Predicative Relatives as Manner Relatives

Caroline Heycock,[1] Roberto Zamparelli[2]

Background Since the seminal work of Grosu and Landman (1998), Predicative Relative Clauses (**PredRC**) like (1) have been grouped into the broader class of *maximizing* relatives, along with free relatives (*I like what Mary bought*) and *amount* relatives (2), where the gap is within a *there*-clause (see Carlson 1977).

(1) a. John is [the businessman (that) his father was].
b. Fred and Ginger remain [the (two) great performers they have always been].
c. I admire/remember [the doctor Mary was].
d. [The pedantic bore he is] never misses the opportunity to show his knowledge.

(2) I ate {(all) the cookies there were / what cookies there were }

Like amount RCs, PredRCs require an external definite article (3a) and disallow *wh*-relative pronouns (3b) (but also the use of *what* found in free relatives).

(3) a. John is {the / *that / *a / *one / *every} student his sister wasn't.
b. *John is still {the businessman which he once was / what businessman he was}.

Grosu and Landman (1998) propose that these RCs have a maximization operator (**MO**) which turns a RC denotation, normally a (plural) property, into a singleton containing that property's maximal elements With three cookies *a*, *b*, *c*, [*cookies that there were*] from (2) yields {*abc*} after MO application. This correctly allows *I ate the (three) cookies there were* and excludes *I ate two cookies that there were*, but cannot block other cases: as pointed out in Schwarzschild (2002), if I put 3 cookies in my bag, the restriction *cookies in my bag* supports a numeral the size of the supremum, (4a), yielding a specific reading. (4b), however, is still out.

(4) a. I am looking for three cookies in my bag.
b. *I am looking for three cookies that there were in my bag.

Analysis: syntax We start from the observation that the gap in (3b) is in a predicative position, and that—as frequently observed in the literature on reconstruction effects—*wh*-elements extracted from such positions *must* reconstruct, even when, as in (5), this yields a Cond-C violation (see *John$_i$ is a great admirer of himself$_i$* vs. **He$_i$ is a great admirer of John$_i$*).

(5) *What kind of admirer of John$_i$ do you think he$_i$ is?

We assume the RC analysis in Bianchi (1999) and the DP structure in Cheng, Heycock, and Zamparelli (2017) (simplified in (6))

(6) $[_{\mathrm{DP}<e>}$ the $[_{\mathrm{PredP}<et>}$ a/3 $[_{\mathrm{ClP}<et>}$ (classifiers) $[_{\mathrm{NP}<e>}$ N]]]]

Bianchi (1999) points out that in (7a), but not (7b), the universal inside the RC can take scope over the numerals. This suggests that the bracketed indefinite in (7b) cannot reconstruct, as this move would leave empty and unlicensed D and Pred heads above CP (8).

(7) a. I contacted the [two patients] that every doctor visited *t* ($\surd \forall > 2$)
b. I contacted [two patients] that every doctor visited *t* (only $2 > \forall$)

(8) $[_{\mathrm{DP}}$ D^0 $[_{\mathrm{PredP}}$ ~~$[_{\mathrm{PredP}}$ two patients]~~ Pred^0 $[_{\mathrm{CP}}$ that every doctor ... two patients]]] *after rec.*

Since reconstruction is forced in PredRC, the definite becomes necessary to fill (and license) the D elements in (7). But now the restrictor (N+PredRC) must contain a single/maximal

[1]School of Philosophy, Psychology and Language Sciences, University of Edinburgh, 3 Charles Street, Edinburgh, EH8 9AD, caroline.heycock@ed.ac.uk

[2]CIMeC, Università di Trento, corso Bettini 31, 38068 Rovereto, Italy; roberto.zamparelli@unitn.it

element (and one compatible with a predicative use, see (9)). We propose that in cases like (1a) the DP subpart that ends up outside CP is smaller than in (8) (possibly, a bare NP), and yields a semantics which is not the set of individuals having a given property (or (1a) would just mean: *Fred is a businessman and his father was, too*). A different semantics is in order.

(9) *Mine is the fastest car this one is. *from: *"...this one is fastest car"*

SEMANTICS PredRCs are typically used within predicates (see (1a) and (1b)), but may also appear in arguments (see (1c),(1d)), if their predicates apply to the 'role', not to the individual endowed with it (see ?**I returned the book that the gift was*). Note that the constituent extracted from the RC cannot give rise to a sub-kind meaning without an explicit *kind*-noun (10).

(10) Ted is a dermatologist. Dermatologists are doctors. Sue is the ??(kind of) doctor Ted is.

One possibility is that the ontological entity that PredRCs make available should be identified with *tropes* (Moltmann 2013, 2004): manifestations of properties as applied to an individual. Tropes have been used to capture the meaning of property nominalizations (*beauty, wisdom*), and the range of 'Special quantifiers' **SQ**s, the words among [ ] in (11) (Moltmann 2013, ch.3).

(11) Ted {admires/hates/remembers/is} [{everything/something/what}] I am not.

The meaning of tropes, however, needs to be clarified. The attribution of a property to an individual can be transferred, (12), and this does not reduce to a mere *degree* comparison.

(12) Mary has her mother's beauty. $\neq$ 'Mary has as much beauty as her mother'

Moroever, SQs have properties which are different from PredRCs. In (13a), the SQ does not reconstruct below *nobody*; in (13b), it can be an argument or a predicate. Contrast with (14).

(13) a. Mary is something nobody is — 8 feet tall. $\forall > \neg$
b. Ted admires/hates/is something I am not — a pragmatist.

(14) a. Ted is the doctor I am not.
b. ??Ted is the doctor I am. *but see: "every bit the doctor I am": degree*
c. ??Ted admires/remembers the doctor I am not.

(14a) is compatible with two situations: (i) I am **not** a doctor (see *Ted is the doctor I could have been*), or , more interestingly, (ii) I **am** a doctor, just in a *way* different from Ted's. In case (ii), the RC in (14a) refers — we propose — to the plurality formed from the complement set of the **ways** in which the 'doctor' trope applies to me. 'My way' of being a doctor is uniquely mine, and this explains the oddness of (14b), barring a derivative 'degree' meaning; finally, verbs that want objects, not 'ways', reject PredRCs (14c) (if I am not a doctor, (14c) says that Ted has an attitude toward this unrealized profession of mine; if I am, the sentence is plainly incoherent; contrast with (13b), where the SQ is free to range over actually different properties).

Our conclusion is that at least with respect to PredRC, "tropes" reduce to the ways/manners in which a property applies to the RC subject. PredRC should actually be named 'MannerRCs'.

SELECTED REFERENCES

Bianchi, V. (1999). *Consequences of Antisymmetry; Headed Relative Clauses*. Mouton de Gruyter.

Carlson, G. (1977). A unified analysis of the English bare plural. *Linguistics and Philosophy 1*, 413–457.

Cheng, L. L.-S., C. Heycock, and R. Zamparelli (2017). Two levels for definiteness. In M. Y. Erlewine (Ed.), *Proceedings of GLOW in Asia XI - Volume 1*, Volume 84 of *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics*. MIT.

Grosu, A. and F. Landman (1998). Strange relatives of the third kind. *Natural Language Semantics 6*, 125–170.

Moltmann, F. (2013). *Abstract Objects and the Semantics of Natural Language*. Oxford University Press.

Schwarzschild, R. S. (2002). Singleton indefinites. *Journal of Semantics 19*(3).