

Sell Nonrestrictive Relatives

Niina Zhang

Aug. 29, 2001

1. Introduction

It has long been a controversial issue whether Chinese has nonrestrictive relatives or appositive relatives (Chao 1968, Tang 1979, Huang 1982, Tsao 1986: 34, etc.). The unique goal of this paper is to argue against the existence of nonrestrictive relatives in Chinese, and account for the absence in terms of the absence of relative pronouns in the language. More accurately, adopting Canac Marquis & Tremblay (1996, CT, hence), we argue that all relative clauses are restrictive and the so-called nonrestrictive relatives are DPs which have a coreferential relation with another DP and which contain a relative with a pro head. The presence of relative pronouns in the DPs licenses the pro syntactically to hold a coreferential relation with the antecedent DP. Since there is no relative pronoun in Chinese, the licensing is not available and thus DPs containing a relative with a pro head cannot have an apposition relation with other DPs in the language.

Although we show that certain constructions do not contain appositive expressions, we do not discuss their other properties in this paper.

Appositive expressions are divided into two types: those with an overt noun head, and those without, as shown in (1a) and (1b), respectively. In (1a) *a woman* is the noun head of the relative clause *whom Mary met at the party*, and the whole DP *a woman whom Mary met at the party* is an appositive expression, coreferential with the antecedent *Jane*. In (1b), the appositive expression *whom Mary met at the party* does not have a noun head.

- (1) a. Jane, a woman whom Mary met at the party, is brilliant.
b. Jane, whom Mary met at the party, is brilliant.

I will call the type of appositive expressions represented by (1a) Headed Appositive (HA), and the type represented by (1b) Null-Head Appositive (NHA).

CT claim that all relatives are restrictive, and those like the one in (1b) has a pro head. According to them, all appositive expressions are nominals, either in the form of a simple DP, like the underlined part in (2), or a DP which contains a relative clause, as in (1).

- (2) John, an absent-minded man, came late.

Obviously, simple nominal appositives like (2) and HAs like (1a) also occur in Chinese, as shown in (3a) and (3b), respectively:

- (3) a. Bolin, zhe ge Ouzhou chengshi, you bashi duo jia bowuguan.
Berlin, this cl Europe city have eighty more cl museum
'There are more than eighty museums in Berlin, the European city.'
b. Bolin, zhe ge [CP renren dou zhidao] de chengshi, you bashi duo jia bowuguan.
Berlin this cl everyone all know de city have eighty more cl museum
'There are more than eighty museums in Berlin, the city that everyone knows.'

Now the question is whether there are NHAs in Chinese. In next two sections we discuss in turn whether the Coda in the so-called Existential Coda Construction (ECC) is NHA, and whether one of the two versions of relatives, one of which is nominal-initial and the other is not, is NHA. Then in section 4 we look for an account for our conclusion. Section 5 is a short summary.

2. Are the Codas in ECCs NHAs?

The existential coda construction (ECC) refers to the construction in (4), where the NP must be indefinite and the XP (the underlined part), called coda, is a clause modifying the NP.

- (4) a. YP - V – NP – XP
b. Jie-shang lai-le yi ge xiaohair mei chuan xie.
street-on come-prf one cl child not wear shoe
'On the street has come a child who does not wear shoes.'
b. Baoyu jiao-guo yi ge xuesheng hen wanpi.
Baoyu teach-prf one cl student very naughty
'Baoyu taught a student who was very naughty.'

The construction has been discussed in Li & Thompson (1981: 611-619 "realis descriptive clause construction"), Huang (1987), McCawley (1988: 451, 1989), and Tsai (1994/1999), among others.

The coda in the ECC is different from a NHA in at least four respects.¹

• 2.1 The Restrictiveness

The codas of ECC can restrict the meaning of their antecedents, whereas NHAs never do so. As it is well-known that removal of an appositive does not affect the basic meaning of the relevant sentence. For instance, both the above (3b) and (5) make the same statement. However, as shown below, the ECC in the a-sentences and the corresponding b-sentences, where the coda is absent, make different statements.

- (5) Bolin you bashi duo jia bowuguan.
Berlin have eighty more cl museum
'There are more than eighty museums in Berlin.'
- (6) a. Zhe ben shu you yi ye shi kongbai. ≠ b
this cl book have onc page be blank
'There is one blank page in this book.'
b. #Zhe ben shu you yi ye.
this cl book have onc page
'This book has one page.'
- (7) a. Zhe jia shangdian zhei xingqi lai-le yi wei guke tebie tiaoti. ≠ b
this cl shop this week come-prf one cl guest very picky
'In this shop came a guest this week who was very picky.'
b. Zhe jia shangdian zhei xingqi lai-le yi wei guke.
this cl shop this week come-prf one cl guest
'In this shop came a guest this week.'
- (8) a. Zhe ge senlin-li zhang-zhe yi ke shu hen qimiao. ≠ b
this cl forest-in grow-prg one cl tree very intriguing
'In this forest there is a tree which is very intriguing.'
b. #Zhe ge senlin-li zhang-zhe yi ke shu.
this cl forest-in grow-prg one cl tree
'In this forest there is a tree.'

¹ I do not use the possibility of stacking as a test. Jackendoff (1977: 171) and McCawley (1988: 419) claim that HlessACs cannot stack. However, see Grosu and Landman (1998) for an opposite view. Vries (1999:4) also finds that appositives can stack in Dutch.

- (9) a. Jia-li conglai mei lai-guo yi ge keren neng bodao fuqin.² ≠ b
 home-in ever not come-exp one cl guest can convince father
 ‘In my home there has never been a guest who can convince my father.’
 b. Jia-li conglai mei lai-guo yi ge keren.
 home-in ever not come-exp one cl guest
 ‘In my home there has never been a guest.’
- (10) a. Ta-mama mei sheng-guo yi ge haizi bu shi jinshiyan. ≠ b
 he-mother not bear-exp one cl child not be short-sighted
 ‘His mother never gives birth to a child who is not short-sighted.’
 b. #ta mama mei sheng-guo yi ge haizi.
 he-mother not bear-exp one cl child
 ‘His mother never gives birth to a child.’

• 2.2 Intonation

NHAs do not integrate into the intonation of the matrix clauses (Jackendoff 1971: 62, McCawley 1988: 418), while the coda of the ECC does. The ECC “is pronounced with one single intonation contour” (Li & Thompson 1981: 614, See also Huang 1987: 235).

• 2.3 Position in the matrix clause

NHAs can occur in the middle of the matrix clauses, as in (1b) above, while the coda of the ECCs must occur to the right of the whole construction.

- (11) Ta song-le yi ben shu (*hen youqu) gei wo.
 he give-ASP one CL book very interesting to I
 ‘He gave a book to me (which is very interesting).’

• 2.4 Adjacency to the antecedent

NHAs must be adjacent to the antecedents (McCawley 1988: 449, CT p. 7), whereas the coda in the ECC does not need to (Huang 1987: 231). In (12b), the relative *who Mary knows* is not adjacent to its head *a man*, and the sentence is acceptable. In contrast, in (13b), the NHA *who Mary knows* is not adjacent to its antecedent *Peter*, but the sentence is not acceptable. Like (12b) and unlike (13b), when the coda *hen youqu* ‘very interesting’ is not adjacent to its antecedent *yi ben shu* ‘a cl book’ in (14), the sentence is acceptable.

- (12) a. A man Mary knows came.
 b. A man came who Mary knows.
- (13) a. Peter, who Mary knows, came.
 b. *Peter came, who Mary knows.
- (14) Ta song-le yi ben shu gei wo hen youqu.
 he give-ASP one CL book to I very interesting
 ‘He gave a book to me which is very interesting.’

The above four points show us that the coda in the ECC does not exhibit properties of NHA.

3. Are Non-Peripheral Relatives NHAs?

Chao (1968: 286) claims that nominal-initial relatives are restrictive, as in (15a), whereas non-peripheral relatives are descriptive, as in (15b).

² Huang (1987: 249) and Tsai (1999: 173) claim that the matrix predicate in ECC cannot be negated. The data here and in McCawley (1989: 38) show that the claim is not true.

- (15) a. [dai yanjing de] na wei xiansheng (restrictive)
 wear glasses de that cl gentleman
 ‘the gentleman who wears glasses’
 b. na wei [dai yanjing de] xiansheng (descriptive)
 that cl wear glasses de gentleman

The restrictive-descriptive contrast of modifiers with respect to the position of relatives, on the one hand, is denied in Tang (1979) and Tsao (1986: 15). On the other hand, it is accepted in Hashimoto (1971) and Huang (1982: 68).³ The general restrictive-descriptive contrast, beyond the position of relatives, nevertheless, is discussed in other contexts (see Sproat & Shih 1988, Lu 1998). However, whether this position contrast is correspondent to the contrast between restrictive relatives and NHAs has never been clarified. Recently, Gobbo (2001) challenges such a correspondence, claiming that “in Chinese the distinction between appositive and restrictive does not actually exist,” and “in Chinese relative clauses can only be restrictives.” (p. 2) In sections 3.1 through 3.4, I discuss some of the facts listed by Gobbo, and in sections 3.5 and 3.6 I add two new arguments, in addition to my arguments with respect to the ECC presented in the last section, to support her claim that relatives in Chinese, regardless of whether they take a nominal-peripheral position or not, are all restrictive.

• 3.1 Proper name antecedents

“Appositives, unlike restrictives, must be able to modify proper nouns” (Jackendoff 1977: 171):⁴

- (16) a. John, who came to dinner, sneezed.
 b. *John that came to dinner sneezed.

Recall that according to CT, all relatives are restrictive, and NHAs are in fact HAs with a null head. Under their proposal, the above contrast follows from the more general constraint according to which proper names cannot be modified or restricted in the syntax by a relative or an adjective unless a determiner is present, in which case such proper names must be treated as common nouns (Longobardi 1994). The only strategy available to qualify a proper name is apposition, as in (2). CT propose that in the apposition, the modifying element is independently computed, and thus is not c-commanded by the proper name, and does not restrict its reference. For cases such as (16a), they argue that the proper name is not the head of the relative. The head of the relative is a covert pronominal, coreferential with the antecedent.

- (17) John_i, **pro**_i who came to dinner, sneezed.

³ Huang (1982: 68) claims that (ii) is ungrammatical. However, many people, including Tsao (1986: 15) and me, find it fine. This disagreement is also discussed in Li (1999: 20).

(i) Niujue, zhe ge [_{CP} renren dou zhidao] de chengshi,
 New-York this cl everyone all know de city
 ‘New York, the city that everyone knows,’
 (ii) Niujue, [_{CP} renren dou zhidao] de zhe ge chengshi,
 New-York everyone all know de this cl city

⁴ The coda in the ECC cannot modify a proper noun. A constraint on ECC is that the pre-coda NP must be indefinite (Huang 1987).

(i) *Baoyu jiao-guo {Daiyu/na ge xuesheng} hen congming.
 Baoyu teach-exp Daiyu/that cl student very smart

In addition to the facts discussed in section 2, this fact also makes codas different from appositives.

In Chinese, when a clause modifies a proper name, a demonstrative is obligatory, regardless of the order of the clause with respect to the demonstrative. The speaker of either of the following two sentences must presuppose the existence of two or more persons called Baoyu:⁵

- (18) a. Ni zuotian kanjian de *(na ge) Baoyu shi Shanghai-ren.
 you yesterday see de that cl Baoyu be Shanghai-person
 ‘The Baoyu whom you saw yesterday is from Shanghai.’
 b. [* (na ge) ni zuotian kanjian de Baoyu shi Shanghai-ren]
 that cl you yesterday see de Baoyu be Shanghai-person
 ‘The Baoyu whom you saw yesterday is from Shanghai.’

Since no clause can directly modify a proper name in Chinese, all relatives in Chinese pattern with restrictive relatives rather than NHAs.

• 3.2 The relative order of NHAs with respect to relatives

Between restrictive relatives and NHAs, the former are closer to the antecedent than the latter (Jackendoff 1977: 171):

- (19) a. The girl who won the prize, whom you know, will go to college.
 b. *The girl, whom you know, who won the prize, will go to college.

The contrast can be explained by the syntactic relation between appositives and their antecedents. Various assumptions have been proposed in the literature. Jackendoff (1977) proposes that the restrictive/nonrestrictive distinction is reflected configurationally, nonrestrictives being adjoined higher than restrictives to the nominals which contain the head noun. Demirdache (1991) claims that appositives are DP-adjuncts, lifted at LF out of the constituent containing their antecedent and then adjoined to the root clause, and they are interpreted at LF as independent clauses. Ross (1967) analyzes appositives as independent clauses and CT claims that appositives are unmerged syntactic objects. Finally, Emonds (1979) and Vries (1999) assume that appositives are conjuncts. Except Jackendoff’s approach, all other approaches, including Aoun et. al. (2001), assume that appositives are interpreted independently of their antecedents at LF. One shared assumption of all of these approaches is that appositives are not c-commanded by their antecedents.

On the other hand, no one doubts that both a relative clause and its noun head are parts of a DP. If a relative clause co-occurs with a NHA, the overt head noun is the head noun of the relative rather than that of the NHA, which has its own null head (CT). Accordingly, the overt head is syntactically closer to the relative clause than to the NHA. Consequently, the DP which contains the relative and its head noun is the antecedent of the NHA. The latter is either an adjunct to the former (in the Jackendoff-Demirdache’s adjunct approach), or is computed independently of the former (in the other approaches). Thus there is no way for the latter to occur in a position internal to the former, i.e., between the over head noun and the relative.

⁵ Tsao (1986: 33) and the researchers cited there consider sentences like (i) to be due to the influence of English and other European languages. Tsao claims that the head in such sentences is ‘inherently’ non-restrictive, where it is not likely to cause any confusion about its function.

- (i) [CP Juyou wu-qian nian youjiu lishi] de Zhongguo, ...
 have five-thousand year long history de China
 ‘China, which has a long history of five thousand years, ...’
 (ii) [CP Tang zai bing-chuang-shang] de Lu Xun hai zai xie wenzhang.
 Lie at sick-bed-on de Lu Xun still prg write article
 ‘Lu Xun was still writing articles when he was in a patient-bed..’

Following Tsao, I treat data like (i) and my (ii) as instances of language change.

Regular relatives in Chinese occur to the left of their head noun.⁶ Between non-peripheral relatives and nominal-initial relatives, the former is closer to the head noun than the latter. So if non-peripheral relatives, which are descriptive in Chao (1968), were NHAs, when they co-occur with nominal-initial relatives, we would expect the order of the following (20a) unacceptable, contrary to the fact. In (20a), there is an intonation pause after the first relative clause, indicating that the second relative clause is a non-peripheral relative, whereas the first one is a peripheral relative. In this order, the assumed non-restrictive relative is closer to the noun head *ren* 'person' than the assumed restrictive relative, an illegal order. However, this order is acceptable. In addition, as shown in the rest data of (20), other possible orders are also acceptable and there is no difference in meaning in this case.⁷

- (20) a. [Ni renshi] de, na ge [de-le da-jiang] de ren lai-le.
 you know de that cl get-prf big-prize de person come-prf
 'The person whom you know and who has got a big prize has come.'
 b. Na ge [ni renshi] de [de-le da-jiang] de ren lai-le.
 that cl you know de get-prf big-prize de person come-prf
 c. [Ni renshi] de [de-le da-jiang] de na ge ren lai-le.
 you know de get-prf big-prize de that cl person come-prf

Again we fail to see a contrast between restrictive and nonrestrictive relatives in Chinese.

• 3.3 Non-nominal antecedent

The head of restrictive relatives are always nominal, whereas NHAs may take an antecedent that is an AP (21a), a PP (21b), and a clause (21c) (cf. Jackendoff 1977: 171):

- (21) a. John is afraid of snakes, which I'm sure that Mary is too.
 b. Senator Snerd is in Bermuda, where most of his colleagues are too.
 c. It has been reported that Senator is in Kuwait, which can't be right.

CT propose that the head of NHAs is always a (pro)nominal, be it overt or not. The NHAs above all contain a null head:

- (22) a. John is afraid of snakes, **pro** which I'm sure that Mary is too.
 b. Senator Snerd is in Bermuda, **pro** where most of his colleagues are too.
 c. It has been reported that Senator is in Kuwait, **pro** which can't be right.

They provide evidence from French for this structure. An overt (pro)nominal head occurs in all instances in French:

- (23) a. Marcelle est très fatiguée, **ce** que Marie n'est pas.
 Marcelle is very tired this what Marie isn't
 'Marcelle is very tired, which Marie is not.'
 b. Marcelle est au Mexique, (**endroit**) où elle avait toujours voulu aller.
 Marcelle is to Mexico place where she had always wanted go
 'Marcelle has gone to Mexico, {a/the} place where she had always wanted to go.'

⁶ We use the word "regular" here because we do not want to rule out the possibility that the coda in the ECC is a relative to the right of its (null) head.

⁷ Considering a wider range of data, we do not agree with Gobbo's (2001: 9) claim that the order in (20a) is the only possible order. Nevertheless, we agree with her conclusion drawn from the order.

- c. Marcelle est arrivée en retard, **ce/chose** qu'elle ne fait jamais.
 Marcelle is arrived in late this/thing what-she not do ever
 'Marcelle arrived late, {a/the} thing which she had never done before.'

This null head hypothesis captures their claim that all relatives are restrictive, and NHAs are restrictive relatives to their own null head. If so, and if appositives in general are computed independently of their antecedent, and thus do not c-select their antecedent, there is no constraint on the category of the antecedent, as expected.

The fact that (restrictive) relatives can never take anything but a nominal head can be covered by the hypothesis that the nominal head has a syntactic relation with the external D, which selects the CP where the nominal head is base-generated, according to Kayne (1994). The syntactic relation can be either Bianchi's (2000) D-incorporation or Kim's (1998) determiner-raising. If the head of a relative is not a nominal, such relation will not be able to hold. This is one account. We do not exclude other accounts for the fact.

As noted by Gobbo (2001), a relative in Chinese can only modify a nominal:

- (24) a. *Daiyu hen [Baoyu conglai jiu bu de] congming.
 Daiyu very Baoyu ever just not de smart
 b. Daiyu hen congming. Baoyu conglai jiu bu.
 Daiyu very smart Baoyu ever just not
 'Daiyu is intelligent. Baoyu never has been.'

Once more, we see that relatives in Chinese show the properties of restrictive relatives only.

• 3.4 Quantifier antecedents

It is well-known fact that NHAs, unlike regular relatives, cannot have a quantifier as their antecedent (Ross 1967). CT claim that if appositives are computed independently of their antecedents, the bound variable relation between them is blocked, just like it is blocked between independent clauses (25b). Since quantifiers have no reference, unlike the name *John* in (17), they may not act as discourse-antecedent of the pronominal either.

- (25) a. *{Everyone/no one}_i, pro_i who attended the party, had a good time.
 b. *{Everyone/no one}_i. He_i left.

In Chinese, if non-peripheral relatives were appositives, we would not expect them to be preceded by quantifiers such as *meige* 'every'. However, as noted by Lin (1997), they can, as shown in (26a) below. We can also see that in this case, the construction containing the non-peripheral relative, (26a), is not different in meaning from the correspondent construction where the relative occurs nominal-initially, (26b).

- (26) a. [DP Meige [chuxi wanhui] de ren] dou wan-le ge tongkai.
 every attend party de person all play-prf cl happy
 'Everyone who attended the party had a good time.'
 b. [DP [Chuxi wanhui] de meige ren] dou wan-le ge tongkai.
 attend party de every person all play-prf cl happy
 'Everyone who attended the party had a good time.'

Since relatives in Chinese, regardless of their position in the hosting DP, can all have an quantifier head, they show properties of restrictive relatives only.

• 3.5 The scope of a VP-ellipsis

As noted by McCawley (1988), VP anaphora does not include an appositive. This is expected from CT's claim that appositive DPs do not belong to the same syntactic object as the VP gap.

- (27) John sold a violin, which had once belong to Nathan Milstein, to Itzhak Perlman, and Mary did [e] too.
 [e] = ... sell a violin to Itzhak Perlman.
 *[e] = ... sell a violin, which had once belong to Nathan Milstein, to Itzhak Perlman

Similarly, VP anaphora does not include a HA in Chinese, as shown in (28a), where the HA *liang ge yuanlai shuyu muqin de jiezhi* 'two rings which had once belonged to the mother' is out of the VP-anaphora. In contrast, VP anaphora does include the relative in both (28b) and (28c), regardless of the order-difference of the two sentences. In (28b), the relative *yuanlai shuyu muqin de* 'which had once belonged to the mother' occurs in the middle of the hosting DP, whereas in (28c), the same relative occurs to the left-peripheral of the DP.

- (28) a. Akiu yuanyi song-gei nü-pengyou liang ge jiezhi, liang ge yuanlai shuyu muqin de jiezhi, Fanjin ke bu yuanyi e.
 Akiu want give-to girl-friend two CL ring two CL originally belong.to mother DE ring Fanjinr rather not want
 'Akiu wanted to give his girl friend two rings, which had once belonged to his mother, but Fanjin did not want to e.'
 [e] = give his girl friend two rings
 *[e] = give his girl friend two rings which had once belonged to his mother
- b. Akiu yuanyi song-gei nü-pengyou [liang ge yuanlai shuyu muqin de jiezhi], Fanjin ke bu yuanyi e.
 Akiu want give-to girl-friend two CL originally belong.to mother DE ring Fanjin rather not want
 'Akiu wanted to give his girl friend two rings which had once belonged to his mother, but Fanjin did not want to e.'
 [e] = give his girl friend two rings which had once belonged to his mother
- c. Akiu yuanyi song-gei nü-pengyou [yuanlai shuyu muqin de liang ge jiezhi], Fanjin ke bu yuanyi e.
 Akiu want give-to girl-friend originally belong.to mother DE two CL ring Fanjin rather not want
 'Akiu wanted to give his girl friend two rings which had once belonged to his mother, but Fanjin did not want to e.'
 [e] = give his girl friend two rings which had once belonged to his mother

We thus see that both types of relatives are included in the VP anaphora, a property of restrictive relatives.

• 3.6 The opacity of NHAs

Unlike restrictive relatives, appositives cannot be in the scope of the verb *think* (Srivastav 1990, cited in Demidache 1991: 147). (29) does not imply that John thinks Bill is a genius. This fact shows that no c-command relation holds between the verb *thinks* and the appositive.

- (29) John thinks that Mary loves Bill, who is a genius.

Similarly, (30a), which contains the HA *zhe liang ge you caihua de tongxue* ‘these two classmates who have talent,’ does not imply that Da Bao thinks that Lili and Mimi have talent. In contrast, both (30b), where the relative occurs to the right of the numeral and classifier, and (30c), where the relative occurs to left of the numeral and classifier, allow the *de dicto* reading that Da Bao indeed thinks that the two persons disliked by Akiu have talent.

- (30) a. Da Bao renwei Akiu taoyan Lili he Mimi, zhe liang ge you caihua de tongxue.
Da Bao think Akiu dislike Lili and Mimi this two CL have talent DE classmate
‘Da Bao thinks that Akiu dislikes Lili and Mimi, the two classmates who have talent.’
- b. Da Bao renwei Akiu taoyan [liang ge you caihua de tongxue].
Da Bao think Akiu dislike two CL have talent DE classmates
‘Da Bao thinks that Akiu dislikes two classmates who have talent.’
- c. Da Bao renwei Akiu taoyan [you caihua de liang ge tongxue].
Da Bao think Akiu dislike have talent DE two CL classmates
‘Da Bao thinks that Akiu dislikes two classmates who have talent.’

The relatives in both orders pattern with restrictive relatives in the scope of the intentional verb reading.

Recall that in section 3.2 we mentioned various approaches to the syntactic relation between appositives and their antecedents. The facts discussed in this section, especially the last two, can only be accounted for by the approaches which assume that appositives are computed independently of their antecedents (Ross, Emonds, CT, Vries). If appositives were adjuncts of their antecedent, as assumed in Jackendoff's adjunct approach, we would not expect the latter to be computed independently of the former.

The above six aspects strongly argue against the NHA status of relatives in either the nominal-peripheral position or non-peripheral position. If neither the coda in the ECC, discussed in section 2, nor relatives can be NHA in Chinese, we conclude that there is no NHA in Chinese at all. In next section, we investigate why this is the case.

4. Accounting for the absence of nonrestrictives in Chinese

Both English and Chinese have HAs, as shown in the a-sentences below, but only English allows NHAs, as shown in the b-sentences below:

- (31) a. Jane, [a woman [whom Mary met at the party]], is brilliant.
b. Jane, [Ø [whom Mary met at the party]], is brilliant.
- (32) a. Daiyu, [[shenshende ai-zhe Baoyu de] na ge guniang], hen piaoliang.
Daiyu, deeply love-prg Baoyu de that cl girl very pretty
‘Daiyu, the girl who loved Baoyu deeply, was very pretty.’
- b. *Daiyu, [[shenshende ai-zhe Baoyu de] Ø], hen piaoliang.
Daiyu, deeply love-prg Baoyu de very pretty

If Chinese indeed does not have NHAs, two questions arise: why UG allows this absence and how this absence is related to any syntactic property of the language.

To answer these two questions, we need to look at the syntactic representations of the appositive relation. Following CT, we have assumed that all appositives have their own heads, regardless of whether the heads are null or not. If UG allows null heads for appositives in languages such as English, conceptually, there is no way to rule out the possibility that in certain languages such as Chinese, appositives must have overt heads. This is just like the case that some languages allow pro-drop, while others do not. UG allows both types.

Our next question is why it is Chinese rather than English that requires an overt head noun for appositives. One important property of apposition in English is that the head noun of a relative clause and its relative pronoun cannot be both null. The ungrammaticality of data like (33d) is discussed in Jackendoff (1977: 171):

- (33) a. Jane, the woman whom you met at the party, is brilliant.
 b. Jane, the woman \emptyset you met at the party, is brilliant.
 c. Jane, \emptyset whom you met at the party, is brilliant.
 d. *Jane, $\emptyset \emptyset$ you met at the party, is brilliant.

Since Paris (1976), it has been generally assumed that there is no relative pronoun in Chinese. Consequently, in apposition constructions in Chinese, if the head noun of a relative clause is null, as in (32b), we get the pattern of (33d), which is not acceptable. We claim that (32b) and (33d) are ruled out by the same constraint.

Notice that out of the apposition construction, relatives with a null head noun are acceptable (Li & Thompson 1981, among many others). Such relatives are called “beheaded relative clause” in Tsao (1986: 25).⁸

- (34) [ni zhidao de (dongxi)] tai duo le.
 you know de thing too many prt
 Lit: ‘The things that you know are too many.’

In (34), the head noun of the subject nominal is optional. When it is absent, the relative clause *ni zhidao de* ‘you know de’ stands alone without a head noun. In (32b), however, the beheaded relative is not allowed. The contrast suggests that it is the syntactic relation of apposition rather than relativization that requires the head noun to show up in Chinese.

In apposition, the role of relative pronouns cannot be played by other functional words. In English, a clause introduced by the complementizer *that* cannot be a NHA (Jackendoff 1977: 171):

- (35) *Jane, that you met at the party, is brilliant.

Similarly, in Chinese, beheaded relatives introduced by the functional word *de*, whatever its function is, cannot occur as appositives. We have seen this in (32b).

In this study, we see three instances of consistency. First, relatives are all restrictive and appositives are all nominal. CT’s approach, which we adopt here, differs from all other approaches we have known so far in that all appositives are treated as nominals rather than clauses. Thus the so-called nonrestrictive relative clauses are in fact DPs containing a restrictive relative clause with a pro head. Apposition, accordingly, is a relation between two DPs. If we are right, we can remove the label of nonrestrictive relative clause from the computation: there is no such category in syntax.

Second, illegal syntactic representations for the apposition relation in both the English-type languages and the Chinese-type languages are ruled out by the same constraint. Under CT’s DP-to-DP relation hypothesis on apposition, we see that (32b) is ruled out by the same constraint that rules out both (33d) and (35). Thus the difference of (32) from (31) is not the missing of a certain type of relatives in Chinese. Instead, it is the missing of a close-set of syntactic elements, namely, relative pronouns, which have the function to license their hosting

⁸ English also has headless relatives, the so-called free relatives:

(i) John liked what(ever) I cooked.

However, the relative pronoun is obligatory here.

DP to have an apposition relation with another DP whenever the head noun (their binder, see below) is a pro. Thus, even in languages which have relative pronouns, in the absence of a relative pronoun, relatives with a null head noun cannot function as appositives. Our account is thus different from Gobbo (2001), where the contrast between English and Chinese is related to the contrast between head-initial relatives in the former and head-final relatives in the latter.

Third, under the pro-hypothesis of NHA, we see that relative pronouns have consistent properties. Based on many contrasts between (restrictive) relatives and NHAs, including the contrast we discussed in section 3.4 (quantifier antecedents), Demirdache (1991) claims that relative pronouns are bound pronouns in restrictive relatives, whereas they are referring pronouns (E-type) in appositive relatives. In contrast, we claim that relative pronouns are bound pronouns consistently. They are bound by the head nominal of the relative clause, and the head nominal can be either overt or pro. As assumed generally, pro is an E-type pronoun. Under our assumption, the pro in a NHA is co-referential with the antecedent DP. Then it is the pros rather than the relative pronouns of the NHAs that show the properties of referring pronouns.

One might wonder why pro can occur in the apposition construction in English, which is not a pro-drop language. However, it is possible that a certain type of pronouns occur only in some specific syntactic environments. For instance, Chinese is a pro-drop language, but pro is never an object of a preposition.

5. Summary

We have shown that clausal modifiers of nominals in Chinese, regardless of their positions, do not show properties of appositive expressions. This fact is related to the fact that there is no relative pronouns in Chinese. Appositives in Chinese must be expressed by either simple nominals, or nominals with their own relative clause. Beheaded relatives cannot occur as appositives. The same constraint is seen in English, where in the absence of a relative pronoun, a relative clause with a null head cannot occur as an appositive.

Theoretically, adopting CT, we view all appositives as DPs and regard the so-called nonrestrictive relative clauses as DPs which contain a relative with a pro head.

References

- Aoun, J., L. Choueiri, and N. Hornstein 2001 Resumption, movement, and derivational economy. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32, 371-403.
- Bianchi, V. 2000 The Raising Analysis of Relative Clauses: A Reply to Borsley. *Linguistic Inquiry* 31, 123-140.
- Canac Marquis, Rejean & Mireille Tremblay. 1996 The WH-feature and the syntax of restrictive and non-restrictive relatives in French and English. Ms. UQAM & Queen's University.
- Chao, Yuen-Ren. 1968 *A Grammar of Spoken Chinese*. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Dimirdache, H. 1991 *Resumptive chains in restrictive relatives, appositives and dislocation structure*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Emonds, J. 1979 Appositive relatives have no properties. *Linguistic Inquiry* 10, 211-243.
- Gobbo, F. 2001 Appositives Schmappositives in Chinese. International Association of Chinese Linguistics 10th Annual Conference, Irvine June 22-24.
- Grosu, A. and F. Landman 1998 Strange relatives of the third kind. *Natural Language Semantics* 6, 125-170.
- Hashimoto, A. 1971 *Mandarin syntactic structures*, Union 8, Princeton University.
- Huang, Cheng-Teh James. 1982 *Logical relations in Chinese and the theory of grammar*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

- Huang, Cheng-Teh James. 1987 Existential sentences in Chinese and (in)definiteness. In Reuland, Eric & Alice ter Meulen (eds.) *The Representation of (In)definiteness*, 226-253, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Jackendoff, R. 1977 *X-bar syntax: a study of phrase structure*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Kayne, R. 1994 *The antisymmetry of syntax*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Kim, K. 1998 *(Anti)-Connectivity*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland at College Park.
- Li, C. & S. Thompson 1981 *Mandarin Chinese: A Functional Reference Grammar*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Li, Yen-hui, Audrey 1999 Word order, structure and relativization. Ms. USC. <http://www.usc.edu/dept/LAS/ealc/chinling/>
- Lin, R. 1997 Some remarks on the semantics of prenominal relative clauses in Chinese. International Association of Chinese Linguistics 7th Annual Conference, Leiden University June 19-21.
- Longobardi, G. 1994 Reference and proper names. *Linguistic Inquiry* 25, 609-665.
- Lu, B. 1998 *Left-Right Asymmetries of Word Order Variation: a Functional Explanation*. USC doctoral dissertation.
- McCawley, James D. 1988 *The syntactic Phenomena of English*. The University of Chicago Press. Chicago, London.
- McCawley, James D. 1989 Notes on Li and Thompson, Mandarin Chinese: A Functional Reference Grammar. *Journal of Chinese Language Teachers Association* XXIV: No1, 19-42.
- Paris, M. 1976 Relative Clause Formation in English and Mandarin Chinese and Ross' Constraints: A contrastive Approach.' In *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference of the English Contrastive Projects*, University of Bucharest Press.
- Ross, J. 1967 *Constraints on variables in syntax*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Sproat, R. & C. Shih 1988 Prenominal adjectival ordering in English and Mandarin. *Proceedings of NELS* 18, 465-489.
- Tang, T.C. 1979 Relative clauses in Chinese. In *Guoyu Yufa Yanjiu Lunji* [Studies in Chinese Syntax] Taipei: Student Book Co.
- Tsai, D. 1994/1999 *On economising the theory of A-bar dependencies*. 1994 Doctoral dissertation. MIT. 1999 Garland, New York.
- Tsao, Feng-fu 1986. Relativization in Chinese and English: A contrastive study of form and function. *Journal of Chinese Language Teachers Association* XXI: No3, 13-47.
- Vries, M. de 1999 Appositive relative clauses. UvA/HIL, Talk at ZAS-Berlin.