

Imke Mendoza
University of Salzburg
imke.mendoza@plus.ac.at
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0080-4810>

POST-POSED DOUBLE-HEADED RELATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS BETWEEN SYNTAX AND COHESION

The paper is a case study on non-restrictive, post-posed double-headed relative clauses using data from Russian and Polish. These double-headed constructions are located at the fringe of the grammatical systems; they are marginal from both a quantitative and a normative perspective. The relation between the antecedent and the internal head closely resembles the relation between the antecedent and the anaphoric noun phrase in syntactically independent clauses. Therefore, I propose analyzing such sequences of clauses in terms of cohesion rather than syntax.

Key words: Syntax, relative clause, Russian, Polish, clause combining.

1. Introduction

Constructions like (1) and (2) often go by the name of “double-headed relative clauses” and differ from “normal” post-posed relative constructions in that they possess an internal head, i.e., they contain an adnominally used pronoun and a congruent noun:

- (1) Polish (NKJP)
która [notatka, I. M.] przybrała kształt *dokumentu służbowego*, który to *dokument służbowy* otrzymał odpowiedni numer.
- (2) Russian (В. А. Успенский; NKRJa)
Слово ложь происходит от глагола *лгать*, каковой *факт* отражается в его определении в толковых словарях.

The classification of this construction, as well as the appropriate terms for its constituent elements, has been the topic of some discussion, and often depends on the respective theoretical framework¹. I will use the following termi-

¹ Cf., amongst others, Cinque (2013); Dryer (2013); Lehmann (1984: 43–49; 236–240); Mel'čuk (2021). See also section 5 of this paper.

nology: The construction itself will be referred to as post-posed double-headed relative construction (post-posed DHRC). The nominal element within the relative clause that refers to an element in the preceding text is the internal head; the element in the preceding text is the antecedent. As illustrated by the examples above, the antecedent may be nominal (1) or verbal. Verbal antecedents can take the form of finite clauses as in (2), or of non-finite verbal phrases (see, e.g., (17) below).

From a typological perspective, DHRC come in many forms and shapes and occur in various languages. In order to place the phenomenon in a broader context, I give a brief overview of its main types and the geographical distribution of DHRC, before zooming in on the type of DHRC that is the topic of this paper (section 2). In section 3, I present a case study of non-restrictive, post-posed DHRC using Polish and Russian data. I then discuss related phenomena and conclude in the last section.

2. Double-headed relative clauses from a typological perspective

DHRC occur in the following regions and language groups: Europe/Asia (Northwest Caucasian, Altaic, Indo-European, Tibeto-Burman), Pacific region (Papuan, Austronesian), Australia (Pama-Nyungan), Africa (Niger-Congo, Chadic), The Americas (Zapotec).² Despite its wide geographical distribution, this relativization strategy appears to be cross-linguistically non-dominant or even marginal.³

DHRC vary with respect to the same parameters as single-headed relative constructions: the position of the relative clause, the presence of a relativizer, the type of relativizer, and the type of external head.

In the following, I present examples of different kinds of DHRC from typologically and genetically diverse languages.⁴ I begin with pre-posed DHRC, as illustrated by examples (3)–(6).⁵

(3) Vedic, RV 1,35,11 (Lehmann 1984: 238)

<i>yé</i>	<i>te</i>	<i>pánthāḥ</i>	<i>savitāḥ</i>	[...]	<i>antárikṣe</i>	<i>tébhīr</i>	<i>no</i>
REL.NOM.PL	you	paths	Savitr	[...]	in_the_air	on_these	us
<i>adyá</i>	<i>pathibhiḥ</i>	[...]	<i>rákṣā!</i>				
today	paths	[...]	protect.2SG.IMP				

‘the paths, Savitr, you have in the air, on those paths protect us today’

² Cf. Lehmann (1984: 236–240); Cinque (2013)

³ Cf. Lehmann (1984: 240); WALS <https://wals.info/feature/90G#3/3.86/70.22>.

⁴ It goes without saying that the data discussed in this section is anything but exhaustive. For a fuller account see Lehmann (1984: 43–49) and Cinque (2013).

⁵ Cinque (2013: 224) addresses the question of whether constructions like (3)–(6) are genuine double-headed relative clauses, or rather relative-correlative constructions “in which an internally headed RC is not followed by an external Head, but is left dislocated and resumed in the main clause by an ‘anaphoric’ full DP, which may give the impression of being an additional, external, Head.” I will not delve into the issue, since my focus is on post-posed DHRC.

(4) Old East Slavic, birch bark № 582; 1280–1300 (DBG)

цето	еси	прислале	дова	целовека	те	побегли
REL	AUX.2SG	send.PTCP	two	man.GEN.PL	DEM.NOM.PL	run.PTCP

‘the two men you sent ran away.’

(5) Colloquial Russian (Kručinina 1968: 84)⁶

У которых комсомольцев были лопата, они рыли ямы

(6) Kombai (example, glossing and translation from Cinque 2013: 223)

<i>gana</i>	<i>gu</i>	<i>fali-kha</i>	<i>ro</i>	<i>na-gana-y-a</i>
bush.knife	2SG	carry-go.2SG.NONFUT	thing	my-bush-knife-TR-PRED

‘The bush knife that you took away, is my bush knife.’

The examples display different types of relativizers. In (3) and (5), the relativizer is a relative pronoun (Ved. *yad-*, Russ. *kotoryj*), in (4) a relative particle (Old East Sl. *čto*), and (6) has no relativizer at all. The external heads in pre-posed DHRC may be nominal (Ved. *tébhiḥ pathibhiḥ*, Kombai *ro*) or pronominal (Old East Slavic *te*, Ru. *oni*).

Examples (7)–(11) illustrate different kinds of post-posed relative clauses. There is a distinction between postnominal and post-posed position, which is, of course, relevant only if the external head is not clause final. The following two examples from Latin illustrate the difference between the postnominal (7) and the post-posed positions (8):

(7) Latin (Caes.B.G. 1.49,1; Lehmann 1984: 238)

<i>ultra</i>	<i>eum</i>	<i>locum</i>	<i>quo</i>	<i>in</i>	<i>loco</i>	<i>Germani</i>
beyond	this.ACC.SG	place.ACC.SG	REL.ABL.SG	in	place.ABL.SG	German.NOM.PL

<i>consederant</i>	...	<i>castris</i>	<i>idoneum</i>	<i>locum</i>	<i>delegit</i>
settle.3PL.PLPRF	...	camp.DAT.PL	suitable.ACC.SG	place.ACC.SG	choose.3SG.PRF

‘he chose a suitable place for the camp beyond the place, where the Germans had settled’

(8) Latin (Caes.B.G.1.6,4; Lehmann 1984: 238)

<i>diem</i>	<i>dicunt</i>	<i>qua</i>	<i>Die</i>	<i>ad</i>	<i>ripam</i>	<i>Rhodani</i>
day.ACC.SG	tell.3SG.PRS	REL.ABL.SG.F	day.ABL.SG.F	to	bank.ACC.SG	Rhone.GEN.SG

<i>omnes</i>	<i>convenient</i>
all.NOM.SG	gather.3PL.SUBJ.PRS

‘they tell a day on which they should all gather at the bank of the river Rhone’

In the two preceding examples, the relativizer and the noun are placed adjacent to each other, in example (9) the pronoun (*to*) is separated from the noun (*su-git*) by intervening material:

(9) Abun (Papuan) (example, glossing and translation from Cinque 2013: 230)

<i>An</i>	<i>ndo-bot</i>	<i>su-git</i>	<i>dik</i>	<i>yo</i>	<i>to</i>	<i>men</i>	<i>ye</i>	<i>bok</i>
3SG	ask-about	food	one	DET.1 ⁷	REL	1PL	people	several

⁶ See also Weiss (2020) on constructions with *kotoryj* in pre-posed relative clauses.

⁷ DET.1 = indefinite determiner.

ne	gi	su-git	ne
ANAPH	eat	food	DET

‘He asked about some (kind of) food, which all of us would eat’

The relative clauses in (2)–(9) above are restrictive, whereas the introductory examples (1) and (2) as well the following examples from English and Czech show non-restrictive relative clauses:

- (10) *Wil had once set fire to a local waterfall, which event had made the nightly news.* (COCA)
- (11) Czech (Euro-Lex 2/2016 parallel; Sketch Engine)
Vlády těchto zemí rovněž určují vnitrostátní agentury a sledují jejich činnost, kterýžto úkol provádějí spolu s Evropskou komisí.

In my paper, I focus on the type of DHRC presented in (1), (2), (10) and (11): non-restrictive, pre-posed DHRC that use a relative pronoun which is adjacent to the internal head, with a nominal or verbal antecedent. While the strategy is available in many modern European languages it seems to be peripheral from both a quantitative and a normative point of view and typical for an overly explicit style. In Polish, these DHRC are considered stylistically awkward (“niezręcznie pod względem stylistycznym”, Buttler 1986: 410). The Czech dictionary SSSJ comments on the pronoun *kterýžto* when introducing an internally headed relative clause (see (11)), as follows: “nevhodně připojuje větu vlastně samostatnou, nikoli vztažnou”. Nešović (2024: 55) observes that relative clauses with “reduplikacija antecedenta” in Serbian and Russian are “karakteristične prevashodno za administrativni funkcionalni stil”. According to the German reference grammar “Duden Grammatik”, post-posed DHRC occur in German only when the antecedent is verbal, primarily in written genres (Duden 2009: 1037). Quirk et al. note that in English they “tend to be uncommon except in formally precise writing” (Quirk et al. 1972: 872).⁸

3. Post-posed double-headed relative constructions in Russian and Polish

The study is based on data from the Russian National Corpus (NKRJa), the Polish National Corpus (NKJP), and the Russian and Polish TenTen-Corpora on Sketch Engine (ruTenTen17 and plTenTen19).

3.1 Relativizers

Both modern Russian and modern Polish use specialized relativizers for post-posed DHRC. Russian employs the relative pronoun *kakovo*,⁹ and Polish

⁸ Similar holds true for Latin and Persian. Lehmann (1984: 240) observes that in Latin DHRC are typical of legal texts and that in Persian they are “offenbar eine Spezialität des umständlichen narrativen Stils”.

⁹ Xolodilova (2014) presents the results of a search in the NKRJa (1950–1911) for DHRC that includes the pronouns *kotoryj* and *kaj*. The search yielded only two hits (0,1% of all occur-

the expression *który to*¹⁰. The element *to* in Polish *który to* may be replaced by *tez* or *mianowicie* (Danielewiczowa 2024: 18). In addition, the expression *jaki to* is also possible in DHRC.¹¹ Since *który to* is by far the most frequent relativizer in DHRC I will focus on it and disregard the other expressions. Both Ru. *kakovej* and Po. *który to* occur in single-headed relative constructions as well. Ru. *kakovej* is rather rare, whether with or without an internal head.¹² The frequency of *który to* as a relativizer in single-headed relative clauses is difficult to estimate, since the role of *to* is unclear (see footnote 10). Bare *który*, however, is the most frequent relativizer in Polish.

3.2 Frequency

I used the TenTen corpora on Sketch Engine for comparing the frequency of DHRC in Polish and in Russian, since they are sufficiently large and include similar registers and text types. However, calculating the frequency of DHRC is a challenge, because there is no easy way to identify them automatically.

I searched for the sequence of Po. *który + to + noun* with *który* and the noun agreeing in case, number and gender. The same was done, *mutatis mutantis*, for Ru. *kakovej*. The queries are reproduced in (12) and (13):

(12) Query Po. *który to*

```
[lemma="który"&case="nom"&gender="f"&number="sg"] [word="to"] [tag="subst.*"&case="nom"&gender="f"&number="sg"] [lemma="który"&case="nom"&gender="m1"&number="sg"] [word="to"] [tag="subst.*"&case="nom"&gender="m1"&number="sg"] [lemma="który"&case="nom"&gender="m2"&number="sg"] [word="to"] [tag="subst.*"&case="nom"&gender="m2"&number="sg"] [lemma="który"&case="nom"&gender="m3"&number="sg"] [word="to"] [tag="subst.*"&case="nom"&gender="m3"&number="sg"] [lemma="który"&case="nom"&gender="n"&number="sg"] [word="to"] [tag="subst.*"&case="nom"&gender="n"&number="sg"] [lemma="który"&case="gen"&gender="f"&number="sg"] [word="to"] [tag="subst.*"&case="gen"&gender="f"&number="sg"] [lemma="który"&case="gen"&gender="m1"&number="sg"] [word="to"] [tag="subst.*"&case="gen"&gender="m1"&number="sg"]
```

rences) for *kaj* and none for *kotoryj*. Nešović (2024: 58) cites one example with *kotoryj* but does not specify the exact source, saying only that it was found in a legal document available online (op. cit.: 56). In older stages of Russian, however, *kotoryj* occurs more freely in post-posed DHRC (see Xolodilova 2014).

¹⁰ There is some discussion about whether *który to* is to be considered a pronoun, i.e., a single lexical unit, or a combination of the relative pronoun *który* and the particle *to*, cf. Mendoza (2010); Danielewiczowa (2024), Linde-Usiekiewicz (2019a, 2019b). Since this issue is not relevant to my argument, I will not delve into it any further.

¹¹ Danielewiczowa (2024: 19) gives the following example from the NKJP: *Wnioskodawca braku tego nie uzupełnił, nadsyłając pismo, iż nie jest w stanie tego uczynić bez wyznaczenia mu adwokata z urzędu, jakiego to żądania — bezpodstawnie — nie uwzględnił Sąd Apelacyjny.* — Danielewiczowa also mentions that it is possible to use bare *który* in DHRC if the internal head carries a rising intonation (2024: 18). — Post-posed DHRC in Old Polish allow even more types of pronouns, see Mendoza (2017).

¹² Xolodilova (2014) counts 706 occurrences of *kakovej* (with and without an internal head) vs. 14,977 occurrences of *kotoryj* in her search (see footnote 9), Švedova (1980: 513) classifies *kakovej* as archaic.

number="s"][[lemma="каковой"&case="g"&gender="n"&number="s"][[tag="N.*"&case="g"&gender="n"&number="s"][[lemma="каковой"&case="d"&gender="m"&number="s"][[tag="N.*"&case="d"&gender="m"&number="s"][[lemma="каковой"&case="f"&number="s"][[tag="N.*"&case="d"&gender="f"&number="s"][[lemma="каковой"&case="d"&gender="n"&number="s"][[tag="N.*"&case="d"&gender="n"&number="s"][[lemma="каковой"&case="a"&gender="m"&number="s"][[tag="N.*"&case="a"&gender="m"&number="s"][[lemma="каковой"&case="a"&gender="f"&number="s"][[tag="N.*"&case="a"&gender="f"&number="s"][[lemma="каковой"&case="a"&gender="n"&number="s"][[tag="N.*"&case="a"&gender="n"&number="s"][[lemma="каковой"&case="i"&gender="m"&number="s"][[tag="N.*"&case="i"&gender="m"&number="s"][[lemma="каковой"&case="i"&gender="f"&number="s"][[tag="N.*"&case="i"&gender="f"&number="s"][[lemma="каковой"&case="i"&gender="n"&number="s"][[tag="N.*"&case="i"&gender="n"&number="s"][[lemma="каковой"&case="l"&gender="m"&number="s"][[tag="N.*"&case="l"&gender="m"&number="s"][[lemma="каковой"&case="l"&gender="n"&number="s"][[tag="N.*"&case="l"&gender="n"&number="s"][[lemma="каковой"&case="l"&gender="m"&number="p"][[tag="N.*"&case="l"&gender="m"&number="p"][[lemma="каковой"&case="l"&gender="f"&number="p"][[tag="N.*"&case="l"&gender="f"&number="p"][[lemma="каковой"&case="l"&gender="n"&number="p"][[tag="N.*"&case="l"&gender="n"&number="p"][[lemma="каковой"&case="g"&gender="m"&number="p"][[tag="N.*"&case="g"&gender="m"&number="p"][[lemma="каковой"&case="g"&gender="f"&number="p"][[tag="N.*"&case="g"&gender="f"&number="p"][[lemma="каковой"&case="g"&gender="n"&number="p"][[tag="N.*"&case="g"&gender="n"&number="p"][[lemma="каковой"&case="d"&gender="m"&number="p"][[tag="N.*"&case="d"&gender="m"&number="p"][[lemma="каковой"&case="d"&gender="f"&number="p"][[tag="N.*"&case="d"&gender="f"&number="p"][[lemma="каковой"&case="d"&gender="n"&number="p"][[tag="N.*"&case="d"&gender="n"&number="p"][[lemma="каковой"&case="a"&gender="m"&number="p"][[tag="N.*"&case="a"&gender="m"&number="p"][[lemma="каковой"&case="a"&gender="f"&number="p"][[tag="N.*"&case="a"&gender="f"&number="p"][[lemma="каковой"&case="a"&gender="n"&number="p"][[tag="N.*"&case="a"&gender="n"&number="p"][[lemma="каковой"&case="i"&gender="m"&number="p"][[tag="N.*"&case="i"&gender="m"&number="p"][[lemma="каковой"&case="i"&gender="f"&number="p"][[tag="N.*"&case="i"&gender="f"&number="p"][[lemma="каковой"&case="i"&gender="n"&number="p"][[tag="N.*"&case="i"&gender="n"&number="p"][[lemma="каковой"&case="l"&gender="m"&number="p"][[tag="N.*"&case="l"&gender="m"&number="p"][[lemma="каковой"&case="l"&gender="f"&number="p"][[tag="N.*"&case="l"&gender="f"&number="p"][[lemma="каковой"&case="l"&gender="n"&number="p"][[tag="N.*"&case="l"&gender="n"&number="p"]

The search yielded a quota of 8.29 ipm for Po. *ktory to* + matching noun, and 1.21 ipm for Ru. *kakovo* + matching noun. The queries, however, were still not precise enough since the mere adjacency of a pronoun and a matching noun does not guarantee the desired combination, namely, a phrase concluding a relative

pronoun and a noun. The pronoun could also be an interrogative pronoun, or the segments could belong to different phrases. All in all, the search for relevant tokens yielded too much “noise” for a meaningful quantitative statement. I then manually analyzed a smaller, randomized sample (ca. 300 tokens) for each language to get some idea about what the share of relevant items might be. In these samples, only about half of the tokens of the Polish sample and approximately one-third of the tokens in the Russian sample proved relevant. Another factor that might skew the results of the query is the fact that the registers included in Sketch Engine usually do not favor the use of post-posed DHRC¹³. Thus, the only reliable statement we can make regarding the frequency of post-posed DHRC is that they are rare, more so in Russian than in Polish.

3.3 Diaphasic properties

The problems associated with the automatic identification of DHRC also lead to difficulties getting quantitative results on the diaphasic distribution of post-posed DHRC. Anecdotal evidence and statements by grammarians and researchers (see section 2 above) strongly suggest that non-restrictive post-posed DHRC are more likely to occur in formal and written texts than in informal speech. This is supported by table (1), which shows the distribution of the combination *kakovoj* + noun in the main corpus of the NKRJa in texts from 1950 to 2024 across the functional domains ¹⁴:

Tab. 1:
Distribution across functional domains of adnominal kakovoj [screenshot of NKRJa graph]

№	Значение атрибута	Тексты	Вхождения	IMP
1	Художественная	88	181 (45,02%)	2,35
2	Публицистика	131	151 (37,56%)	1,87
3	Учебно-научная	26	44 (10,95%)	1,93
4	Бытовая	16	20 (4,98%)	1,47
5	Церковно-богословская	6	7 (1,74%)	2,43
6	Электронная коммуникация	2	2 (0,5%)	0,59

The table shows clearly that the sequence *kakovoj* + noun is more frequent in the more formal domains (literature, journalism, academic-educational) than in everyday and internet communication. I do not possess similar data for Polish

¹³ Xolodilova (2014) found a much higher rate of almost 11% for post-posed DHRC in the main corpus of the NKRJa (based on texts from 1950–2011).
¹⁴ Note that this search also includes “noise”, which is, however, considerably less than in the Sketch Engine data.

and therefore, for the time being, we have to make do with the less systematic observations mentioned above.

3.4 Semantic relation between internal and external head

A nominal antecedent may be lexically identical or non-identical with the internal head. Example (1), here repeated as (14), shows identical heads:

- (14) Polish (NKJP)
która [notatka, *I. M.*] przybrała kształt *dokumentu służbowego*, który to *dokument służbowy* otrzymał odpowiedni numer

Under the concept of identity, I also subsume quasi-identity, i.e., cases where the internal head repeats only the noun of a complex antecedent and omits the modifiers. Cf. the following example:

- (15) Russian (И. Сахновский, 2012; NKRJa)
Среди недовольных было *семейство Рицци*, к каковому *семейству* принадлежала девица по имени Кассандра

When the nominal antecedent and the internal head are non-identical the internal head is usually the hypernym to the antecedent, cf. *zwanie* to *pomošnik žreca* in (16) and *stanowisko* to *poseł* in (17):

- (16) Russian (M. Rybakova, Zvezda, 2001; NKRJa)
Будучи отличником, он, согласно царившим в паннонийских школах правилам, мог быть назначен *помощником жреца*, *какового звания* с ревностью добивался.
- (17) Polish (NKJP)
Następnie został mianowany *posłem* w Londynie, *na którym to stanowisku* pozostał do swej emerytury,

The following examples illustrate verbal antecedents. In (18), the internal head refers to a finite clause, in (19) to a converb-construction:

- (18) Russian (B. A. Успенский; НКРЯ)
Слово ложь происходит от глагола *лгать*, каковой *факт* отражается в его определении в толковых словарях:
- (19) Polish (NKJP)
Robił lobbing na własną rzecz, *spotykając się z licznymi ludźmi*, w trakcie *których to spotkań* przedstawiał argumenty, [...],

In addition to these relations, there are more indirect links between the antecedent and the internal head. In (20), the internal head has been omitted and needs to be inferred from the preceding discourse:

- (20) Polish (NKJP)
Ale o której rozmowie pan teraz mówi? Ø Z Michałem Brudno, *po której to rozmowie*, w mojej opinii, powinna być sporządzona notatka

The internal head *jazyk* in (21) relates to an adverb in the preceding clause (*po-pol'ski*):

- (21) Russian (Ю. К. Олеша; НКРЯ)

Я произношу Иван, с ударением на первом слоге, *по-польски*, в *каковом языке* не может быть ударения на последнем слоге.

The relative clause in (22) with its internal head *sojuz* is a meta-linguistic comment on the use of the connective *ibo* in the preceding clause:

- (22) Russian (A. Najman, Oktjabr'. 2013)

Но еще Гарик со мной договорился, что за чистую справедливость мы не боремся, «*ибо*» (*через каковой союз он любил высказывать свою культурность*) за идею на работу не выходим.

Antecedent and internal head in (23) are quasi-identical. This relation, however, holds only on the lexical level, since the two phrases are not coreferent:

- (23) Polish (NKJP)

aby pan prokurator Kazimierz Olejnik mógł być wyłączony *od ogólnego nadzoru* nad toczącymi się śledztwami, *których to nadzorów* bardzo wiele, a które to nadzory nie mogą być nadzorami wymienionymi w art. 326 K.p

3.5 Accessibility

According to the Accessibility Hierarchy proposed by Keenan and Comrie (Keenan — Comrie 1977; Comrie — Keenan 1979), the syntactic function of the relativized element in the relative clause imposes certain restrictions on relativization. The easiest position for relativization is the subject and the least accessible function is the object of comparison.¹⁵ Accessibility is also impacted by the type of relativizer, i.e., certain relativizers favor or block certain positions (cf. Murelli 216f. and *passim*; Mendoza 2019).

Post-posed DHRC in Russian and Polish and their pronouns have no special restrictions as to the accessibility beyond the general restrictions that apply to the respective language. The relevant examples cited in this paper show the relativized element in the subject, direct object and oblique object positions, (19) and (22) demonstrate that pied piping is also possible.

4. Related phenomena

There are two syntactic strategies that bear a certain resemblance to post-posed DHRC in that they include an element in the relative clause that anaphorically refers to the external head. A closer look, however, reveals that they are quite different from post-posed DHRC and cannot be subsumed under the same label.

4.1 Decumulation

Decumulation is a relativization strategy that combines an invariable relativizer with a resumptive pronoun that is coreferent with the external head in the

¹⁵ Keenan and Comrie suggest the following order of syntactic positions: subject > direct object > indirect object > major oblique case > genitive or possessor > object of comparison.

main clause (Murelli 2011: 218). The resumptive pronoun expresses the grammatical categories of the relativized element, cf. *go* in example (24) from Polish:¹⁶

- (24) Polish (Topolińska 1984: 345)
To jest *ten*, *co go* wczoraj puścili z aresztu

Decumulative constructions and post-posed DHRC resemble each other in that they both include an expression in the relative clause that refers to the antecedent: the internal head in post-posed DHRC and the resumptive pronoun in decumulative constructions. However, this is where the similarities end. Post-posed DHRC typically employ pronouns as relativizers, decumulative constructions use relative particles. DHRC do not allow light heads, decumulative constructions do. DHRC have no special restrictions with respect to accessibility, decumulation is often blocked in subject position. Post-posed DHRC are post-posed rather than postnominal, decumulative clauses occur in either position. Post-posed DHRC are non-restrictive, decumulative constructions may be restrictive or non-restrictive. And last, but not least, post-posed DHRC are typical for formal registers whereas decumulation usually occurs in less formal discourse¹⁷.

4.2 First language acquisition

Cinque (2013: 233–235) draws a parallel between DHRC and the use of a resumptive noun phrase in the second clause, a discourse strategy observed in first language acquisition across many languages (FLA strategy). The examples (24)–(27) illustrate this strategy:

- (25) Italian (Cinque 2013: 233)
la bambina che il nonno bacia *la bambina*
‘the girl that the grandfather kisses the girl’
- (26) French (Cinque 2013: 233)
Sur *la balle* qu’i(l) lance *la balle*
‘on the ball that he throws the ball’
- (27) English (Cinque 2013: 234)
There’s a *train worker* that we saw a *switchman*

As with DHRC, the antecedent and the referring noun phrase may be lexically identical, as in (25) and (26), or distinct, as in (27). The difference between the post-posed DHRC and the FLA strategy is in the position and phrasal properties of the referring expression. The referring expression in FLA constructions seems to tend to clause final position¹⁸, whereas in post-posed DHRC it is clause

¹⁶ Note that the Russian Standard language does not allow resumptive pronouns. See Mendoza (2019) for details and further references.

¹⁷ See Murelli (2011).

¹⁸ Cinque (2013: 235) cites one example from Hebrew that shows the resumptive noun phrase in clause initial position.

initial. The FLA strategy includes a full-fledged noun phrase with a determiner in addition to the relativizer while the anaphoric element in a DHRC is formed by the relative pronoun and a noun.

5. Conclusions

Double-headed relative clause constructions in modern Polish and Russian resemble each other in most respects. They possess the same syntactic, semantic, pragmatic, and diaphasic properties; they apparently only differ in their frequency.

This case study has shown that the relation between antecedent and internal head in post-posed DHRC shows striking similarities to the relation between anaphoric element and antecedent in syntactically independent clauses: the antecedent and the anaphoric expression may be identical or non-identical, direct or indirect, coreferent or non-coreferent, and the second clause is always non-restrictive. In other words, the relation between the two clauses in post-posed DHRC is more cohesive than syntactic in nature. Linde-Usiekniewicz (2019b) argues in a similar vein, when she suggests that “the standard version of double headed appositive relative clauses in Polish seems to invoke a semantic relation between the external and internal head” (142) and that the general meaning of *to* enhances “the grammatical acceptability of otherwise doubtful examples, by virtue of making the semantic connection between the head and the relative overriding the apparent absence of a syntactic connection” (141). Accordingly, the pronouns function as mere anaphoric devices that have only cohesive and no syntactic ties to the preceding clause. Quirk et al. and Huddleston — Pullum seem to acknowledge this for English when they describe En. *which* in DHRC as “not a pronoun, but a determiner” (Quirk et al. 1972: 765), “relative determiner” (Quirk et al. 1972: 872) or a “determinative rather than a pronoun” (Huddleston — Pullum 2002: 1043f.). The same goes for Duden (2009: 303), where the pronoun Ge. *welcher* in post-posed DHRC is classified as “relatives Artikelwort” (relative determiner).

The syntactic relation between the two clauses in a post-posed DHRC has been characterized across languages as somehow “more independent” than the clauses in single-headed relative constructions, even more independent than single-headed non-restrictive relative constructions (see, e.g., Butler et al. 1986: 409f., Duden: 1036, Mendoza 2010, Lehmann 1984: 239f.).

Given these facts and arguments, I propose to take the matter one step further and to treat the constructions discussed in this paper as syntactically independent sequences of two clauses. Consequently, the pronouns used in these sequences need to be considered as anaphoric adnominal pronouns rather than relative pronouns. The fact that languages allow the use of a certain pronoun in both the relative and anaphoric capacities has to be dealt with on the lexicographic level, e.g., in describing them as polysemous items.

REFERENCES

- Buttler Danuta, Kurkowska Halina, Satkiewicz Halina. *Kultura języka polskiego*. Warszawa: PWN, 1986.
- COCA = *Corpus of Contemporary American English* <<https://www.english-corpora.org/coca/>> 21.03.2025
- Dryer Matthew. "Order of Relative Clause and Noun". Dryer Matthew, Haspelmath Martin (eds.). *WALS Online*, 2013. <wals.info/> 16.01.2025.
- Cinque Guglielmo. "On Double-headed Relative Clauses". Guglielmo Cinque, *Typological Studies*. New York, London: Routledge, 2013: 223–237.
- Comrie Bernard, Keenan Edward L. "Noun Phrase Accessibility Revisited". *Language* 55 (1979): 649–664.
- Danielewiczowa Magdalena. "To — polski operator struktury tematyczno-rematycznej. W poszukiwaniu uogólnienia jego funkcji i znaczenia". *Prace Językoznawcze* 26 (2024): 15–30.
- DBG = *Drevnerusskie berestjanye gramoty*. <gramoty.ru> 16.01.2025.
- Duden = Eisenberg Peter et al. *Duden Bd. 4: Die Grammatik*. Berlin: Duden-Verlag, 2009.
- Huddleston Rodney, Pullum Geoffrey K. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Keenan Edward L., Comrie Bernard. "Noun Phrase Accessibility and Universal Grammar". *Linguistic Inquiry* 8 (1977): 63–99.
- Kručinina I.N. "Konstrukcija s mestoimeniem *kotoryj* v sovremennom russkom jazyke". *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 2 (1968): 82–88.
- Lehmann Christian. *Der Relativsatz*. Tübingen: Narr, 1984.
- Linde-Usiekniewicz Jadwiga. "*Wh + To* Non-Restrictive Clauses in Polish and Related Phenomena. Part One. *Wh* vs. *Wh-to* Relative Clauses: An Overview". *Studies in Polish Linguistics* 14 (2019a): 81–99.
- Linde-Usiekniewicz Jadwiga. "*Wh + To* Non-Restrictive Clauses in Polish and Related Phenomena. Part Two: Establishing the Role of *to* in Appositive Clauses, Adverbials and Interrogatives". *Studies in Polish Linguistics* 14 (2019b): 125–147.
- Mel'čuk Igor. "Relative Clause: A Typology". Mel'čuk Igor. *Ten Studies in Dependency Syntax*. Berlin, Boston: de Gruyter Mouton, 2021: 235–274.
- Mendoza Imke. "Relativsätze mit *który to*". *Wiener Slavistischer Almanach* 65 (2010): 105–117.
- Mendoza Imke. "Zur Variation von Relativpronomina im Altpolnischen: Die Rolle der Relativisatoren". *Wiener Slavistischer Almanach* 79 (2017): 93–105.
- Mendoza Imke. "Relative Particles and Resumptive Pronouns in Slavic". *Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie* 75 (2019): 5–42.
- Murelli Adriano. *Relative Constructions in European Non-standard Varieties*. Berlin, Boston: de Gruyter Mouton, 2011.
- Nacional'nyj korpus russkogo jazyka. <ruscorpora.ru> 16.01.2025.
- Narodowy korpus języka polskiego. <nkjp.pl> 16.01.2025.
- Nešović, Matija. "O nekim osobenostima apozitivne relativne klauze u administrativnom stilu u srpskom i ruskom jeziku." *Slavistika* XXVIII/2 (2024): 53–70. <https://doi.org/10.18485/slavistika.2024.28.2.3>
- Quirk Randolph et al. *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. London: Longman, 1972.
- Sketch Engine <<https://www.sketchengine.eu/>> 16.01.2025
- SSJČ = *Slovník spisovného jazyka českého* II: h-l. Praha: Academia, 1989.
- Švedova N.Ju. (gl. red.). *Russkaja grammatika*. T. II: Sintaksis. Moskva: Nauka, 1980.
- WALS = World Atlas of Language Structures. <<https://wals.info/>> 21.03.2025.
- Weiss Daniel. "Konstrukcija s prepozitivnoj odnositel'noj klauzoi". *Trudy Instituta russkogo jazyka im. V.V. Vinogradova* 23 (2020): 91–107.
- Xolodilova, M.A. *Finitnoe odnositel'nye pridatočnye. Materialy dlja proekta korpusnogo opisanija russkoj grammatiki*. Na pravach rukopisi. Moskva 2014. Data poslednego izmenenija 2024-03-31 17:43:02 MSK. <rusgram.ru> 26.03.2025.

Имке Мендоза

АПОЗИТИВНЕ РЕЛАТИВНЕ КОНСТРУКЦИЈЕ
СА ПОНОВЉЕНИМ АНТЕЦЕДЕНТОМ: ИЗМЕЋУ СИНТАКСЕ И КОХЕЗИЈЕ

Резиме

Овај рад представља студију случаја о нерестриктивним апозитивним релативним реченицама са поновљеним антецедентом, засновану на материјалу из руског и пољског језика. Конструкције са поновљеним антецедентом припадају периферији граматичких система и као такве маргиналне су и са квантитативног и са нормативног становишта. Однос између антецедента и интерног центра релативне клаузе блиско подсећа на однос између антецедента и анафоричне именичке синтагме у синтаксички независним реченицама. Стога, предлажем да се овакве секвенце реченица анализирају пре у терминима кохезије него синтаксе.

Кључне речи: синтакса, релативна реченица, руски језик, пољски језик, комбиновање реченица.