forth C&L (1977, fn. 46), based on three assumptions:

(i) a Wh Movement analysis of both kinds of relatives;
(ii) a recoverability condition blocking deletion of wh-words with semantic content;
(iii) a surface filter that rules out the combination of wh-phrase plus that in COMP position.

This surface filter is given in (3):

$$\ast_{\text{COMP}} \text{wh-phrase } \phi \neq c \quad (= \text{C&L (53)})$$

Surface filter (3) is, as C&L point out (p. 446), “a language-specific filter; in fact, it did not hold in Middle English.” Restrictive relatives commonly began with which that in Middle English (ME), but not in the Elizabethan period. For a historical discussion of this filter, see Keyser (1975).

C&L argue that an appropriate form of the recoverability condition will prevent deletion of wh-words in questions (direct or indirect), where the quantifier-like wh-word has intrinsic semantic content, but will allow deletion of the wh-word in relatives, where it is simply a clause marker without semantic content. They suggest (p. 447, fn. 46) that any “residual semantic content in relative pronouns is redundant, since it is expressed in the head of the construction”; they further suggest that this redundancy would automatically follow from a raising analysis of relatives along the lines suggested in Vergnaud (1974). They then go on to say that “these remarks apply only to restrictive relatives. In appositives, a raising analysis is inappropriate and a full NP with lexical content remains in the wh-phrase. This explains the fact that deletion of the wh-phrase is impossible in appositives. Note that it then follows, given filter (53), that the complementizer that will never appear with appositives.”

2. This analysis of appositives makes certain predictions about the possible range of complementizers in ME appositives. First, since filter (53) did not hold in ME, it then follows that the combination of wh-word plus that should have appeared in appositives as well as in restrictive relatives. (As in modern English, that could optionally delete.) Second, according to assumption (ii), deletion of the wh-phrase is impossible in appositives; hence, the analysis predicts that that could not by itself have introduced ME appositives, but could only have occurred in combination with a wh-word.

These predictions are only partially borne out by the data. The first prediction is correct: appositives were commonly introduced by which that in ME. (Note that who was not yet used as a relative pronoun; which was used for human as well as nonhuman NPs.) The following examples from Chaucer il-
There is no reason to assume that the semantics of restrictive versus non-restrictive relative clauses was different in ME than it is today. Hence, if C&C are correct in claiming that the semantic content of the two types of relatives is not different, the difference in the null relative markers in OF and MH cannot be attributed to the nonoccurrence of non-restrictive relatives in this period. In fact, the question of whether the recoverability principle was at work in the non-restrictive relatives in the English language is a matter of debate. Some linguists argue that the non-restrictive relatives in ME were not recoverable, whereas others maintain that they were.

The second prediction, however, is incorrect: ME appositives could be introduced by that alone, as illustrated by the following examples from Chaucer:

(7) But Trolue, that brought his berte bledde for ... (not ME: Trolue, that brought his berte bledde for ...)

(8) Aaron, for hadde the temperle governance, ... (not ME: Aaron, for hadde the temperle governance, ...)

(9) The bye God, that, of this word that wrought eth ... (not ME: The bye God, that, of this word that wrought eth ...)

(10) bat upon his wif, that calleth was Fredeke. ... (not ME: bat upon his wif, that calleth was Fredeke. ...)

(11) This Ascendio, that joile and gay, would with a sencer on the holiday. ... (not ME: This Ascendio, that joile and gay, would with a sencer on the holiday. ...)

The difference in the use of that and which in OF and ME needs to be accounted for. While the null relative marker is recoverable in OF, it is not recoverable in ME. The difference in recoverability is due to the fact that the relative marker in OF is recoverable, whereas the relative marker in ME is not recoverable.

Yet, the Scandinavian languages clearly distinguish between restrictive and non-restrictive relatives, as illustrated by the contrast between the Norwegian examples in (114) and (116):

(114) a. Mennesket som neste måte igår ... (not Norwegian: Mennesket som neste måte igår ...)

b. Mennesket som neste år ... (not Norwegian: Mennesket som neste år ...)

In Norwegian, the restrictive relatives are recoverable, whereas the non-restrictive relatives are not recoverable. The difference in recoverability is due to the fact that the relative marker is recoverable in Norwegian, whereas the relative marker is not recoverable in ME.

This difference in recoverability is due to the fact that the relative marker is recoverable in Norwegian, whereas the relative marker is not recoverable in ME. This difference in recoverability is due to the fact that the relative marker is recoverable in Norwegian, whereas the relative marker is not recoverable in ME.
not plausibly be explained by claiming that the Scandinavian languages, unlike English, have only one type of relative clause.

3. There remains, of course, the interesting question of how the modern restriction on the use of *that* developed in English. It seems to be a much later development than the constraint against consecutive *which that*. Jespersen cites numerous examples of *that* in appositives after the ME period, from Shakespeare even into the nineteenth century:

(15) Flenas, his sonne, *that keepes him company*
Shakespeare, *Macbeth* III 1, 135

(16) my only child, my poor Sophy, *that was the joy of my heart*
Fielding, *Tom Jones* 2.50

(17) he looks as auld as me, *that might be his mother*
Scott, *The Antiquary* 1.247

(18) Is it kind to have made me a grave so rough?
Me, *that was never a quiet sleeper?*
Tennyson, *Maud* 306

More examples of appositives introduced by *that* alone are cited in Jespersen, *MEG* III, 4.3a, 4.4a, 5.1a, 5.2a, 8.1a.

Jespersen describes the development of this restriction against *that* as follows: “In early Modern English, *that* is the favorite relative and is found in non-restrictive as well as in restrictive clauses, but there is in literature a growing tendency to extend the sphere of the *wh*-words, which more and more oust *that* from non-restrictive clauses,” probably because “*wh*-words seemed more refined or dignified than *that*” (4.4a). Traugott (1972) notes that this restriction on *that* was not one of the suggestions put forth by the prescriptive grammarians of the eighteenth century; rather “*that* change seems to have occurred spontaneously” (pp. 182–183). Jespersen suggests that the difference is a function of the “looser” connection of appositives to the head noun. He notes that “restrictive clauses are generally placed immediately after the antecedent, while non-restrictive clauses may stand at some distance...[*wh*-words] gain greater carrying power than *that* and hence are often preferred in the second of two coordinated relative clauses, even when

polarity items such as (Swedish) *längre* ‘any more’ and *det minsta* ‘at all’:

(i) \[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{Ingen} \\
\text{No one} \\
\text{*Någon} \\
\text{someone} \\
\text{*Per} \\
\text{Peter} \\
\end{array}
\]

som studerat *det minsta* kan misslyckas.
who studied at all can fail.

they are restrictive and the first has *that* or no pronoun” (5.3):

(19) ingenious sentences, *that I* suddenly or accidentally recollected; and *which* without my utmost vigilance, had been irrevocably lost for ever.
Swift, *Polite Conversation* 48

(20) things *that* neither the Spaniards, or the English men had tasted for many years; *and which*, it may be supposed, they were glad of.
Defoe, *Robinson Crusoe* 2.134

(21) that ideal *that we* were pleased to call aristocracy *and which* soon became the common property of our set.
H. G. Wells, *The New Macchiavelli* 99

(22) a sort of thing *that used to cut me to the heart, and which* she kept up till the very day I left her.
Shaw, *Cashel Byron’s Profession* 163

(23) she possessed gifts *that were not only higher than a ready tongue, but which paid better in the long run.*
Eden Phillpotts, *The Mother* 38

Jespersen observes that “the inverse order (who or which...and *that*) is rare” (5.3). It is probable that similar considerations explain why the zero-complementizer has always been used exclusively in restrictive relatives (4.4a).

Another contributing factor in the loss of *that* from appositive relatives may lie in the feeling that *that* should be limited to inanimate antecedents. An anonymous referee points out that if eighteenth century grammarians did not legislate against nonrestrictive *that* per se, they did object to the use of *that* with animate (or at least human) heads. For example, John Dryden says the following in a letter to William Walsh, criticizing an essay that Walsh had sent him:

I find likewise that you make not a due distinction betwixt that and who; a man *that* is not proper; the relative *who* is proper. *That*, ought always to signify a thing; *who* a person.

Although prescriptive grammarians were not completely successful in establishing this usage, the stricture may well have contributed to preventing *that* from appearing in relatives with proper noun heads, the nonrestrictive relative par excellence.
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