinitive or other irrealis forms).

(53) *Ce   sta   [ce   so   **cunuscete**   a   la*

there stay.PRES.3SG who be.PRES.1SG meet.PTCP at   the.SG.F

feste].

party.SG.F

'There are people who I met at the party.'

(54) *Ce*   *stave*   [*ce*   ***m'-aguardave***   *li*

      there stay.PAST.3SG who   to.me-look.after.PAST.3SG   the.PL.M

      frichene   *quande*   *iave*   *da*   *mamme*].

      child.PL.M   when   go.PAST.1SG   from   mom.SG.F

      'There was someone who would look after the kids for me when I was at my

       mom's.'

Lastly, Existential FRs do not exhibit categorial matching effects, unlike Maximal FRs. The matrix existential predicates in the examples above usually select for a DP/NP in their complement position. Nevertheless, the Existential FR that occurs in their complement position can be introduced by any kind of *wh-* phrase: a *wh-* DP (e.g., (44)b–d, (53), (54)) or *wh-* PPs with different P heads (e.g., (43)b–d, (44)a). This pattern within Existential FRs and the contrast with Maximal FRs is attested across language (Šimík 2011, 2020).

3.3. Lack of true Free Choice Free Relative Clauses in Teramano

      The third kind of FR that is attested across languages is Free Choice FR. In this section, we argue that Teramano lacks them, despite some evidence to the contrary. Free Choice FRs across languages exhibit both morphosyntactic and meaning peculiarities.[18] Morphosyntactically, they are characterized by "free choice" markers occurring as morphemes on *wh*-expressions or as independent words (next to or near *wh*-expressions). For instance, the bracketed FR in (55) from Italian is introduced by the *wh*-word *chi* 'who' with the free choice (FC) suffix *-unque*. Example (56) shows a similar pattern in English.

(55) *Paolo*   *starà*   *parlando*   *con*   [***chi-unque***   *gli*

      Paolo   stay.FUT.3SG talk.PROGR   with   who-FC   he.DAT

      dia   *retta*].

      give.SUBJ.PRES.SG   attention

      'Paolo is likely to be talking to anybody who pays attention to him.'   Italian

---

[18] See Šimík (2018) for an overview and relevant references.

IGNORANCE INFERENCE: The speaker doesn't know which specific people Paolo is talking to.

(56)　Paul ate [**what-ever** he found in the fridge]. It just happened to be a piece of parmesan cheese.
INDIFFERENCE INFERENCE: Paul ate what he found in the fridge and didn't care that it was a piece of parmesan cheese.

At the semantic/pragmatic level, Free Choice FRs trigger "free choice" inferences of two main kinds: "ignorance" inferences, signaling that the speaker (or some other salient epistemic agent) does not know the identity of the objects sharing the property conveyed by the Free Choice FR, as shown in (55), or "indifference" inferences, signaling that the speaker (or some other salient epistemic agent) does not care about the identity of those objects, as shown in (56).

Free Choice FRs in a given language may trigger only one of the inferences above. For instance, Caponigro & Fălăuş (2018) show that Free Choice FRs in Italian and Romanian pattern like DPs introduced by the free choice determiner *any* in English (see translation of (55) above) in licensing only an ignorance reading. As free choice *any* DPs show in English, ignorance inferences can be triggered by constructions other than Free Choice FRs. Also, a language does not need to have a specialized FR or non-FR construction to trigger free choice inferences. Regular Maximal FRs like *what he found in the fridge*, definite DPs like *the people who pay attention to him*, or quantified DPs like *all the people that pay attention to him* can be used in contexts in which it is clear that the speaker (or some other salient epistemic agent) does not know (or care about) what is in the fridge or who those people are. The crucial difference between the constructions that are morphosyntactically marked as free choice and those that are not, is that the former but not the latter, obligatorily trigger free choice inferences whenever they occur, imposing stronger pragmatic constraints on their conditions of use. Like other Upper Southern Italian varieties (Silvestri 2019), Teramano does not have any true free choice *wh*-expressions. *Cual-siase* 'which-FC' would be the only candidate, but there are at least a couple of strong reasons to believe that it is a borrowing from Italian *qualsiasi*. First of all, native speakers are reluctant to produce sentences with *cualsiase* and strongly prefer to use a quantified DP of the kind '(*all*) *the* NP' or '*the same* NP', as shown in (57)a vs. b and (58)a vs. b.

(57) a. *Je*　　　*me*　　*posse*　　　　*addurmì*　　　*in*　　　[*cualsiase*　　*parte*

　　　1SG　　REFL　can.PRES.1SG　fall.asleep.INF　in　　which+FC　　part.SG.F

　　　(*che*)　*ce*　　*sta*　　　　*nu*　　*lette*].

　　　COMP　there　stay.PRES.3SG　a.SG.M　bed.SG.M

　　　'I can sleep in any place with a bed.'

　　b. *Je*　　　　*me*　　*posse*　　　*addurmì*　　　*in*　　[*tutte*　　　*li*

　　　1SG　　REFL　can.PRES.1SG　fall.asleep.INF　in　　all.PL.M　　the.PL.M

　　　parte　　　*che/addu'-/du'-/u'-a*　*ce*　　*sta*　　　　*nu*　　*lette*].

　　　part.PL.M　COMP/where-a　　　　　there　stay.PRES.3SG　a.SG.M　bed.SG.M

　　　'I can sleep in all places with a bed.'

(58) a. *Je guarde*　　　　　　[*cualsiase*　　*film*　　　(*che*)　*guird*e

　　　1SG watch.PRES.1SG　　　which+FC　　movie.SG.M　COMP　watch.PRES.2SG

　　　tu].

　　　2SG

　　　'I'll watch any movie you watch.'

　　b. *Je*　　　　　*guarde*　　　　[*li*　　　*stisse*　　　*film*　　　**(ch*e)

　　　1SG　　　watch.PRES.1SG　the.PL.M　same.PL.M　movie.PL.M　COMP

　　　guirde　　　　*tu*].

　　　watch.PRES.2SG　2SG

　　　'I'll watch the same movies that you watch.'

Second, the Teramano word for 'which' is *che*, while the *wh*-component of *cualsiase* is *cual*, which is not even a *wh*-word in Teramano (*cua/cuale* is acceptable only as a borrowing from Italian).

　　　In conclusion, there is no evidence that Teramano has Free Choice FRs. This has at least two broader consequences. It shows a further difference between Teramano and Italian as far as their systems of FRs are concerned. It also argues for a careful study of each kind of FR in each language, since it cannot be taken for granted that the presence of one kind in one language automatically implies the presence of all the other kinds of FRs in the very same language.

4. Conclusion

We have shown that Teramano exhibits a productive pattern of FRs—embedded clauses that syntactically and semantically act like DPs, PPs, AdjPs, or AdvPs, rather than like nominal modifiers (as headed relative clauses do) or argument or adjunct clauses conveying propositional content. Two of the three most common kinds of FRs across languages are attested in Teramano as well. Like Italian, Teramano has Maximal FRs and Existential FRs; unlike Italian, Teramano lacks Free Choice FRs.

We have provided evidence showing that neither kind of FR in Teramano can be reduced to some form of headed relative clause with a silent nominal head, nor can one kind be reduced to the others. In particular, we have shown that Maximal FRs and Existential FRs exhibit the distributional and interpretative properties that we have discussed in §3.1 and §3.2. These properties are different between the two kinds of FRs and also different from the distribution and the interpretation of headed relative clauses, which occur and are interpreted as modifiers of a nominal head. Additionally, we have shown that Maximal FRs exhibit categorial matching effects, while Existential FRs do not. Finally, Maximal FRs, Existential FRs, and headed relative clauses are introduced by different subsets of the set of *wh*-expressions, introducing *wh*- interrogative clauses, as summarized in Table 5.

Table 5 Distribution of *wh*-expressions in Maximal FRs (Max-FR), Existential FRs (Ex-FR), and headed relative clauses (HeadedR) in Teramano

	Who	What	Where	When	How	How much	Why	What/ Which +N	How much/ many	
									+N	+Adj
Max-FR	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗
Ex-FR	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
HeadedR	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	?	?

Only the *wh*-word for 'where' can introduce all three constructions and only the *wh*-expression 'what/which'+N cannot introduce any. The *wh*-word for 'who' can introduce both kinds of FRs, but no headed relative clauses. On the other hand, the *wh*-word for 'what' can only introduce Existential FRs. *Wh*-expressions of the kind 'how much/many' can never introduce Existential FRs. They can introduce a Maximal FR when combining with a nominal complement. They can also introduce headed relative clauses when combining with an adjectival complement. Only Maximal FRs and headed relative clauses can be introduced by the *wh*-word for 'why' in Teramano, which is not possible in Italian, is a rare option in Romance, and seems to be less common crosslinguistically (see data in Caponigro 2003, 2021, Šimík 2011).

If Maximal FRs or Existential FRs were kind of headed relative clauses with a silent nominal head, all these differences with each other and with headed relative clauses would be surprising and would require some ad hoc assumption on the nature and the properties of this silent head in either kind of FR.

This articulated distributional pattern of *wh*-expressions in non-interrogative clauses in Teramano further supports the need to investigate and test each *wh*-expression when studying FRs (or non-interrogative *wh*- clauses in general) in a language and across languages, since languages that are clearly related and in close contact like Teramano and Italian can exhibit differences in the subset of *wh*-expressions that are allowed to introduce FRs. We hope that our study encourages

others to pursue a similar investigation in Teramano and across other Italian languages by providing a detailed case study, a thorough methodology, useful tools, and crosslinguistic and typological patterns and motivations.

References

Caponigro, Ivano (2003). *Free not to ask: On the semantics of free relatives and wh-words cross-linguistically*. University of California Los Angeles: dissertation.

Caponigro, Ivano (2004). 'The semantic contributions of *wh*-words and type shifts: evidence from free relatives cross-linguistically.' *Semantics and Linguistic Theory* 14: 38–55.

Caponigro, Ivano (2021). Introducing Headless Relative Clauses and the findings from Mesoamerican languages. In I. Caponigro, H. Torrence, and R. Zavala Maldonado (eds), *Headless Relative Clauses in Mesoamerican languages*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Caponigro, Ivano & Anamaria Fălăuş (2018). 'Free choice free relative clauses in Italian and Romanian.' *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 36(2): 323–363.

Caponigro, Ivano, Harold Torrence & Carlos Cisneros (2013). 'Free relative clauses in two Mixtec languages.' *International Journal of American Linguistics* 79(1): 61–96.

Caponigro, Ivano, Harold Torrence & Roberto Zavala Maldonado. (eds.) (2021). *Headless relative clauses in Mesoamerican Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cinque, Guglielmo (2013). *Typological studies. Word order and relative clauses.* London: Routledge.

Cinque, Guglielmo (2020). *The Syntax of Relative Clauses. A Unified Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dayal, Veneeta (1996). *Locality in WH quantification: Questions and relative clauses in Hindi.* Dordrecht: Kluwer.

D'Alessandro, Roberta & Claudio Di Felice (2015). 'The diachrony of Abruzzese complementation.' *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique-Romanian Review of Linguistics*, *60*(2-3), 129-145.

D'Alessandro, Roberta & Adam Ledgeway (2010). 'At the CT boundary: Investigating Abruzzese complementation.' *Lingua* 120(8): 2040-2060.

D'Alessandro, Roberta & Ian Roberts (2010). 'Past Participle Agreement in Abruzzese: Split Auxiliary Selection and the Null-Subject Parameter.' *Natural Language Linguistic Theory* 28: 41–72.

Grosu, Alexander (2004). 'The syntax-semantics of modal existential *wh*-constructions.' in O. Mišeska Tomić (ed.), *Topics in the syntax and semantics of Balkan languages*, pp. 419–449. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hastings, Rachel (1997). 'Abruzzo and Molise.' in M. Maiden, M. Parry (eds.), *The Dialects of Italy*, pp. 321–329. New York: Routledge.

Jacobson, Pauline (1995). 'On the quantificational force of English free relatives.' in E. Bach, E. Jelinek, A. Kratzer, B. H. Partee (eds.), *Quantification in natural languages*, pp. 451–486. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Link, Godehard (1983). 'The logical analysis of plural and mass terms: A lattice-theoretical approach.' in R. Bauerle, C. Schwarze, A. von Stechow (eds.), *Meaning, use and interpretation of language* pp. 302–323. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Mantenuto, Iara & Ivano Caponigro (2020). 'Light-headed relative clauses in Teramano.' *Studies in Language.*

Munaro, Nicola (2000). 'Free relatives as defective *wh*-elements: Evidence from the North-Western Italian dialects.' *Working papers in Linguistics* 10(1): 1-22.

Pancheva Izvorski, Roumyana (2000). *Free Relatives and related matters*: University of Pennsylvania dissertation.

Pellegrini, Giovan Battista (1977). *Carta dei dialetti d'Italia*. Pisa: Pacini.

Poletto, Cecilia, & Emanuela Sanfelici (2018). On relative complementizers and relative pronouns. *Linguistic Variation*, *18*(2), 265-298.

Poletto, Cecilia, & Emanuela Sanfelici (2018). On demonstratives as relative pronouns. *Atypical Demonstratives: Syntax, Semantics and Pragmatics*, *568*, 95.

Poletto, Cecilia, & Emanuela Sanfelici (2019). Embedded interrogatives as free relatives. *Mapping Linguistic Data*, 214.

van Riemsdijk, Henk (2017). 'Free relatives.' in M. Everaert & H. van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell companion to syntax*, 2nd ed., Ch. 116. Wiley Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118358733.wbsyncom116.

Savini, Giuseppe (1881). *La grammatica ed il lessico del dialetto teramano.* Torino: Ermanno Loescher.

Silvestri, Giuseppina (2019). 'Reduplication as a strategy for ever- free relatives: semantic and syntactic observations.' *Working Papers in Linguistics and Oriental Studies* https://doi.org/10.13128/QULSO-2421-7220-25354

Šimík, Radek (2011). *Modal existential wh-constructions:* LOT – Netherlands Graduate School of Linguistics. https://www.lotpublications.nl/Documents/269_fulltext.pdf

Šimík, Radek (2018). 'Ever free relatives crosslinguistically.' in: U. Sauerland and S. Solt (eds.), *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 22*, vol. 2, ZASPiL 61, pp. 375–392. ZAS, Berlin.

Šimik, Radek. (2020). 'Free relatives.' in D. Gutzmann, L. Matthewson, C. Meier, H. Rullmann, & T. Ede Zimmermann (eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to semantics*, pp. 1-38. Wiley-Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118788516.sem093

de Vries, Mark (2002). *The syntax of relativization*. LOT - Netherlands Graduate School of Linguistics. https://www.lotpublications.nl/Documents/053_fulltext.pdf