

Appositive Relative Clauses

1 Some Basic Properties

Some terminology:

- (1) Marta, who is a Republican, likes me.
 - a. anchor: *Marta*
 - b. appositive: [*who is a Republican*]
 - c. nominal appositive: *Marta, who is a Republican*
 - d. additional ingredient: comma intonation(from Potts (2005):93)

1.1 A little bit about meaning

As the appositive vs. restrictive opposition suggests, there is a difference in the way an appositive relative clause combines with the head (the *anchor*) and the way a restrictive relative clause does.

- (2) a. restrictive relative clause:
the students who are from Sydney like Kylie.

→ all the students don't need to be from Sydney.
- b. appositive relative clause:
the students, who are from Sydney, like Kylie.

→ all the students are from Sydney.

But such a truth-conditional distinction is not always present:

- (3) (from Potts (2005):94-95)
 - a. restrictive: A plumber that endorses nephrology came by.
 - b. appositive: A plumber, who endorses nephrology, came by.

Also note that 'restrictive' relative clauses do not always involve restriction.

- (4) (from Potts (2005):94-95)
 - a. the positive numbers that aren't negative
 - b. the bachelors who are unmarried

For these reasons, Potts (2005) proposes the term *supplementary* for what we have been calling appositive relatives and *integrated* for what we have been calling restrictive relatives.

- Non-restrictive adjectives: *the industrious Greek*.

1.2 Where are they located?

This is a matter of some controversy which we will get into later in the discussion. But the following can be said:

They **are** in the tree and are in fact syntactically embedded as the following contrast shows:

- (5) *Lui_i sostiene che Maria, che ama Gianni_i, è felice.
he claims that Maria, that loves Gianni, is happy
'He claims that Maria, who loves Gianni, is happy.'

1.3 Choice of Relative Pronoun

In English, appositive relatives clauses need to have overt *wh*-material in their [Spec,CP].

- (6) a. *This book, that I read thoroughly, is delightful.
b. This book, which I read thoroughly, is delightful.
c. *This book, ϕ I read thoroughly, is delightful.
(see Kayne (1994), Bianchi (1999):201)

But in Italian, *that*-relatives allow for appositive interpretations.

- (7) (from Bianchi (1999):201)
questo libro, che ho letto attentamente
this book that have read thoroughly
'This book, which I read thoroughly...'

A possible connection: overt *wh*-phrases in [Spec,CP] are limited to cases involving a pied-piped relative pronoun (cf. Pesetsky (1997)).

1.4 Ordering Effects

When a restrictive relative clause and an appositive relative clause appear together, the restrictive relative clause precedes the appositive relative clause.

- (8) (from Jackendoff (1977):171)
- The man that came to dinner, who was drunk, fainted.
 - *The man, who was drunk, that came to dinner fainted.

1.5 Adjacency

It is claimed that Appositive Relative Clauses need to be immediately right adjacent to their anchor - they cannot be extraposed.

- (9) (from Potts (2005):104)
- *We spoke with Lance before the race, who is a famous cyclist, about the weather.
 - *Jan was the fastest on the course, who is a famous German sprinter, yesterday.
 - *Lance has, who is a famous cyclist, taken the lead.

The above examples involve relative clauses in non-right peripheral positions where extraposed relative clauses are not perfect. Still it seems that a contrast exists between the appositive and the restrictive.

- (10) We spoke with a cyclist before the race [who had won the Tour de France] about the weather.

We also expect the following to only have a restrictive interpretation:

- (11) a. The tall student has left [who Mary likes].
b. (*)The tall student has left, [who Mary likes].

But de Vries (to appear) notes that appositive relative clauses in Dutch can be extraposed.

- (12) a. Ik heb Joop gezien, [die twee zusters heeft].
I have Joop seen who two sisters has
'I have seen Joop, who has two sisters.'

- b. Ritzen kwam op bezoek, [van wie laatst een schaamteloos boek Ritzen came on visit by whom lately a shameless book over ministerschap is verschenen].
on ministership has appeared
'Ritzen came on a visit, by whom a shameless book on ministership has been published recently.'

In fact, de Vries (to appear) notes that in certain cases extraposition is obligatory.

- (13) a. Ik heb het min tante verteld, die in tranen uitbarstte.
I have it my aunt told who in tears burst
'I have told it to my aunt, who in tears burst.'
b. *Ik heb het min tante, die in tranen uitbarstte, verteld.
I have it my aunt who in tears burst told
'I have told it to my aunt, who in tears burst.'

1.6 Restrictions on Anchors

Anchors can be proper names, definite descriptions, and indefinites.

- (14) a. John, who is from Inverness, came up with this idea.
b. The new student, who is from Inverness, came up with this idea.
c. A student of mine, who is from Inverness, came up with this idea.

The anchor must be referential - so if a head contains a pronoun bound by a quantifier, then it is not a good anchor for an appositive relative clause.

- (15) a. John_i thinks that [a student of his_i], who is from Inverness, came up with this idea.
b. *Every professor_i thinks that [a student of his_i], who is from Inverness, came up with this idea.

Quantified expressions cannot, in general, be anchors for appositive relative clauses.

- (16) a. *The doctor gave a lollipop to each child, who she examined.
b. *Susan interviewed every senator, who is crooked.
c. *No person, who knows everything, is perfect.
d. *No candidate, who scored 40 percent or more, ever failed.

1.7 Stacking

Appositive Relative Clauses can be stacked despite claims to the contrary (Kempson 2003, Potts (2005), contra McCawley 1998).

- (17) The sole, which I caught yesterday, which was caught in Scotland, was delicious. (from Kempson 2003, via Potts (2005):101)

McCawley's example:

- (18) ??Sam Boronowski, who took the qualifying exam, who failed it, wants to retake it.

Appositive Relative Clauses can themselves contain appositive relative clauses:

- (19) Sam Boronowski, who took the qualifying exam, which almost everyone else failed, did brilliantly on it. (from McCawley 1998:482, via Potts (2005):102)

1.8 Compatibility with Floating Quantification

Bianchi (1999):47 notes that restrictive relative clauses in Italian cannot have relative clause-internal floating quantifiers associated with the movement chain.

- (20) Italian:
- restrictive relative, *tutti* relative clause external: ok
Elencami tutti i libri che devi leggere per l'esame.
tall-me all the books that must read for the-exam
'Tell me all the books that you must read for the exam.'
 - restrictive relative, *tutti* relative clause internal: *
Elencami tutti i libri che devi leggere per l'esame.
tall-me all the books that must read for the-exam
'Tell me all the books that you must read for the exam.'

But appositive relative clauses can:

- (21) (from Bianchi (1999):137)
- Ho interrogato gli studenti, che avevano superato tutti la prova
have examined the students that had passed all the written
scritta.
exam
'I examined the students, who had all passed the written exam.'

1.9 Definiteness of the Relative Trace

Restrictive relatives allow for extraction out of a definiteness effect position, while appositive relatives do not:

- (22) a. restrictive:
The men that there were in the garden were all diplomats.
b. appositive: (from Postal (1993):745)
*She left the magazines, which there are on the table.

(note though that amount readings are not good with *which* to begin with.)

1.10 Non-nominal Antecedents and Relatif de Liaison

Appositive relative clauses can in certain languages stand by themselves.

- (23) Relatif de Liaison:
- Ha difeso la sua tesi quasi contro tutti. La quale
has defended the his thesis against almost everybody. which
sosteneva la necessità del non intervento.
asserted the necessity of the non-intervention
- 'He maintained his thesis against almost everyone. Which asserted the necessity of non-intervention.

Appositives also permit a wide variety non-nominal antecedents.

- (24) a. Mary is [courageous], which I will never be.
b. John is [in the garden], which is where I should be.
c. Mary has [resigned], which John hasn't.
d. [John was late], which was unfortunate.

1.11 Additional Semantic Properties

• Non-cancellability

- (25) a. Edna, who is a fearless leader, started the descent. #Edna is not a fearless leader.
b. # Lance Armstrong, who won the 2003 Tour de France, is training, if Armstrong did win the 2003 Tour.
c. # If Armstrong did win the 2003 Tour de France, then Lance Armstrong, who is the 2003 Tour de France winner, is training.

Compare with:

- (26) If Eddie has a dog, then his dog is a ferocious man-eater.

- Anti-backgrounding

- (27) Lance Armstrong survived cancer.
- # When reporters interview Lance, who is a cancer survivor, he often talks about the disease.
 - And most riders know that Lance is a cancer survivor.

- Non-restrictiveness

- (28) a. #Armstrong, who is a Texan, is a cyclist. Armstrong, who is an Ohioan, is an wrestler.
- b. Armstrong the Texan is a cyclist. Armstrong the Ohioan is an wrestler. (*integrated appositive*)

- Scopelessness

- (29) It's false that Alonzo, who is a big shot executive, is now behind bars.
- (30) a. The agency interviewed Chuck, who is a confirmed psychopath, just after his release from prison.
- b. The agency interviewed Chuck just after his release from prison. Chuck is a confirmed psychopath.
- (31) a. Sheila believes that the agency interviewed Chuck, who is a confirmed psychopath, just after his release from prison.
- b. Sheila believes that the agency interviewed Chuck just after his release from prison and that Chuck is a confirmed psychopath.

2 Major Approaches

The focus in this section is on the syntactic proposals. As we shall see, appositive relative clauses have certain semantic properties that do not fall out directly from the syntactic proposals.

2.1 Exceptional Rules of Attachment

2.1.1 Re-ordering of Phrase Structure

- Co-ordinate Analysis: Emonds (1979)
- Discontinuous constituent structure: McCawley (1982)

→ in both these analyses, the appositive does not form a constituent with the head, but is attached at the clausal level.

2.1.2 Late Attachment

LF' - Safir (1986):672-677

2.2 Height of Attachment

Appositive relative clauses attach higher than restrictive relative clauses. Appositives attach at the DP level while Restrictives attach at the NP level (see Jackendoff (1977), Demirdache (1991), Potts (2005) i.a.).

2.3 Two Antisymmetric Approaches

Antisymmetry does not allow for right adjunction. Hence the options proposed above are not tenable.

Bianchi (1999) considers the following structures:

Option 1:

- (32) ... $[_{XP} DP_i [_{XP} X^0 [_{CP} Op_i [_{CP} \dots t_i \dots]]]]$

The nature of X^0 is unclear and the various instantiations considered by Bianchi (predicative, specifying co-ordination) all lead to problems according to her. Hence she abandons this option.

Option 2:

Head-Raising plus LF-movement of IP

- (33) a. Pre-LF: $[_{DP} D^0 [_{CP} [_{DP} NP [_{DP} D t_{NP}]]] C^0 [_{IP} \dots t_{DP} \dots]]]$
- b. LF: $[_{DP} IP [_{DP} D^0 [_{CP} [_{DP} NP [_{DP} D t_{NP}]]] C^0 t_{IP}]]]$

Kayne (1994):78-83 relates the LF-movement of the IP to a feature on D⁰ and takes comma intonation to be a reflex of this movement. But he also notes that the intonational breaks comes at the left edge of the CP, not the IP.

I think Kayne moves the IP rather than the CP at LF to try and keep a connection with his analysis of prenominal relatives - he locates the NP head in the specifier of the DP in [Spec,CP] and therefore CP fronting would yield the wrong word order.

But if prenominal relatives in say Chinese have the same LF as English appositive relatives, does this also mean that Chinese prenominal relatives are all appositive?

Further Kayne attempts to derive why prenominal relative clauses lack relative pronouns - his explanation depends upon these being IPs and not CPs. This begs the question of why something like the following is not possible:

- (34) (pretend Amharic)
- a. ... [_{DP} [John wrote t_i]_j D⁰ [_{CP} [book]_i that t_{IP}]]
 - b. ... [_{DP} [John wrote t_i]_j D⁰ [_{CP} [book]_k which t_k]_i that t_{IP}]]

3 Asymmetries with respect to Reconstruction

Bianchi (1999):IV notes that Appositive Relative Clauses do not pattern with Restrictive Relative Clauses with respect to reconstruction (contra certain observations in Kayne (1994):112-113).

3.1 Condition C

(35) Restrictive Relative Clause:

a. null subject:

*Quello è l'[amico di Gianni]_i [[a cui]_j pro_i ha offerto un lavoro
this is the-friend of Gianni has offered a job
t_j]

'This is the friend of Gianni's to whom he offered a job.

b. clitic pronoun:

*Questo è il [quadro di Gianni]_j [che gli]_i piace t_j di più]
this is the picture of Gianni that to-him_{CL} pleases most

'This is the picture of Gianni's that pleases him the most.'

(36) Appositive Relative Clause:

a. null subject:

Il libro di Gianni_i, [che pro_i ha sicuramente dedicato __ ai suoi
the book of Gianni that has surely dedicated to his
figli], parla di psicologia infantile
children speaks about psychology child

'Gianni's book, which he surely dedicated to his children, is about children's psychology.'

b. clitic pronoun:

L'ultimo quadro di Gianni_i, che gli_i piace __ moltissimo, non
the-last picture by Gianni that to-him_{CL} pleases very-much not
sarà messo in vendita
will-be put on sale

'Gianni's last picture, which he likes very much, will not be put on sale.'

3.2 Condition A

(37) a. control:

L'imputato_i produsse un'unica prova della propria_i innocenza.
the-defendant produced a-single proof of self's innocence

'The defendant produced a single proof of his innocence.'

b. restrictive relative:

Il giudice_j invalidò l'unica prova della propria_i innocenza
the judge invalidated the-single proof of self's innocence
con cui l'imputato_i sperava di scagionarsi __
with which the-defendant hoped of exculpate-self

'The judge invalidated the only proof of his innocence with which the defendant hoped that he could exonerate himself.'

c. appositive relative:

*Il giudice_j invalidò l'unica prova della propria_i innocenza,
the judge invalidated the-single proof of self's innocence
con la quale l'imputato_i era certo di scagionarsi __
by which the-defendant was able to exculpate-self

'The judge invalidated the only proof of his innocence, with which the defendant was able to exonerate himself.'

3.3 Scope Reconstruction

(38) a. restrictive, different equations possible:

Scriverò su fogli diversi l'equazione [che ciascuno studente
write on sheets different the-equation that each student
dovrà risolvere _]
will-have-to solve

'I will write the equation [that every student will have to solve] on
different sheets.

- b. appositive, only one equation:

Scriverò sulla lavagna l'equazione [che ciascuno studente
write on-the blackboard the-equation that each student
dovrà risolvere _ per solo]
will-have-to solve by himself

'I will write on the blackboard the equation, [which every student will
have to solve by himself].'

Variable binding seems to pattern with the above tests i.e. restrictives allow for a
relative clause-internal pronoun to bind into the head while appositives do not.

3.4 Idiomatic Expressions

Appositives do not allow for idiom heads.

- (39) a. *That headway, which the students made last week, was phenomenal.
b. *We were surprised by the unexpected advantage, which he had taken
of the situation.
c. *The fun, which they made of me,...

3.5 Relative Clause-Internal Reconstruction

All of the above tests show that the head of an appositive relative clause does not
reconstruct into the relative clause.

But there are nevertheless reconstruction effects internal to the appositive:

- (40) a. Condition C:
*Andrea, [[le cui insinuazioni su Beatrice,] pro, non è più
Andrea whose insinuations on Beatrice not is anymore
disposta a sopportare _]
willing to stand
'Andrea, whose insinuations about Beatrice she is not willing to stand
any more....'
b. Condition A:

Andrea, [[la cui passione per la propria, moglie] Juan, non è
Andrew whose passione for the self's wife Juan not is
disposto a tollerare _]
willing to tolerate

'Andrea, whose passions fo his_i wife Juan_i is not willing to tolerate....'

References

- Bianchi, V. (1999) *Consequences of antisymmetry: Headed Relative Clauses*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Demirdache, H. (1991) *Resumptive Chains in Restrictive Relatives, Appositives, and Dislocation Structures*, Doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts. Distributed by MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.
- Emonds, J. (1979) "Appositive Relatives have no properties," *Linguistic Inquiry* 10, 211–243.
- Jackendoff, R. (1977) *X̄ Syntax: A study of Phrase Structure*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Kayne, R. S. (1994) *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*, Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 25, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- McCawley, J. D. (1982) "Parentheticals and Discontinuous Constituent Structure," *Linguistic Inquiry* 13, 91–106.
- Pesetsky, D. (1997) "Some Optimality Principles of Sentence Pronunciation," in P. Barbosa, D. Fox, P. Hagstrom, M. J. McGinnis, and D. Pesetsky, eds., *Is the Best Good Enough?*, MITWPL/MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Postal, P. M. (1993) "Parasitic Gaps and the ATB Phenomenon," *Linguistic Inquiry* 24:4, 735–754.
- Potts, C. (2005) *The Logic of Conventional Implicatures*, Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics 7, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Safir, K. (1986) "Relative Clauses in a Theory of Binding and Levels," *Linguistic Inquiry* 17:4, 663–689.
- Vries, M. de (to appear) "The Syntax of Appositive Relativization: On Specifying Coordination, False Free Relatives, and Promotion," *Linguistic Inquiry*.