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1. Introduction

Relative clauses represent an extremely intriguing empirical domain, both because of the complexity of the data and of the theoretical relevance of the construction. In this respect, a particularly interesting area of research is the distinction between restrictive and appositive clauses, for which different analyses have been proposed in terms of adjunction sites (for a general survey cf. the Introduction in Alexiadou et al., eds. 2000, Bianchi 2002).

All these analyses, however, have been challenged by Kayne’s (1994) antisymmetry hypothesis, which excludes right-hand adjunction. Kayne takes Chomsky’s (1977) approach to connectivity effects (in terms of Operator-movement of the head) to support a revised version of Vergnaud’s (1974) “Raising Analysis”, according to which the D° head selects the relative CP as its unique complement and the lexical NP is generated within the relative clause:

(1) \[ \text{DP the [CP [NP book]$_k$ [C that [IP I bought t$_k$ ]]]] \]

* We wish to thank Axmed Cabdullaahi Axmed, Cabdalla Omar Mansur (Somali) and Mohammed Ali Mahmoud (Afar) for their help and patience in providing, testing and discussing our data. We are also grateful to the members of the XXX IGG (Venice, February 26th-28th 2004) for their helpful suggestions and comments. General disclaimers apply.
The relativization chain is thus completely assimilated to the standard A'-movement chain: the head leaves a Variable within the relative clause which is an identical copy of the head itself. Crucially, Kayne assumes this explanation for both restrictive and appositive clauses, so that the two types of relative clauses are only distinguished by the following covert operation:

(2) \[\text{DP IP} \left[\text{D}^\circ \left[ \text{CP NP} \left[\text{C}^\circ \text{tIP} \right]\right]\right]\]

As is shown in (2), the appositive IP raises to Spec,DP in Logical Form (LF), thus escaping from the scope of the article in D°. Kayne thus concludes that the “intonational break” which typically distinguishes appositives from restrictives is only a “PF property”.

Though a unified analysis of relative clauses is advantageous for many respects (cf. Bianchi 2000, 2002), it also triggers both theoretical and empirical problems. In the former instance, it implies that the PF interface can have access to LF operations (contrary to standard tenets), since the intonational break which characterizes appositive clauses crucially depends on LF movement. Regarding empirical problems, restrictive and appositive clauses show important asymmetries cross-linguistically, that challenge the feasibility of a unified derivation (cf. Alexiadou et al., eds., 2000).

The aim of this paper is to illustrate and discuss some major discrepancies between restrictive and appositive clauses, in order to propose a structural distinction between these constructions. The relevant data are taken from Somali and Afar, two Cushitic languages, whose major morphosyntactic properties will be illustrated in the next two sections.

2. Somali

Somali is an SOV, non pro-drop, polysynthetic language (in the sense of Baker 1996). The latter condition entails that argument roles (also, “\(\theta\)-roles”) are only assigned through incorporation onto the verbal head (the so-called “Morphological Visibility Condition”), so that the argument structure of a verb is only realised by means of clitic pronouns, which are disposed in the Verbal Complex (VC).\(^2\) The SOV order is thus strictly realised within the VC (cf. Puglielli 1981), while full DPs are merged in non-argument position and connected to the sentence by means of resumptive pronouns, which bind constituents to their thematic roles.

---

1 When not otherwise indicated, the Somali data exposed in this paper are original sentences.
2 A number of facts support polysynthesis in Somali like, for instance, the absence of non-finite clauses and multiple wh-questions (cf. Svolacchia and Puglielli 1999 for details).
Somali is also a *Focus-prominent* language, so that in a main declarative sentence one constituent must be overtly realised as the Focus of the sentence. Nominal Focus occurs in preverbal position and is immediately followed by the Focus Marker (FM) `baa` (cf. (3)). In the absence of nominal Focus, `waa` marks the VC on its right side as new information (cf. (4)). Non-focused DPs are realised extrasententially as Topics (Focus is capitalized, as in standard use).\(^3\)

(3)  *Shalay jamacadda  CAlI  baan (baa+ aan) ku arkay.*
    yesterday university. ART  Cali  FM.SCL1SG  at saw.1SG
    ‘Yesterday, I saw CALI, at the university.’

(4)  *Shalay jamacadda Cali  waan (waa+ aan) ku ARKAY.*
    yesterday university. ART  Cali  FM.SCL1SG  at saw.1SG
    ‘As for Cali, yesterday, I SAW him, at the university.’

When the subject is focused (or wh-questioned), Somali shows *Antiagreement effects* (cf. Ouhalla 1993, Frascarelli and Puglielli 2004):

(5)  *Hilib NIMANKAAS  baa  cunayá.*
    meat  men.those.ABS  FM  eat.PRG.RD
    ‘THOSE MEN are eating meat.’

(6a)  *Hilib NIMANKAASU  baa  cunayá.*
    meat  men.those.NOM  FM  eat.PRG.RD

b.  *Hilib NIMANKAAS  bay  cunayá.*
    meat  men.those.ABS  FM.SCL3PL  eat.PRG.RD

c.  *Hilib NIMANKAAS  baa  cunayaan.*
    meat  men.those.ABS  FM  eat.PRG.3PL

As the ungrammaticality of (6a-c) shows, a focused subject does not show NOM Case (but the unmarked Absolutive (ABS) Case), it cannot be resumed

---

\(^3\) The list of the abbreviations used in the glosses is the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>absolutive case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>definite article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN</td>
<td>anaphoric article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONJ</td>
<td>conjunctive head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEP</td>
<td>dependent paradigm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM</td>
<td>Focus Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>nominative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>possessive pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRG</td>
<td>(present) progressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>reduced paradigm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPR</td>
<td>relative pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCL</td>
<td>subject clitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
by a clitic (SCL) (which is obligatory in all other cases) and the verb appears in a reduced (but not invariable\(^4\)) form of agreement, the so-called “reduced paradigm” (RD).

As far as relative clauses are concerned, both restrictives and appositives take the form of postnominal modifiers (though Somali is head-final in the VC). They are not introduced by any Complementizer-like element and belong to the head deletion type, so that neither a clitic nor a relative pronoun resume the head within the modifying clause (cf. Antinucci 1981, Gebert 1981). When the head-noun has a subject role in the relative clause, the verb shows Antiagreement (henceforth, AA) effects:

    boy.ART M. with speak.PRG.RD /*3SGM FM brother.POSS.1SG
    ‘The boy that is talking to Maryam is my brother.’

    boy.ART wake up.PRG.RD /*3SGM FM farm in work.PRG.3SGM
    ‘The boy that is waking up works in a farm.’

c. Wiilaasha [baabuurka ku dhoofáy /*dhoofeen] baan
    boys.ART car.ART in leave.PRG.RD /*3PL FM.SCL1SG
    macasalaameyay.
    greeted.1SG
    ‘I greeted the boys that are leaving by car.’

As we can see, AA effects in the restrictive clause are independent of the type of Focus construction (\textit{waa} in (7a), \textit{baa} in (7b-c)) and of the syntactic role of the head in the main clause (a subject in (7a-b), an object in (7c)). This is also the case for appositive clauses:

    Cali Maryam with speak.PRG.RD/*3SGM FM brother.POSS.1SG
    ‘Cali, who is talking to Maryam, is my brother.’

    Cali wake up.PRG.RD/*3SGM FM quantity little slept.3SGM
    ‘Cali, who is waking up, didn’t sleep much.’

c. Cali iy Maryam [ oo baabuurka ku dhoofáy /*dhoofeen] baan
    C. and M. car.ART in leave.PRG.RD/*3PL FM.SCL1SG
    macasalaameyay.
    greeted.1SG
    ‘I greeted Cali and Maryam, who are leaving by car.

\(^4\) The RD shows three forms: one for 3SGF, one for 1PL and one for all other persons.
According to our informants, no particular intonational break is produced between the head and the appositive clause, which is introduced by a specific element, namely oo (to be discussed in section 4).

3. Afar

Afar is also a Cushitic SOV language. However, its morphosyntactic properties are quite different from Somali, so that a comparison of the two languages is very effective for the issues of the present study. Afar is, in fact, an inflectional pro-drop language, so that DPs carry argument role and pronouns are “strong” elements, realised as object of either verbs or postpositions. Consider the following examples (from Bliese 1981):

(9) amoy’t-i  ‘sara daa’me.
    the-chief.NOM clothes.ABS bought.3SGM
    ‘The chief bought clothes.’

(10) ‘kimal moo’t-ar-at ‘bilu-k yemee’t-e.
     yesterday car.ABS-by Bilu.ABS-from came.3SGM
     ‘Yesterday he came by car from Bilu.’

(11) a’nu ‘kaa ‘ko-h ruu’be.
     I him you-to sent.1SG
     ‘I sent him to you.’

As is shown, the Afar Case system distinguishes NOM Case (for subjects) from ABS Case (marking non-subject constituents, nominal predicates and Foci). As with Somali, ABS Case is considered the unmarked (i.e., “citation”) form of nouns.

As for relative clauses, restrictives precede the antecedent, independent of the syntactic role of the head and consistent with the head-final character of the language. Like in Somali, no pronominal form resumes the head within the relative clause. However, differently from Somali, AA effects are not present. Consider the following (from Bliese 1981):

(12) [a’nu ub’le] aw’ki ‘daa cammi’se.
     I saw.1SG boy.NOM stone.ABS threw.3SGF
     ‘The boy that I saw threw a stone.’

5 Afar data are either the result of our original research or taken from Bliese’s (1981) grammar. The latter case is indicated in the text.
Appositive clauses, on the other hand, are head-initial, they show the presence of a relative pronoun (iyya) that is marked for ABS Case (independent of its grammatical role)\(^6\) and, finally, the verb always shows 3SGM agreement. Consider the following examples, in which the appositive head is, in turn, a subject, a direct object and an indirect object within the appositive clause (from Bliese 1981):

(15) ‘awka ['abba fan ge’da-h-iyya] wee’ce.
    boy.ABS father towards go.3SGM-h-RPR.ABS cried.3SGM
    ‘The boy, who is going to his father, cried.’

    that gun.ABS boy.NOM hold.3SGM-h-RPR.ABS broke.3SGM
    ‘That gun, which the boy holds, is broken.’

    you.ABS be-far.3SGM-h-RPR.ABS-to news told.3SGM
    ‘He told the news to you (PL) who were [lit.: was] far.’

Some of these properties seem to support Kayne’s (1994) analysis. Indeed, the absence of a Complementizer in prenominal restrictive clauses is immediately explained in terms of IP-movement to Spec,DP, which leaves a (null) C° head stranded in postnominal position (cf. (2)). However, prenominal restrictives show full agreement in Afar, so that splitting I° from C° cannot be taken as a cross-linguistic explanation for AA effects in these kinds of constructions (cf. Kayne 1994: 95). Moreover it is not clear why AA should appear in postnominal appositive clauses, where a(n invariable) relative pronoun is present.

---
\(^6\) The pronoun iyya is also used as a wh-constituent. In this case it shows the NOM form iyyi:

(i) ‘iyya tab’le?
    who.ABS saw.2SG
    ‘Who did you see?’

(ii) ‘iyyi yemee’te?
    who.NOM came.3SGM
    ‘Who came?’
4. Restrictive vs. Appositive Relative Clauses

The semantic distinction between restrictive and non-restrictive modification is formally realised to different extents cross-linguistically, so that it is very often difficult to propose a structural distinction which can be taken as universal. In Somali and Afar, on the other hand, restrictive and appositive clauses show crucial formal and interpretative asymmetries (in terms of word order, binding, and scope properties). A comparative analysis can thus provide a crucial insight into the understanding of these constructions.

4.1. Extraposition Effects

While extraposition is totally blocked for restrictive clauses, some languages seem to allow this operation in appositives (cf. Alexiadou et al., eds. 2000). In the two Cushitic languages examined, restrictive clauses can never be extraposed, as is shown in (18b) for Somali and in (19b) for Afar:

(18) a. WILKA [TOOSAYÁ] baa warshad ka shaqaysaa.
   ‘THE BOY THAT IS WAKING UP NOW works in a factory.’
   b. *WILKA baa warshad ka shaqaysaa [TOOSAYÁ].

(19) a. [a’nu a’mo ‘kaa-k oogo’re] ‘too ‘num yer’dé
   ‘That man [that I hit on the head] ran.’
   b. *’too ‘num yer’dé [a’nu a’mo ‘kaa-k oogo’re]

On the other hand, appositive clauses can be extraposed in both languages, but only in nominal Focus constructions. So, in Somali extraposition is allowed in baa constructions (with a slight marginal effect), but not in the presence of waa:

(20) a. CAASHA [oo soor sameysáy] baa soo gashay.
   ‘CASHA, who prepared the meal, entered.’
   b. *CAASHA baa soo gashay [oo soor sameysáy].

(21) a. CALI [oo arday ah] baan la kulmay.
   ‘I met CALI, who is a student.’
   b. *CALI baan la kulmay [oo arday ah].
In Afar, narrow Focus is generally realised in situ and is not lexically marked. Nevertheless, like in Somali, extraposition is only possible when the head-noun is focused. Therefore, sentences like (23a) and (24a) are only allowed as answers to the questions given in the examples, while they are excluded in a broad Focus context (that is to say, as an answer to a question like “what happened?”). Of course, the non-extraposed version is also possible (given in (b)):

(23) Q: ‘Iyyi wee’ce?
   ‘Who cried?’
   a. AHMED wee’ce ['abba fan ge’da-h-iyya]
      Ahmed cried.3SGM father towards go.3SGM-h-RPR.ABS
      ‘AHMED cried, who is going to his father.’
   b. AHMED ['abba fan ge’da-h-iyya] wee’ce

(24) Q: maxa tiddigi’le?
   ‘What is broken?’
   a. GI’RA tiddigi’le [aw’ki yabbi’d-e-h-iyya]
      gun.ABS broke.3SGM boy.NOM hold.3SGM-h-RPR.ABS
      ‘THE GUN is broken, which the boy holds.’
   b. GI’RA [aw’ki yabbi’d-e-h-iyya] tiddigi’le

The block imposed on restrictives (shown in (18)-(19)) is consistent with Kayne’s raising analysis. Since right-hand movement is excluded by antisymmetry, extraposition does not imply movement of the relative clause, but (leftward) movement of the head. Hence, this movement is ungrammatical in restrictive clauses, since the string [D°+ HEAD-NOUN] does not form a constituent (cf. (1)). However, what prevents bare nouns from moving in appositives? And – what is more intriguing – how can Focus make this operation legitimate? It is clear that a raising approach to appositives cannot explain these facts.

---

7 Bliese (1981) claims that the fronted option is also available, but apparently only to realise contrastive Focus: “any element of the sentence (except postposition and conjunctions) may be moved to or toward the front of the sentence to give emphasis or focus” (p. 102).
4.2. Case Marking of the head

In Afar, the head-noun of a restrictive clause is marked for Case according to its syntactic role in the matrix clause (cf. (12)-(14)). In appositive clauses, on the other hand, relative heads always show the unmarked ABS Case, as is shown by ‘avka, gi’ra and ‘siiniy in (15)-(17).

The realization of Case in Somali relative clauses also provides an interesting point for discussion. Case marking in Somali appears on the rightmost element within the DP. So, if a subject is modified by one or more adjectives, NOM Case only appears on the last constituent within the relevant DP:

(25) a. *[gabarta yaree qurxooni] guriga
girl.ART.ABS small and nice.NOM home.ART
bay go.PRG.3SGF
‘The small and nice girl is going home.’

b. *gabartī (NOM) yar ee qurxoon (ABS) guriga bay aadeysaa

Consistently, when the head of a restrictive clause has a subject role, NOM Case marking is found at the end of the relative clause:8

(26) a. *[wilk a [aan af Talyaaniga ku hadlin]]
boy.ART.ABS NEG language Italian.ART in speak.NEG.NOM
waa walaalkay.
brother.POSS.1SG
‘The boy that cannot speak Italian is my brother.’

b. *wiikku (NOM) [aan af Talyaaniga ku hadlin ]] waa walaalkay.

On the other hand, in appositive clauses NOM Case marking is never realised, whether it be on the head or at the end of the appositive clause:

(27) a. Adiga oo aadan af Talyaaniga ku
you.ABS NEG.2SG language Italian.ART in
hadleynin] speak.PRG.NEG
FM brother.POSS.3SG
‘You, who cannot speak Italian, are his brother.’

Since in affirmative clauses NOM marking on the verb is only realised through prosody (by means of a low tone), to show Case marking we have used a negative verb in (26), in which NOM Case is morphologically realised.

---

8 Since in affirmative clauses NOM marking on the verb is only realised through prosody (by means of a low tone), to show Case marking we have used a negative verb in (26), in which NOM Case is morphologically realised.
b. *Adigu (NOM) [oo aadan af Talyaaniga ku hadleynin] waa…
c. *Adiga [oo aadan af Talyaaniga ku hadleynini (NOM)] waa…

The comparison between sentences (26) and (27) shows that the string [HEAD+RESTR] counts as one constituent for the purposes of Case marking and, specifically, that these two elements form one and the same DP. However, what about the string [HEAD+APPOS]? Not only do sentences like (27) show that they do not form a (unique) DP, they also prove that neither the head nor the appositive are in a position to receive NOM Case. This proves an additional challenge for a uniform analysis of relative clauses.

4.3. *Stacking effects*

In many languages, it is possible that both types of relative clause refer to the same head. In this case, however, the linear order must be one in which the restrictive clause is adjacent to the head and the appositive follows. This is also the case in Somali:

(28) a. Wiilka [hadlayá], [oo aan ku baray],
    boy.ART speak.PRG.RD SCL1SG you introduced.1SG
    baa Landan ka yimid
    FM London from came.3SGM
    ‘The boy that is talking, whom I introduced you before, comes from London.’

b. *Wiilka [oo aan ku baray], [hadlayá], baa Landan ka yimid.

It is clear that in a uniform analysis the order of relative and appositive clauses should not be affected by such a restriction.

In Afar, where restrictive and appositive clauses are located on different sides, linear order is not an issue. However, it is interesting to point out that in this type of “complex modification” an introducing head appears between the head and the appositive clause, namely –ay (to be discussed later):

(29) [yinniki’se] ‘awka [ay ‘abba fan ge’da-h-iyya] wee’ce
    fell.3SGM boy.ABS father towards went.3SGM-h-RPR.ABS cried.3SG
    ‘The boy that fell, who is going to his father, cried.’
4.4. Binding by external Operators and Scope of Negation

As is generally agreed in the literature, appositives are impervious to syntactic binding by external Operators (cf., among others, Fox 2002). So, for instance, a QP can be the antecedent for an element within a restrictive relative clause, but it cannot be coreferent to a DP located within an appositive clause. This is precisely the case in Somali:

(30) a. Arday walbaₖ₆ gabarta [Øₖ₆ jecel ] buu
    student every girl.ART (him) love.RD FM.SCL3SGM
    la cayaar aaday.₉
    with danced.3SGM
    ‘Every studentₖ₆ danced with the girl [that loves him₆₆]’

    ‘*Every student₆ danced with Mary, [that loves him₆]’

Similarly, appositive clauses cannot have a negative polarity item (NPI) as an antecedent, as is shown in (31b):

    no boy complained.RD NEG heard.NEG
    ‘I noticed no boy that complained.’

    no boy.AN complained.RD NEG heard.NEG
    ‘*I noticed no boy, who complained.’

These facts also represent a major cross-linguistic difference between the two types of relative clause and provide additional evidence against a mirror analysis.

4.5. Extraction

In some languages, it is possible to extrapose elements from within a restrictive relative clause, while appositive clauses behave as syntactic islands, so that no constituent can be extracted from them (cf. Engdahl 1997 for Swedish). This is also the case in Somali, as is shown in the following sentences (in which the ‘Complex NP’ is taken into account):¹⁰

---

⁹ Notice that 3rd person object clitics in Somali are realised as Ø forms.
¹⁰ In Afar, on the other hand, extraction is not allowed in either case (as in many other languages, like English and Italian).
(32) a. qofka [buugga qoráy] baan bartay. 
   person.ART book.ART wrote.RD FM.SCL1SG knew.1SG 
   ‘I knew the person who wrote the book.’
   b. buugga, qofka [ tì qoráy] baan bartay.

(33) a. Cali [ oo buugga qoráy] baan bartay. 
   Cali book.ART wrote.RD FM.SCL1SG knew.1SG 
   ‘I knew Cali, who wrote the book.’

5. The syntactic proposal

Our investigation has shown that, despite their different core grammars, Somali and Afar show a number of morphosyntactic and interpretative phenomena (summarised in the table 1) that invoke a distinction between restrictive and appositive clauses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHENOMENON</th>
<th>SOMALI</th>
<th>AFAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unmarked position</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extraposition</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM Case on the head</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM Case on RPR</td>
<td>no RPR</td>
<td>no RPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stacking</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>not relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>binding by external QP</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extraction</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1. A structural distinction

In the light of the data examined, we consider Kayne’s (1994) analysis to relativization as appropriate to account for restrictive clauses. We thus maintain a promotion analysis for restrictives, according to which the relative clause is the complement of a D° head and the NP-head is an Operator sitting in Spec,CP and connected with a variable (i.e., a deleted NP, according to the “copy and delete” theory of movement; cf. Chomsky 1995,
2004). Therefore, the NP-head is part of the relative CP and forms a (movement) chain with a Variable in IP-internal position.\footnote{Given the structure in (34), the IP-initial order in Afar (an N-final language) is obtained through IP-raising to Spec,DP, while in polysynthetic Somali the head-noun further raises to D°, so as to incorporate into the Determiner (as assumed in Kayne 1994 for Rumanian).}

(34) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[DP} \\
\text{[D'} \text{[CPRESTR} \text{[NP-head]}_k \text{[C'} [\text{IP} \ldots \text{VAR}_k \ldots ]]])
\end{array}
\]

On the other hand, we propose an analysis of appositive clauses in terms of an assertive sentence “conjoined” to its antecedent (in the spirit of Rebuschi 2002, 2005\footnote{Rebuschi (2002, 2005), however, assumes a “linking morpheme” both in restrictive and appositive clauses, while our proposal claims for a structural distinction and supports a promotion analysis for restrictives.}):

(35) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[ConjP(=DP)} \text{[DP-head]}_k \text{[Conf} \text{CONJ°} \text{[CPAPPOS} \text{DP}_k/\text{RELP}_k \text{[C'} [\text{IP} \ldots \text{VAR}_k \ldots ]]))
\end{array}
\]

According to this analysis, the antecedent is merged as an independent and fully referential DP, while the appositive clause is a CP providing some additional information about the antecedent (e.g., a property, a definite description, background/new information, etc.; cf. Chierchia and McConnell-Ginet 1990, Doron 1994, Del Gobbo 2003). The appositive clause is conjoined with its antecedent through an “asymmetric conjunctive structure”, whose head is overtly realised in some languages (like Somali and Afar) and left covert in others (for reasons to be made clear later).

The antecedent DP is therefore not the head of an A’-chain, but is coindexed with either a deleted copy (a ∅ form) or a relative pronoun (an “e-type” pronoun, cf. Heim 1990, Del Gobbo 2003), sitting in Operator position in the appositive CP. Given Spec-head agreement, the whole ConjP assumes the properties of its Spec (Johannesen 1998) hence, it is a “big DP”.\footnote{This analysis clearly explains why the head of appositive clauses can be a proper name or a pronoun across languages, while this is excluded for restrictive clauses. The independent generation of the antecedent as a fully referential DP also explains why, crosslinguistically, the head of an appositive clause cannot be an Operator (i.e., a QP or a WH-constituent).}

Finally, as is shown in (34) and (35), both restrictive and appositive clauses include the presence of a Variable within the relative IP. Specifically, in restrictive clauses the Variable is connected to the NP-head through a movement chain, while in appositive clauses this connection is mediated by the relative (or zero) pronoun sitting in Spec,CP. This is a crucial point, that provides an explanation for a number of structural and interpretative issues, as the analysis of AA effects will show (section 6.1).
This analysis of appositive clauses can be considered an extension of Kayne’s (1994) theory on coordination. It is in fact reminiscent of the Kaynian approach to possessive constructions and APs (Kayne, 1994:85ff.)\(^{14}\) and, as such, it is fully in the spirit of antisymmetry. This proposal is also in line with Chomsky’s (2004) “late merge” analysis of non-argument information:

\[ (36) \text{We saw[NPa painting], (that is) [a painting [ADJP from the museum ]]} \]

Like adjuncts (and unlike restrictives), appositives may be left out without loss of grammaticality. In this sense, they can be considered an “afterthought structure” in which the head of the apposition undergoes ellipsis.

5.2. Evidence for a ConjP Structure

In this section we will consider additional data supporting a conjoined structure to account for the syntax of appositive clauses. In particular, we will show that the antecedent DP is merged as an independent constituent but, at the same time, shows a clear morphosyntactic connection with the appositive CP.

In this respect, the first element that is worth mentioning is the so-called “anaphoric article” in Somali, that is to say, a specific type of Determiner that modifies the antecedent DP in appositive clauses (when it is not a proper name). Consider the following:

\[ (37) \text{Xasan gabarti}/gabarta [oo guriga u socota].} \]
\[ \text{Xasan AN ART CONJ house.ART to go.PRG.RD} \]
\[ \text{buu arky FM.SCL3SGM saw.3SG} \]
\[ ‘Xasan met [that (specific) girl]_k, [who_k is now going to home].’ \]

As we can see, the definite article cannot be used in this context, while it is present in restrictive clauses (cf. (7)). This means that the selection of the Determiner is connected with the presence of a specific modifier and, in particular, that the anaphoric article and the appositive CP refer conjointly to some previous information. This connection is well explained syntactically through a conjoined structure, in which the denotation of the antecedent is calculated on the basis of the entire “big DP” (cf. also Doron 1994).

\(^{14}\) Rebuschi (2005) discusses many similarities between relative clauses, APs and locative PPs in Chinese and Turkish. Crucial similarities are also present in Somali (cf. note 16).
Another important consequence of the structure proposed in (35) is that the appositive CP must be considered a dependent clause (as also argued in Demirdarche 1991). This is clearly shown in Somali by the absence of focalization, which is instead present in every main, declarative sentence (as it is a Focus-prominent language). So, no element can be focused in an appositive clause and this is evidence that the appositive CP is structurally dependent on its antecedent:

(38)  

   Cali CONJ Maryam FM with speak.PRGRD FM teacher  
   ‘Cali, who is talking to Maryam, is a teacher.’

   Cali CONJ Maryam FM with speak.PRGR3SG FM teacher  
   ‘Cali, who is talking to Maryam, is a teacher.’

In particular, we claim that this structural dependency is triggered by an “Identification Condition”: the DP-head must c-command and identify the anaphoric pronoun in the Spec,CP of the appositive clause. Strong support for this claim comes from the analysis of sentences like (39) and (40) below, that reproduce the same meaning in Somali and Afar respectively:

(39)  

a. [isaga₉ [oo Øk isbitaalka ku jira]] buu dhintay.  
   he CONJ hospital.ART in stayed.RD FM.SGCL3SGM died.3SGM  
   ‘He died while he was in the hospital.’

b. *[oo Øk isbitaalka ku jira] isaga₉ baa dhintay.

(40)  

a. [Ahmedk [isbital suge-iyya₉]] rabe.  
   Ahmed hospital.ART be.3SGM.RP.RABS died.3SGM  
   ‘Ahmed died while he was in the hospital.’


As we can see, the appositive clause in the relevant sentences is interpreted as an adverbial clause. Indeed, from a semantic point of view, it provides a piece of information concerning the time of the event expressed in the matrix clause. However, it is structurally an appositive and, as such, it is strictly dependent on the DP-head (isaga/Ahmed). Hence, it cannot be extraposed
and precede the antecedent-DP (or the anaphoric pronoun does not meet the identification requirement).\textsuperscript{15}

Bianchi (2000) proposes that appositives raise and attach to the matrix sentence at LF ("Long raising analysis"). The availability of an adverbial meaning for appositive clauses seems to support this analysis. In this respect, the following sentences should also be considered:

\begin{enumerate}
\item [a.] \texttt{[gabartii [oo markaas guriga \textit{gashay}]] baan arkay girl.AN CONJ time.ART house.ART entered.RD FM.1SCL saw.1SG} \textit{‘I saw the girl (soon) after she got home.’}
\item [b.] \texttt{[gabartii [oo markaas guriga \textit{galaysá}]] baan arkay girl.AN CONJ time.ART house.ART enter.PRG.RD FM.1SCL saw.1SG} \textit{‘I saw the girl when she was coming home.’}
\end{enumerate}

\begin{enumerate}
\item [a.] \texttt{[gabartii [oo ku taqan]] baa ag taadii markay girl.AN CONJ you know.PRG.RDFM.1SCL near you.POSS passed.3SGF} \textit{‘That girl, though she knows you, she did not greet you.’}
\item [b.] \texttt{[gabartii [oo ku taqan]] baa ag taadii markay girl.AN CONJ you know.PRG.RDFM.1SCL near you.POSS passed.3SGF} \textit{‘That girl, though she knows you, she did not greet you.’}
\end{enumerate}

As we can see, the temporal meaning associated with these sentences depends on the tense in the relative clause. So, with a past tense, the adverbial apposition expresses a sequence of two events (41a), while with a present tense the adverbial clause expresses contemporaneous events (41b). Finally, adverbial apposition can also encode concessive/adversative information (as is shown in (42)).

Let us finally consider the \texttt{CONJ} head (\texttt{oo} in Somali, \texttt{ay} in Afar). Though it \texttt{connects} the DP-head with the appositive CP, it cannot be considered a coordinative head in a proper sense. First of all, it connects two constituents of a different kind, thus forming what we have defined as an "asymmetric conjunction". Secondly, its behaviour shows crucial asymmetries with respect to "real" coordinative (CRD) heads, like \texttt{–na} in Somali. Consider the following:

\begin{enumerate}
\item [a.] \texttt{Cali wuu bukay \textit{adiguna} dawaysay.} Cali FM.SCL3SGM be-sick.3SGM you.NOM-CRD cured.3SGM \textit{‘Cali was sick and you have cured him.’}
\item [b.] \texttt{*Cali wuu bukay \texttt{oo} adiguna dawaysay.}
\end{enumerate}

\textsuperscript{15} Also note that in (39) the presence of the subject clitic on the FM \texttt{baa} (yielding \texttt{bua}) shows that the DP \texttt{isaga} is not the Focus of the main clause (since subject focusing excludes clitic resumption, cf. (6b)). This implies that the Focus in (39) is the \textit{entire ConjP}.\hfill
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(44) a. Cali hilib buu cunay caano buuna cabbay.
    C. meat FM.SCL3SGM ate 3SGM milk FM.SCL3SGM-CRD drank.3SGM
    ‘Cali ate meat and drank milk.’

   b. *Cali hilib buu cunay oo caano buu cabbay.

As we can see, the CONJ oo cannot be used to connect two independent sentences (regardless of subject identity). Moreover, as is clearly shown, sentences coordinated by –na can both contain a Focus marker, while oo-clauses exclude focusing (cf. (38)). We thus conclude, with Thompson (1971), that “an appositive cannot be simply the counterpart of a coordinated structure” and that the CONJ head is not a genuine coordinative head: it is a partially unspecified element whose value is defined by distributional properties (cf. Rebuschi 2003).

As for its overt/covert realization, we suggest that an overt CONJ head in appositive constructions is required to differentiate meanings and avoid ambiguities in those languages in which categorial distinction crucially relies on syntactic structure. This is a very complex issue, that is far beyond the scope of this work. However, to exemplify our suggestion, consider “minimal pairs” like the following, in Somali:

(45) a. [Cali [keli ah]] baa yimid
    Cali alone be.RD FM came.1SG
    ‘Only CALI came.’

   b. [Cali [oo keli ah]] baa yimid
    Cali CONJ alone be.RD FM came.1SG
    ‘CALI came, alone.’

The contrast offered in (45a-b) shows that the presence of the CONJ head in the relative clause distinguishes an adverbial interpretation from an appositive reading of the noun keli. Since in Somali “adverbs” and “adjectives” are not morphologically characterized (i.e., they do not form “categories” in the traditional sense), adverbial and adjectival interpretation only depends on the specific type of relative clause that is headed by the relevant head-noun. An overt functional head like oo is therefore needed to make this distinction clear.16

16 Specifically, adjectives in Somali are realised as a particular class of verbs and they modify nouns in the form of restrictive clauses (cf. (ia)). It is thus interesting to note that, in the presence of more than one “adjectival” modification, the second modifier must take the form of an appositive clause (cf. (ib)) and their word order cannot be changed (cf. (ic)).
Avoidance of ambiguities can also be invoked to explain the presence of the CONJ head ay in Afar when the DP-head is modified both by a restrictive and an appositive (cf. (29) above). Since sentence coordination is generally realised through simple juxtaposition in Afar, it is plausible to assume that the CONJ head ay appears in this kind of complex structure to signal that the following predicate is an apposition to the DP-head (awka in (29)) and avoid an interpretation in which the Noun abba is interpreted as the subject of the following verb (thus obtaining the (wrong) reading: “the boy that fell and his father who is going cried”)

6. Back to data: a full account

Let us now resume the different phenomena examined in section 4. and see how the structural distinction proposed in section 5.1. can provide a comprehensive explanation for the asymmetries shown by restrictive and appositive clauses.

6.1. Antiagreement effects

We have seen in section 2. that both restrictive and appositive clauses show AA effects in Somali, when the head-noun has a subject role, and that such effects typically arise when the subject is a Focus (or wh-questioned).

In recent works, Frascarelli and Puglielli (2004, forthcoming) have argued for a cleft-like structure in Focus marking languages. According to this analysis, Focus is realised by means of a copular construction in which a matrix Focus Marker (an original copular form) selects a Small Clause (SC) as its complement. The subject of the relevant SC is a (restrictive) relative clause headed by a generic (overt/covert) NP (“person”, “time”, “place”, etc.), that is the piece of information we lack and that we are going to provide in the predication (i.e., the rhematic part of the sentence). The predicate is therefore the focused DP that Operator-moves to Spec,FocP in order to identify the NP-head in the relative clause.

(i) a. Cali [DP baaburkaₐ [ fiican ah ]] buu soo gatay
   Cali car.AN nice be.RD FM.SCL.3SGM bought.RD
   'As for Cali, he bought A NICE CAR.' [lit: Cali, he bought a car that is nice]

b. Cali [DP baaburkaₐ [ fiican ah ]] [ oo [ duug ah ]] buu soo gatay
   'Cali bought a NICE, OLD CAR.' [lit: Cali, he bought a car that is old and is good]

c. *Cali [DP baaburkaₐ [ oo [ duug ah ]] [ fiican ah ]] buu soo gatay

17 The relevant ambiguity could not be solved by Case marking on the DP ‘abba because, as shown in section 3., the DP-head of an appositive clause always shows ABS Case.
This amounts to saying that the Focus is not the head of the relative clause, but is merged as an independent constituent in the SC. Hence, in the case of subject focusing, the relevant DP is in fact only reinterpreted as the subject of the verb (after the identification of the Variable), as is shown in (46b):

(46)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{CALI baa Soomali ah.} \\
& \text{Cali FM Somali be.RD} \\
& \text{‘CALI is (the person that) is Somali.’} \\
\text{b. } & [\text{FocP } \text{CALIk } [\text{Foc'baa } [\text{IP tbaa [SC}[\text{CP } \emptyset [\text{IP } \text{VARk soomaali ah}] ] ] ] ] ]
\end{align*}
\]

This provides an immediate explanation for AA effects: the reduced (“participial”) form of the verb is triggered by the presence of an empty subject (within the relative clause) in a non pro-drop language\(^{18}\) (for discussion and details, cf. Frascarelli and Puglielli 2004, forthcoming).

This analysis plays a crucial role in the present proposal since, as we have seen in section 5.1., both restrictive and appositive clauses include the presence of a Variable within the relative IP. Thus, if the Variable plays a subject role, this creates the structural condition for AA effects. This is shown for sentences (7b)-(8b), repeated below as (47)-(48):

(47)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Wiilka [toosayá ] baa warshad ka shaqaysaa.} \\
& \text{boy.ART wake up.PRGRD FM farm in work.PRGR3SGM} \\
& \text{‘The boy that is waking up works in a farm.’} \\
\text{b. } & [\text{DP } \text{wiilik} [\text{CP } \text{tk } [\text{IP } \text{VARk toosayá } ] ] ] ...
\end{align*}
\]

(48)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Cali [oo toosayá] baa in yar sexday.} \\
& \text{Cali CONJ wake up.PRGRD FM quantity little slept.3SGM} \\
& \text{‘Cali, who is waking up, didn’t sleep much.’} \\
\text{b. } & [\text{ConJP } \text{Calik } [\text{ConJ' oo } [\text{CP } \emptyset [\text{IP } \text{VARk toosayá } ] ] ] ] ...
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{18}\) The connection between AA and the pro-drop parameter is also evident in non-Afroasiatic languages. Consider, for instance, cleft sentences in English as compared to pro-drop Italian (for further discussion, cf. Frascarelli 2000b).

(i)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{It \textit{is ME (1SG) that goes (3SG) to America.}} \\
& \text{b. } \text{Sono io (1SG) che vado (1SG) in America.}
\end{align*}
\]
The reduced paradigm is thus dependent on the presence of a Variable sitting in subject position in the relative clause, and not on the particular FM in the matrix sentence. Consider, for instance, (49) below (an appropriate answer to “where is Cali, with the present?”), where \textit{waa} is used:

\begin{equation}
\text{(49)} \quad \text{[Cali [oo } \text{∅ } \text{hadiyadda keenaya /*keenayaa]} \text{] waa } \text{IMANAYAA}
\end{equation}

Cali CONJ present.ART bring.PRG.RD/*3SGM FM come.PRG.3SGM

‘Cali is ARRIVING, with the present.’

(lit.: Cali, who is bringing the present, is arriving)

As we can see, the verb in the matrix clause (imanayaa) shows full agreement, given the unfocused status of the subject. Nonetheless the verb in the appositive clause is necessarily in the reduced form, due to the presence of an empty element in subject position.

6.2. Extraposition Effects

As shown in section 4.1., restrictive clauses in Somali and Afar can never be separated from their head, while extraposition is possible for appositives when the relevant head is a narrow Focus. The present analysis can explain this asymmetry. In restrictive clauses the NP-head does not form a maximal projection with the Determiner and, as such, these two elements cannot be subject to movement. On the contrary, the antecedent DP in appositive clauses is merged independently. Movement is thus possible, but only if \textit{triggered by interface requirements}, in the spirit of Minimalism: this condition makes Focus relevant.

In nominal Focus constructions the DP-head must move to SpecFocP to check the [+F] feature (cf. Frascarelli 2000a). This interface requirement does not extend to the appositive CP, which is not included within the DP-head. Therefore, given a Merge structure as in (50a), either the entire ConjP moves to SpecFocP (as in (50b)) or \textit{Cali} only moves, leaving the appositive CP stranded (as in (50c)). Hence, extraposition is in fact CP-stranding:

\begin{equation}
\text{(50) \ a. } \text{[FocP baa [SC [DP[CP∅ [IP aan arkay]] [Conjp Cali [oo wareersan]]]]]}
\end{equation}

FM SCL1SG saw.1SG C. CONJ be-confused.RD

lit.: (what) I saw (is) [ Cali [who was confused] ]

b. \text{[FocP[Conjp CALI [oo wareersan]] [Foc baa [SC[DP[CP∅ arkay]]t]]]}

c. \text{[FocP[CALI]k [Foc baa [SC[DP[CP∅ arkay]] [Conjp*k [oo wareersan]]]]]}

‘I saw CALI, who was confused.’
On the other hand, extraposition is excluded for non-focused DP-heads because no Operator movement is required for them. As argued in Frascarelli and Puglielli (2004), waa constructions are existential statements used to give salience to an in situ predicate. Moreover, in a verb Focus construction the “subject” DP is in fact a Topic and, as such, is merged in extrasentential position. It is thus evident that, given the basic order (51a), extraposition (in (51b)) is simply impossible to derive: the ConjP sits in extrasentential position and a lower position of the appositive clause could only be obtained through rightward movement (that is excluded for independent reasons):

(51) a. \[
\text{[TopP [ConjP Cali [oo [wareersan]]] [FocP waan [TopP ARKAY]]]}
\]
    \[
    \quad \text{Cali CONJ be-confused.RD FM.1SCL saw.ISG}
    \]
    \[
    \quad \text{‘I SAW Cali, who was confused.’}
    \]
    b. *Cali waan ARKAY [oo wareersan]

This analysis is further supported by the observation that extraposition is particularly frequent when the DP-head is indefinite. As is well known, indefinite nouns convey new information, hence their movement to SpecFocP with the stranding of additional (non-focused) information is considered the most natural option by speakers (cf. Gebert 1981:89):

(52) a. \[
\text{Cali GABAR buu arkay [oo talyaani ah]}
\]
    \[
    \quad \text{Cali girl FM.3SGM.SCL saw.RD CONJ Italian be.RD}
    \]
    \[
    \quad \text{‘Cali met a girl who is Italian.’}
    \]
    b. MAGAALO baan tagnay [oo la yirahdo Galkacyo]
    \[
    \quad \text{town FM.1SG.SCL went.RD CONJ IMP call.DEP Galkacyo}
    \]
    \[
    \quad \text{‘We went to a city called Galkacyo.’}
    \]

Also in this case, the presence of waa makes the relevant sentences completely unacceptable, as expected:

(53) a. *Cali gabar wuu ARKAY [oo talyaani ah]
    \[
    \quad \text{‘Cali MET a girl, who is Italian.’}
    \]
    b. *Magaalo waan TAGNAY [oo la yirahdo Galkacyo]
    \[
    \quad \text{‘We WENT to a city, called Galkacyo.’}
    \]
6.3. Case marking and Stacking effects

Data in section 4.2. have shown that, both in Somali and Afar, the head of an appositive clause always shows the unmarked ABS Case, independent of its syntactic role. This is a clear consequence of the ConjP that we propose.

We have seen that Case marking in these languages only takes place on the rightmost constituent within the DP. So, in coordinated structures it only shows on the second conjunct, as is illustrated in (54)-(55) for Somali and Afar, respectively:

(54) [DP[DP qalinka] iyo [DP buugaggu / *-ga]] miiska way saran yihin pencil.ART.ABS and books.ART.NOM/*ABS table.ART.FM.SCL3PL lay.3PL ‘The pencil and the books are on the table.’

(55) [DP[DPmu’sac ca’d a ’kee [DPnabuw’wab bar’si /*-’s a]’tu ‘maduu’da Moses law.ABS and prophets teaching.NOM/*ABS thing NEG.able.IMPF ‘Moses’ law and the prophets’ teaching achieve nothing.’

Consistently, in appositive constructions the first conjoined element (the DP-head) cannot be marked for Case, while the second conjunct is an independent CP and, as such, it is not subject to Case marking.19

Stacking effects (shown in (28)) also represent an immediate consequence of the present analysis since, in that kind of complex modification, the NP-head of the restrictive clause is part of the DP-head which is the antecedent of the (conjoined) appositive CP. Hence, an appositive clause must necessarily follow a restrictive one (and any other internal modifier referring the same head-noun), as is shown in (56) below:20

19 It is worth mentioning that predicative DPs also show ABS Case in Cushitic languages. Consider, for instance, the following copular sentences in Somali (i) and Afar (ii):

(i) Tani waa sonkort / *sonkorti ‘This is sugar.’
   this.NOM FM sugar.ART.ABS sugar.ART.NOM

(ii) a’li ra’kubu / *ra’kub ‘The animal is a camel.’
   animal.NOM camel.ABS camel.NOM

20 This word order constraint is reminiscent of Kayne’s (1994) analysis for sentences like (ib):

(i) a. The student of chemistry from New Jersey.
   b. *The student from New Jersey of chemistry.

Kayne suggests that of chemistry is a complement of the students while from New Jersey is a predicate. This is very much in the spirit of the distinction that we are proposing.
(56) \[ \text{IP} \left[ \text{ConjP} \left[ \text{DP} \left[ \text{NP} \text{wiilkak} \left[ \text{IP} \	ext{VARk} \text{hadlayá} \right] \right] \right] \left[ \text{Conj'oo} \left[ \text{CP} \text{wiilka} \left[ \text{IP} \text{aan ku} \\text{O}_k \text{baray} \right] \right] \right] \text{ baa Landan ka yimid} \right] \] \quad (= (28))

‘The boy that is talking, whom I introduced you before, comes from L.’

As for Afar, this analysis can account for word order without positing an {	extit{ad hoc}} exception to the otherwise very consistent (S)OV order of the language. Indeed, since the appositive clause is a predicative CP (in a conjoined structure), it must follow the head, as expected:

(57) \[ \text{IP} \left[ \text{ConjP} \left[ \text{DP} \left[ \text{IP} \text{VARk} \text{yinniki’se} \right] \left[ \text{NP} \text{‘awkak tIP} \right] \right] \right] \left[ \text{Conj’ ay} \left[ \text{CP} \left[ \text{IP} \text{Øk ‘abba fan ge’da-h-} \text{iyya} \text{ tIP} \right] \text{ wee’ce} \right] \right] \] \quad (= (29))

‘The boy that fell, who is going to his father, cried.’

As indicated in (57), the prenominal position of the restrictive clause is derived through IP-movement to Spec,DP, consistent with Kayne’s assumptions. The same kind of operation applies in the appositive clause, thus deriving the final position of the relative pronoun \textit{iyya} (located in C°).21

6.4. Binding by external Operators, scope of Negation and Extraction

In sentences (30) and (31) we have seen that QPs/NPIs can be the antecedent for an element within a restrictive clause, while this is excluded for appositive clauses. Given the structural distinction proposed, this asymmetry is also easily explained.

Restrictive CPs are complements of a D°-head whose Spec,DP provides the target for QR (Quantifier Raising) at LF. Hence, after (covert) Operator-movement, both QPs and NPIs scope over the sentence and bind a DP therein contained.22 Appositive clauses, on the other hand, are impervious to syntactic binding by external Operators because the DP-head is merged in the Spec, ConjP position, as the “subject” of a Conjoined structure. Hence, a QP referring to this head cannot reach “the highest Operator position” and scope over the entire “big DP”. Therefore, appositive clauses form an independent binding domain with respect to their head.

---

21 The head status of the relative pronoun in Afar is shown by its incorporation into the leftward verb, so that it cannot be separated from the rest of the sentence by any kind of linguistic material. This “grammaticalized” status can also account for the obligatory 3SG agreement in appositive relative clauses.

22 Remember that, according to Kayne’s analysis (1994:26-27), constituents located in the highest Specifier position within a subject DP can c-command out of it.
As far as extraction is concerned, we can say that restrictive clauses allow for this option because the relative clause is the complement of a D° head and, as is known, complements are not islands and extraction is possible. On the other hand, appositive clauses are included in a Conjoined structure, that is to say, in a syntactic island. Extraction from an appositive clause is thus ungrammatical as it is from any second term of a coordinated structure.

7. Conclusions

The data discussed from Somali and Afar have provided evidence that the morphosyntactic properties of restrictive and appositive clauses cannot be fully explained within a uniform approach to relative clauses. In particular, we have shown that restrictive and appositive clauses have contrasting behaviour regarding extraposition, extraction and binding from external Operators. Moreover, appositive clauses are characterised by some specific properties concerning Case assignment, that never arises for restrictives.

We have therefore argued for a promotion analysis of restrictive clauses and refuted this approach for appositives. We have thus proposed an analysis of appositive clauses in terms of a “conjoined” structure, in which an independent DP-head is conjoined to the appositive CP and is connected to a relative (or zero) pronoun (an E-type anaphora) sitting in Spec,CP.

This analysis provides a clear explanation for the data discussed in the paper and sheds new light on the cross-linguistic understanding of some interpretative asymmetries between restrictive and appositive clauses. From a theoretical point of view, the structure proposed is in line with recent cross-linguistic studies of appositive clauses (cf. Del Gobbo 2003, Rebuschi 2002, 2003) and is fully consistent with antisymmetric requirements.
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