

Relative Clauses

Head Raising Only

DOMINIQUE SPORTICHE

UCLA

dominique.sportiche@gmail.com



“A Adriana, pour la complicité intellectuelle et les goûts en partage, théoriques et au delà.”

It is argued that headed (restrictive) relative clauses are only derived by head raising (Vergnaud, 1974, Kayne, 1994) thus disallowing an additional matching derivation (Sauerland, 2000). In so doing we argue that a number of postulated mechanisms are not needed: Late Adjunct insertion (Lebeaux, 1991, 2009), Late NP Insertion (Lebeaux, 1991), Wholesale Late merger (Takahashi and Hulsey, 2008), Minimize operator restriction (Chomsky, 1995), PF subject Raising (Sauerland and Elbourne, 2002).

It is first shown that the coexistence of the two relative clause derivations as they need to be construed lead to serious explanatory gaps, particularly concerning why matching relatives have to

- Involve matching of meaning but not of form (as is required by the existence of secondary crossover effects, cf. Safir, 1996)
- Relative clause internal movement
- Elision of Relative clause internal copies

These gaps immediately disappear under a head raising analysis.

Secondly, the motivations for postulating the matching derivation are critically examined and alternative explanations are explored for three properties underlying the need for matching relatives:

(i) Since Late Adjunct Insertion of a relative clause is unavailable under a head raising analysis, the complement / adjunct asymmetry leading to Lebeaux’s 1991, 2009 postulation of Late Adjunct Insertion must be reanalyzed.

Dispensing with Late adjunct insertion is done in two steps. First, a detailed examination of of-nominal and clausal adnominal complements (based on Kayne's 2010 and Stowell, 1981) show that they are not plausibly complements but rather must be analyzed as predicate headed (small) relative clauses derived by head raising. The second step simply notes that the very argumentation for the existence of head raising relatives requires that copies generated under movement need not all to be interpreted, a conclusion independently supported by cases of total reconstruction under A-movement (pace Sauerland and Elbourne, 2002, see Thoms 2009) or A-bar movement. Thus Chomsky's 1986 Principle of Full Interpretation (PFI) as it applies at the LF interface – must be understood as not requiring that all copies of a Syntactic Object be interpreted. The complement/adjunct asymmetry is then shown to follow from:

- (a) This Interpretation of the PFI allowing in principle a (pied piped) adjunct to be interpreted in one or more of any of the position in which it appears.
- (b) The independently justified properties (however they are derived) that
 - Moved predicates obligatory reconstruct at LF (Heycock, 1995, Huang, 1993, Takano, 1995)
 - Predicates must be locally saturated by their arguments at LF (fundamentally the interpretive justification for trace theory).

Such a theory handles without further assumptions the properties of extraposition discussed in Fox and Nissenbaum, 1999, (and possibly those of result clauses doing away with Late merger of result clauses postulated in Bhatt and Pancheva, 2004).

(ii) A second problem is the apparent violations of movement constraints needed to generate some relative clauses under head raising leading e.g. Bhatt 2002 to accept instances of matching relatives.

As head raising involve NP- rather than DP- movement, it is to be expected that head raising should be subject to Phase based locality (Chomsky's 2008 PIC) as well as Rizzi's 1990 Relativized Minimality (RM) intervention effects by NPs. It is argued that

- the very existence of pied piping can be understood as a way to avoid violating such movement constraints
- that attempts to circumvent these constraints via pied piping but leaving the to-be-raised head too deeply embedded within the pied piped constituent from the relative clause periphery displays typical movement properties (PIC effects, RM effects) including Coordinate Structure Constraint effects (plausibly distinguishing movement from Agree).

(iii) The question/relative clause asymmetry found with respect to condition C of the binding theory has been taken to mean (Hulsey and Sauerland, 2006) that both cannot always be treated as movement respectively of a wh-phrase, or of a raised head, thus justifying an analysis in terms of matching of meaning but not form.

It will be shown that this asymmetry with respect to Principle C is in fact also found among movement types: A-movement can behave so as to suggest that under certain circumstances, copies of moved phrase can be partially deleted, an option which by default falls out of the needed construal of the PFI mentioned above. It is

however argued that unlike total deletion of a copy, partial deletion is subject to a restriction: a copy can be partially deleted – call it Vehicle Change - (so a DP like [the [man]] can become [the [e_{+human}]] = him) only if another, undeleted copy is found in the same spell out domain (this restriction is needed to derive the A/A-bar movement asymmetry under reconstruction). The relative clause/ question asymmetry can now be argued not to arise from the raising /matching difference but from the fact that relative clauses tolerate in some cases a derivation akin to A-movement (in the crucial cases) thus allowing A-movement like Vehicle Change (reminiscent of Safir, 1999). It is last argued that the A-like derivation found in relative clause formation is overtly exhibit in languages such as Vata (Koopman, 1984) or Nez Perce (Deal, 2014) and is akin to A-scrambling (Mahajan, 1990), predicting various differences between short and long relatives.

References

- Bhatt, R. (2002) The Raising Analysis of Relative Clauses: Evidence from Adjectival Modification in Natural Language Semantics, 10:43-90. Chomsky, Noam. 1986. Knowledge of Language, Praeger, New York.
- Chomsky, N. (1995) *The Minimalist Program*, MIT Press Cambridge, Mass.
- Chomsky, N. (2008) "On Phases". In Freidin, Robert; Otero, Carlos P.; Zubizarreta, Maria Luisa. *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory. Essays in Honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. pp. 133–166.
- Deal, A. R. (2014) Cyclicity and connectivity in Nez Perce relative clauses, Unpublished, UCSC.
- Fox, D. (2000) Economy and Semantic Interpretation, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Fox, D., and Nissenbaum J. (1999). Extraposition and scope: A case for overt QR. In *WCCFL 18*, S. Bird, A. Carnie, J. D. Haugen, & P. Norquest (Eds.) 132–144. Somerville, Mass.: Cascadia Press.
- Heycock, C. (1995) Asymmetries in Reconstruction. *Linguistic Inquiry* 26, 547-570
- Huang, C. T James. 1993. Reconstruction and the Structure of VP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24.1, 103-138.
- Hulsey, S. and Sauerland U. (2006) Sorting out relative clauses. *Natural Language Semantics* 14:111–137.
- Kayne, R. (2010) *Comparisons and Contrasts*. Oxford University Press.
- Koopman, H. (1984) *The Syntax of Verbs*. Foris Publications. Dordrecht.
- Lebeaux, D. (1991) "Relative Clauses, Licensing and the Nature of Derivations", in *Phrase Structure, Heads and Licensing*, S. Rothstein & M. Speas (Eds), *Syntax and Semantics* 25, Academic Press.
- Lebeaux, D. (2009) Where Does Binding Theory Apply? *Linguistic Inquiry Monographs*, MIT Press.
- Mahajan, A. (1990) *The A/A-bar Distinction and Movement Theory*. MIT PhD.
- Rizzi, L. (1990) *Relativized Minimality*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Safir, K. (1996) Derivation, Representation and Resumption: The Domain of Weak Crossover. *Linguistic Inquiry* 27.2.
- Safir, K. (1999) Vehicle Change and Reconstruction in A'-chains. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30: 587-620.
- Sauerland, U. (2000) Two Structures for English Restrictive Relative Clauses, in M. Saito et al. (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Nanzan GLOW*, (pp. 351–366). Nanzan University, Nagoya, Japan.
- Sauerland, U and Elbourne P. (2002) Total reconstruction, PF-movement, and derivational order, *Linguistic Inquiry* 33, 283-319.
- Stowell, T. (1981) *Origins of Phrase Structure*. MIT PhD.
- Takahashi, S. and Hulsey S. (2009) Wholesale Merger. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40.3, 387-426.
- Takano, Y. (1995) Predicate fronting and internal subjects. *Linguistic Inquiry* 26, 327–340
- Thoms, G. (2009) British "team" DPs and theories of scope. Paper presented at LangUE 09, University of Essex.
- Vergnaud, J.R. (1974) French Relative Clauses, Doctoral Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.