author(s) details

Integrated Non-restrictive Relative Clauses in Shupamem

Jason Kandybowicz (Corresponding author)
Linguistics Program
The Graduate Center, City University of New York
365 Fifth Ave, Room 7407
New York, New York 10016
USA
jkandybowicz@gc.cuny.edu
212-817-8503

and

Abdoulaye Laziz Nchare
St. John's University
ncharelaziz@gmail.com

Abstract
This article investigates the structural and interpretative properties of relative clauses in Shupamem, an under-studied Grassfields Bantu language of Cameroon, focusing on the integration status of non-restrictive relative clauses, an under-researched aspect of relative clause syntax. We show that non-restrictive relatives have the same properties as restrictive relatives in the language and argue that considerations relating to illocutionary independence, scope relations with matrix negation and intentional verbs, VP ellipsis, pronominalization, binding, weak crossover effects, parasitic gaps, and split antecedents, among others, support the conclusion that Shupamem non-restrictive relatives are clause-internal nominally-integrated syntactic objects, as in Italian and Mandarin Chinese. This finding supports Cinque's (2008) discovery that non-restrictive relative clauses come in both integrated and non-integrated varieties and typologically places Shupamem among the languages of the world that exclusively manifest the integrated non-restrictive relative clause structure.

Key Words
Relative clause • Non-restrictive relative • Integrated vs. Non-integrated relative clause • Shupamem

Declarations
Funding: None/Not applicable

Conflicts of interest: None

Availability of data and material: Not applicable

Code availability: Not applicable

Author's contributions: The manuscript was written by the first author. Data was collected and analyzed by the first author, but provided by the second author. Both authors read, commented on, and approved the final manuscript.

Integrated Non-restrictive Relative Clauses in Shupamem

Abstract
This article investigates the structural and interpretative properties of relative clauses in Shupamem, an under-studied Grassfields Bantu language of Cameroon, focusing on the integration status of non-restrictive relative clauses, an under-researched aspect of relative clause syntax. We show that non-restrictive relatives have the same properties as restrictive relatives in the language and argue that considerations relating to illocutionary independence, scope relations with matrix negation and intentional verbs, VP ellipsis, pronominalization, binding, weak crossover effects, parasitic gaps, and split antecedents, among others, support the conclusion that Shupamem non-restrictive relatives are clause-internal nominally-integrated syntactic objects, as in Italian and Mandarin Chinese. This finding supports Cinque's (2008) discovery that non-restrictive relative clauses come in both integrated and non-integrated varieties and typologically places Shupamem among the languages of the world that exclusively manifest the integrated non-restrictive relative clause structure.

Key Words
Relative clause • Non-restrictive relative • Integrated vs. non-integrated relative clause • Shupamem

Integrated Non-restrictive Relative Clauses in Shupamem*

1. INTRODUCTION

Cinque (2008) proposes that unlike relative clauses (RCs) of the restrictive variety, non-restrictive RCs are a heterogeneous class, consisting of both "integrated" and "non-integrated" types. Integrated RCs are clauses that are internal to the nominal projection containing the RC head and belong to the domain of "Sentence Grammar", where syntactic operations like movement and binding, among others, apply. Non-integrated RCs are sentences that are generated independently of the sentence/nominal projection containing the RC head and belong to the domain of what Williams (1977) calls "Discourse Grammar". Along these lines, non-integrated RCs manipulate pronouns/relativizers that relate to the RC head in a way that is similar to how E-type pronouns and demonstratives relate to antecedents across discourse. According to Cinque, the non-restrictive RCs of some of the most thoroughly studied RC systems (e.g. English) do not afford us an opportunity to observe non-restrictive RCs of the integrated variety because they exclusively manifest the Discourse Grammar type of non-restrictive relatives. Consequently, our understanding of the syntax of non-restrictive RCs is not only incomplete, but also biased towards analyses proposed in the literature for English-style non-restrictive relatives. Crucially, however, Italian is a language that exploits both the integration and non-integration strategies in non-restrictive RC formation (Cinque 2008, 2020) and Mandarin Chinese exclusively builds non-restrictives that are clausally integrated (Zhang 2001; Del Gobbo 2001, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2007, 2010, 2015; Lin & Tsai 2015). These discoveries raise an important open question. How prevalent is the integrated non-restrictive RC type cross-linguistically? Presently, the cross-linguistic integration status of non-restrictive RCs remains an under-researched aspect of relative clause syntax. In our present state of knowledge, integrated non-restrictive relative clauses appear to be typologically marked, but this may simply be an artifact of a state of the field in which non-restrictive RCs receive less attention than their restrictive counterparts or possibly to a sampling bias in the languages investigated. In this article, we present a new instance of non-restrictive RC integration in a language whose relative clauses have yet to receive a formal treatment in the literature, lending further support to Cinque's integrated non-restrictive RC proposal.

This article investigates the structural and interpretative properties of RCs in Shupamem[1], an under-studied Eastern Grassfields Bantu language, focusing on the integration of non-restrictive

* We thank our handling editor Martin Salzmann and our three anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments and thoughtful questions, all of which substantially improved the quality of this article. For valuable feedback and insightful comments, we are also grateful to the following individuals: Sam Al Khatib, Masha Esipova, John Gluckman, Brent Henderson, Richie Kayne, Margaret Matte, Gesoel Mendes, and Hagay Schurr. Finally, we thank the audiences of NYU Syntax Brown Bag and Annual Conference on African Linguistics 51-52, where portions of this material were presented. All errors and oversights are our own.

[1] Shupamem (ISA 639-3: bax), also known as "Bamun" is spoken by about 420,000 people (Eberhard et al. 2019) in the Western Province of central Cameroon. The Shupamem data in this article are presented in IPA. Abbreviations follow the Leipzig Glossing Rules with minor deviations and include: COMP = complementizer; COP = copula; EVID = evidential; EXPL = expletive; IMPERF = imperfective; NEG = negative; PL = plural; PRS = present; PRT = particle; PSTn = past, level n (there are 4 past tense time depths in Shupamem (Nchare 2012)); Q = question particle; RECIP = reciprocal; REL = relative clause marker; SG = singular; TOP = topic. The following diacritics are used to mark surface tone: V́ = high, V̀ = low, V̌ = rising, V̂ = falling.

RCs. We show that these non-restrictive relatives have the same properties as restrictive RCs in the language and argue that a variety of syntactic and semantic considerations support the conclusion that Shupamem non-restrictives are clause-internal nominally-integrated syntactic objects, as in Italian and Mandarin Chinese. This finding supports Cinque's discovery that non-restrictive relative clauses come in both integrated and non-integrated varieties and typologically places Shupamem among the languages of the world that exclusively manifest the integrated non-restrictive relative clause structure.

The Shupamem examples presented in this article represent the judgments of the second author, a linguist and native speaker of the language. The data were elicited in-person over a two-year period (2019-2021) via a series of acceptability judgment tasks. The authors collaboratively analyzed the resulting data.

We have structured the article as follows. In section two, we provide a brief overview of relativization in Shupamem. Section three presents the core evidence that Shupamem non-restrictive RCs are clausally integrated. Section four brings additional less decisive but nonetheless supporting considerations to bear on the integrated status of non-restrictive RCs in the language. Section five concludes with some brief analytical and comparative remarks.

2. A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF SHUPAMEM RELATIVE CLAUSES

Shupamem is a head-initial language with fairly rigid SVO syntax (Nchare 2012). RCs in the language are post-nominal externally-headed structures, as exemplified by the data in (1).

(1) a. mə̌ jì mìn [juə́ í-jɨɣə̀n Râjè nə́]
1.SG know.PRS person.SG REL.SG 3.SG-see.PST1 Raye REL.PRT
'I know the person that saw Raye.'

b. mə̌ jì pìn [puə́ Râjè jɨɣə̀n nə́]
1.SG know.PRS person.PL REL.PL Raye see.PST1 REL.PRT
'I know the people that Raye saw.'

Relativized nominals are represented inside the RC as resumptive pronouns in subject (1a) and indirect object relative clauses. Relativized direct objects, on the other hand, are gapped (1b). In Shupamem, the nominal antecedent selects the RC, as evidenced by number agreement on the relativizer (*juə́* (1a) vs. *puə́* (1b)). Despite inflecting for number, relative markers in the language do not inflect for person or noun class. Shupamem's relative markers are limited to the two forms illustrated in (1a) and (1b). That is to say, Shupamem lacks *wh*- relative pronouns (i.e. relative markers non-distinct from question words). RCs in the language are bounded on their right edges by an invariable secondary relative particle (*nə́*).

According to Watters (2000), formal distinctions between restrictive and non-restrictive RCs are generally not marked in African languages. Shupamem embodies this generalization. The data in (2) present RCs headed by proper names and pronouns. Regardless of whether the RC

head is a nominal (1), a proper name (2a), or a pronoun (2b), Shupamem RCs are formally indistinguishable. All three resemble one another both morphosyntactically and prosodically[2].

(2) a. mə̌ jì Mímʃə́ [juə́ í-jɨ́ɣə̀n Râjè nə́]
1.SG know.PRS Mimshe REL.SG 3.SG-see.PST1 Raye REL.PRT
'I know Mimshe, who saw Raye.'

b. mə̌ jì ŋú [juə́ ú-jɨ́ɣə̀n Râjè nə́]
1.SG know.PRS 2.SG REL.SG 2.SG-see.PST1 Raye REL.PRT
'I know you, who saw Raye.'

RCs in the language also look (and sound) the same regardless of whether the antecedent is a quantified expression that licenses a discourse referent (3a) or one that does not (3b).

(3) a. mə̌ʔ mɨ̀n [juə́ í-jɨ́ɣə̀n Râjè nə́] ɣɨə̀
some person.SG REL.SG 3.SG-see.PST1 Raye REL.PRT laugh.PST1
'Some person who saw Raye laughed.'

b. ŋgù pɨ̀n [puə́ pə́-jɨ́ɣə̀n Râjè nə́] ɣɨə̀
every person.PL REL.PL 3.PL-see.PST1 Raye REL.PRT laugh.PST1
'Every person that saw Raye laughed.'

Although it might be tempting to claim that despite their formal similarity to the restrictive RCs in (1), the RCs in (2) are semantically non-restrictive in virtue of taking proper name and pronominal antecedents (Jackendoff 1977), this would be an oversimplification. In languages like English, proper names can head restrictive or kind relatives (4a)[3] depending on context and third person pronominals can serve as heads of restrictive RCs (4b), similar to other definite descriptions.

(4) a. I felt that John was not like the John that I used to know.
b. He who owns little is little owned.

In Shupamem, RCs headed by proper names and third person pronominals can be interpreted either restrictively or non-restrictively. That is, RCs like the one in (2a) are ambiguous and require context to disambiguate – (2a) is felicitous in a discourse with multiple salient 'Mimshe' referents (i.e. RC interpreted restrictively) and it is also felicitous in a context with only one such referent (i.e. RC interpreted non-restrictively). Furthermore, like Italian (Cinque 2014) but opposite English (Bolinger 1967, Larson & Marušič 2004), post-nominal adjectives in Shupamem are ambiguous between restrictive and non-restrictive readings (5a), while pre-nominal adjectives in the language can only be interpreted restrictively (5b). When modifying an

[2] We determined that restrictive and non-restrictive RCs in Shupamem are prosodically and intonationally identical by informally analyzing F0 contours and checking other prosodic features (e.g. presence of pauses, boundary tones, etc.) using Praat (Boersma & Weenink 2017).
[3] We thank an anonymous reviewer for providing this example as well as the one in (4b).

RC head, the interpretation of the adjective influences the interpretation of the RC, as reflected in the translations below.

(5) a. mə̌ jì Mímʃə́ nsà [juó í-jɨɣə̀n Râjè nə́]
1.SG know.PRS Mimshe tall REL.SG 3.SG-see.PST1 Raye REL.PRT
'I know the tall Mimshe that saw Raye.'
'I know Mimshe, who is tall, who saw Raye.'

b. mə̌ jì ntàm Mímʃə́ [juó í-jɨɣə̀n Râjè nə́]
1.SG know.PRS tall Mimshe REL.SG 3.SG-see.PST1 Raye REL.PRT
'I know the tall Mimshe that saw Raye.'
*'I know Mimshe, who is tall, who saw Raye.'

These two observations can be pressed into service when investigating the behavior of non-restrictive RCs headed by proper names and third person pronominals in the language. In order to guarantee that such RCs are interpreted non-restrictively in the example sentences that follow in this article, we: a) make use of contexts centered on unique referents/kinds for the RC heads and b) further bias non-restrictive interpretations in these contexts through the use of post-nominal RC head modifiers when possible. Because RCs headed by unmodified first or second person pronominal expressions (e.g. (2b)) are exclusively interpreted non-restrictively in the language, we favor the use of bare non-third person pronominal RC heads when investigating pronominally headed RCs. In these cases, we typically present examples of RCs headed by second person singular forms unless the nature of the diagnostic requires the use of a third person pronoun (e.g. weak crossover (section 3.7)) or a non-second person form (e.g. imperative RCs (section 3.1)).

In the remainder of this article, we will take the formal identity of Shupamem restrictive and non-restrictive RCs as a jumping-off point and argue that this formal similarity across RC types in the language reveals a deeper unity. That unity, we will argue, concerns the fact that Shupamem non-restrictive RCs, like restrictive RCs in the language, are syntactically integrated in the sense of Cinque 2008, 2020. The argument will run as follows. All applicable diagnostics fail to differentiate restrictive RCs from non-restrictive RCs in the language. That is, we observe no asymmetries between the two RC types. The interpretative and syntactic properties of Shupamem non-restrictive relatives that we discover are shown to be fully consistent with a clause-internal nominally-integrated syntactic analysis. This conclusion is fully in line with Cinque's (2020: 164) claim that "where restrictive and non-restrictive RCs are syntactically indistinguishable only the integrated type is present".

3. EVIDENCE THAT SHUPAMEM NON-RESTRICTIVE RELATIVES ARE INTEGRATED

3.1. Illocutionary Independence

In languages like English where non-restrictives are non-integrated (Cinque 2008), non-restrictive RCs and matrix clauses can have independent illocutionary forces. This is illustrated in (6). In (6a), a declarative RC is embedded in an interrogative clause; in (6b), a declarative

relative is embedded in an imperative clause; in (6c)[4], an RC with interrogative force is nested inside a matrix declarative; and in (6d), a relative with imperative force is contained within a declarative root clause.

(6) a. Is even Clarence, who is wearing mauve socks, a swinger? (Ross 1967)
b. Get Bill, who is in charge of this operation! (Andrews 1975)
c. The boss – from whose tyranny will we ever escape? – has asked us to work overtime.
d. The end of the show – at which point please remember to switch on the lights! – is quite spectacular.

Cinque (2008) shows that in Italian as well, non-integrated non-restrictive RCs are illocutionarily independent from the force of the root clause by presenting structures in which forces beyond declarative are possible within non-integrated non-restrictive relatives. The cases of English and Italian thus demonstrate that when probing the illocutionary independence of RCs and the sentences they are embedded in, a variety of RC forces should be considered beyond declarative.

In Shupamem, restrictive and non-restrictive RCs may only be illocutionarily independent from the force of the root clause when the RC is declarative. The paradigm in (7) illustrates that while declarative RCs headed by nominals and pronouns may be embedded under imperative matrix clauses (7b-c) as in English, RCs with imperative force are incompatible with matrix declarative force regardless of whether the RC is restrictive/headed by a nominal expression (7d) or non-restrictive/headed by a proper name (7e). As a baseline for the structures in (7b-e), the datum in (7a) shows the form of an unembedded imperative in the language.

(7) a. súsú-nù ɣɛ́tə́ í
please-2.SG embrace 3.SG
'Please embrace her/him!'

b. súsú-nù ɣɛ́tə́ mɨ̀n [juə́ Râjè ʃàʔʃǎ nə́]
please-2.SG embrace person.SG REL Raye greet.PST1 REL.PRT
'Please embrace the person that Raye greeted!'

c. súsú-nù ɣɛ́tə́ á [juə́ Râjè ʃàʔʃǎ nə́]
please-2.SG embrace 1.SG REL Raye greet.PST1 REL.PRT
'Please embrace me, who Raye greeted!'

d. *mə̌ ʃàʔʃǎ mɨ̀n [juə́ súsú-nù ɣɛ́tə́ (í) nə́]
1.SG greet.PST1 person.SG REL please-2.SG embrace 3.SG REL.PRT
Intended: 'I greeted the person that you should please embrace (him/her).'

e. *mə̌ ʃàʔʃǎ Râjè nsà [juə́ súsú-nù ɣɛ́tə́ (í) nə́]
1.SG greet.PST1 Raye tall REL please-2.SG embrace 3.SG REL.PRT
Intended: 'I greeted Raye, who is tall, who you should please embrace (her).'

[4] We thank an anonymous reviewer for supplying this example as well as the one in (6d).

The paradigm in (8) considers the interaction of declarative and interrogative forces within RC structures in the language. While declarative restrictive and non-restrictive RCs may be embedded under interrogative root clauses (8b-c), RCs with interrogative force headed by nominal expressions (8d) and proper names (8e) may not appear under matrix clauses specified for declarative force. A baseline structure illustrating the form of a Shupamem polar question is provided in (8a).

(8) a. ŭ ʃàʔʃă Râjè nə̂
2.SG greet.PST1 Raye Q
'Did you greet Raye?'

b. ŭ ʃàʔʃă mɨ̀n [juə́ í lɔ̀ʔ nə́] nə̂
2.SG greet.PST1 person.SG REL 3.SG leave.PST1 REL.PRT Q
'Did you greet the person that left?'

c. ŭ ʃàʔʃă Râjè nsà [juə́ í lɔ̀ʔ nə́] nə̂
2.SG greet.PST1 Raye tall REL 3.SG leave.PST1 REL.PRT Q
'Did you greet Raye, who is tall, who left?'

d. *ŭ ʃàʔʃă mɨ̀n [juə́ í lɔ̀ʔ nə̂ nə́]
2.SG greet.PST1 person.SG REL 3.SG leave.PST1 Q REL.PRT
Intended: 'You greeted the person X who is such that did X leave?'

e. *ŭ ʃàʔʃă Râjè nsà [juə́ í lɔ̀ʔ nə̂ nə́]
2.SG greet.PST1 Raye tall REL 3.SG leave.PST1 Q REL.PRT
Intended: 'You greeted Raye X, who is tall, who is such that did X leave?'

Taking the facts in (7) and (8) into consideration, a generalization emerges: Shupamem RCs may not be specified for any illocutionary force other than declarative. According to Cinque (2008, 2020), integrated RCs (whether restrictive or non-restrictive) may only be specified for declarative force. From this lack of illocutionary independence, it follows, therefore, that both restrictive and non-restrictive RCs in Shupamem are clausally integrated syntactic structures. One way of interpreting these facts would be to analyze integrated (i.e. embedded) RCs as truncated syntactic objects (Haegeman 2003, 2006a,b) and non-integrated relatives as structures with fully articulated left peripheries. Lacking the ForceP projection, truncated integrated RCs would thus take declarative force by default and be incompatible with overt imperative or interrogative force marking, as observed in Shupamem. Non-integrated RCs, on the other hand, could project ForceP domains given that they are generated independently of the sentence containing the RC head, as in Italian. On an analysis such as this, illocutionary independence is a consequence of a lack of clausal integration. The absence of full illocutionary independence in Shupamem RCs thus constitutes an argument that both restrictive and non-restrictive RCs in the language are clausally integrated.

3.2. Matrix Negation

By definition, in virtue of their integration with the root clause, integrated RCs appear under the scope of matrix negation, while non-integrated relatives do not interact with root negation (see Demirdache 1991 for an early formulation of this claim). The integration status of an RC can therefore be diagnosed on the basis of whether or not a given RC falls under the scope of matrix negation.

In Shupamem, RCs anteceded by nominal heads (9c), proper names (9d), and pronouns (9e) may all appear under the scope of matrix negation. Evidence that all of these RCs truly fall under the scope of matrix negation comes from the fact that negative concord items (NCIs) in these contexts are licensed. Sentences (9a-b) illustrate that the negative lexical item *nʃè-mɨn*, which Nchare (2012) shows has definitive NCI-like properties, requires a negative licensor. This NCI is licensed RC-internally in (9c-e) when negation is present in the matrix clause, regardless of whether the RC it appears in is restrictive or non-restrictive.

(9) a. *Râjè jɨɣən nʃè-mɨn
Raye see.PST1 NEG-person.SG

b. Râjè mâ n-ʒɨɣən-ì nʃè-mɨn
Raye NEG.PST IMPERF-see-3.SG NEG-person.SG
'Raye didn't see anybody.'

c. mə̌ pí mâ n-ʒí-à mɨn [juə́ í-jɨɣən nʃè-mɨn nə́]
1.SG PST3 NEG.PST IMPERF-know-1.SG person.SG REL 3.SG-see.PST1 NEG-person.SG REL.PRT
'I didn't know the person that saw anybody.'

d. mə̌ pí mâ n-ʒí-à Músá nsà [juə́ í-jɨɣən nʃè-mɨn nə́]
1.SG PST3 NEG.PST IMPERF-know-1.SG Musa tall REL 3.SG-see.PST1 NEG-person.SG REL.PRT
'I didn't know Musa, who is tall, who saw anybody.'

e. mə̌ pí mâ n-ʒí-à ŋú [juə́ ú-jɨɣən nʃè-mɨn nə́]
1.SG PST3 NEG.PST IMPERF-know-1.SG 2.SG REL 2.SG-see.PST1 NEG-person.SG REL.PRT
'I didn't know you, who saw anybody.'

An anonymous reviewer points out that NCI licensing in (9c-e) crosses an island boundary, potentially showing that the NCI *nʃè-mɨn* might be discourse-licensed rather than structurally licensed. If so, then perhaps the data in (9d-e) do not constitute proof for the integration of non-restrictive RCs in the language. Recent work on islands in Shupamem (Schurr et. al 2022), however, has revealed that complex NPs like RCs do not constitute either strong or weak islands in the language. Several types of A-bar extraction from RCs in the language (i.e. topicalization and *wh*- focus clefting) are possible, as revealed by the fact such movements give rise to crossover effects, license parasitic gaps within the RC, and manifest Condition A-based reconstruction effects inside the complex NP. See Schurr et. al 2022 for details. Given that RCs do not have island status in the language, the NCI licensing facts in (9c-e) are neither unexpected

nor do they cast doubt on the conclusion that both restrictive and non-restrictive RCs in Shupamem appear under the scope of matrix negation.

As observed in the previous subsection, a reliable diagnostic thus fails to differentiate restrictive RCs from non-restrictive RCs in Shupamem. The fact that non-restrictive relatives appear under the scope of matrix negation (9d-e) supports the analysis that they are clausally integrated in the language.

3.3. Intentional Verbs

A non-restrictive RC's ability to appear in the scope of an intentional verb can be taken as a diagnostic of clausal integration. In a number of languages, restrictive RCs can appear under the scope of an intentional verb, but non-restrictive RCs cannot (Srivastav 1991, Zhang 2001). Consider the following English data.

(10) a. John thinks that Jane admires the florist that is a genius.
b. John thinks that Jane admires Bill, who is a genius.

Sentence (10a) implies that John thinks the florist is a genius, while (10b) does not imply that John thinks Bill is a genius. This shows that the restrictive RC in (10a) is under the scope of the matrix intentional verb, while the non-restrictive RC in (10b) is not.

In Shupamem, RCs headed by nominals (11a), proper names (11b), and pronouns (11c) may all appear under the scope of an intentional verb, as revealed by their interpretations and the logical inferences they give rise to.

(11) a. Mímʃə́ ná ŋ-gúpmə mí mə̌ jì mɨ̀n [juə́ í-jɨ́ɣən Râjè nə́]
Mimshe PRS.EVID IMPERF-think COMP 1.SG know.PRS person.SG REL 3.SG see.PST1 Raye REL.PRT
'Mimshe thinks that I know the person that saw Raye.'
⇒ Implies that Mimshe thinks that the person (in question) saw Raye.

b. Mímʃə́ ná ŋ-gúpmə mí mə̌ jì Músá nsà [juə́ í-jɨ́ɣən Râjè nə́]
Mimshe PRS.EVID IMPERF-think COMP 1.SG know.PRS Musa tall REL 3.SG see.PST1 R REL.PRT
'Mimshe thinks that I know Musa, who is tall, who saw Raye.'
⇒ Implies that Mimshe thinks that Musa saw Raye.

c. Mímʃə́ ná ŋ-gúpmə mí mə̌ jì ŋú [juə́ ú-jɨ́ɣən Râjè nə́]
Mimshe PRS.EVID IMPERF-think COMP 1.SG know.PRS 2.SG REL 2.SG see.PST1 Raye REL.PRT
'Mimshe thinks that I know you, who saw Raye.'
⇒ Implies that Mimshe thinks that you saw Raye.

The findings in (11) hold for a number of other intentional verbs in the language, such as *buə̌* 'fear' and *ʃäʔ* 'wish'. We thus take the facts reported in (11) to be fully general.

Additional and perhaps stronger evidence for the claim that both restrictive and non-restrictive RCs in the language may appear under the scope of intentional verbs comes from the fact that sentences like those in (12)[5] are interpreted as contradictory.

(12) a. #Mímʃə́ ná ŋ-gúpmə́ mí mə̀mbà: [juə́ í-pâ ŋkɨ̀mbà nə́] lámə́
Mimshe PRS.EVID IMPERF-think COMP man REL 3.SG-COP.PRS bachelor REL.PRT be.married
'Mimshe thinks that the man that is a bachelor is married.'

b. #Mímʃə́ ná ŋ-gúpmə́ mí Músá nsà [juə́ í-pâ ŋkɨ̀mbà nə́] lámə́
Mimshe PRS.EVID IMPERF-think COMP Musa tall REL 3.SG-COP.PRS bachelor REL.PRT be.married
'Mimshe thinks that Musa, who is tall, who is a bachelor, is married.'

c. #Mímʃə́ ná ŋ-gúpmə́ mí wú [juə́ ú-pâ ŋkɨ̀mbà nə́] lámə́
Mimshe PRS.EVID IMPERF-think COMP 2.SG REL 2.SG-COP.PRS bachelor REL.PRT be.married
'Mimshe thinks that you, who are a bachelor, are married.'

Once again, we find that restrictive RCs and non-restrictive RCs pattern together in Shupamem. The data above suggest that both RC types are syntactically integrated into the clause.

3.4. VP Ellipsis

A well-known asymmetry distinguishing restrictive from non-restrictive RCs in languages like English concerns the fact that the antecedent of VP ellipsis may include a restrictive RC (13a), but not a non-restrictive one (13b) (McCawley 1988).

(13) a. My mother liked the pizza that I baked, but my brother did not [e].
[e] = 'like the pizza that I baked'

b. My mother likes pizza, which (by the way) I bake well, but my brother does not [e].
[e] = 'like pizza'; [e] ≠ 'like pizza, which (by the way) I bake well'

The ability of an RC to be included in the antecedent of VP ellipsis, therefore, directly tests whether that RC is clausally integrated or not.

Shupamem has a form of VP ellipsis, constructed through stripping via a zero conjunction marker and the inflected particle *nkà* 'too' (14b). Example (14a) below is the unelided version of (14b).

(14) a. mə̌ jì Mímʃə́ wù nkà-ú jì Mímʃə
1.SG know.PRS Mimshe 2.SG too-2.SG know.PRS Mimshe
'I know Mimshe and you too know Mimshe.'

b. mə̌ jì Mímʃə́ wù nkà-ú
1.SG know.PRS Mimshe 2.SG too-2.SG
'I know Mimshe and you too ~~know Mimshe~~.'

[5] We thank an anonymous review for suggesting this diagnostic to us.

When RCs are headed by nominal expressions (15), elided VPs are interpreted as anteceded by VPs containing the entire RC. That is, the antecedent of VP ellipsis behaves as though it includes the restrictive RC.

(15) Mímʃə́ jì tɛ̀t pɨ̀n [puə́ Músá jɨ́ɣən ŋkù:rə nə́] Râjè nkà-í
Mimshe know.PRS three person.PL REL.PL Musa see.PST1 yesterday REL.PRT Raye too-3.SG
'Mimshe knows three people that Musa saw yesterday and Raye too [e].'
[e] = 'knows three people that Musa saw yesterday'
[e] ≠ 'knows three people'

RCs headed by proper names and pronouns are also included in the antecedent of VP ellipsis in the language. Evidence comes from the fact that when the subject of the RC is pronominal, both strict and sloppy readings are possible in the ellipsis site, as shown in (16).

(16) a. Mímʃə́ jì Məfîrə́ [juə́ í-jɨ́ɣən ŋkù:rə nə́] Râjè nkà-í
Mimshe know.PRS Mefire REL 3.SG-see.PST1 yesterday REL.PRT Raye too-3.SG
'Mimshe$_i$ knows Mefire, who he$_i$ saw yesterday and Raye$_j$ too [e].'
[e] = 'knows Mefire, who he$_i$ saw yesterday' (✓STRICT IDENTITY)
[e] = 'knows Mefire, who she$_j$ saw yesterday' (✓SLOPPY IDENTITY)

b. Mímʃə́ jì ŋú [juə́ í-jɨ́ɣən ŋkù:rə nə́] Râjè nkà-í
Mimshe know.PRS 2.SG REL 3.SG-see.PST1 yesterday REL.PRT Raye too-3.SG
'Mimshe$_i$ knows you, who he$_i$ saw yesterday and Raye too [e].'
[e] = 'knows you, who he$_i$ saw yesterday' (✓STRICT IDENTITY)
[e] = 'knows you, who she$_j$ saw yesterday' (✓SLOPPY IDENTITY)

These data reveal that the antecedent of VP ellipsis systematically includes the full RC, irrespective of whether that RC is restrictive or non-restrictive. VP ellipsis thus furnishes another argument that restrictive and non-restrictive RCs pattern together in Shupamem and that both RCs are of the integrated variety.

3.5. Pronominalization

In languages like English (McCawley 1981), proforms can resume nominal heads plus restrictive RCs (17a), but not heads plus non-restrictive RCs (17b). This suggests that non-restrictive relatives in English, unlike restrictive RCs, are not clausally integrated.

(17) a. John has an apartment that overlooks Central Park and now he wants another.
('another' = 'apartment that overlooks Central Park').

b. John has an apartment, which (by the way) overlooks Central Park, and now he wants another.
('another' = 'apartment'; ≠ 'apartment which (by the way) overlooks Central Park').

In Shupamem, the situation is different. Pronouns may resume heads plus non-restrictive RCs (18)[6]. Evidence that the proform is resuming the direct object head + non-restrictive RC comes from the fact that pronominalization can yield sloppy identity readings in these cases, as shown below.

(18) a. Mímʃə́ ʃàʔʃã Râjè nsà [juə́ í-ŋ-gǐʔ nə́] Músá ʃàʔʃã í nkà-í
Mimshe greet.PST1 Raye tall REL 3.SG-IMPERF-love REL.PRT Musa greet.PST1 3.SG too-3.SG
'Mimshe$_i$ greeted Raye$_j$, who is tall, who he$_i$ loves, and Musa$_k$ greeted her$_j$ too.'
⇒ Yields an interpretation in which Musa loves Raye. (✓SLOPPY IDENTITY)

b. Mímʃə́ ʃàʔʃã ŋú [juə́ í-ŋ-gǐʔ nə́] Músá ʃàʔʃã ŋú nkà-í
Mimshe greet.PST1 2.SG REL 3.SG-IMPERF-love REL.PRT Musa greet.PST1 2.SG too-3.SG
'Mimshe$_i$ greeted you, who he$_i$ loves, and Musa$_k$ greeted you too.'
⇒ Yields an interpretation in which Musa loves you. (✓SLOPPY IDENTITY)

These facts are fully consistent with the integrated status of non-restrictive RCs in the language. If Shupamem non-restrictive relatives were not integrated, the proforms in (18) would only be expected to target RC heads, making the existence of sloppy readings unexpected and difficult to account for.

3.6. Binding

It has been claimed that a fundamental difference between restrictive and non-restrictive RCs concerns variable binding. Safir (1986) showed that English matrix quantifiers can bind pronouns inside restrictive RCs (19a), but they cannot bind pronouns inside non-restrictive RCs (19b).

(19) a. [Every Christian]$_i$ forgives a man who harms him$_i$. (Safir 1986)
b. *[Every Christian]$_i$ forgives John, who harms him$_i$. (Safir 1986)

In Shupamem, there is no comparable asymmetry. RC-external quantifiers can bind RC-internal pronominal variables, regardless of whether the RC is headed by a nominal (20a), a proper name (20b), or a pronoun (20c). The data in (20) employ an NCI quantifier in order to circumvent the possibility of modal or temporal subordination, which could act as an interfering factor due to its potential to facilitate discourse binding.

(20) a. nʃə̀-mɨ̀n mâ n-ʒɨɣə̀n-ì mɔ́n [juə́ í-ŋə̌m í nə́]
NEG-person.SG NEG.PST IMPERF-see-3.SG child REL 3.SG-bother.PST1 3.SG REL.PRT
'No person$_i$ saw the child that bothered him/her$_i$.'

b. nʃə̀-mɨ̀n mâ n-ʒɨɣə̀n-ì Mímʃə́ nsà [juə́ í-ŋə̌m í nə́]
NEG-person.SG NEG.PST IMPERF-see-3.SG Mimshe tall REL 3.SG-bother.PST1 3.SG REL.PRT
'No person$_i$ saw Mimshe, who is tall, who bothered him/her$_i$.'

[6] Proforms may also resume heads plus restrictive RCs, as in English, once again demonstrating an absence of structural asymmetry between restrictive and non-restrictive RCs in the language. Evidence that the proforms in these cases are replacing the full RC and not just the RC head comes from the fact that such substitutions give rise to ambiguities involving strict vs. sloppy identity. Due to space limitations, the relevant examples are not presented here.

c. ŋʃə̀ mɨ̀n mâ n-ʒɨɣə̀n-ì ŋú [juə́ ú-ŋə̌m í nə́]
NEG-person.SG NEG.PST IMPERF-see-3.SG 2.SG REL 2.SG-bother.PST1 3.SG REL.PRT
'No person$_i$ saw you, who bothered him/her$_i$.'

Another known RC binding asymmetry relates to anaphor binding. Unlike anaphors within restrictive RCs, anaphors inside non-restrictive relatives cannot be bound by RC-external material (including the head) in some languages (e.g. Italian (Giorgi 1984)). This asymmetry is not attested in Shupamem. RC-internal anaphors can be bound by elements outside the RC, regardless of whether the RC head is a nominal (e.g. 'man' in (21a)), a proper name (e.g. 'Raye' in (21b)), or a pronoun (e.g. 'you' in (21c)). Note that although the long-distance anaphors in (21a-c) can take either the RC heads or the matrix subjects as antecedents, only the case of binding by the matrix subject is relevant, as RC heads are either pronominally or covertly represented in the RC and thus binding by the RC head is fully expected.

(21) a. Mímʃə́ jɨɣə̀n mə̀mbà: [juə́ í-sŭ tû ŋwàr-ì nə́]
Mimshe see.PST man REL 3.SG-wash.PST1 head body-3.SG REL.PRT
'Mimshe$_i$ saw the man$_j$ that washed himself$_{i/j}$.'

b. Mímʃə́ jɨɣə̀n Râjè nsà [juə́ í-sŭ tû ŋwàr-ì nə́]
Mimshe see.PST Raye tall REL 3.SG-wash.PST1 head body-3.SG REL.PRT
'Mimshe$_i$ saw Raye$_j$, who is tall, who washed himself$_i$/herself$_j$.'

c. Mímʃə́ jɨɣə̀n ŋú [juə́ ú-sŭ tû ŋwàr-ù nə́]
Mimshe see.PST 2.SG REL 2.SG-wash.PST1 head body-2.SG REL.PRT
'Mimshe$_i$ saw you$_j$, who washed himself$_i$/yourself$_j$.'

An anonymous reviewer rightfully points out that in order for this diagnostic to be conclusive, we must demonstrate that the long-distance anaphor *tû ŋwàr-ì/ù* is necessarily structurally bound and cannot take a discourse antecedent. The datum in (22) establishes that despite the availability of a suitable discourse antecedent in an immediately preceding sentence, the anaphor must be structurally bound by a c-commanding element within its sentence. The data in (21), therefore, establish that RC-internal anaphors can indeed be bound by elements outside the RC in both restrictive and non-restrictive RCs.

(22) Mímʃə́ lə̀ʔ.
Mimshe leave.PST1
'Mimshe$_i$ left.'

*Tû ŋwàr-ì mâ n-ʃàʔʃə̃-ì Râjè.
head body-3.SG NEG.PST IMPERF-greet-3.SG Raye
Intended: 'Self$_i$ didn't greet Raye.'

As with the other diagnostics considered thus far in this section, restrictive and non-restrictive RCs behave identically with respect to binding. These facts argue that both restrictive and non-restrictive RCs in Shupamem must be clausally integrated.

3.7. Weak Crossover Effects

Another way to diagnose RC integration is through weak crossover effects. In a number of languages, there is an asymmetry between RC types, in which restrictive RCs give rise to weak crossover effects, while non-restrictive RCs are immune to them (Safir 1986). More precisely, Cinque (2008) shows that non-integrated non-restrictive RCs are immune to weak crossover effects, while non-restrictive relatives of the integrated variety show the effect.

In Shupamem, there is no analogous asymmetry. Regardless of whether the RC head is a nominal (23a), a proper name (23b), or a pronoun (23c), weak crossover effects can be observed inside the RC.

(23) a. Râjè ʃàʔʃǎ màmbà: [juə́ mɔ́n-ì jɨɣàn nə́]
Raye greet.PST1 man REL child-3.SG see.PST1 REL.PRT
'Raye greeted the man$_i$ that his$_{j/*i}$ child saw.'

b. Râjè ʃàʔʃǎ Músá nsà [juə́ mɔ́n-ì jɨɣàn nə́]
Raye greet.PST1 Musa tall REL child-3.SG see.PST1 REL.PRT
'Raye greeted Musa$_i$, who is tall, who his$_{j/*i}$ child saw.'

c. Râjè ʃàʔʃǎ í [juə́ mɔ́n-ì jɨɣàn nə́]
Raye greet.PST1 3.SG REL child-3.SG see.PST1 REL.PRT
'Raye greeted him/her$_i$, who his/her$_{j/*i}$ child saw.'

The finding that Shupamem restrictive and non-restrictive RCs are both susceptible to weak crossover effects once again places the two RC types on equal footing and strongly suggests that non-restrictive relatives in the language are clausally integrated.

3.8. Parasitic Gaps

The presence of parasitic gaps also effectively diagnoses RC integration. In English, parasitic gaps can appear within restrictive RCs (24a), but not within non-restrictive relatives (24b) (Safir 1986). Cinque (2008) observes a similar asymmetry in Italian (at least with respect to the non-integrated variety of non-restrictive RCs in the language).

(24) a. John is a man that everyone that knows <e> admires __. (Safir 1986)
b. *John is a man who Bill, who knows <e>, admires __. (Safir 1986)

In this domain as well, we find no comparable asymmetry in Shupamem. Parasitic gaps can be found in all RC typess, regardless of whether the RC is headed by a nominal (25b), a proper name (25c), or a pronoun (25d). In other words, parasitic gaps are licensed inside both restrictive and non-restrictive RCs in the language. In the paradigm below, example (25a) establishes the illicit gap that will be licensed as a parasitic gap in the RC structures of (25b-d).

(25) a. *{nʃè mɨn/Músá/í} [juə́ í-jí <e> nə́] ná ŋ-gɨ̌ʔ mɔ́n
every person.SG/Musa/3.SG REL 3.SG-know.PRS REL.PRT PRS.EVID IMPERF-love child

b. jî pâ mɔ́n [juɔ́ nʃɛ̀ mɨ̀n [juɔ́ í-jí <e> nɔ́] ná ŋ-gɨ̌ʔ __ nɔ́]
this COP.PRS child REL every person REL 3.SG-know.PRS REL.PRT PRS.EVID IMPERF-love REL.PRT
'This is the child that everyone that knows loves.'

c. jî pâ mɔ́n [juɔ́ Músá nsà [juɔ́ í-jí <e> nɔ́] ná ŋ-gɨ̌ʔ __ nɔ́]
this COP.PRS child REL Musa tall REL 3.SG-know.PRS REL.PRT PRS.EVID IMPERF-love REL.PRT
'This is the child X that Musa, who is tall, who knows X, loves.'

d. jî pâ mɔ́n [juɔ́ ŋú [juɔ́ ú-jí <e> nɔ́] ná ŋ-gɨ̌ʔ __ nɔ́]
this COP.PRS child REL 2.SG REL 2.SG-know.PRS REL.PRT PRS.EVID IMPERF-love REL.PRT
'This is the child X that you, who know X, love.'

The connectivity between non-restrictive RC-internal parasitic gaps and other A-bar gaps supports the conclusion that Shupamem non-restrictive RCs are clausally integrated structures.

3.9. Split Antecedents

The possibility of split antecedents can also be employed to diagnose RC integration. In Italian, only non-integrated RCs can have split antecedents (Cinque 2008). Non-restrictive RCs in English, which are non-integrated according to Cinque (2008), also allow for split antecedents (Perlmutter & Ross 1970), as shown below in the example from Arnold 2007.

(26) Kim likes muffins$_i$, but Sandy prefers scones$_j$, which$_{i+j}$/*that they eat with jam.

If all Shupamem RCs are integrated, as we have argued, we predict the impossibility of split antecedents in non-restrictive RCs headed by both proper names and pronouns. This prediction is borne out, as shown in (27). With restrictive RCs (27a), the impossibility of split antecedents is demonstrated by the unavailability of RC-internal reciprocals (e.g. *ŋwàt-t-àp*), which require plural antecedents. The same is true for non-restrictive relatives headed by proper names (27b) and pronouns (27c). Note that the reciprocals in the structures below are unlicensed regardless of whether a singular or (crucially) plural relative particle introduces the RC, further highlighting the unavailability of split antecedents across both RC types in the language.

(27) a. *Râjè ʃàʔʃă nă: Músá ʃàʔʃă wă: [juɔ́/puɔ́ pɔ́-ŋ-gɨ̌ʔ
Raye greet.PST1 mother Musa greet.PST1 father REL.SG/REL.PL 3.PL-IMPERF-love
ŋwàt-t-àp nɔ́]
body-RECIP-3.PL REL.PRT
Intended: 'Raye greeted the mother$_i$ and Musa greeted the father$_j$ who$_{i+j}$ love each other$_{i+j}$.'

b. *Râjè ʃàʔʃă Mímʃɔ́ nsà Músá ʃàʔʃă Mɔ́fîrɔ́ nsà [juɔ́/puɔ́
Raye greet.PST1 Mimshe tall Musa greet.PST1 Mefire tall REL.SG/REL.PL
pɔ́-ŋ-gɨ̌ʔ ŋwàt-t-àp nɔ́]
3.PL-IMPERF-love body-RECIP-3.PL REL.PRT
Intended: 'Raye greeted Mimshe$_i$, who is tall, and Musa greeted Mefire$_j$, who is tall, who$_{i+j}$ love each other$_{i+j}$.'

c. *Râjè ʃàʔʃã í Músá ʃàʔʃã ŋú [juə́/puə́ pə́-ŋ-gɨ̌ʔ
Raye greet.PST1 3.SG Musa greet.PST1 2.SG REL.SG/REL.PL 3.PL-IMPERF-love
ŋwàt-t-àp nə́]
body-RECIP-3.PL REL.PRT
Intended: 'Raye greeted him/her$_i$ and Musa greeted you$_j$, who$_{i+j}$ love each other$_{i+j}$.'

We thus observe yet another way in which restrictive and non-restrictive RCs pattern together in their integrated status. In summary, non-restrictive RCs in Shupamem pattern like restrictive relatives across a diverse range of diagnostics and considerations[7]: illocutionary independence; the ability to scope under matrix negation; the ability to scope under an intentional verb; inclusion in the antecedent of VP ellipsis; the ability to be pronominalized; binding transparency; susceptibility to weak crossover effects; the appearance of parasitic gaps; and the capacity to take split antecedents. In the next section, we bring other (less decisive) considerations to bear on the integrated status of non-restrictive RCs in Shupamem. While these observations do not argue directly for the integrated status of non-restrictive RCs like the considerations brought forth in this section do, they serve to further highlight the ways in which restrictive and non-restrictive relatives pattern together syntactically in the language in a way that is consistent with the clausal integration analysis.

4. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

4.1. Stacking

A well-known (but contested[8]) asymmetry between restrictive and non-restrictive RCs is that unlike restrictive relatives, non-restrictive RCs cannot stack (Carlson 1977: 520, Chomsky 1977: 66, Jackendoff 1977: 171, Emonds 1979: 222, Smits 1989: 174, McCawley 1998: 447, Bianchi 1999: 262). By "stacking", we mean cases where RC_1 modifies a nominal, while RC_2 modifies the unit [nominal + RC_1]. In others words, stacking involves an RC modifying another [head + RC] structure, not two conjoined RCs modifying the same antecedent and not nesting, both of which are possible with non-restrictive RCs. This restrictive/non-restrictive asymmetry is exemplified below with English examples from McCawley 1998.

(28) a. The book that I saw that I wanted to buy was rare.
b. ??Sam Boronowski, who took the qualifying exam, who failed it, wants to retake it.

Unlike English, Shupamem RCs behave alike with respect to stacking. RCs headed by nominal heads (29a) and non-restrictive RCs headed by proper names (29b) and pronouns (29c)

[7] An anonymous reviewer suggests that further evidence for the integrated status of non-restrictive RCs in Shupamem might come from the domain of main clause phenomena. If any such phenomena could be recognized in the language, they would be predicted to be unavailable inside both non-restrictive and restrictive RCs in the language, due to their shared integrated/embedded status. Space limitations prevent us from pursuing this diagnostic here, so we leave it for future research to determine. We thank the reviewer for this helpful suggestion.

[8] A number of authors have disputed the claim that non-restrictive RCs cannot be stacked. These include Grosu & Landman (1998: 126), Grosu (2000: 112); Kempson (2003); De Vries (2006: 252), Arnold (2007), Loock (2010), Fukui (1986: 232), and Kameshima (1989).

all permit stacking. In other words, asymmetrical stacking patterns in languages like English are neutralized in Shupamem.

(29) a. mə̌ jì mìn [juə́ Râjè jɨɣən nə́] [juə́ Mímʃə̌ ɣɨ́ʔ nə́]
1.SG know.PRS person.SG REL Raye see.PST1 REL.PRT REL Mimshe like.PRS REL.PRT
'I know the person that Raye saw that Mimshe likes.'
⇒ Mimshe likes the person that Raye saw, but does not necessarily like Raye.

b. mə̌ jì Músá nsà [juə́ Râjè jɨɣən nə́] [juə́ Mímʃə̌ ɣɨ́ʔ nə́]
1.SG know.PRS Musa tall REL Raye see.PST1 REL.PRT REL Mimshe like.PRS REL.PRT
'I know Musa, who is tall, who Raye saw, who Mimshe likes.'
⇒ Mimshe likes Musa, who Raye saw, but does not necessarily like Raye.

c. mə̌ jì ŋú [juə́ Râjè jɨɣən nə́] [juə́ Mímʃə̌ ɣɨ́ʔ nə́]
1.SG know.PRS 2.SG REL Raye see.PST1 REL.PRT REL Mimshe like.PRS REL.PRT
'I know you, who Raye saw, who Mimshe likes.'
⇒ Mimshe likes you, who Raye saw, but does not necessarily like Raye.

These facts are reminiscent of Dutch, where non-restrictive RCs can also stack (Vries 2000), as wells as Italian (Cinque 2020) and Japanese (Fukui 1986). It isn't immediately clear why stackability would depend on clausal integration, but if the ability to stack RCs diagnoses the clausal integration of those RCs and not just restrictive vs. non-restrictive status[9], then Shupamem non-restrictive relatives once again manifest properties of clausally integrated syntactic objects.

4.2. Extraposition

Ziv (1973), Ziv & Cole (1974), and McCawley (1988) argued that another difference between restrictive and non-restrictive RCs in languages like English is that restrictive RCs can extrapose (see English translation in (30c)), but non-restrictive RCs cannot[10] (see ungrammatical English translations in (31) and (32) – i.e. the first of the two English translations). No comparable asymmetry exists in Shupamem. Both restrictive RCs (30c) & non-restrictive RCs with proper name (31) and pronominal (32) antecedents can extrapose to the right edge of the clause. To see this, first consider the paradigm in (30). The structure in (30a) places an RC in a position modifying the subject, while the sentence in (30b) locates the same RC in an object-modifying position. When the RC in question appears to the right of the adverb 'yesterday' (30c), the

[9] A reviewer points out that although non-restrictive RCs can stack in Dutch, the language has clearly non-integrated non-restrictive RCs according to considerations of prosody and the criteria outlined in section 3. Thus, stacking is likely not a decisive diagnostic for integration, at least for languages like Dutch.

[10] See Kempson 2003: 302 and Arnold 2007: 288 for purported examples of extraposed non-restrictive RCs in English and De Vries (2006: 254) for a case of non-restrictive RC extraposition in Dutch. It is not entirely clear whether such cases represent genuine instances of extraposition or special cases of non-adjacency like that found across discourse. An anonymous reviewer, however, remarks that extraposition of non-restrictive RCs in Dutch is fully productive and thus, that extraposition is not a decisive diagnostic for RC integration in languages like Dutch.

resulting output is ambiguous between readings in which either the subject or the object is the antecedent of the RC. This provides evidence that the RC in question has indeed extraposed. The subject RC reading is consistent with an analysis in which (30a) is taken to be the base-merge structure, while the object RC reading results from analyzing (30b) as the origin structure.

(30) a. mɨn [juə́ Râjè jɨɣən nə́] kɨp rɨ: ŋkù:rə̀
person.SG REL Raye see.PST1 REL.PRT break.PST1 chair yesterday
'The person that Raye saw broke the chair yesterday.'

b. mɨn kɨp rɨ: [juə́ Râjè jɨɣən nə́] ŋkù:rə̀
person.SG break.PST1 chair REL Raye see.PST1 REL.PRT yesterday
'The person broke the chair that Raye saw yesterday.'

c. mɨn kɨp rɨ: ŋkù:rə̀ [juə́ Râjè jɨɣən nə́]
person.SG break.PST1 chair yesterday REL Raye see.PST1 REL.PRT
✓'The person__broke the chair yesterday [that Raye saw].' (Raye saw the person.)
✓'The person broke the chair__ yesterday [that Raye saw].' (Raye saw the chair.)

Crucially, if the structure in (30c) is modified so that the matrix subject is replaced with a proper name, RC dislocation once again results in ambiguity (31), revealing that the extraposed RC can be interpreted either non-restrictively or restrictively.

(31) Mímʃə́ kɨp rɨ: ŋkù:rə̀ [juə́ Râjè jɨɣən nə́]
Mimshe break.PST1 chair yesterday REL Raye see.PST1 REL.PRT
✓'Mimshe __ broke the chair yesterday [who Raye saw].' (Raye saw Mimshe.)
✓'Mimshe broke the chair __ yesterday [that Raye saw].' (Raye saw the chair.)

Likewise, if the structure in (30c) is modified so that the matrix subject is replaced with a pronoun, right edge RC placement also results in ambiguity (32), revealing once again that the extraposed RC can be interpreted non-restrictively.

(32) wú kɨp rɨ: ŋkù:rə̀ [juə́ Râjè jɨɣən nə́]
2.SG break.PST1 chair yesterday REL Raye see.PST1 REL.PRT
✓'You __ broke the chair yesterday [who Raye saw].' (Raye saw you.)
✓'You broke the chair __ yesterday [that Raye saw].' (Raye saw the chair.)

As with the stacking diagnostic previously considered, it isn't clear why the ability of an RC to extrapose would depend on clausal integration. However, if the ability to extrapose diagnoses the clausal integration of an RC and not just restrictive vs. non-restrictive status, then Shupamem non-restrictive RCs once again behave as though they are clausally integrated syntactic structures.

4.3. Extraction

In some languages, extraction from restrictive RCs is possible, but extraction from non-restrictive RCs is impossible. Swedish is purported to be one such language (Engdahl 1997).[11]

(33) Swedish (Platzack 2000: 275)

a. [Den här teorin]$_i$ känner jag mannen som uppfann t_i.
this here theory know I man.the REL invented
'I know the man that invented this theory.'

b. *[Den här teorin]$_i$ känner jag Kalle som uppfann t_i.
this here theory know I Kalle REL invented
Intended: 'I know Kalle, who invented this theory.'

Despite constituting complex NP islands in some languages, RCs are robustly transparent extraction domains in Shupamem (Schurr et al. 2022). A-bar extraction out of RCs is possible regardless of whether the RC is restrictive (i.e. headed by a nominal (34a)) or non-restrictive (i.e. headed by either a proper name (34b) or a pronoun (34c)), with no restrictions on the definiteness of the RC head, the nature of the relativizer, or the embedded verb, as in Scandinavian. The data in (34) showcase the possibility of topicalization out of both types of RCs.[12] *Wh-* movement (and focus movement more generally) is also possible out of both restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses in the language.

(34) a. á pò: ɲí mə̌ jì mɨ̀n [juə́ í-jɨɣə̀n __ nə́]
EXPL TOP machete 1.SG know.PRS person.SG REL 3.SG-see.PST1 REL.PRT
'As for the machete, I know the person that saw (it).'

b. á pò: ɲí mə̌ jì Músá nsà [juə́ í-jɨɣə̀n __ nə́]
EXPL TOP machete 1.SG know.PRS Musa tall REL 3.SG-see.PST1 REL.PRT
'As for the machete, I know Musa, who is tall, who saw (it).'

c. á pò: ɲí mə̌ jì ŋú [juə́ ú-jɨɣə̀n __ nə́]
EXPL TOP machete 1.SG know.PRS 2.SG REL 2.SG-see.PST1 REL.PRT
'As for the machete, I know you, who saw (it).'

[11] Apparent cases of extraction out of restrictive RCs are also observed in Romance languages (Cinque 2010) and beyond (see Sichel 2018 and Cinque 2020 for an overview). It is not clear, however, that extractable RCs in Scandinavian and these other languages have a complex NP/DP structure, as opposed to CP/weak island syntax (Grosu 1994, Sichel 2014, Cinque 2020). Thus, the non-island character of restrictive RCs in these languages may in fact be an illusion.

[12] An anonymous reviewer asks if the peripheral/moved DP elements in (34) can be analyzed as base-generated hanging topic left dislocated constituents. They cannot. Space limitations preclude a detailed defense of this claim, but see Schurr et al. 2022, where the argument for A-bar movement is made on the basis of the following facts: the moved element triggers crossover effects within the RC; extraction licenses parasitic gaps within the RC; and Condition A-based reconstruction effects within the RC obtain.

The connection between clausal integration and the ability to extract follows if both RC types in Shupamem belong to the domain of Sentence Grammar, as outlined in the introduction. We have thus identified another property diagnosing the clausal integration of an RC that transcends restrictive vs. non-restrictive categorization. Once again, Shupamem non-restrictive relatives behave as though they are clausally integrated.

5. CONCLUSION

In this article, we have argued that Shupamem non-restrictive relatives are clausally integrated. According to Cinque (2020), only *wh*- relative pronouns can build non-integrated non-restrictive RCs due to their demonstrative-like nature and related usage as E-type pronouns. Given that Shupamem lacks *wh*- relative pronouns, it is perhaps not surprising that it also lacks non-integrated non-restrictive RCs, making use exclusively of the integrated RC variety. This, of course, raises the interesting theoretical question of how the semantics of non-restrictive RCs in the language can be related to its clausally integrated syntactic structure. Although beyond the scope of this article, we invite the reader to consider the analysis in Cinque 2020, where it is proposed that integrated non-restrictive relative clauses are merged as CPs in the specifiers of nominal projections dominating DP (i.e. outside the scope of definite determiners or demonstratives) and involve double-headed 'matching' derivations in which the external head moves to the specifier of a functional projection dominating the RC CP, licensing the deletion of the internal head or its replacement by a proform (both of which are possible in Shupamem RCs). We believe that a similar analysis can be successfully applied to Shupamem's integrated non-restrictive RCs, but leave this for future work.

Although research on the syntax of relative clauses has advanced in many areas, one aspect that remains under-investigated is the integration status of non-restrictive RCs cross-linguistically. Typologically speaking, how prevalent are the integrated and non-integrated varieties? As Cinque (2020: 163) remarks "an in-depth typological study of non-restrictives is not available. The few observations that are found in the literature are sketchy and do not even always converge". Despite this dearth of research, Cinque's (2020) theory of non-restrictive RCs gives us a prediction about the typological landscape. If it is true that non-integrated RCs require a *wh*- relative pronoun, then the cross-linguistic rarity of such relativizers (Comrie 1998) means that of the two varieties of non-restrictive relatives, it is likely the case that it is the non-integrated (i.e. English) type that is rare. Comrie's (1998) claim, also made in other publications by him, is that the RC strategy employing *wh*- relative pronouns is virtually limited to European languages and a few others often in contact with them. If this is true, then languages like Shupamem that exclusively employ integrated non-restrictive RCs might turn out to represent the typologically unmarked case, once more non-restrictive RCs are investigated with clausal integration status in mind. At present, however, our catalog of languages manifesting integrated non-restrictive RCs includes a few entries, mostly of European stock surprisingly. Cinque (2020) claims that both integrated and non-integrated non-restrictive RCs exist in Italian, French, Spanish, Catalan, European Portuguese, the Germanic languages (except for Nyorsk, modern Faroese, Icelandic, and some varieties of Swedish), Maltese, and Albanian. Not all of these categorizations, however, are based on rigorous empirical analysis. Citing considerably less evidence, Cinque (2020) claims that northern Italian dialects, Basque, Japanese, and Yoruba are languages whose non-restrictive RCs are exclusively integrated. In addition to Mandarin Chinese

(Del Gobbo 2015, Lin & Tsai 2015), Shupamem belongs to this latter group. The language thus furnishes additional support for Cinque's proposal that integrated non-restrictive RCs exist and represents a new non-European language that manifests the exclusively integrated non-restrictive RC structure.

Despite the fact that relativization in Bantu is fairly well-studied in the syntax literature, non-restrictive relativization (in particular, whether such RCs are clausally integrated or not) has not been systematically investigated in the language family, to the best of our knowledge. We hope that this article catalyzes future research into the integration status of non-restrictive RCs in Bantu so that it can be determined whether Shupamem's exclusively integrated non-restrictive relative clause formation strategy is either typologically representative or exotic within Bantu.

REFERENCES

Andrews, Avery Delano III. 1975. Studies in the Syntax of Relative and Comparative Clauses. Doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Arnold, Doug. 2007. Non-restrictive Relatives are Not Orphans. *Journal of Linguistics* 43: 271-309.

Bianchi, Valentina. 1999. *Consequences of Antisymmetry: Headed Relative Clauses*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Boersma, Paul and David Weenink. 2017. Praat: Doing Phonetics by Computer [Computer program]. Version 6.0.31.

Bolinger, Dwight. 1967. Adjectives in English: Attribution and Predication. *Lingua* 18: 1-34.

Carlson, Gregory. 1977. Amount Relatives. *Language* 53: 520-542.

Chomsky, Noam. 1977. On *Wh*- Movement. In Peter Cullicover, Thomas Wasow, and Adrian Akmajian (eds.), *Formal Syntax*, 71-132. New York: Academic Press.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 2008. Two Types of Non-restrictive Relatives. In Olivier Bonami and Patricia Cabredo Hofherr (eds.), *Empirical Issues in Syntax and Semantics,* Volume 7, 99-137. http://www.cssp.cnrs.fr/eiss7/eiss7.pdf

Cinque, Guglielmo. 2010. On a Selective 'Violation' of the Complex NP Constraint. In Jan-Wouter Zwart and Mark de Vries (eds.), *Structure Preserved*: *Studies in Syntax for Jan Koster*, 81-90. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 2014. The Semantic Classification of Adjectives: A View from Syntax. *Studies in Chinese Linguistics* 35: 3-32.

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

Comrie, Bernard. 1998. Rethinking the Typology of Relative Clauses. *Language Design* 1: 59-86.

Del Gobbo, Francesca. 2001. Non-restrictives Schmnon-restrictives in Chinese. In Maki Irie and Hajime Ono (eds.), *UCI Working Papers in Linguistics 7*, 1-25. University of California, Irvine.

Del Gobbo, Francesca. 2003. Non-restrictives at the Interface. Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Irvine.

Del Gobbo, Francesca. 2004. On Prenominal Relative Clauses and Non-restrictive Adjectives. In B. Schmeiser, Vineeta Chand, Ann Kelleher, and Angelo Rodriguez (eds.), *WCCFL 23 Proceedings*, 182-194. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

Del Gobbo, Francesca. 2005. Chinese Relative Clauses: Restrictive, Descriptive or Non-restrictive? In Nicola Munaro, Walter Schweikert, and Giuseppina Turano (eds.), *Contributions to the 30th Incontro di Grammatica Generativa*, 207-305. Venezia: Libreria Editrice Cafoscarina.

Del Gobbo, Francesca. 2007. On the Syntax and Semantics of Appositive Relative Clauses. In Nicole Dehè and Yordanka Kavalova (eds.), *Parentheticals*, 173-201. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Del Gobbo, Francesca. 2010. On Chinese Appositive Relative Clauses. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 19: 385-417.
Del Gobbo, Francesca. 2015. Appositives in Mandarin Chinese and Cross-linguistically. In Audrey Li, Andrew Simpson, and Wei-Tien Dylan Tsai (eds)., *Chinese Syntax in a Cross-linguistic Perspective*, 73-99. New York: Oxford University Press.
Demirdache, Hamida. 1991. Resumptive Chains in Restrictive Relatives, Non-restrictives and Dislocation Structures. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
Eberhard, David M., Gary F. Simons, and Charles D. Fennig. 2019. *Ethnologue: Languages of the World, Twenty-second Edition*. Dallas, TX: SIL International. http://www.ethnologue.com
Emonds, Joseph. 1979. Appositive Relatives Have No Properties. *Linguistic Inquiry* 10: 211-243.
Engdahl, Elisabet. 1997. Relative Clause Extractions in Context. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 60: 50-79.
Fukui, Naoki. 1986. A Theory of Category Projections and its Applications. Doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
Giorgi, Alexander. 1984. Towards a Theory of Long-distance Anaphors: A GB Approach. *The Linguistic Review* 3: 307-361.
Grosu, Alexander. 1994. *Three Studies in Locality and Case*. London: Routledge.
Grosu, Alexander. 2000. Type Resolution in Relative Constructions: Featural Marking and Dependency Encoding. In Artemis Alexiadou, Andre Meinunger, and Chris Wilder (eds.), *The Syntax of Relative Clauses*, 83-120. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Grosu, Alexander and Fred Landman. 1998. Strange Relatives of the Third Kind. *Natural Language Semantics* 6: 125-170.
Haegeman, Liliane. 2003. Conditional Clauses: External and Internal Syntax. *Mind and Language* 18: 317-339.
Haegeman, Liliane. 2006a. Argument Fronting in English, Romance CLLD and the Left Periphery. In Rafaella Zanuttini, Héctor Campos, Elena Herburger, and Paul H. Portner (eds.), *Cross-linguistic Research in Syntax and Semantics: Negation, Tense and Clausal Architecture*, 27-52. Georgetown University Press, Washington D.C.
Haegeman, Liliane. 2006b. Conditionals, Factives and the Left Periphery. *Lingua* 116: 1651-1669.
Jackendoff, Ray. 1977. *X-bar Syntax: A Study of Phrase Structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Kameshima, Nanako. 1989. The Syntax of Restrictive and Non-restrictive Relative Clauses in Japanese. Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison.
Kempson, Ruth. 2003. Non-restrictive Relatives and Growth of Logical Form. In Gina Garding and Mimu Tsujimura (eds.), *Proceedings of the West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics 22*, 301-314. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
Larson, Richard K. and Franc Marušič. 2004. On Indefinite Pronoun Structures with Aps: Reply to Kishimoto. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35: 268-287.
Lin, Jo-Wang and Wei-Tien Dylan Tsai. 2015. Restricting Non-restrictive Relatives in Mandarin Chinese. In Audrey Li, Andrew Simpson, and Wei-Tien Dylan Tsai (eds)., *Chinese Syntax in a Cross-linguistic Perspective*, 100-127. New York: Oxford University Press.
Loock, Rudy. 2010. *Appositive Relative Clauses in English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
McCawley, James D. 1981. The Syntax and Semantics of English Relative Clauses. *Lingua* 53: 99-149.
McCawley, James D. 1988. *The Syntactic Phenomena of English*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

McCawley, James D. 1998. *The Syntactic Phenomena of English*. Second edition. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Nchare, Abdoulaye Laziz. 2012. The Grammar of Shupamem. Doctoral dissertation, New York University.

Perlmutter, David M. and John Robert Ross. 1970. Relative Clauses with Split Antecedents. *Linguistic Inquiry* 1: 350.

Platzack, Christer. 2000. A Complement-of-N^0 Account of Restrictive and Non-Restrictive Relatives. In Artemis Alexiadou, Paul Law, André Meinunger, and Chris Wilder (eds.), *The Syntax of Relative Clauses*, 265-308. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ross, John. 1967. Constraints on Variables in Syntax. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Safir, Kenneth. 1986. Relative Clauses in a Theory of Binding and Levels. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17: 663-689.

Schurr, Hagay, Jason Kandybowicz, Abdoulaye Laziz Nchare, Magdalena Markowska, Tysean Bucknor, Xiaomeng Ma, and Armando Tapia. 2022. Widespread Clausal Island Insensitivity in Shupamem. Ms. The Graduate Center, City University of New York.

Sichel, Ivy. 2014. Resumptive Pronouns and Competition. *Linguistic Inquiry* 45: 655-693.

Sichel, Ivy. 2018. Anatomy of a Counterexample: Extraction from Relative Clauses. *Linguistic Inquiry* 49: 335-378.

Smits, Rik. 1989. *Eurogrammar: The Relative and Cleft Constructions of the Germanic and Romance Languages*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

Srivastav, Vaneeta. 1991. WH Dependencies in Hindi and the Theory of Grammar. Doctoral dissertation, Cornell University.

Vries, Mark de. 2000. Non-restrictive Relative Clauses. *Linguistics in the Netherlands* 17: 221-231.

Vries, Mark de. 2006. The Syntax of Appositive Relativization. *Linguistic Inquiry* 37: 229-270.

Watters, John R. 2000. Syntax. In Bernd Heine and Derek Nurse (eds.), *African Languages: An Introduction*, 194-230. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Williams, Edwin. 1977. Discourse and Logical Form. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8: 101-139.

Zhang, Niina. 2001. On the Absence of Nonrestrictive Relatives (in Chinese). Ms. ZAS, Berlin.

Ziv, Yael. 1973. Why Can't Appositives be Extraposed? *Papers in Linguistics* 6: 243-254.

Ziv, Yael and Peter Cole. 1974. Relative Extraposition and the Scope of Definite Descriptions in Hebrew and English. *Proceedings of Chicago Linguistics Society 10*: 772-786.