1 *Background*

1.1 Introduction

This chapter provides an introduction to the main types of relative clause found in standard registers and varieties of English, which typically contain an (overt or null) relativiser associated with a gap lower down in the structure. I begin by presenting a brief typology of different types of relative clause in §1.2, focusing mainly on three types which will be most relevant to the discussion of relative clauses in colloquial English in chapters 2–4 (namely restrictive, appositive, and kind relatives). In §1.3, I turn to examine the syntax of the clause periphery in relatives, before turning in §1.4 to look at whether some relative clauses have a truncated peripheral structure. In §1.5, I examine the nature of the relativisers that introduce relative clauses, while in §1.6 I turn to look at the derivation of the (filler–) gap relatives found in standard varieties of English. In §1.7, I summarise the overall contents of this chapter.

1.2 Types of Relative Clause

The sentences in (1) below illustrate two different types of (bracketed) relative clause found in English (and more widely):

(1) a. The allegations [*which/that/ø* Trump made during his campaign] turned out to be fake
b. These allegations, [*which/*that/*ø* Trump made during his campaign], turned out to be fake

The relative clause highlighted in (1a) is said to be restrictive because it restricts the class of entities denoted by the (underlined) head/antecedent to those which have the property described in the relative clause (e.g. the allegations referred to in 1a are restricted to those made by Trump). By contrast, the relative clause highlighted in (1b) is said to be appositive, and typically serves as a parenthetical comment or afterthought. (Note, incidentally, that I use an

asterisk to denote a sentence judged by me or others to be ungrammatical, rather than to denote one which does not occur in my data.)

In addition to this difference in their semantic function, there are a number of other differences between restrictive and appositive relatives. For one thing, restrictive relative clauses like that in (1a) can be introduced by an overt wh-relativiser (like *which/who/where/when/why*), or by an overt complementiser (like *that*), or by a zero/null relativiser (here denoted as *ø*); by contrast, appositive relatives like that in (1b) can only be introduced by an overt wh-relativiser.[1] A second difference is that appositive relative clauses are set off in a separate intonation group from the rest of the sentence (this being marked by the commas enclosing the relative clause in 1b), whereas there is no such intonation break between the relative clause and its antecedent in the case of restrictives: this reflects a difference in structure, in that (in the terminology of Cinque 2008) restrictive clauses are integrated with the antecedent (in the sense that they are contained within an NP that also contains the antecedent), whereas appositive clauses in English are not. This lack of integration is reflected in the fact that an appositive relative clause can also serve as an independent sentence – as is the case with the second (italicised) *which*-clause below:

(2) The mail that came early yesterday, which was a surprise, held good news. *Which really lifted Robert's spirits* (Reid 1997: 7)

A third difference is that only an appositive relative like that italicised in (3a) below can occur after an unmodified proper name like *Chomsky*, not a restrictive relative like that italicised in (3b):

(3) a. He finally got to meet Chomsky, *who he had long admired*
b. *He finally got to meet Chomsky *that he had long admired*

[1] However, my data include the following example of a (resumptive) relative *that*-clause seemingly used appositively:

(i) I'm gonna start with this one, that I don't think that it got the coverage that it deserves (Jason Cundy, Talksport Radio)

Similarly, Reid (1997: 246) reports potential counterexamples like that below from a corpus she collected of spoken Australian English, in which what appears to be an appositive relative clause is introduced by *that*:

(ii) You actually do become part of the UN, *that* does all those things

See also Jacobsson (1994), and examples on *Linguist List* 7.1266, 12 September 1996.

Conversely (as observed by Smith 1964) only a restrictive relative clause like that italicised in (4a) below can modify a quantified expression like that underlined below, not an appositive like that italicised in (4b):

(4) a. Every student *that took my syntax course* enjoyed it
b. *Every student, *who took my syntax course*, enjoyed it

Similarly relative clauses like those italicised/underlined below can be stacked if restrictive (as in 5a), but not if appositive (as in 5b):

(5) a. The one person *that I met* that really impressed me was Chomsky
b. *Chomsky, *who I met in Cambridge*, who really impressed me, always replies to emails

Another difference is that appositive relatives like that bracketed in (6a) below allow pied-piping of the kind of quantificational material underlined, whereas restrictives like that in (6b) do not:

(6) a. Twenty demonstrators were arrested, some of *whom* the police subsequently charged
b. *Lawyers have been hired to represent the demonstrators some of *whom* the police subsequently charged

Furthermore, appositives (but not restrictives) can involve *which* used as a determiner modifying an (underlined) noun expression in archaic registers of English, as the following examples cited by Cinque (2008: 113) illustrate:

(7) a. He rode twenty miles to see her picture in the house of a stranger, *which* stranger politely insisted on his acceptance of it (Jespersen 1949: 126)
b. . . . a young woman with a wedding-ring and a baby, *which* baby she carried about with her when serving at the table (Jespersen ibid.)
c. The French procured allies, *which* allies proved of the utmost importance (Poutsma 1914: 961)

In addition, whereas restrictives have nominal antecedents, appositive clauses can have other types of antecedent as well – like the constituents underlined in the following examples from McCawley (1981: 118):[2]

(8) a. Sam is at home, *which* is where Sue is
b. Tom played basketball yesterday from 5:00 to 7:30, *which* is exactly when the committee meeting was held
c. It appalls me that Betty was fired, *which* I hadn't been expecting

[2] While this is true of English, it does not appear to hold universally: Memo Cinque (personal communication) points out that appositives in languages lacking relative pronouns can only modify DP.

Furthermore, whereas restrictives are typically declarative in force, appositives can express a range of alternative force types, as illustrated below:

(9) a. He has massive gambling debts, *which* is he really in control of?
b. He used the F-word on live TV, *which* how lucky he was to get away with!
c. I've forwarded the document, *which* please be careful to double check
d. He made a silly mistake, *which* let's not make a big deal about

Thus, the appositive clause is interrogative in force in (9a), exclamative in (9b), imperative in (9c) and hortative in (9d). Overall, then, we have evidence of clear syntactic, semantic, lexical and phonological differences between restrictive and appositive relatives.[3]

A third type of relative clause (which at first sight seems to be a sub-type of restrictive relatives, but which shares some properties with appositives, and has unique syntactic and semantic characteristics of its own) involves clauses which are termed 'kind clauses' by Prince (1990, 1995). A typical example (adapted from Prince 1995) is the relative clause italicised below:

(10) He's a guy *who/that gets into a lot of fights*

Prince notes that the relative clause in such cases describes a kind, and that kind relatives have an interpretation akin to that of *such* clauses (so that the relative clause in 10 is paraphrasable as 'of such a kind that he gets into lots of fights'). They seem to correspond fairly closely to a class of clauses which McCawley (1981) termed pseudo-relatives, like those italicised below:

(11) a. There are many Americans *who like opera*
b. I've never met an American *who doesn't like pizza*

McCawley claims that pseudo-relatives are typically found in existential sentences like like (11a), or after a verb like *see/meet/hear of/run into* in sentences like (11b). He notes that they differ from restrictives (inter alia) in that extraction is more readily permitted out of a pseudo-relative clause like that in (12a) below than out of a restrictive like (12b):

(12) a. Violence is something that there are many Americans *who condone*
b. *Violence is something that Snead is an Englishman *who condones*

[3] For further discussion of the properties of appositive relatives, see Jespersen (1949), Emonds (1979), Cornilescu (1981), McCawley (1981), Huddleston (1984), Fabb (1990), Borsley (1997), Reid (1997), Khalifa (1999), de Vries (2002), Huddleston & Pullum (2002), Loock (2003, 2005, 2007a, 2010), Arnold (2004, 2007), Cinque (2008), and Citko (2008).

In more recent work, Benincà (2003, 2012b), and Benincà and Cinque (2014) have termed such relative clauses 'kind-defining'. They claim that they differ from restrictives in that 'the proposition expressed by the relative is not presupposed to be true' and (unlike restrictives and appositives) 'the head of the relative is non-referential (since it is a predicate)' (Benincà & Cinque 2014: 270–1). They 'do not have the function of narrowing down the reference of the head noun, which can remain undetermined' (2014: 261), but rather serve to 'mark the semantic class which the head belongs to' (2014: 262). I shall use Prince's original (and more succinct) term 'kind relatives' in the discussion hereafter.

Benincà & Cinque identify a number of properties of kind relatives which differentiate them from restrictives and appositives, illustrating these with Italian data including (13, 14, 16) below. One such property is that (unlike restrictives and appositives) kind relatives can be irrealis (e.g. subjunctive or infinitival) – as in the examples in (13) below (where the subscript SUBJ marks a subjunctive form, and INF an infinitive form):

(13) a. Mario è l'unico [che *abbia*$_{\text{SUBJ}}$ risolto il problema]
Mario is the.only that have solved the problem
'Mario is the only one that's solved the problem'
b. Cercava una segretaria [a cui *affidare*$_{\text{INF}}$ il lavoro di traduzione]
He.sought a secretary to whom to.entrust the work of translation
'He was looking for a secretary to entrust the translation work to'

In addition, kind relatives have different distributional properties from restrictives and appositives, in that they follow a restrictive relative clause like that underlined in (14a) below, but precede an appositive like that underlined in (14b):[4]

[4] Data from the Kroch corpus suggest that the same ordering holds in English, since it contains 27 examples (like the first two examples below) in which an antecedent is modified both by a restrictive gap relative and a resumptive kind relative, and in every one of these cases, the restrictive relative precedes the kind relative – and this is also true of the example in (iii) from my own data:

(i) There's a train [you can take] [that *it* stops in Chicago] (Ann Houston; Kroch corpus)
(ii) I have a friend [that I talk to] [that *we* left-dislocate and topicalize all the time] (Wendy C., Kroch corpus)
(iii) Everywhere you look you can see someone [that you trust] [that you know *they*'re behind you] (Deli Alli, Talksport Radio)

(14) a. Quello è un ragazzo che conosco *che non esita mica a rischiare*
That is a young.man that I.know that not hesitates at.all to risk
'That is a young man that I know that does not hesitate at all to take risks'
b. Quello è un ragazzo coraggioso *che non esita mica a rischiare*,
That is a young.man brave that not hesitates at.all to risk
le azioni del quale, tra parentesi, mi hanno sempre colpito
The actions of.the which, between parethenses, me have always struck
'That is a brave young man that does not hesitate to take risks, whose actions, incidentally, have always impressed me'

Furthermore, kind relatives share a number of properties with appositives that differentiate them from restrictives. For example, kind relatives (like appositives, but unlike restrictives) can have independent illocutionary force – as illustrated by the examples in (15) below from my broadcast English data. Thus, whereas finite restrictive relatives are typically declarative in force, kind relatives can be interrogative in force (as in 15a, 15b) below, or imperative (as in 15c, 15d), or hortative as in (15e):

(15) a. It's one of those [that do we just push to one side?] (Brian Laws, BBC Radio 5)
b. It's one of them situations now [where Harry, what does he do?] (Ray Parlour, Talksport Radio)
c. It's one of those things [where imagine that they stay in the second division for 3 years!] (Tim Vickery, BBC Radio 5)
d. The top speed, [which please don't try to reach!], is 220 miles an hour (Ferrari test driver, BBC Radio 5)
e. It's one of those days [where, let's forget about this!] (Commentator, Sky Sports TV)

In addition, kind relatives differ from restrictives (but resemble appositives) in that they cannot be stacked – as the following Italian example illustrates:

(16) *Quello è un ragazzo *che deve essere sempre stato coraggioso*
That is a young.man that must be always been brave
che non esita mica a rischiare
that not hesitates at.all to risk
'That's a young man that must have always been brave that does not hesitate to take risks'

A further property of kind relatives identified by Benincà and Cinque is that (in some language varieties) they can allow the verb in the relative clause to agree with the subject of the relative clause rather than with the relative clause head,

as in the following example (from 14th century Ligurian, quoted in Parry 2007: 26, fn. 16.):[5]

(17) He' som quella che lo portay nove meysi e che lo norigay
I am the.one that him I.bore nine months and that him I.fed
com lo me' layte
with the my milk
'I am the one that bore him for 9 months and that fed him with my milk'

Benincà and Cinque conjecture that absence of agreement with the relative clause head in such structures may reflect 'the lack of referential features in the endowment of the syntactic head of the relative clause' (2014: 276).

While the main focus in this book will be on the three types of relative clause mentioned above, there are a number of other types of relative clause which I will not have much to say about here, because they did not prove to be a productive source in my data for the resumptive, prepositional and gapless relative structures discussed in chapters 2–4. These include infinitival relatives like those bracketed below:

(18) a. London is becoming a cheaper place [in which to live and work], according to a new survey
b. London is becoming a cheaper place [to live and work in], according to a new survey
c. London is becoming a cheaper place [for people to live and work in], according to a new survey

For the same reason, I also have little to say about contact relatives like those bracketed below, which appear to be dialectal or variety-specific structures, insofar as no examples of them occurred in a corpus study of restrictive relatives in standard varieties of English analysed by Hinrichs et al. (2015),

[5] A similar phenomenon is found in resumptive kind relatives in colloquial English, as illustrated below:

(i) I'm the kind of guy [that *I* like to ask a lot of questions] (readingeagle.com)
(ii) . . . I'm the kind of guy [that *I* like to play carefree a little bit] . . . (Willie Byrn, quoted in The Roanoke Times).
(iii) I'm the type of person [*I* like to be positive] (unidentified TV/radio speaker, Kroch corpus)
(iv) Well you're the kind of guy [that, you know, when *you* can take a limo, *you*'ll walk] (Kevin Newman, interview on CTV news)
(v) . . . I think we're people [that *we* love the music, *we* love the fans and *we*'re taking advantage of being able to express our opinions . . .] (MC Logic, nationofbillions.com)

and only the three examples cited in (19c–19e below occurred in my broadcast English data:

(19) a. We had this French girl [came to stay] (Berizzi 2001: 104)
b. There's a man in our street [has a Jaguar] (Miller & Fernandez-Vest, 2006: 51)
c. He's brought 4 lads in [are explosive] (Joe Cole, BT Sport TV)
d. This is a side [plays in a similar vein] (Danny Mills, Sky Sports TV)
e. When you've got a player [doesn't want to be there], you've got to get rid of them (Jamie Redknapp, Sky Sports TV)

Also playing little part in the present study for the same reason are amount relative structures such as those bracketed below:

(20) a. They ate [what food there was]
b. They ate [the food there was]

and free relative clauses like those bracketed in (21):

(21) a. I never believed [what he told me]
b. The police searched for [what(ever) clues they could find]

While there is a considerable amount of research literature on structures like those in (18–21),[6] they will not be discussed in any detail here, for the reasons already given.

As will be apparent from the discussion above, the three types of relative clause which constitute the main focus of the present study are finite appositive, restrictive and kind relatives (henceforth referred to as 'FARK' relatives for

[6] On infinitial relatives, see Breivik (1997), Dubinsky (1997), Geisler (1998), Girard & Malan (1999), Akiyama (2002), Castillo (2009), Yang (2009), Hackl & Nissenbaum (2012), Simonin (2012), Bylinina (2013), Douglas (2016). On contact relatives, see Bever & Langendoen (1972), Erdmann (1980), Harris & Vincent (1980), Weisler (1980), Shnukal, (1981), Napoli (1982), Quirk et al. (1985), Lambrecht (1988), Rizzi (1990), Doherty (1993, 1994), Biber et al. (1999), Huddleston & Pullum (2002), Tagliamonte (2002), Herrmann (2003), and Haegeman et al. (2015). On amount relatives, see Carlson (1977), Heim (1987), Grosu & Landman (1998), von Fintel (1999), Herdan (2008), McNally (2008), Watanabe (2013), Meier (2015), Douglas (2016), Kotek (2016), Patterson & Caponigro (2016). On free relatives, see Hirschbühler (1976, 1978), Bresnan & Grimshaw (1978), Groos & van Riemsdijk (1981), Harbert (1983), Hirschbühler & Rivero (1983), Borsley (1984), Huddleston (1984), Larson (1987), McCawley (1988), Battye (1989), Grosu (1989, 1996, 2003), Kayne (1994), Rooryck (1994), Jacobson (1995), Reid (1997), Citko (2000, 2002, 2004, 2008, 2011), Izvorski (2001), Vogel (2001), Caponigro (2002), de Vries (2002), van Riemsdijk (2005), Donati (2006), Caponigro & Pearl (2008, 2009), Nakamura (2009), Donati & Cecchetto (2011), Ott (2011), Benincà (2012a), Bertollo & Cavall (2012), Caponigro, Torrence & Cisneros (2013), Radford (2016: 464–70) and Cinque (2017).

succinctness). In the remainder of this chapter, I turn to consider a range of aspects of the structure of FARK relatives in standard varieties of English.

1.3 The Structure of Relative Clauses

This section focuses on the structure of relative clauses, but by way of background information, I'll begin by taking a brief look at the structure of clauses more generally. Within the framework used here (dating back to work in the 1970s and 1980s), it is assumed that clauses are built up by combining words together to form phrases, and phrases together to form clauses/sentences, so that clauses comprise a number of different layers of structure. Phrases are formed by *merging* (i.e. combining) a head word with a following constituent termed its *complement*, and the resulting structure can be extended into an even larger phrase of the same type by merging it with a preceding constituent termed its *specifier*, so that phrases have the structure (*specifier*)+*head*+*complement*.

To illustrate what all this means in more concrete terms, consider the structure of the clause produced by speaker B in the dialogue below:

(22) SPEAKER A: Why did the twins have bruises? What did their mother say?
SPEAKER B: That they had both fallen down the stairs

On the assumptions made here, merging the determiner/D *the* with its complement *stairs* forms the determiner phrase/DP *the stairs*. Merging the preposition/P *down* with its complement *the stairs* forms the prepositional phrase/PP *down the stairs*. Merging the verb/V *fallen* with its complement *down the stairs* and its specifier *both* forms the verb phrase/VP *both fallen down the stairs*. Merging the (past) tense auxiliary/T *had* with its complement *both fallen down the stairs* and its specifier *they* forms the tense phrase/TP *they had both fallen down the stairs*. Merging the complementiser/C *that* with its complement *they had both fallen down the stairs* forms the complementiser phrase *that they had both fallen down the stairs*. On this view, the sentence produced by speaker B in (22) has the structure shown in simplified form below:

(23) [$_{CP}$ [$_{C}$ that] [$_{TP}$ they [$_{T}$ had] [$_{VP}$ both [$_{V}$ fallen] [$_{PP}$ [$_{P}$ down] [$_{DP}$ [$_{D}$ the] stairs]]]]]

Each phrase has a head and is said to be a *projection* of its head, in the sense that the head projects its properties onto the phrase: e.g. a prepositional phrase like *down the stairs* is a prepositional phrase (and not a noun phrase, for example) because its head is a preposition (not a noun). Consequently,

a prepositional phrase/PP can equally be termed a 'prepositional projection', a complementiser phrase/CP can equally be termed a 'complementiser projection', a tense phrase/TP can equally be termed a 'tense projection', and so on. That part of a phrase which comprises the head and any specifier it has is termed the *edge* of the phrase. Thus, the edge of the DP *the stairs* in (23) comprises its head D *the*; the edge of the PP *down the stairs* comprises its head P *down*; the edge of the VP *both fallen down the stairs* comprises the head V *fallen* and its specifier *both*; the edge of the TP *they had both fallen down the stairs* comprises the head T-auxiliary *had* and its specifier/subject *they*; and the edge of the CP *that they had both fallen down the stairs* comprises the head C *that*.

A key assumption of work in this framework is that constituents that are present in the syntax (and play an important role in the semantics) can sometimes be unpronounced in the phonology (or, to use a technical term, they can be given a *silent spellout/null spellout* in the phonology). For example, the constituents enclosed in <angle brackets> below can optionally be silent/unpronounced:

(24) a. <I> mustn't take myself too seriously
b. <Are> you hungry?
c. You can leave it <in> there
d. Mary is shopping, and John <is> playing football
e. John said he would do it, but he didn't say when <he would do it>

For example, the first word in sentences like (24a, 24b) can be 'clipped' in rapid speech and hence be silent. In (24c), *there* is the complement of the preposition *in*, and the preposition can optionally be given a silent spellout. In (24d), the second occurrence of the tense auxiliary *is* can be given a silent spellout by a form of ellipsis termed Gapping (so called because it leaves a 'gap' in the middle of the sentence). In (24e), everything following the word *when* can be given a silent spellout by a type of ellipsis known as 'Sluicing'. Silent constituents are known as 'empty categories', and they play an extensive (and important) role in contemporary work in syntax.

There are two main parts to the structure of a clause: the propositional component (comprising the subject and everything following it), and the periphery (comprising everything preceding the subject). I will have little to say about the propositional component of clauses here, and simply assume that (as in 23 above) it has the status of a TP constituent. Instead, I will focus on the structure of the clause periphery. This is the locus of complementisers (i.e. clause-introducing particles like *that/whether/if*) and hence in work dating back to 1980, the periphery was taken to comprise a CP constituent