

ON CHINESE APPOSITIVE RELATIVE CLAUSES

Francesca Del Gobbo

Ca'Foscari University of Venice, Italy/University of Southern California

E-mail: fdelgobb@unive.it/fdelgobb@usc.edu

Cinque (2006), on the basis of evidence from Italian, shows that there exist two types of Appositive Relative Clauses (henceforth, ARCs): integrated and non-integrated ones. English can only have non-integrated ones. In this talk I claim that Chinese ARCs are adjectival (Del Gobbo 2004, 2005) in the sense that they can only be integrated ones, and I propose that the typological difference is due to the type of relative pronoun and to linear order.

Cinque (2006) proposes a unified syntactic analysis of RCs, whereby RCs originate prenominaly; and both matching and raising are needed:

(1) [_{DP} the [_{CP} that [[_{IP} John bought [_{dP₂} expensive book]] [_{dP₁} [[_{AP} expensive] [_{NP} book]]]]]]]

From the basic structure represented in (1), a raising structure is obtained by raising dP_2 , and by PF deletion of dP_1 ; a matching structure, by raising of both dP_1 and dP_2 and PF deletion of dP_2 .

Following Cinque (2006), I propose the following matching structure for Chinese RCs:

(2) [_{DP} D [_{CP₃} [_{CP₁} [_{IP} wo xihuan t_{dP₂}] de t_{IP} [_{dP₁} xiaohuozi]] [_{CP₂} [_{dP₂} ~~xiaohuozi~~ t_{CP₁}]]]]]
I like DE guy guy
'the guy I like'

The structure in (2) is obtained by first raising dP_2 (to account for island effects), then raising CP_1 . The absence of reconstruction effects is captured by the fact that the 'head' is not directly linked to the trace within IP. I assume that PF deletion of dP_2 is allowed by cyclic c-command (Huang 1982). For cases of raising, I instead propose the following structure:

(3) [_{DP} D [_{CP₃} [_{CP₁} [_{IP} ta chi t_{dP₂}] de t_{IP} [_{dP₁} ~~ta~~]] [_{CP₂} [_{dP₂} cu] t_{CP₁}]]]]]
he eat DE vinegar vinegar
'his jealousy'

The structure in (3) is obtained by raising dP_2 (to account for island effects). After dP_2 raises, it c-commands dP_1 , thereby allowing its deletion at PF. Only afterwards, CP_1 raises. The presence of reconstruction effects is captured by the fact that the 'head' is directly linked to the trace within IP.

Interestingly, the main differences between English (representing post-nominal RCs) and Chinese (representing pre-nominal RCs) are:

1. dP_1 never raises in Chinese, the remnant CP_1 does;
2. in Chinese, dP_2 is never a pronoun.

Notice that crosslinguistically, no prenominal RC allows pronouns. If the structure and derivation proposed here for prenominal RCs are correct, we can explain the unavailability of pronouns in Chinese RCs (and typologically in all prenominal RCs) by assuming that relative pronouns need to be c-commanded and bound by the 'head' of the relative clause (see Fukui and Takano 2000, Cinque 1982, among others). In fact, in the two structures postulated here

for Chinese (i.e., those in (2) and (3)), this is not possible. This will also have some consequences for ARCs.

I claim, in fact, that non-integrated ARCs are the canonical or default ones: they are parentheticals, so, at a certain level, they are independent sentences. All the properties we are aware of follow from this. I also claim that a canonical ARC requires the following three conditions to be met:

1. the link must be spelled out, i.e. the pronoun must be overt, it can't be an operator (so, in our terms, it can't be a raised nominal);
2. the pronoun must be of the type also used in interrogatives (see Cinque 1982);
3. the pronoun must follow its antecedent, as a linear order requirement imposed by discourse.

If one or more of the above conditions isn't met, the language resorts to other strategies.

Extending the proposal put forth for restrictives to ARCs in Chinese, we obtain the following structure:

(4) [DP D [CP3 [CP1 [IP WO xihuan t_{DP2}] de t_{IP} [DP1 Zhangsan]] [CP2 [DP2 Zhangsan] t_{CP1}]]]
 I like DE Zhangsan Zhangsan

Lit. 'Zhangsan who I like'

The main difference with restrictive matching RCs is given by the fact that here it's the entire DP that raises, not the dP.

Notice that given (4), Chinese doesn't satisfy any of the conditions above, as the relative pronoun is not spelled out, it is not of the type used in interrogatives (which btw stays in situ), and it doesn't follow its antecedent. It follows that for its appositives Chinese is forced to use the integrated strategy.

References

- Cinque, G. 1982. On the Theory of Relative Clauses and Markedness. *The Linguistic Review* 1, 247-294.
- Cinque, G. 2006. *Relative Clauses*, lecture notes (Spring 2006), Ca' Foscari University, Venice, Italy.
- Del Gobbo, F. 2005 "Chinese Relative Clauses: Restrictive, Descriptive or Appositive?", in L. Brugè, G. Giusti, N. Munaro, W. Schweikert and G. Turano (eds.) *Contributions to the XXX Incontro di Grammatica Generativa*. Venezia: Cafoscarina, 287-305.
- Del Gobbo, F. 2004. On Prenominal Relative Clauses and Appositive Adjectives. In B. Schmeiser, V. Chand, A. Kelleher and A. Rodriguez (eds.) *WCCFL 23 Proceedings*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press, 182-194.
- Fukui, N. and Y. Takano. 2000. Nominal structure: An extension of the symmetry principle. In *The derivation of vo and ov*, ed. Peter Svenonius, 321-362. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Huang, C.-T. J. 1982. *Logical relations in Chinese and the theory of grammar*. Doctoral dissertation. MIT, Cambridge, MA.