

**Advanced Syntax**  
**lecture course**  
**handout 6**

Instructor: Szécsényi, Krisztina  
Email address: kszecsenyi@gmail.com

**ADJUNCTS WITHIN THE DP**

**Adjective Phrases**

*the (second) tall building:* N'-adjunction

**Prepositional Phrases**

*the students in the lecture hall:* NP-adjunction

**Adverbial Phrases**

*almost/nearly John's whole life:* DP-adjunction

**Complementiser Phrases**

**Relative clauses**

Structure similar to embedded questions, function and interpretation very different. Relative clauses are modifiers inside the DP, they modify nouns, so we expect them to appear within the NP: NP or N' adjunction. N'-adjunction:

*my favourite [places I like to go] and [people I like to visit]*  
*favourite:* N'-adjunct (*the many famous people*)

**Non-restrictive relatives:** *my supervisor, who you have already met*

Differences bw restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses:

- only restrictive relatives can be introduced by *that*;
- prosodic differences: comma-intonation in non-restrictives, slight pause bw noun and clause;
- interpretation: restrictives focus on one element out of a set of possible referents, no range of possible referents in non-restrictives;
- only restrictive relatives and their nouns can be substituted by the preform *one*:  
*this man who you met is taller than that one*  
*\*my mother who you met is taller than his one*

→ non-restrictive relative clauses are more distant from the noun they modify than restrictive relatives.

Restrictive relatives: N'-adjuncts  
Non-restrictive relatives: NP-adjuncts

**A comparison of relative and interrogative clauses**

The differences follow from the different functions of the two constructions.

Hungarian: different pronouns *ki/aki*

English: *what* is not a basic relative pronoun, can appear only in **headless relatives** (=the thing that)

*What you should do now* = *The thing that you should do now*

Types of restrictive relatives: *wh*-relative, *that*-relative (*that* being a complementiser, never introducing non-finite clauses, not ok, with pied-piped prepositions, only preposition stranding is possible), zero-relative (only for non-subject relatives)

	<b>relative clauses</b>	<b>interrogative clauses</b>
<b>interpretation</b>	declarative (can be introduced by <i>that</i> )	interrogative
<b>feature</b>	[-wh]	[+wh]
<b>gap</b>	yes, independently of type <i>the man (who<sub>1</sub>)/that Sherlock suspects t<sub>1</sub></i>	yes, trace of <i>wh</i> -word <i>ask who<sub>1</sub> Sherlock suspects t<sub>1</sub></i>
<b>null <i>wh</i>-operator</b>	allowed (except subject relatives) <i>the man [Op<sub>1</sub> (<i>that</i>) Sherlock suspects t<sub>1</sub>]</i>	not allowed (but there can be a zero operator in yes-no questions)
<b>motivation for movement</b>	mediating bw noun and clause	interrogative interpretation
<b>recoverability of empty operators</b>	from modified noun as antecedent	the <i>wh</i> -word is not recoverable, it cannot be empty, there is no antecedent

**Similarities:** both movements have semantic motivations related to CP, *wh*-word is an operator.

Reading: BESE pp. 142-143, pp. 263-269.