Abstract. We investigate a rich but less studied component of the relative clause system in Teramano, one of the Upper Southern Italian languages. We focus on light-headed relative clauses—relative clauses that lack a full nominal head and are introduced by only a Determiner-like or pronominal “light head.” We also briefly describe headed relative clauses in Teramano since the morphosyntactic features they exhibit are relevant for the investigation of light-headed relative clauses. Last, we highlight commonalities and differences between light-headed relative clauses in Teramano and Italian. Our paper provides the first systematic in-depth description of light-headed relative clauses in an Upper Southern Italian language that we are aware of, contributes to the knowledge of Teramano, the study of light-headed relative clauses crosslinguistically, and the ongoing investigation of microvariation among Italian and Italian languages.
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Abbreviations: The data are reported in Teramano’s orthography. The following abbreviations are in the glosses: 1: first person; 2: second person; 3: third person; SG: singular; F: feminine; M: masculine; INF: infinitive; REFL: reflexive; COMP: complementizer; POSS: possessive; INF: infinitival; FC: free choice; PRON: pronominal; ACC: accusative; DET: determiner; DEM: demonstrative; PROX: proximal; DIST: distal; MED: medial; INAN: inanimate.
1. Introduction

Light-headed Relative Clauses (LHRs) are embedded clauses whose distribution and interpretations resemble those of NPs and PPs in argument or adjunct positions. Unlike fully headed relative clauses, LHRs lack a nominal head and are introduced by only a “light head” that is D(eterminer)-like or pronominal in nature (Citko 2004; de Vries 2002: Ch.2, Sec 6.3.1; Caponigro 2020, a.o.). Their structure can be schematized as in (1), with the light head in bold and RC (‘Relative Clause’) standing for an LHR without its light head.

(1) \[[LHR \text{ Light Head } [RC \ldots ]]\]

An example of a LHR in English is given in brackets in (2)a while one in Italian is given in (3)a.

(2) a. Paola hired \[[LHR those [RC that Lea recommended]]\].
   b. Paola hired \[[NP those applicants [RC that Lea recommended]]\].

(3) a. Rimani \[[LHR là [RC dove sei]]\].
   ‘Stay there where be.PRES.2SG
   ‘Stay where you are.’
   b. Rimani \[[PP nel posto [RC in cui sei]]\].
   ‘Stay in the place in which be.PRES.2SG
   ‘Stay in the place where you are.’

In (2)b, the bracketed LHR in (2)a has been replaced and paraphrased with the bracketed complex NP containing a headed relative clause. Although both bracketed embedded constructions in (2)a and (2)b are introduced by the demonstrative determiner those, in (1b) the determiner is followed by the nominal applicants as the nominal head of the headed relative clause. The LHR in (2)a is interpreted as referring to individuals (the people who Lea recommended) in the same way as the definite NP in (2)b.

The Italian LHR in (3)a, instead, is introduced by the deictic locative pronominal head là (‘there’), without any nominal. Its distribution and interpretation resemble those of the bracketed PP in (3)b. The complex PP is introduced by a P (combined with the definite determiner) followed by its nominal complement posto, which acts as the nominal head
introducing the following headed relative clause. The LHR in (3)a ends up denoting a location (where the listener is) in the same way as the PP in (3)b.

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 adjunct clauses introduced by a subordinator have a different distribution from LHRs and/or convey a different meaning—some form of propositional content. As seen in (2)b and (3)b, headed relative clauses—another well-studied kind of embedded clause—are associated with an overt nominal head whose meaning they restrict—a type of semantic behavior resembling that of nominal modifiers like AdjPs, rather than that of full NPs or PPs. On the other hand, LHRs and headed relative clauses share the requirement for a gap or missing constituent (which can be sometimes signaled by a resumptive pronoun).\(^1\)

This paper investigates the main morphosyntactic and semantic properties of LHRs in Teramano, a language spoken in Italy. In doing so, we also briefly describe a related construction in Teramano—headed relative clauses, whose similarities and differences with LHRs have been mentioned above.\(^2\) Finally, throughout the paper, we highlight similarities and differences with the closest constructions in Italian.

Overall, our paper provides the first systematic in-depth description of LHRs in an Upper Southern Italian language that we are aware of, contributes to the knowledge of Teramano, the typology of LHRs, the methodology for their crosslinguistically investigation, and the study of microvariation among Italian and Italian languages (Benincà 2012, Poletto & Sanfelici 2018, a.o.).

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. Section 2 provides some background information on Teramano, with a focus on headed relative clauses. Section 3 describes light-headed relative clauses. Section 4 concludes.

---

\(^1\) See de Vries (2002: Ch. 2) for a comprehensive discussion of the typology and terminology concerning relative clauses. Also, see Cinque (2020) for a new unifying approach to all the main varieties of relative clauses.

\(^2\) See Mantenuto & Caponigro (in preparation) for a detailed description of free relative clauses, another kind of relative clause without a nominal head that also lacks a light head and is always introduced by a wh-expression.
2. Teramano basics and headed relative clauses

Teramano (ISO: ita) is a language spoken in the province of Teramo in Abruzzo, a central eastern region in Italy on the Adriatic coast with 311,168 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 an SVO word order and is head initial, with the specifier to the left of the head.

(4) Marie vo magnà lu timballe.

Marie want.3SG eat.INF the.SG.M timballo.SG.M

‘Marie wants to eat the timballo.’

In the next subsection, we briefly introduce a construction in Teramano that exhibits significant morphosyntactic and semantic similarities but also differences with LHRs: headed relative clauses.

2.1 Headed relative clauses in Teramano

In Teramano, headed relative clauses always follow their nominal head, are marked by a relativizer in clause-initial position, and have an argument or adjunct gap, as summarized in the schema in (1)

(5) [np (D) N [rc ... ___ ... ]]
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’. It can introduce embedded declarative clauses like the bracketed one in (6).

(6) Nicole *a datte [ch’-a cucinite Marie].
Nicole have.3SG said COMP-have.3SG cooked Marie
‘Nicole said that Marie cooked.’

The complementizer *che* is required in Teramano to introduce headed relative clauses with a subject and a direct object gap, as in Italian. It is also needed for the relativization of an indirect object or a prepositional phrase, unlike in Italian. The *wh*-word *ce* ‘who’ is completely unacceptable in these contexts, as shown in (7).\(^6\) In the examples that follow, headed relative clauses are represented within brackets with their relativizer (the complementizer or a *wh*-word) in bold, while their nominal head is underlined outside the brackets.

(7) Nen me piace la *gende [che7*/ce fatije
not to.me like the.PL.F people.PL.F COMP/who work.3PL
assi]. a.lot
‘I don’t like (the) people that work a lot.’

Headed relative clauses with an indirect-object gap require the complementizer followed by the resumptive pronoun—the form *-i* in the example in (8).

---

\(^6\) 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 [tʃa->tʃa]*). \(^7\) Unless otherwise indicated, the complementizer should always be considered obligatory when reported.
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 (9)–(12).

(8) *'Lla fammene ([*a] *ch’-i-a* arrubite*
that.SG.F woman.SG.F to COMP-3SG-have.3SG stolen
*la macchine è cugine-me.*
the.SG.F car.SG.F be.3SG cousin-POSS.1SG

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

(9) *Je so nate a lu stasse pahase [addu’/-du’/-u’/-ch-a*]
1SG am born at the same town where/where/where/ COMP-have.3SG
*nite li ginture a mi].*
born the.PL.M parents.PL.M a POSS.1SG

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

(10) *Me ne so ijte a ‘llu mumende*
me of.it am gone at that.SG.M moment.SG.M
*[ch’/-quand’-a arrivite Marie].*
COMP/-when-have.3SG arrived Marie

‘I left at the moment when Marie arrived.’

(11) *Lu so* *fatte a lu stasse mode*
it be.1SG done at the.SG.M same way.SG.M
*[che’/nda l-i fatte tu].*
COMP/how it-be.2SG done you

‘I did it in the (same) way you did it.’

---

8 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.

9 Teramano has a split auxiliary system, as attested in other varieties of Abruzzese, (D’Alessandro and Roberts 2010). The term *Abruzzese* includes every linguistic variety spoken in the Abruzzo region.
(12) *Lu sò fatte pe lu stasse mutive*  
*it be.1SG done for the.SG.M same reason.SG.M*  
*[pecca/che l-i fatte tu].*  
*why/COMP it-are done you*  
‘I did it for the same reason why you did it.’

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 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. Light-headed Relative Clauses in Teramano

This core section of the paper presents LHRs in Teramano in detail. The light heads introducing LHRs in Teramano can be of four kinds: (i) a specialized light head *ciò*, which can only occur in LHRs and can never be used absolutely nor with an N complement; or, (ii) a series of demonstrative pronouns (DEM) that can also be used absolutely but can never take an N complement’ or, (iii) quantificational Ds (QUANT) that can also be used absolutely or with an N complement; or, finally, (iv) two deictic adverbial pronominals that allow for an absolute use as well: a manner one and a locative one. We discuss each kind of LHR in turn in the next four sections. It will be clear from our discussion that LHRs in Teramano cannot be simply reduced to headed relative clauses with a silent nominal head.

3.1 Light-headed Relative Clauses with a pronominal head

LHRs in Teramano can be introduced by the light head *ciò*, as schematized in (13) and exemplified in (14) and (15), with the LHR in brackets and its pronominal head in bold.

(13) [[LHR *ciò* [RC ... ]]]
The light head *ciò* carries the features 3\(^{rd}\) person, singular, and inanimate. It cannot be used with an N complement nor absolutely without introducing an LHR, as shown in (16).

(14) *Nen so lette* \([LHR \; *ciò \; [RC \; che \; m-i \; mannate]]\).
*not be.1SG read PRON.INAN COMP to.me-be.2SG sent*
‘I haven’t read that which you sent me.’

(15) *So magnate* \([LHR \; *ciò \; [RC \; che \; hi \; cucinite]]\).
*be.1SG eaten PRON.INAN COMP be.2SG cooked*
‘I ate what you cooked.’

Indirect evidence that *ciò* is pronominal in nature come from the corresponding Italian form, which is also fully homophous. *Ciò* in Italian can be used absolutely but not with a nominal, as shown in (17). In this use, it exhibits the same features as in Teramano plus the extra deictic feature of being physically close to the speaker or recently mentioned in the discourse.

(16) *So magnate ciò (magnà).*
*be.1SG eaten PRON.INAN food.SG.M*

These extra features are lost when *ciò* introduces LHRs in Italian, as shown in (18). This is the same pattern we observed in (15) in Teramano.

(17) *Ho parlato di* \([ciò \; (*cibo) \; con \; Maria.]\) \(\text{It.}^{10}\)
*have.1SG talked about PRON.INAN food.SG.M with Maria*
‘I talked about this with Maria.’

(18) *Ho parlato di* \([ciò \; che \; hai \; cucinato].\) \(\text{It.}\)
*have.1SG talked about PRON.INAN COMP have.2SG cooked*
‘I ate what you cooked.’

\(^{10}\text{It.: Italian.}\)
When *ciò* introduces LHRs in Teramano and Italian, it triggers a maximal reading of the whole LHR, which is not the case in its absolute use in Italian. Both the LHR in Teramano in (15) and the one in Italian in (18) refer the unique maximal (plural) individual of the set of things the addressee cooked, regardless of its proximity to the speaker or its discourse status. In conclusion, when the pronominal element *ciò* introduces an LHR, it loses its anaphoricity and acquires the uniqueness/maximality semantic feature.

Finally, the absolute use of *ciò* without an LHR in Teremano is still unacceptable even if preceded by the quantifier *tutte* ‘all’, as shown in (19)a. On the other hand, *tutte ciò* can introduce an LHR, as shown in (19)b.

(19) a. *Nen riesce a capì tutte ciò.*
not be.able.1SG to understand.INF all.SG.M PRON.INAN
b. *Nen riesce a capì [tutte ciò]*
not be.able.1SG to understand.INF all.SG.M PRON.INAN

‘I can’t understand everything that he says.’

3.2 Light-headed relative clauses with a demonstrative light head

In this section, we present the second kind of LHR that is attested in Teramano. It can be schematized as in (20), with the light head being realized by either the distal, the medial or the proximal pronominal demonstrative.

(20) [LHR DEM [RC … ]]
and in (22), in which the LHR introduced by the same kinds of demonstratives (but different gender and number) can introduce a LHR referring to humans.\footnote{Whenever a pronominal demonstrative acts as the light D head of an LHR and exhibits the feature distal/proximal/medial in its morphology, but lacks that feature, we gloss the demonstrative with DIST, MED or PROX in parenthesis.} 

(21) \textit{Je magne [quelle/quaste/quasse}}
\begin{tabbing}
I \hspace{1em} eat.3SG PRON.DEM.(DIST).SG.M/PRON.DEM.PROX.SG.M/PRON.DEM.MED.SG.M\hspace{1em}
\textit{che sti cucini].}\hspace{1em}
COMP stay.3SG cooking
\end{tabbing}
\begin{tabbing}
\textit{‘I eat what you are cooking.’}
\end{tabbing}

(22) \textit{Nen me pjace}
\begin{tabbing}
not to.me like
\textit{[chelle/cheste/chesse}}\hspace{1em}chel/*ce
\begin{tabbing}
PRON.DEM.(DIST).PL.F/PRON.DEM.PROX.PL.F/PRON.DEM.MED.PL.F\hspace{1em}
COMP/who
\textit{pjace a ta].}\hspace{1em}
like to you
\end{tabbing}
\begin{tabbing}
\textit{‘I don’t like those who you like.’}
\end{tabbing}

Teramano presents two sets of non-homophonous demonstratives, unlike Italian, which only has one multi-functional set. One set of demonstratives in Teramano is formed from the pronominal demonstratives that we just saw in (21)-(22), which are disyllabic and must occur without a nominal complement. The other set consists of demonstratives determiner, which are monosyllabic and require a nominal complement.\footnote{Monosyllabic demonstrative determiners can sometimes be disyllabic due to phonological reasons (see Mantenuto 2017).} This pattern is summarized in Table 6.
Demonstrative determiners cannot function as light heads of LHRs, as shown in (23).  

(23) *Je magne ['stu che sti cucinì].
I eat.1SG DET.DEM.PROX.SG.M COMP stay.2SG cooking  
(‘I’ll eat that which you are cooking.’)

When a pronominal demonstrative is used on its own without introducing a LHR, it carries deictic and distal semantic features: deictic as it is used to refer back to something introduced previously in the discourse or physically in the location where the speakers are, distal as the demonstrative is able to express the location of the object in respect to the location of the speaker and/or of the listener. The demonstratives quaste ‘this’ and qualle ‘that,’ used on their own or with a nominal, convey deictic and proximal/distal requirements without requiring uniqueness/maximality.

(24) So magnate qualle.
be.1SG eaten PRON.DEM.DIST.SG.M  
‘I ate that one.’

For instance, the pronominal demonstrative in (24) requires the speaker to point at some specific piece/kind of food that is physically present or had been previously mentioned in the discourse (deictic feature). It also requires that piece/kind of food to be
close to the hearer and far from the speaker (distal feature). Finally, the speaker can use the demonstrative in (24) to point at just one among the many edible things that could be present in the surroundings (lack of uniqueness/maximality). However, similarly to ciò (§3.1), when a pronominal demonstrative introduces an LHR, it loses its deictic and distal features and triggers a maximal reading.

(25) So  magnate [quelle ch’i
be.1SG eaten PRON.DEM.(DIST).SG.M COMP-have.2SG
cucinite].
cooked ‘I ate what you cooked.’

In (25), the pronominal demonstrative quale introducing an LHR loses its deictic and distal features, as it can be used out of the blue regardless of the context and the pointing. At the same time, it imposes a maximality requirement. If the set of things that the hearer cooked contains more than one individual, then the LHR in (25) has to refer to the unique maximal plural individual of that set.

Teramano also has a reduced (monosyllabic) pronominal proximal demonstrative inflecting by gender and number (Mantenuto 2017) that cannot take a nominal complement (26)a, can occur on its own (26)b, and can also be used as a deictic reinforcement in postnominal position (27).

(26) a. *So  cumbrate qua libbre.
be.1SG bought PRON.DEM.PROX.SG.M book.SG.M
‘I bought this book.’
b. So  cumbrate qua.
be.1SG bought PRON.DEM.PROX.SG.M
‘I bought this one.’

(27) So  cumbrate stu libbre
be.1SG bought DET.DEM.PROX.SG.M book.SG.M
qua.
PRON.DEM.PROX.SG.M
‘I bought this book here.’

Like the full (disyllabic) pronominal demonstratives, the reduced pronominal demonstrative can introduce LHRs. When it does so, it loses its deictic feature to acquire maximality, and it retains its proximal feature as shown in (28).

(28) Je magne [qua che sti cucini].
I eat.1SG PRON.DEM.PROX.SG.M COMP stay.2SG cooking
‘I eat what you are cooking.’

Both the disyllabic and the monosyllabic demonstrative forms carry further restrictions when they are inflected in a form other than the default masculine singular. In particular, they presuppose a contextually salient nominal that matches their number and gender features. For instance, in (29) both the monosyllabic and the disyllabic feminine singular demonstratives trigger the presupposition that the hearer is cooking something that is discourse salient and can be labeled by means of a feminine singular noun, e.g. minastre (‘soup’).

(29) Je magne [ca-ste che sti cucini].
I eat.1SG PRON.DEM.PROX.SG.F COMP stay.2SG cooking
‘I eat what you are cooking.’

LHRs introduced by a demonstrative pronouns can relativize arguments others than subjects or objects. The example in (30) shows an LHR that introduced by a demonstrative pronoun that relativizes the locative complement by means of the location wh-expressions.

(30) Vuje quaste addu ‘-/du’ ‘-/u’-a so messe
want.1SG this.SG.M where-a be.1SG put
li male.
the.PL.M apple.PL.M
‘I want this one where I put the apples.’

To sum up so far, LHRs introduced by demonstrative pronominal forms in Teramano show an interesting pattern. Unlike Italian, Teramano distinguishes between
pronominal and demonstrative determiners. Only pronominal demonstratives can introduce LHRs. When this happens, all demonstratives lose their deictic features; distal demonstratives lose their distal features as well; while proximal demonstratives retain their proximal features. Therefore, LHRs introduced by demonstrative Ds in Teramano are a construction on its own that cannot be simply reduced to a headed relative clause with a silent N head without *ad hoc* stipulations.

3.3 Light-headed Relative Clauses with a quantificational light head

The third kind of LHR in Teramano is introduced by quantificational Ds (QUANT) without a nominal complement that act as light head. They can be schematized as in (31).

(31) \([\text{LHR QUANT} [\text{RC} \ldots]]\)

All the positive quantificational Ds in Teramano obligatorily require a nominal complement when they do not introduce an LHR, as shown in (32)a-b. In other words, none of them can behave as a pronominal.

(32) a. *So cumbrate *paracchie/tinde/(\nu sacche de)/\{na fra\}

be.1SG bought several/many/a.SG.M sack.SG.M of/a.SG.F

\{cose\} *(cose) lot of thing.PL.M

‘I bought a lot of things.’

b. *So cumbrate *assi *(robbe).

be.1SG bought a.lot stuff.M

‘I bought a lot of stuff.’

All the positive quantificational Ds can introduce an LHR in direct object position, without a nominal complement, as shown in (33), although our consultants find them slightly degraded.

(33) *So 'ncuntride \'?paricchie/tinde/?assi/\{nu sacche\}*/
I met many who behave like this.

Negative quantifiers behave somehow differently. The animate negative quantifier *nisciene* ‘nobody/no + N’ can take a nominal complement or behave like a pronominal, as shown in (34) and (35), while the inanimate negative quantifier *ninde* ‘nothing’ can only be used as pronominal (36), regardless of whether they occur in subject or object position.

(34) *Nen so viste nisciene/ {niscien-a fammene}.*
    Not be.1SG seen nobody/ no-SG.F woman.SG.F
    ‘I didn’t see anyone/{any woman}.’

(35) *Nisciene /{ niscien-a fammene} parlesse accusci.*
    nobody/ no-SG.F woman.SG.F speak.3SG like.this
    ‘Nobody/{No woman} would speak like this.’

(36) *Nen so viste ninde*/{ninde cose}.
    not be.1SG seen nothing/nothing thing.PL.M
    ‘I didn’t see anything.’

Both negative quantifiers can introduce LHRs, regardless of their syntactic position, as shown in (37)-(39).

(37) *Nen so viste [nisciene che cucinave].*
    not be.1SG seen no/nobody COMP cooked
    ‘I didn’t see anyone who cooked.’

(38) *[Nisciene ch’è bbone] parlesse accusci.*
    no/nobody COMP-be.1SG good speak.3SG like.this
    ‘Nobody that is good would speak like this.’
(39) Nen so viste [ninde che cascave].
not be.1SG seen nothing COMP fell
‘I didn’t see anything fall.’

To sum up, LHRs can be introduced by negative quantificational Ds in both subject and object position in Teramano. Therefore, the emerging picture shows that the clausal component—the CP—of an LHR acts like a nominal—an NP—both syntactically and semantically and the whole LHR introduced by a quantificational D cannot be reduced to a headed relative clause with an over D and silent N head.

3.4 Light-headed Relative Clauses with an adverbial light head

The last kind of LHR that is attested in Teramano is introduced by two deictic adverbial pronouns. One is the deictic distal locative pronoun lla (‘there’), the other is the deictic manner pronoun accusci (‘like this’), as shown in (40) and (41), respectively (the pronominal light heads are in bold and the wh-relativizers are underlined).

(40) Va [lla addu’/-du’/-u’-a fa lu cace].
go.2SG there where-a do.3SG the.SG.M cheese.SG.M
‘Go there where he does the cheese.’

(41) Lu so fatte [accusci ‘nda l’-ha fatte asse].
it be.1SG done like.this how it-have.3SG done he
‘I did it in the way he has done it.’

The distribution and the interpretation of the bracketed LHRs in (40) and (41) resemble those of locative and manner PPs or AdvPs, respectively. Neither adverbial allows for a nominal complement (*lla pahase ‘there town’, *accusci mode ‘like this way’), while they can be both be used absolutely without introducing an LHR, as shown in (42) and (43). For these reasons, we are assuming they are pronominal in nature.
In their absolute use, *lla* and *accusci* exhibit deictic features: they require an overt act of physical or discourse pointing. On the other hand, they lack these deictic requirements in their use as light heads of LHRs.

4. Conclusion

We have shown that Teramano has a productive system of LHRs. Four patterns of LHRs are attested in the language: LHRs introduced by a specialized light head *ciò*, LHRs introduced by demonstrative pronouns, LHRs introduced by quantificational Ds, and, finally, LHRs introduced by a manner or a locative deictic adverbial pronominal.

We have shown that they are all clear cases of LHRs, rather than headed relative clauses with a silent nominal, since the vast majorities of those light heads behave as exclusively pronominal forms that can never take an overt nominal complement. We have shown that despite their nature of full clauses, LHRs behave like NPs or PPs, distributionally and semantically, rather than like modifiers (along the lines of headed relative clauses) or argument or adjunct clauses conveying propositional content.

One kind of LHR has, to the best of our knowledge, not yet been described in the typological literature: the LHR that is introduced by a proximal pronominal demonstrative that, as the light head of an LHR, loses its deictic feature and acquires the maximality/uniqueness feature without losing its proximal feature. It would be interesting to investigate whether other Italian languages or Romance languages or any other languages exhibit a similar pattern.

We hope that our study will encourage others to pursue a similar investigation in across (Italian) languages by providing a detailed case study, a methodology, and crosslinguistic and typological patterns and motivations.
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