

# Chapter 15

## Rethinking relatives

Jamie Douglas

University of Cambridge

This chapter is concerned with the syntactic size of finite and infinitival relative clauses in English. I claim that these fall into three (or even four) distinct structural sizes. Assuming a cartographic descriptive framework, I provide evidence for this claim from novel observations concerning the (un)availability of adverbial and argument fronting in the different types of relative clause (following Haegeman 2012). Specifically, some relative clauses permit both adverbial and argument fronting, some permit adverbial fronting only, whilst others do not permit fronting at all. Additional support for my claim comes from three instances of categorial distinctness effect (in the sense of Richards 2010), which I argue instantiate a distinctness effect between elements in SpecTopP and SpecFocP.

### 1 Introduction

Relative clauses (RCs) have been a subject of study within generative frameworks for decades. It is probably fair to say that the syntactic literature has been primarily concerned with how the RC head (the noun modified by the RC) is related to the RC-internal gap, with reconstruction effects playing a prominent role in discussions and analyses. However, rather than focussing on the RC head, I will consider the RC itself. More specifically, I will investigate the syntactic structure and the structural size of English RCs.

The literature typically recognises two distinct structural sizes as far as RCs are concerned: clausal RCs, as in (1), and reduced RCs, as in (2).

- (1) Clausal RCs  
the man [(who(m)/that) I met yesterday]



- (2) Reduced RCs  
the man [(being) arrested by police yesterday]

I will not discuss reduced RCs here (for recent discussion, see Douglas 2016; Harwood 2017) but will focus exclusively on clausal RCs, simply calling them RCs from now on. I argue that RCs are not homogeneous in their structural size, i.e. they vary in terms of how much syntactic structure they contain. The different types of RC that I will investigate are exemplified below:

- (3) Finite *wh*-RCs
- The man [who saw me] is John.
  - The house [which I lived in] fell down.
  - The house [in which I lived] fell down.
- (4) (Finite) *that*-RCs
- The man [that saw me] is John.
  - The man [that I saw] is John.
  - The house [that I lived in] fell down.
- (5) Finite  $\emptyset$ -RCs
- The man [I saw] is John.
  - The house [I lived in] fell down.
- (6) Infinitival *wh*-RCs
- The man [to whom to speak] is John.
  - The house [in which to live] is that one.
  - For a beginner, the course will likely provide a good atmosphere [in which for you to fire your first shots].<sup>1</sup>
- (7) Infinitival *for*-RCs
- The man [for you to see] is John.
  - The man [for her to speak to] is John.
- (8) Infinitival  $\emptyset$ -RCs
- The man [to see] is John.
  - The man [to speak to] is John.

---

<sup>1</sup>This example is from: <http://hunting.about.com/od/hunting-for-beginners/a/Hunting-For-Beginners.htm>. Such examples are not acceptable to all speakers (see, e.g., the judgements in Chomsky & Lasnik 1977; Huddleston et al. 2002), though there are speakers for whom they are acceptable.

The names for the different types of RC should be reasonably transparent. I do not refer to *wh*-RCs with and without preposition pied-piping as different types. Furthermore, I classify examples like (6c) as infinitival *wh*-RCs rather than infinitival *for*-RCs since the *wh*-phrase is further to the left.  $\emptyset$ -RCs are those without an overt *wh*-relative pronoun, *that* or *for*.

The idea that RCs might vary in structural size is not new, with a number of authors claiming a size difference between finite RCs introduced by an overt relative pronoun or complementiser and those not (Bošković 1994; 1996; 1997; 2016; Weisler 1980; Doherty 1993; 2000), or between infinitival RCs relativising on subjects and those relativising on non-subjects (Bhatt 1999). However, previous studies tend not to consider finite and infinitival RCs together, nor to consider the issue from a cartographic perspective (though see Haegeman 2012 for the application of such an approach to a range of clause types in English).

My more specific aim is thus to determine the structure and size of the left periphery of full clausal RCs. To investigate this question, I test whether full clausal RCs of the various types illustrated above are compatible with adverbial and argument fronting (including negative preposing), as done in Haegeman (2012) for a range of clause types following the cartographic tradition (Rizzi 1997 et seq. among many others). Unlike Haegeman (2012), I focus exclusively on RCs, demonstrating that there is a lot more to say about RCs and fronting possibilities in their left peripheries. This is largely a result of empirical differences. Haegeman writes:

In the following discussion judgments are based on the literature and on a number of informants, all speakers of British English. There is, however, interspeaker variation, and some speakers are much more liberal when it comes to the distribution of fronted arguments in English. These speakers may well find that their judgments deviate systematically from those discussed here. Given that the divergence is systematic, I tentatively conclude that their grammar must differ from that of the speakers on whom this work is based. (Haegeman 2012: 54)

I, and some that I have informally consulted, seem to belong to the “much more liberal” speakers of British English (others that I have consulted seem to belong to Haegeman’s “not-so-liberal” group).<sup>2</sup> The biggest difference between Haegeman’s (2012) reported judgements and those to be reported below is that Haegeman essentially rejects argument fronting in all RCs (a long-standing and

---

<sup>2</sup>Haegeman (2012) notes where some authors seem to be more liberal, e.g. Radford (2009a).

widespread claim in the literature, see Chomsky 1977 and Bak 1984), whilst I (and some of my consultants) accept it in some (but not all) RC-types. Nonetheless, even when it is permitted, argument fronting is constrained. I will argue that argument fronting is subject to what will be called a *categorial distinctness effect* (see Richards 2010), i.e. an argument that is fronted inside an RC must be of a different phrasal category from whatever is relativised. This will become apparent in §3.

The structure of this chapter is as follows. The adverbial fronting data is laid out in §2, whilst the argument fronting data and the aforementioned categorial distinctness effect are presented in §3. My analysis is laid out in §4 and suggests a close formal relation between relativisation and topicalisation (at least in finite RC contexts). §5 concludes.

## 2 Adverbial fronting

### 2.1 Finite *wh*-RCs

Adverbial fronting and adverbial negative preposing seem to behave in more or less the same way, except that adverbial negative preposing triggers so-called subject–auxiliary inversion. In this section, I will show that adverbial fronting is permitted in finite *wh*- and *that*-RCs and in infinitival *wh*-RCs, but is not permitted in the other RC-types.

Adverbial fronting is permitted in *wh*-RCs, both in non-subject RCs, as in (9), and in subject RCs, as in (10) (see also Doherty 1993; 2000). The same applies to adverbial negative preposing, as in (11) (non-subject RCs) and (12) (subject RCs).

- (9) a. I met a man who *next year* Mary might (actually) date.  
b. I bought a dress which *next year* Mary might (actually) wear.
- (10) a. I met a man who *next year* might (actually) date Mary.  
b. I bought a dress which *next year* might (actually) make Mary popular.
- (11) a. I met a man who *under no circumstances* would Mary ever date.  
b. I bought a dress which *under no circumstances* would Mary ever wear.
- (12) a. I met a man who *under no circumstances* would ever go out with Mary.  
b. I bought a dress which *under no circumstances* would ever make Mary popular.

The *wh*-relative pronoun may or may not pied-pipe a preposition. Adverbial fronting is compatible with either option, as in (13). The same applies to adverbial negative preposing, as in (14).

- (13) a. I met a man who *next year* Mary might (actually) grant a second date to.  
 b. I met a man to whom *next year* Mary might (actually) grant a second date.
- (14) a. I met a man who *under no circumstances* would Mary ever grant a first date to.  
 b. I met a man to whom *under no circumstances* would Mary ever grant a first date.

## 2.2 Finite *that*-RCs

Adverbial fronting is permitted in *that*-RCs, both in non-subject RCs, as in (15), and in subject RCs, as in (16) (see also Doherty 1993; 2000). The same applies to adverbial negative preposing, as in (17) (non-subject RCs) and (18) (subject RCs).

- (15) a. I met a man that *next year* Mary might (actually) date.  
 b. I bought a dress that *next year* Mary might (actually) wear.
- (16) a. I met a man that *next year* might (actually) date Mary.  
 b. I bought a dress that *next year* might (actually) make Mary popular.
- (17) a. I met a man that *under no circumstances* would Mary ever date.  
 b. I bought a dress that *under no circumstances* would Mary ever wear.
- (18) a. I met a man that *under no circumstances* would ever go out with Mary.  
 b. I bought a dress that *under no circumstances* would ever make Mary popular.

*that*-RCs do not permit pied-piping of prepositions at all so (19b) and (20b) are ungrammatical independently of adverbial fronting and adverbial negative preposing respectively.

- (19) a. I met a man that *next year* Mary might (actually) grant a second date to.  
 b. \* I met a man to that (*next year*) Mary might (actually) grant a second date.

- (20) a. I met a man that *under no circumstances* would Mary ever grant a first date to.  
b. \* I met a man to that (*under no circumstances*) would Mary ever grant a first date.

### 2.3 Finite $\emptyset$ -RCs

Unlike in finite *wh*-RCs and finite *that*-RCs, adverbial fronting is not permitted in finite  $\emptyset$ -RCs (see also Doherty 1993; 2000). This applies to both non-subject RCs, as in (21), and subject RCs, as in (22). Note, however, that finite subject  $\emptyset$ -RCs are generally impossible in (standard) English.<sup>3</sup> In other words, the examples in (22) are ungrammatical independently of adverbial fronting. Exactly the same holds of adverbial negative preposing, as in (23) (non-subject RCs) and (24) (subject RCs).

- (21) a. \* I met a man *next year* Mary might (actually) date.  
b. \* I bought a dress *next year* Mary might (actually) wear.  
(22) a. \* I met a man (*next year*) might (actually) date Mary.  
b. \* I bought a dress (*next year*) might (actually) make Mary popular.  
(23) a. \* I met a man *under no circumstances* would Mary ever date.  
b. \* I bought a dress *under no circumstances* would Mary ever wear.  
(24) a. \* I met a man (*under no circumstances*) would (ever) go out with Mary.  
b. \* I bought a dress (*under no circumstances*) would (ever) make Mary popular.

$\emptyset$ -RCs do not permit pied-piping of prepositions in general. Hence (25b) and (26b) are ungrammatical independently of adverbial fronting or adverbial negative preposing respectively.

- (25) a. \* I met a man *next year* Mary might (actually) grant a second date to.  
b. \* I met a man to (*next year*) Mary might (actually) grant a second date.

---

<sup>3</sup>There are apparent counterexamples, such as (i):

(i) There's a man sells vegetables at the market.

However, there is good reason to believe that these are not instances of genuine  $\emptyset$ -RCs (see den Dikken 2005; Harris & Vincent 1980; Henry 1995; Lambrecht 1988; McCawley 1998), so I set these aside (pace Doherty 1993; 2000).

- (26) a. \* I met a man *under no circumstances* would Mary ever grant a first date.  
 b. \* I met a man to (*under no circumstances*) would Mary ever grant a first date.

## 2.4 Infinitival *wh*-RCs

In English, infinitival *wh*-RCs obligatorily involve a pied-piped preposition. Subject infinitival *wh*-RCs are consequently impossible because subjects do not have any prepositions to pied-pipe. All of the examples therefore involve non-subject relativisation. As can be seen, adverbial fronting and adverbial negative preposing is permitted, as in (27) and (28) respectively.

- (27) Mary's the woman to whom *next week* to hand these documents.  
 (28) Mary's the woman to whom *under no circumstances* to ever hand these documents.

Some speakers allow the complementiser *for* and an overt subject in infinitival *wh*-RCs, though even then it is typically judged as somewhat degraded. Other speakers judge it ungrammatical (see Chomsky & Lasnik 1977; Huddleston et al. 2002: 1067). For those that do accept such structures, adverbial fronting is permitted in such cases. The fronted adverbial obligatorily precedes *for*, as in (29).

- (29) a. ?? Mary's the woman to whom *next week* for you to hand these documents.  
 b. \* Mary's the woman to whom for you *next week* to hand these documents.

The same seems to be true for adverbial negative preposing, as in (30).

- (30) a. ?? Mary's the woman to whom *under no circumstances* for you to ever hand these documents.  
 b. \* Mary's the woman to whom for you *under no circumstances* to ever hand these documents.

## 2.5 Infinitival *for*-RCs

Unlike in infinitival *wh*-RCs (with and without *for*), adverbial fronting is not permitted in infinitival *for*-RCs, i.e. infinitival RCs with overt *for* but no *wh*-relative pronoun, as in (31). The same applies to adverbial negative preposing, as in (32).

- (31) a. ?\* I met a man *next year* for you to bring to the party.  
b. \* I met a man for you *next year* to bring to the party.
- (32) a. \* I met a man *under no circumstances* for you to ever bring to the party.  
b. \* I met a man for you *under no circumstances* to ever bring to the party.

Infinitival *for*-RCs do not permit pied-piping of prepositions in general. Hence (33) and (34) are ungrammatical independently of adverbial fronting and adverbial negative preposing.

- (33) \* Mary's the woman to (*next week*) for you to hand these documents.  
(34) \* Mary's the woman to (*under no circumstances*) for you to ever hand these documents.

## 2.6 Infinitival $\emptyset$ -RCs

Like in infinitival *for*-RCs, adverbial fronting is not permitted in infinitival  $\emptyset$ -RCs, i.e. infinitival RCs with neither *for* nor a *wh*-relative pronoun, as in (35). The same applies to adverbial negative preposing, as in (36).

- (35) \* I met a man *next year* to bring to the party.  
(36) \* I met a man *under no circumstances* to ever bring to the party.

Infinitival  $\emptyset$ -RCs do not permit pied-piping of prepositions in general, hence (37) and (38) are ungrammatical independently of adverbial fronting and adverbial negative preposing.

- (37) \* Mary's the woman to (*next week*) to hand these documents.  
(38) \* Mary's the woman to (*under no circumstances*) to ever hand these documents.

## 2.7 Summary

Adverbial fronting and adverbial negative preposing are permitted in finite *wh*-RCs, finite *that*-RCs, and infinitival *wh*-RCs (with and without *for*). They are not permitted in finite  $\emptyset$ -RCs, infinitival *for*-RCs, and infinitival  $\emptyset$ -RCs. Furthermore, they do not seem to interact with preposition pied-piping in any way.



### 3 Argument fronting

#### 3.1 Finite *wh*-RCs

I turn now to argument fronting. As I will show, argument fronting is more constrained than adverbial fronting. Indeed, as pointed out in §1, Haegeman's (2012) analysis is based on cases where argument fronting in RCs is generally impossible. This seems to be true for some of the speakers I have consulted as well. However, other speakers are "more liberal". Nevertheless, even for these more liberal speakers it is not the case that fronted arguments are freely permitted in all types of RC. As will be seen, argument fronting exhibits a *categorical distinctness effect*. Anticipating the findings, argument fronting is permitted in finite *wh*- and *that*-RCs but not in the other RC-types.

Let us first consider non-subject RCs. Fronted arguments are acceptable to "more liberal" informants, as in (39).<sup>4</sup> The fronted argument obligatorily follows the relative pronoun, as shown by the ungrammaticality of (40).

- (39) a. I met a man to whom, *a second date*, Mary might actually grant.  
 b. I bought a car in which, *muddy shoes*, I would never allow.
- (40) a. \* I met a man, *a second date*, to whom Mary might actually grant.  
 b. \* I bought a car, *muddy shoes*, in which I would never allow.

However, argument fronting is restricted. Observe that in (39) the *wh*-relative pronouns have pied-piped a preposition. Interestingly, without such pied-piping, the examples become degraded or unacceptable, as in (41).

- (41) a. ?\* I met a man who(m), *a second date*, Mary might actually grant to.  
 b. ?\* I bought a car which, *muddy shoes*, I would never allow in.

The same effect can be seen when it is the fronted argument rather than the relative pronoun that has the option of pied-piping a preposition. In (42), the fronted argument has pied-piped a preposition and the result is acceptable, whilst in (43), it has not pied-piped a preposition and the result is unacceptable.

- (42) I witnessed the second date which, *to that man*, Mary should never have granted.

---

<sup>4</sup>Similarly, Radford (2009a: 282) judges the following example as acceptable:

- (i) A university is the kind of place in which, that kind of behaviour, we cannot tolerate.

- (43) \* I witnessed the second date which, *that man*, Mary should never have granted to.

What these data tell us is that the relative pronoun and fronted argument cannot both be nominal phrases (DPs). If one is a DP, the other must pied-pipe a preposition, i.e. be a prepositional phrase (PP). To my knowledge, this is a novel empirical generalisation. Adopting Richards's (2010) terminology, I refer to this as a *categorial distinctness effect*.

This raises the question of what happens when both the relative pronoun and fronted argument pied-pipe a preposition. The result is grammatical (example adapted from Totsuka (2014)).

- (44) I met a man *with whom, about linguistics*, I could talk all day.

However, there is an issue about whether the fronted PP in such examples is actually an argument (see Rizzi 1997: 294, 322–325). I leave such examples aside for now but will return to them in §4.4.

The categorial distinctness effect is particularly important when it comes to argument fronting in subject RCs. It has been claimed that fronted topics, or fronted arguments more generally, are impossible in subject RCs (Haegeman 2012: 58; Rizzi 1997: 307). The following examples, taken from Rizzi (1997: 307), are intended to show that fronted arguments are possible in non-subject RCs, as in (45a) and (46a), but impossible in subject RCs, as in (45b) and (46b) (judgements as in the original).<sup>5</sup>

- (45) a. ?? the man to whom, *that book*, I gave  
b. \* the man who, *that book*, gave to me
- (46) a. ? a man to whom, *liberty*, we should never grant<sup>6</sup>  
b. \* a man who, *liberty*, should never grant to us

---

<sup>5</sup>Haegeman (2012: Ch. 2, note 6) notes via personal communication with Andrew Radford that he accepts the following:

- (i) He's the kind of person who, a noble gesture like that, would simply not appreciate.

I, and others, find this example odd. We feel that it needs a subject resumptive pronoun to be even marginally acceptable, as in (ii). Interestingly, an object resumptive does not seem even marginally possible, as in (iii). See §4.4 for discussion.

- (ii) ? He's the kind of person who, a noble gesture like that, he would simply not appreciate.  
(iii) \* He's the kind of person who, a noble gesture like that, would simply not appreciate it.

However, observe that the non-subject RC examples in (45a) and (46a) satisfy categorial distinctness whilst the subject RC examples in (45b) and (46b) do not. If the categorial distinctness effect is responsible for the ungrammaticality of (45b) and (46b), the prediction is that fronted arguments will be allowed in subject RCs provided that the fronted argument pied-pipes a preposition. This prediction is borne out as the contrast between (47) and (48) shows.

- (47) a. \* I met a man who, *Mary*, might actually grant a second date to.  
 b. \* I bought a car which, *children*, can give hours of entertainment to.
- (48) a. ? I met a man who, *to Mary*, might actually grant a second date.  
 b. I bought a car which, *to children*, can give hours of entertainment.

These data thus show that argument fronting *is* permitted in subject RCs but that the fronted argument must be a PP in line with the categorial distinctness effect.

The same effect can be seen with argument negative preposing. As the contrasts below show, if the relative pronoun has not pied-piped a preposition, the fronted argument must do so. This applies to both non-subject and subject RCs.

- (49) a. I met a man who(m), *to no woman*, would I ever recommend (as a date).  
 b. I bought a dress which, *to no woman*, would I ever give (as a present).  
 c. I met a man who, *to no woman*, would ever give roses.  
 d. I bought a dress which, *to no woman*, would ever be given (as a present).
- (50) a. \* I met a man who(m), *no woman*, would I ever recommend to (as a date).  
 b. \* I bought a dress which, *no woman*, would I ever give to (as a present).  
 c. \* I met a man who, *no woman*, would ever give roses to.  
 d. \* I bought a dress which, *no woman*, would ever be given to (as a present).

The negative preposed argument can only be a DP if the relative pronoun pied-pipes a preposition.

- (51) a. I met a man to whom, *no advice* would I ever give.  
 b. I met a woman to whom, *no roses* would a man ever give.

---

<sup>6</sup>(46a) is adapted from Baltin (1982: 17). Baltin judges it as acceptable, but notes that not all speakers find it totally acceptable.

- (52) a. \* I met a man who(m), *no advice* would I ever give to.  
 b. ?? I met a woman who(m), *no roses* would a man ever give to.

To summarise, I have shown that argument fronting is permitted in finite *wh*-RCs but is subject to a categorial distinctness effect. The categorial distinctness effect says that a relative pronoun and fronted argument cannot both be DPs. If one is a DP, the other must be a PP. This is schematised in Table 15.1.

Table 15.1: Categorial distinctness effect

Relative pronoun	Fronted argument	Combination allowed?
DP	DP	*
DP	PP	✓
PP	DP	✓
PP	PP	See §4.4

### 3.2 Finite *that*-RCs

Argument fronting is permitted in finite *that*-RCs and is subject to the categorial distinctness effect. However, for whatever reason, preposition pied-piping is not possible with *that*, which rules out PP–DP and PP–PP, and I predict from the categorial distinctness effect that option DP–DP is not available either. Consequently, I predict that DP–PP is the only option, i.e. the fronted argument can only be a PP. This prediction is borne out and applies to both non-subject and subject RCs.

- (53) a. I bought a dress that, *to Mary*, I might consider giving (as a present).  
 b. I bought a dress that, *to Mary*, could be given (as a present).  
 c. I bought a car that, *to children*, would give hours of entertainment.
- (54) a. \* I bought a dress that, *Mary*, I might consider giving to (as a present).  
 b. \* I bought a dress that, *Mary*, could be given to (as a present).  
 c. \* I bought a car that, *children*, would give hours of entertainment to.

The same applies to argument negative preposing.

- (55) a. I bought a dress that, *to no woman*, would I ever give (as a present).  
 b. I bought a dress that, *to no woman*, would ever be given (as a present).

- (56) a. \* I bought a dress that, *no woman*, would I ever give to (as a present).  
 b. \* I bought a dress that, *no woman*, would ever be given to (as a present).

If there is no preposition for the fronted argument to pied-pipe in the first place, we predict that argument fronting will simply be unavailable. This prediction is also borne out as the following examples show.

- (57) a. \* I bought a car that, *muddy shoes*, I would never allow in.  
 b. \* I bought a car that, *hours of entertainment*, would give to children.  
 c. \* I bought a car that, *the children*, can keep entertained.
- (58) a. ?? I bought a car that, *not a single muddy shoe* would I ever allow in.  
 b. \* I bought a car that, *not a single hour of entertainment*, would ever give to any child.  
 c. \* I bought a car that, *no child*, can keep entertained.

### 3.3 Finite $\emptyset$ -RCs

Unlike finite *wh*-RCs and finite *that*-RCs, argument fronting is not permitted in finite  $\emptyset$ -RCs at all, even if the fronted argument is a PP. Since subject  $\emptyset$ -RCs are generally impossible in English, only non-subject  $\emptyset$ -RCs are illustrated.

- (59) a. \* I met a man, *Mary*, I might recommend to (as a date).  
 b. \* I bought a dress, *Mary*, I could give to (as a present).
- (60) a. \* I met a man, *to Mary*, I might recommend (as a date).  
 b. \* I bought a dress, *to Mary*, I could give (as a present).

Pied-piping of prepositions is not permitted with  $\emptyset$ . Therefore, if argument fronting were possible at all, we would expect PP fronted arguments to be possible, as they were with *that*-RCs. Since PP fronted arguments are impossible, I conclude that argument fronting is generally impossible in finite  $\emptyset$ -RCs.

Argument negative preposing behaves in exactly the same way.

- (61) a. \* I met a man, *no woman* would I ever recommend to (as a date).  
 b. \* I bought a dress, *no woman* would I ever give to (as a present).
- (62) a. \* I met a man, *to no woman* would I ever recommend (as a date).  
 b. \* I bought a dress, *to no woman* would I ever give (as a present).

### 3.4 Infinitival *wh*-RCs

Argument fronting is not permitted in infinitival *wh*-RCs (regardless of whether *for* is present or not), even if the fronted argument is a DP. Since infinitival *wh*-RCs obligatorily involve pied-piping of a preposition, if argument fronting were possible at all, we would expect DP fronted arguments to be possible. Since they are not, I conclude that argument fronting is generally impossible in infinitival *wh*-RCs.

- (63) a. \* I found an ideal venue in which, *Mary*, to propose to.  
b. \* I found an ideal venue in which, *Mary*, for you to propose to.  
c. \* I found an ideal venue in which for you, *Mary*, to propose to.
- (64) a. \* I found an ideal venue in which, *to Mary*, to propose.  
b. \* I found an ideal venue in which, *to Mary*, for you to propose.  
c. \* I found an ideal venue in which for you, *to Mary*, to propose.

Similarly, argument negative preposing is not permitted (regardless of whether *for* is present or not, and regardless of whether the fronted argument is a PP or a DP).

- (65) a. \* This is a place in which, *no man*, to ever give one's real name to.  
b. \* This is a place in which, *no man*, for you to ever give your real name to.  
c. \* This is a place in which for you, *no man*, to ever give your real name to.
- (66) a. \* This is a place in which, *to no man*, to ever give one's real name.  
b. \* This is a place in which, *to no man*, for you to ever give your real name.  
c. \* This is a place in which for you, *to no man*, to ever give your real name.

### 3.5 Infinitival *for*-RCs

As with infinitival *wh*-RCs, argument fronting is not permitted in infinitival *for*-RCs at all, regardless of whether the fronted argument is a DP or a PP.

- (67) a. \* I found an ideal venue, *Mary*, for you to propose to in.  
b. \* I found an ideal venue for you, *Mary*, to propose to in.

- (68) a. \* I found an ideal venue, *to Mary*, for you to propose in.  
 b. \* I found an ideal venue for you, *to Mary*, to propose in.

The same applies to argument negative preposing.

- (69) a. \* I saw a venue, *no woman*, for one to propose to in.  
 b. \* I saw a venue for one, *no woman*, to propose to in.  
 (70) a. \* I saw a venue, *to no woman*, for one to propose in.  
 b. \* I saw a venue for one, *to no woman*, to propose in.

### 3.6 Infinitival $\emptyset$ -RCs

Finally, as with all other infinitival RCs so far, argument fronting is not permitted in infinitival  $\emptyset$ -RCs, regardless of whether the fronted argument is a DP or a PP.

- (71) \* I found an ideal venue, *Mary*, to propose to in.  
 (72) \* I found an ideal venue, *to Mary*, to propose in.

The same applies to argument negative preposing.

- (73) \* I saw a venue, *no woman*, for one to propose to in.  
 (74) \* I saw a venue, *to no woman*, for one to propose in.

### 3.7 Summary

Argument fronting is permitted in finite *wh*-RCs and *that*-RCs, and is prohibited in finite  $\emptyset$ -RCs and all infinitival RCs. Where argument fronting is permitted, it is subject to a categorial distinctness effect. The relative pronoun (or relative operator in the case of *that*-RCs) and fronted argument cannot both be DPs. If one is a DP, the other must be a PP. Exactly the same pattern is found with argument negative preposing.

## 4 Analysis and discussion

### 4.1 The distribution of adverbial and argument fronting

Putting the conclusions from §2 and §3 together, we have the empirical situation regarding the distribution of adverbial and argument fronting in English RCs shown in Table 15.2 (note that the terms *adverbial fronting* and *argument fronting* will now be used to cover their negative preposing counterparts as well).

Table 15.2: Distribution of adverbial and argument fronting in full clausal RCs in English. ✓: allowed; (✓): allowed subject to restrictions; \*: not allowed.

	Finite			Infinitival		
	<i>wh</i> -RCs	<i>that</i> -RCs	∅-RCs	<i>wh</i> -RCs	<i>for</i> -RCs	∅-RCs
Adverbial fronting	✓	✓	*	✓	*	*
Argument fronting	(✓)	(✓)	*	*	*	*

I propose that this distribution can be captured by positing (at least) three distinct sizes of RC in English, which I will describe in cartographic terms. Rizzi (2004: 242) proposes the following articulation of the C-domain (\* here means “iterable”):

(75) Force > Top\* > Int > Top\* > Focus > Mod\* > Top\* > Fin > IP

SpecTopP hosts topic phrases, SpecFocusP hosts focus phrases, SpecIntP hosts high *wh*-elements such as Italian *perché* ‘why’, and SpecModP hosts fronted adverbials in all but “very special discourse contexts” (Rizzi 2004). I will adopt the simplified version in (76).

(76) Force > Top > Foc > Mod\* > Fin > IP

The reasons for this simplification are: (i) I am not concerned with Int; (ii) English does not permit multiple topics (see Haegeman 2012 and references therein); and (iii) English topics can never follow foci (see Haegeman 2012 and references therein). Fronted arguments can be topics or foci. Below, I will address the issue of whether the fronted argument in RCs is a topic or a focus.

I am now in a position to account for the distribution of argument fronting and adverbial fronting in RCs. In brief, I propose that finite *wh*-RCs and *that*-RCs are TopPs, infinitival *wh*-RCs are FocPs, and finite ∅-RCs, infinitival *for*-RCs and infinitival ∅-RCs are FinPs (or alternatively, unsplit CPs). This proposal is summarised in Table 15.3.

FinPs are too small to contain TopP, FocP or ModP. Consequently, they permit neither argument nor adverbial fronting. In finite ∅-RCs, Fin is ∅, whilst in infinitival *for*-RCs, Fin is lexicalised as *for*, in line with previous proposals (Haegeman 2012; Radford 2009b; Rizzi 1997). If infinitival ∅-RCs are FinPs, Fin is also ∅ in these cases. FocPs contain ModP, so permit adverbial fronting. Argument fronting is not permitted because FocP is too small to contain TopP and because



Table 15.3: RC structures

	Finite <i>wh</i> -RCs	Finite <i>that</i> -RCs	Infinitival <i>wh</i> -RCs	Finite $\emptyset$ -RCs	Infinitival <i>for</i> -RCs	Infinitival $\emptyset$ -RCs
Adverbial fronting	✓	✓	✓	*	*	*
Argument fronting	(✓)	(✓)	*	*	*	*
Structural size	TopP		FocP	FinP (or unsplit CP)		

relativisation in infinitival *wh*-RCs targets SpecFocP. Finally, TopPs contain FocP and ModP. Consequently, they permit argument fronting (focus fronting) and adverbial fronting. I assume that Top is lexicalised as *that* in *that*-RCs, but is  $\emptyset$  in finite *wh*-RCs (where the *wh*-relative pronoun occupies SpecTopP). In the following subsections, I will expand on and discuss various aspects of this proposal.

## 4.2 FinP RCs

There is potentially a size difference between finite  $\emptyset$ -RCs and infinitival *for*-RCs on the one hand, and infinitival  $\emptyset$ -RCs on the other. The evidence comes from accessibility in the sense of Keenan & Comrie (1977), i.e. the grammatical functions that can be relativised. Finite  $\emptyset$ -RCs and infinitival *for*-RCs can relativise any argument (except the subject), including arguments embedded inside (finite) clauses. Infinitival  $\emptyset$ -RCs can also relativise any argument (including the subject), but cannot relativise out of an embedded finite clause (Longenbaugh 2016), at least for some speakers.<sup>7</sup> This is shown in the following examples (the (e) and (f) examples in (77) to (79) are taken or adapted from Longenbaugh 2016).

### (77) Finite $\emptyset$ -RCs

- a. \* I found a man can fix the sink.
- b. I found a sink you can fix.
- c. I found a woman you can give a present to.
- d. I found a boy you can force to run faster.
- e. I found a play you can prove was written by Shakespeare.
- f. I found a play you can prove (that) Shakespeare wrote.

<sup>7</sup>I have found the judgements of (79e,f) to be somewhat variable.

(78) Infinitival *for*-RCs

- a. \* I found a man for to fix the sink.
- b. I found a sink for you to fix.
- c. I found a woman for you to give a present to.
- d. I found a boy for you to force to run faster.
- e. I found a play for you to prove was written by Shakespeare.
- f. I found a play for you to prove (that) Shakespeare wrote.

(79) Infinitival  $\emptyset$ -RCs

- a. I found a man to fix the sink.
- b. I found a sink to fix.
- c. I found a woman to give a present to.
- d. I found a boy to force to run faster.
- e. \* I found a play to prove was written by Shakespeare.
- f. ?\* I found a play to prove (that) Shakespeare wrote.

If this is correct, infinitival  $\emptyset$ -RCs seem to exhibit  $A'$ -properties in that arguments can be relativised without higher arguments intervening with such movement, as well as  $A$ -properties in that such movement is clause-bound (at least for some speakers), as shown by the ungrammaticality of relativising an element from an embedded finite clause in (79e, f). In contrast, finite  $\emptyset$ -RCs and infinitival *for*-RCs exhibit  $A'$ -properties. Longenbaugh (2016) suggests that the hybrid  $A'/A$ -properties are the result of a composite probe, i.e. one seeking both  $A$ - and  $A'$ -related features. One could hypothesise that, if a  $C$ -domain is absent, both  $A$ - and  $A'$ -features are present on  $T$ , whilst if a  $C$ -domain is present, the  $A$ -features are on  $T$  and the  $A'$ -features in the  $C$ -domain. If this is correct, this suggests the following three things. First, finite  $\emptyset$ -RCs, infinitival *for*-RCs and infinitival  $\emptyset$ -RCs all lack the requisite structure to host fronted adverbials and fronted arguments, i.e. their  $C$ -domains contain no structure higher than  $\text{FinP}$ . Second, finite  $\emptyset$ -RCs and infinitival *for*-RCs do have at least some portion of the  $C$ -domain. Third, infinitival  $\emptyset$ -RCs may lack a  $C$ -domain altogether.

### 4.3 FocP RCs

According to my proposal, infinitival *wh*-RCs do not permit argument fronting because relativisation and argument fronting would be competing for the same position, namely  $\text{SpecFocP}$ . However, it has also been claimed in the literature that argument fronting is generally impossible in infinitival clauses (see Bianchi

1999: 206–208). Evidence comes from the impossibility of argument fronting in raising and control infinitivals (Haegeman 2012: 67–68; see also Hooper & Thompson 1973: 484–485).

(80) Hooper & Thompson (1973: 485)

- a. \* My friends tend, the more liberal candidates, to support.
- b. \* I have decided, your book, to read.

Argument fronting is also prohibited in ECM complements (Haegeman 2012: Ch. 2, note 20).

(81) Culicover & Levine (2001: 297, fn. 14)

- a. \* I really want, that solution, Robin to explore thoroughly.
- b. \* Police believe, the London area, the suspect to have left.

However, this evidence does not rule out structural size being relevant since these infinitival clauses could themselves be too small to host fronted arguments. Instead, we need to test an infinitival clause that is independently considered to be quite large. If argument fronting is impossible in such cases, this is evidence that argument fronting is simply impossible in infinitival clauses regardless of their size. However, if argument fronting is possible, it suggests that structural size does play a role in the availability of argument fronting. In this respect, consider embedded questions. It is typically said that *wh*-phrases in embedded finite contexts target a higher position in the left periphery (SpecForceP) than in matrix contexts (SpecFocP) (see Haegeman 2012; Pesetsky 1995), thereby capturing the observation that matrix *wh*-phrases follow topics but embedded *wh*-phrases precede them. The high position of *wh*-phrases in embedded clauses is potentially related to clause-typing (Cheng 1991). Now, assuming that *wh*-phrases in embedded infinitival questions also occupy a high left peripheral position for clause-typing, observe that argument fronting seems to be possible. The examples may not be perfect, but they certainly seem better than those in (80) and (81).

- (82) a. ? John didn't know what, to Mary especially, to say at a time like that.  
 b. ? I asked to whom, this particular form, to give so that it would be processed promptly.

Therefore, it seems that argument fronting is not incompatible with infinitival contexts per se (pace Bianchi 1999), and I thus conclude that infinitival *wh*-RCs do not permit argument fronting because they are structurally too small and not because they are infinitival.

Finally, a potential problem is that infinitival *wh*-RCs do not seem to be necessarily associated with focus interpretations (Luigi Rizzi, p.c.). This may be due to us erroneously associating the lowest position for fronted arguments in the C-domain with SpecFocP. The crucial proposal that I am making is that infinitival *wh*-RCs have only a single position for fronted arguments in their left-periphery. This is targeted by relativisation and hence blocks all other argument fronting. If it turns out that there is a position for fronted arguments below FocP (see Douglas 2016: 83, fn. 15), what I have been calling FocP RCs would actually be slightly smaller than FocP. However, the essence of the present proposal would remain unaffected.

#### 4.4 TopP RCs

I now return to finite *wh*-RCs and *that*-RCs, which I have proposed are TopPs. This proposal makes several (correct) predictions. First, if relativisation targets SpecTopP, we predict that there is only a single position left for argument fronting. Thus, we expect multiple argument fronting to be permitted in non-RC contexts, but only single argument fronting in RC contexts. This prediction is borne out. English permits multiple fronted arguments in non-RC contexts always in the order topic–focus (Culicover 1991; Haegeman 2012).<sup>8</sup>

(83) That book, *to John* Mary gave in 1979.

However, it is extremely difficult if not impossible to have multiple fronted arguments within RCs.

(84) \* the year in which, that book, *to John* Mary gave

Alternatively, the difficulty with multiple argument fronting in RCs may be due to the categorial distinctness effect, i.e. it may simply be too difficult to front two arguments and relativise an element whilst simultaneously respecting categorial distinctness. To tease these two options apart, I will consider a second prediction made by the present analysis.

My analysis predicts that fronted arguments in finite *wh*- and *that*-RCs will target SpecFocP, i.e. the fronted argument will be a focus rather than a topic. On a hypothetical alternative analysis, multiple argument fronting is allowed in principle but ruled out by categorial distinctness. This means that a single fronted

---

<sup>8</sup>The standard claim is that multiple topics are not permitted in English (Haegeman 2012 and references therein), and that multiple foci are not permitted generally (Haegeman 2012; Rizzi 1997).

argument could be either a focus or a topic in principle. To distinguish these two hypotheses, we must thus ask whether the fronted argument behaves like a topic at all. The empirical situation is difficult, but overall the fronted argument in RCs seems to be a focus rather than a topic, as will be shown below, thereby supporting our analysis rather than the hypothetical alternative.

I will apply two of Rizzi's (1997) topic/focus diagnostics. Rizzi shows that foci exhibit weak crossover (WCO) whilst topics do not. As the following data show, the fronted argument always seems to be sensitive to WCO suggesting that it must be a focus and cannot be a topic (the judgements may be quite subtle in some cases).

- (85) a. ?\* the school to which, John Smith<sub>i</sub> his<sub>i</sub> mother is planning to send  
 b. the school to which, John Smith Mary is planning to send
- (86) a. ? the person to whom, this book<sub>i</sub> its<sub>i</sub> author is happy to give for free  
 b. the person to whom, this book Mary is happy to give for free

As a second diagnostic, Rizzi (1997) notes that topics can be resumed by resumptive pronouns, but foci cannot (at least in Italian). Although English does not typically make use of resumptive pronouns (unless with hanging topics or to repair certain island violations), it seems that the fronted argument is not very readily resumed by a resumptive pronoun. In fact, it seems more acceptable to resume the RC head (or relative pronoun) than the fronted argument (recall footnote 5). This suggests that the fronted argument must be a focus and cannot be a topic. Consider the following contrasts:

- (87) a. ?\* a man to whom, *unfettered liberty* we would never grant *it*  
 b. ? a man *to whom*, *unfettered liberty* we would never grant *to him*
- (88) a. ?\* a man to whom, *this book* Mary would happily give *it*  
 b. ? a man *to whom*, *this book* Mary would happily give *to him*

Although none of these considerations are conclusive in isolation, they nevertheless both seem to converge on the conclusion that argument fronting in English RCs is always focalisation and never topicalisation. This in turn suggests that the ban on multiple argument fronting in RCs in English, as in (84), is due to the idea that SpecTopP is targeted by relativisation and so cannot be targeted by topicalisation as well. This thus suggests that relativisation and topicalisation compete for the same position, i.e. SpecTopP. This formally captures the long-standing intuition that relativisation and topicalisation are intimately related (see Abels

2012; Bianchi 1999; Kuno 1973; 1976; Williams 2011) and could in fact suggest that topicalisation feeds relativisation in English and other languages (see Douglas 2016 for discussion of English and Malagasy in this respect).

The third prediction made by our analysis concerns the categorial distinctness effect. As seen above, this effect holds between the fronted argument and the relative pronoun/operator, i.e. between the constituents in SpecFocP and SpecTopP. If this is correct, we might also expect to find the categorial distinctness effect between foci and topics more generally. This is indeed what we find.

- (89) a. This present, *to Mary* I would give.  
b. \* This present, *Mary* I would give to.
- (90) a. To *Mary*, *this present* I would give.  
b. \* *Mary*, *this present* I would give to.

(89) shows that, if the topic phrase is a DP, the focus phrase cannot be a DP, as in (89b), and must be a PP, as in (89a). (90) shows that, if the focus phrase is a DP, the topic phrase cannot be a DP, as in (90b), and must be a PP, as in (90a). As far as I am aware, this is a novel observation and lends independent and important support to our proposal.

Finally, our analysis is able to incorporate Richards's (2010) idea of why the relative pronoun in infinitival *wh*-RCs obligatorily pied-pipes a preposition in English.

- (91) Infinitival *wh*-RCs
- a. \* the man *whom* to talk to  
b. the man *to whom* to talk

Richards (2010) proposes that this is due to a categorial distinctness effect between the *wh*-relative pronoun and the external determiner of the RC head. Richards (2010: 35) provides the following schematic structures:

- (92) Infinitival *wh*-RCs
- a. \* [<sub>DP</sub> D [<sub>NP</sub> N=RC head [<sub>CP</sub> [<sub>DP</sub> *wh*-relative pronoun ] [<sub>C'</sub> C [<sub>TP</sub> ...]]]]]]  
b. [<sub>DP</sub> D [<sub>NP</sub> N=RC head [<sub>CP</sub> [<sub>PP</sub> P [<sub>DP</sub> *wh*-relative pronoun ] ] [<sub>C'</sub> C [<sub>TP</sub> ...]]]]]]

According to Richards, D and N are not phase heads. Consequently, the DP relative pronoun and the external determiner D in (92a) are linearised in the same spellout domain. This yields the linearisation statement ⟨D,D⟩ (amongst others).

However, because the two D's are non-distinct,  $\langle D, D \rangle$  is uninterpretable at the interfaces by hypothesis. This is the categorial distinctness effect and accounts for the ungrammaticality of (91a). In (92b), however, the DP relative pronoun is embedded in a PP (where P is a phase head). Consequently, the external determiner D and the DP relative pronoun are linearised in separate spellout domains so the problematic  $\langle D, D \rangle$  statement never arises and (91b) is grammatical.

Richards (2010) highlights that his structures in (92) simply serve to illustrate his proposal; they are not integral to it. Consequently, I adapt the structures in (92) to those in (93) to be more consistent with our conclusions and assumptions.

(93) Infinitival *wh*-RCs

- a. \*  $[_{DP} D [_{TopP} [_{DP} RC\ head] Top [_{FocP} [_{DP} wh\text{-relative pronoun}] Foc [_{FinP} Fin [_{TP} \dots]]]]]$
- b.  $[_{DP} D [_{TopP} [_{DP} RC\ head] Top [_{FocP} [_{PP} P [_{DP} wh\text{-relative pronoun}]] Foc [_{FinP} Fin [_{TP} \dots]]]]]$

Following Borsley (1997) and Bianchi (2000), I analyse the RC head as a DP phrase (rather than as an N head, as in 92). In this way, the categorial distinctness effect arises because the DP relative pronoun and the DP RC head are linearised in the same spellout domain, i.e. the categorial distinctness effect is a relation between two phrases rather than between two heads, as in (92).

Now, recall that I argued independently on the basis of the distribution of adverbial and argument fronting that infinitival *wh*-RCs are FocPs. In (93), I have shown the RC head as being in SpecTopP. This can be interpreted under the raising analysis of RCs (see especially Bianchi 1999; 2000) if one assumes that the RC head is subextracted out of the relative pronoun DP, or under the matching analysis if one assumes that the RC head can be base-generated in SpecTopP (see Douglas 2016 for discussion). What is interesting for present purposes is that, once again, the categorial distinctness effect holds between the constituents in SpecFocP and SpecTopP. According to Richards's (2010) account, this would mean that Top is not a phase head. If it were, the constituent in SpecTopP and the one in SpecFocP would be in different spellout domains and we would not expect any categorial distinctness effect, contrary to fact.<sup>9</sup>

Why does the RC head in finite *wh*-RCs not exhibit categorial distinctness effects with the relative pronoun?

<sup>9</sup>Note that, if this is correct, it would suggest that the C-domain is not a dynamic phase domain (in the sense of Bošković 2014; Harwood 2015), i.e. it cannot be the case that the highest head in the C-domain (whatever it may be) is necessarily phasal (in fact, Bošković 2014 explicitly leaves the C-domain out of his discussion of dynamic phases). If it were, we would expect the Top head in infinitival *wh*-RCs to be a phase head.

- (94) Finite *wh*-RCs
- a. the man *whom* I should speak to
  - b. the man *to whom* I should speak

The answer that our analysis provides is that the relative pronoun is located in SpecTopP in such cases and the RC head is higher, i.e. in SpecForceP, as schematised in (95).

- (95) Finite *wh*-RCs
- a. [<sub>DP</sub> D [<sub>ForceP</sub> [<sub>DP</sub> RC head] Force [<sub>TopP</sub> [<sub>DP</sub> *wh*-relative pronoun] Top [<sub>FocP</sub> Foc [<sub>FinP</sub> Fin [TP ...]]]]]]
  - b. [<sub>DP</sub> D [<sub>ForceP</sub> [<sub>DP</sub> RC head] Force [<sub>TopP</sub> [<sub>PP</sub> P [<sub>DP</sub> *wh*-relative pronoun]] Top [<sub>FocP</sub> Foc [<sub>FinP</sub> Fin [TP ...]]]]]]

In other words, whilst there is a categorial distinctness effect between constituents in SpecFocP and SpecTopP, there is no such effect between constituents in SpecTopP and SpecForceP. Again, on Richards's (2010) account, this would suggest that Force *is* a phase head. As a result, the constituents in SpecForceP and SpecTopP would be in different spellout domains and no categorial distinctness effect would arise between them, i.e. if the constituent in SpecForceP is a DP, the constituent in SpecTopP can be either a PP, as in (95b), or a DP, as in (95a).

I have thus argued that infinitival *wh*-RCs are FocPs with the RC head being located in SpecTopP, and the finite *wh*-RCs are TopPs with the RC head being located in SpecForceP. This analysis allows us to give a uniform analysis of the categorial distinctness effects in the three contexts identified above: (i) between topics and foci in non-RC contexts, (ii) between relative pronouns and fronted foci in finite *wh*-RCs, and (iii) between the RC head and relative pronouns in infinitival *wh*-RCs. This brings our proposal very close to the configurations proposed by Bianchi (1999; 2000; 2004). However, whilst Bianchi proposes that the RC head moves into SpecTopP or SpecForceP, i.e. a head raising analysis of RCs, I believe that there are various reasons for adopting a matching analysis of RCs instead whereby the RC head is base-generated in SpecTopP or SpecForceP rather than moving into these positions (see Douglas 2016: Ch. 2 for details and discussion). Although it might be unorthodox to posit that the RC head in a matching analysis is base-generated in a high C-domain position, Chierchia (2016) has recently proposed that the crucial property of A-positions is that they are positions that introduce discourse markers. This applies to theta-positions and the EPP-subject position, but also to certain discourse-based positions such as topic positions. This potentially provides a rationale for why the RC head may



be base-generated in SpecTopP (self-evidently a topic position). Whether it can be extended to SpecForceP is a matter I leave for future research.

I have proposed that the restrictions on argument fronting found in finite *wh*-RCs manifest the categorial distinctness effect found more generally between the constituents in SpecTopP and SpecFocP in English. Recall that the categorial distinctness effect I have been considering effectively restricts the distribution of fronted DP arguments, i.e. I have said that two fronted arguments cannot both be DPs. What about PPs? If the effect is really one of categorial distinctness, we would predict that two fronted arguments cannot both be PPs either. However, PPs do not seem to be sensitive to the categorial distinctness effect. Recall (44), repeated as (96) below:

(96) I met a man *with whom, about linguistics*, I could talk all day.

In (96), the relative pronoun and *linguistics* have both pied-piped a preposition resulting in two fronted PPs in the C-domain. Totsuka (2014) concludes on the basis of such examples that there is *no* categorial distinctness effect between the relative pronoun and the fronted argument, contrary to what I have demonstrated for DPs (Totsuka does not discuss the data I have been concerned with though). However, there is a serious question about whether *about linguistics* is an argument PP as opposed to a fronted adverbial PP (see Rizzi 1997: 294, 322–325). Although it is difficult to front a lot of material simultaneously in English, it at least seems marginally possible to front the RC subject in an example like (97).

(97) ? I met a man with whom, *Mary*, about linguistics, could talk all day.

Crucially, both the focussed subject DP and the PP *about linguistics* can co-occur suggesting that they are not competing for the same position (by hypothesis, SpecFocP). This suggests that the PP *about linguistics* is lower than FocP, plausibly in SpecModP. In fact, given the difficulty of finding multiple PP arguments with any single predicate in English, it may be that the fronted “argument” PP in all examples like (96) is in fact a fronted adverbial PP.

Finally, I return to the issue of categorial distinctness effects in finite *that*-RCs, illustrated in (53) and (54), repeated below.

- (98) a. I bought a dress that, *to Mary*, I might consider giving (as a present).  
 b. I bought a dress that, *to Mary*, could be given (as a present).  
 c. I bought a car that, *to children*, would give hours of entertainment.

- (99) a. \* I bought a dress that, *Mary*, I might consider giving to (as a present).  
b. \* I bought a dress that, *Mary*, could be given to (as a present).  
c. \* I bought a car that, *children*, would give hours of entertainment to.

This pattern can be straightforwardly assimilated to the pattern in finite *wh*-RCs if *that* is analysed as a relative pronoun rather than a complementiser, except that unlike the *wh*-relative pronouns it cannot pied-pipe a preposition (see, e.g., Kayne 2014). However, there are dialects of English where both a relative pronoun and *that* can co-occur (see Trotta 2004: 6) suggesting that *that* is not a relative pronoun and is in fact a complementiser.

If *that* is a complementiser, we can hypothesise that the fronted argument is interacting with the null relative operator in finite *that*-RCs, which (for whatever reason) is always a DP, never a PP. This is potentially problematic for Richards's (2010) approach to categorial distinctness, according to which categorial distinctness effects arise when linearisation statements involve two non-distinct categories. If one of those elements does not require linearisation, e.g. if it is unpronounced, Richards suggests that there will be no distinctness effect. For example, Richards proposes that traces (or the unpronounced copies in a movement chain) do not count for linearisation because the system can tell *pre-linearisation* that such elements will be null. If we wish to maintain Richards's system for finite *that*-RCs, the system must not be able to tell that the relative operator in finite *that*-RCs is going to be null until after the linearisation statements have been calculated. The raising analysis would have trouble accounting for this under Richards's system since the relative operator is a trace/copy, whilst the matching analysis could capture this if the relative operator becomes null post-syntactically (see Douglas 2016 for further discussion of the raising and matching analyses).

## 5 Conclusion

I have reached the conclusion that the different types of clausal RCs in English systematically differ in structural size. This accounts for the various fronting possibilities. Finite *wh*- and *that*-RCs are the largest: they can host fronted adverbials and fronted focussed arguments. Infinitival *wh*-RCs are the next largest: they can host fronted adverbials but not fronted arguments. Finite  $\emptyset$ -, infinitival *for*- and infinitival  $\emptyset$ -RCs are the smallest: they do not permit fronting of any kind. This is summarised in Table 15.4.

I argued that argument fronting in finite *wh*- and *that*-RCs is focalisation, not topicalisation. I suggested that topicalisation in these RCs is ruled out because relativisation and topicalisation compete for the same structural position. Similarly,

Table 15.4: Summary of RC structures

	Finite <i>wh</i> -RCs	Finite <i>that</i> -RCs	Infinitival <i>wh</i> -RCs	Finite $\emptyset$ -RCs	Infinitival <i>for</i> -RCs	Infinitival $\emptyset$ -RCs
Adverbial fronting	✓	✓	✓	*	*	*
Argument fronting	(✓)	(✓)	*	*	*	*
Structural size	TopP		FocP	FinP (or unsplit CP)		FinP/TP

I suggested that focalisation in infinitival *wh*-RCs is ruled out because focalisation and relativisation compete for the same structural position. I thus concluded that finite *wh*- and *that*-RCs are TopPs, whilst infinitival *wh*-RCs are FocPs. I also proposed that the other types of RC are FinPs (or unsplit CPs), i.e. they have a C-domain with a single C head, or, in the case of infinitival  $\emptyset$ -RCs, perhaps no C-domain at all.

I also observed that English exhibits a categorial distinctness effect in the C-domain in (at least) three environments: (i) between the relative pronoun/operator and fronted (focussed) argument in finite *wh*- and *that*-RCs; (ii) between topic and focus in non-RC contexts; and (iii) between the RC head and relative pronoun/operator in infinitival *wh*-RCs (following Richards 2010). I proposed that these are three instances of a single effect, namely the categorial distinctness effect between topic and focus in English, and that relativisation and topicalisation are formally similar (at least in finite RCs).

## Abbreviations

ECM	exceptional case marking	RC	relative clause
EPP	extended projection principle	WCO	weak crossover

## Acknowledgements

I wish to thank Ian Roberts, Theresa Biberauer, Luigi Rizzi, Guglielmo Cinque, David Willis, and the audience of SynCart 1 (Chiusi, 2016) for helpful feedback and comments on this work. This paper is adapted from Chapter 3 of my thesis, which was supervised by Ian Roberts at the University of Cambridge. I gratefully

acknowledge the AHRC grant no. 04271 and the ERC grant no. 269752 (*Rethinking comparative syntax*).

## References

- Abels, Klaus. 2012. The Italian left periphery: A view from locality. *Linguistic Inquiry* 43(2). 229–254. DOI: 10.1162/LING\_a\_00084.
- Bak, Sung-Yun. 1984. Why not a topic in a relative clause? *Language Research* 20(2). 163–180.
- Baltin, Mark R. 1982. A landing site theory of movement rules. *Linguistic Inquiry* 13(1). 1–38.
- Bhatt, Rajesh. 1999. *Covert modality in non-finite contexts*. University of Pennsylvania. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Bianchi, Valentina. 1999. *Consequences of antisymmetry: Headed relative clauses*. Berlin: De Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/9783110803372.
- Bianchi, Valentina. 2000. The raising analysis of relative clauses: A reply to Borsley. *Linguistic Inquiry* 31(1). 123–140. DOI: 10.1162/002438900554316.
- Bianchi, Valentina. 2004. Resumptive relatives and LF chains. In Luigi Rizzi (ed.), *The structure of CP and IP* (The Cartography of syntactic Structures 2), 76–114. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Borsley, Robert D. 1997. Relative clauses and the theory of phrase structure. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28(4). 629–647.
- Bošković, Željko. 1994. Categorical status of null operator relatives and finite declarative complements. *Language Research* 30(2). 387–417.
- Bošković, Željko. 1996. Selection and the categorial status of nonfinite complements. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 14(2). 269–304. DOI: 10.1007/BF00133685.
- Bošković, Željko. 1997. *The syntax of nonfinite complementation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bošković, Željko. 2014. Now I'm a phase, now I'm not a phase: On the variability of phases with extraction and ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 45(1). 27–89. DOI: 10.1162/LING\_a\_00148.
- Bošković, Željko. 2016. What is sent to spell-out is phases, not phasal complements. *Linguistica* 56(1). 25–66. DOI: 10.4312/linguistica.56.1.25-66.
- Cheng, Lisa Lai-shen. 1991. *On the typology of wh-questions*. MIT. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Chierchia, Gennaro. 2016. *Weak crossover: A “dynamic” explanation?* Paper presented at 1st SynCart Workshop, Chiusi, 14th July.

- Chomsky, Noam. 1977. On wh-movement. In Peter W. Culicover, Thomas Wasow & Adrian Akmajian (eds.), *Formal syntax*, 71–132. New York: Academic Press.
- Chomsky, Noam & Howard Lasnik. 1977. Filters and Control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8(3). 425–504.
- Culicover, Peter W. 1991. Topicalization, inversion and complementizers in English. In Denis Delfitto, Martin Everaert, Arnold Evers & Frits Stuurman (eds.), *Going romance and beyond*, 1–45. Utrecht: University of Utrecht.
- Culicover, Peter W. & Robert D. Levine. 2001. Stylistic inversion in english: A reconsideration. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 19(2). 283–310. DOI: 10.1023/A:1010646417840.
- den Dikken, Marcel. 2005. A comment on the topic of topic-comment. *Lingua* 115(5). 691–710. DOI: 10.1016/j.lingua.2003.11.005.
- Doherty, Cathal. 1993. *Clauses without that: The case for bare sentential complementation in English*. University of California, Santa Cruz. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Doherty, Cathal. 2000. *Clauses without “that”: The case for bare sentential complementation in English*. New York: Garland.
- Douglas, Jamie. 2016. *The syntactic structures of relativisation*. University of Cambridge. (Doctoral dissertation). <http://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/003182>.
- Haegeman, Liliane. 2012. *Adverbial clauses, main clause phenomena, and the composition of the left periphery* (The Cartography of Syntactic Structures 8). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harris, Martin & Nigel Vincent. 1980. On zero relatives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11(4). 805–807.
- Harwood, William. 2015. Being progressive is just a phase: Celebrating the uniqueness of progressive aspect under a phase-based analysis. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 33(2). 523–573. DOI: 10.1007/s11049-014-9267-3.
- Harwood, William. 2017. Reduced relatives and extended phases: A phase-based analysis of the inflectional restrictions on English reduced relative clauses. *Studia Linguistica* 72(2). 428–471. DOI: 10.1111/stul.12069.
- Henry, Alison. 1995. *Belfast English and Standard English: Dialect variation and parameter setting*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hooper, Joan B. & Sandra A. Thompson. 1973. On the applicability of root transformations. *Linguistic Inquiry* 4(4). 465–497.
- Huddleston, Rodney, Geoffrey K. Pullum & Peter G. Peterson. 2002. Relative constructions and unbounded dependencies. In Rodney Huddleston & Geoffrey K. Pullum (eds.), *The Cambridge grammar of the English language*, 1031–1096. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Kayne, Richard S. 2014. Why isn't *this* a complementizer? In Peter Svenonius (ed.), *Functional structure from top to toe* (The Cartography of Syntactic Structures 9), 188–231. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Keenan, Edward L. & Bernard Comrie. 1977. Noun phrase accessibility and universal grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8(1). 63–99.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1973. *The structure of the Japanese language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1976. Subject, theme and speaker's empathy: A re-examination of relativization phenomena. In Charles N. Li (ed.), *Subject and topic*, 417–444. New York: Academic Press.
- Lambrecht, Knud. 1988. There was a farmer had a dog: Syntactic amalgams revisited. *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*. 319–339. DOI: 10.3765/bls.v14i0.1796.
- Longenbaugh, Nicholas. 2016. Difficult movement. Paper presented at GLOW 39, April 5–8, University of Göttingen.
- McCawley, James D. 1998. *The syntactic phenomena of English*. Second edition. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Pesetsky, David. 1995. *Zero syntax: Experiencers and cascades*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Radford, Andrew. 2009a. *An introduction to English sentence structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Radford, Andrew. 2009b. *Analysing English sentences: A minimalist approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, Norvin. 2010. *Uttering trees*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In Liliane Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of grammar*, 281–337. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 2004. Locality and left periphery. In Adriana Belletti (ed.), *Structures and beyond* (The Cartography of Syntactic Structures 3), 223–251. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Totsuka, Masashi. 2014. On syntactic distinctness and phase head in English relative clause. *文化* 77(3/4). 74–88.
- Trotta, Joe. 2004. *Comments on vacuous subject movement*. Halmstad University. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Weisler, Steven. 1980. The syntax of *that*-less relatives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11(3). 624–631.
- Williams, Edwin. 2011. *Regimes of derivation in syntax and morphology*. London: Routledge.