

*the American who had ousted Enderby from the john* [3a]

to be further reduced to:

*the American from the john* [3b]

and finally:

an American, not *the john one*, poised his camera to shoot [3c]

The order of presentation in this chapter will be from most explicit to least explicit. We therefore start with the most explicit type of noun-phrase modification, *i.e.* postmodification by finite clause.

## Postmodification by finite clauses

### Types of postmodifying finite clauses

**17.9** We distinguish two major types of finite clauses as noun-phrase postmodifiers, RELATIVE clauses [1] and APPOSITIVE clauses [2]:

The news *that appeared in the papers this morning* was well received. [1]

The news *that the team had won* calls for a celebration. [2]

Although superficially similar, the difference between these two types of finite clause becomes apparent, for example if we try to replace *that* by *which* in the two examples:

The news *which appeared in the papers this morning* was well received. [1a]

\*The news *which the team had won* calls for a celebration. [2a]

Thus *that* is not replaceable by a *wh*-pronoun in appositive clauses, as it is in relative clauses. More significantly from a general point of view, *that* in [2] has no function as clause element within the *that*-clause, as it has in relative clause structure. Thus in [1], the relative pronoun is subject; in [1b] it is object:

The news *which we saw in the papers this morning* was well received. [1b]

Appositive clauses will be further discussed in 17.26f. The type of relative clause represented by [1] is called an ADNOMINAL relative clause, and will be discussed below.

In addition to adnominal relative clauses, we distinguish NOMINAL relative clauses, as in [3], and SENTENTIAL relative clauses, as in [4]:

*What surprises me* is that they are fond of snakes and lizards. [3]

They are fond of snakes and lizards, *which surprises me*. [4]

Nominal relative clauses are unique among relative clauses in that they 'contain' their antecedents. They are discussed, with other nominal dependent clauses, in 15.8f.

In sentential relative clauses, the antecedent is not nominal but clausal, *ie* in [4] the whole clause *They are fond of snakes and lizards* is postmodified by *which surprises me*. That this is so can be seen in the choice of singular verb concord (*surprises*). The sentential relative clause has affinities with, on the one hand, nominal relative clauses, and, on the other hand, with coordinate clauses (*cf* 13.50f):

They are fond of snakes and lizards, *and that surprises me.* [4a]

The adnominal relative clause is the central type of relative clause, and, unless indicated otherwise, 'relative clause' here means 'adnominal relative clause'. Within such relative clauses we make a distinction between restrictive [5] and nonrestrictive [6] (*cf* 17.3ff):

Snakes *which are poisonous* should be avoided. [5]

Rattlesnakes, *which are poisonous*, should be avoided. [6]

Among those two types, the restrictive is the more common, and will be treated before the nonrestrictive.

### Characteristics of relative clauses

**17.10** Part of the explicitness of relative clauses lies in the specifying power of the relative pronoun. It may be capable of

(i) showing concord with its antecedent, *ie* the preceding part of the noun phrase of which the relative clause is a postmodifier [external relation];

and

(ii) indicating its function within the relative clause either as an element of clause structure (S, O, C, A), or as a constituent of an element in the relative clause [internal relation].

### Gender concord

**17.11** Concord is on the basis of a two-term 'gender' system, personal and nonpersonal (*cf* 5.105ff, 6.8f), and applies only to the *wh*-series:

Joan, <i>who</i> . . .	London, <i>which</i> . . .
the boy/people <i>who</i> . . .	the fox/animals <i>which</i> . . .
the human being <i>who</i> . . .	the human body <i>which</i> . . .
the fairy <i>who</i> . . .	the unicorn <i>which</i> . . .

It will be seen from these examples that 'personality' is ascribed basically to human beings but extends to creatures in the supernatural world (angels, elves, etc) which are thought of as having human characteristics such as speech. Pet animals can be regarded as 'personal' (at least by their owners; *cf* 5.109f):

Rover, *who* was barking, frightened the children.

On the other hand, human babies can be regarded (though rarely perhaps by their parents) as not having developed personality:

This is the baby *which* needs inoculation.

Though ships may take the personal pronoun *she*, the relative pronoun is regularly nonpersonal (*cf* 5.111 Note):

Is  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} it \\ she \end{array} \right\}$  the ship which is due to leave for a Caribbean cruise tomorrow?

Collective nouns (*cf* 5.108) are normally treated as personal when they have plural concord (esp in BrE), and as nonpersonal when they have singular concord:

The committee  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} who \text{ were} \\ which \text{ was} \end{array} \right\}$  responsible for this decision . . .

The gender contrast is neutralized when the *wh*-series is replaced by *that* or a zero relative:

She must be the *nicest person that* ever lived.

That must be the *nicest thing that* ever happened.

With coordinated antecedents of mixed gender, the choice of relative pronoun may create a problem. It does not arise when zero relative is possible or when *that* is chosen, *eg*:

the people and things  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{she likes most} \\ \text{that amuse her most} \end{array} \right\}$

With *wh*-pronouns, the principle of proximity seems to be favoured (*cf* 10.35):

the people and things *which*  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{amuse her most} \\ \text{the things and people who} \end{array} \right\}$

*Which* can have a personal noun as its antecedent when the relative is a complement with the semantic role of characterization attribute (*cf* 10.20):

He imagined himself to be an artist, *which* he was not.

Note [a] Other nonhuman creatures besides pets may take *who* even in sentences where this involves an apparent clash with the neuter pronoun *it*; thus, from a recent work of nonfiction:

the chameleon *who* changes *its* colours

This is less likely however when the relative pronoun is object in its clause, as we see from the following examples on two successive pages of a work on zoology:

the black rhinoceroses *who* live in the park

the white rhinoceros *which* we saw in the wilds outside the park

On the factors involved in this difference, *cf* 17.16.

[b] It so happens that, in familiar speech, the word *character* can be used in the sense of 'person', and the word *personality* can be used for somebody who has achieved notoriety. In consequence, we may have not only [1] and [2] but also [1a] and [2a]:

Charles has a fine character *which* he inherits from his father. [1]

Smith has a strange personality *which* repels many people. [2]

Charles is a strange character *who* dislikes parties. <familiar> [1a]

Smith is now a famous personality *who* is often interviewed on television. [2a]

17.12 The nominal relative clause is common with definite nonpersonal reference (though with a different pronoun from that used in adnominal relative clauses; *cf* 15.8f, 6.35 Note [b]): *what*, *whatever*, *whichever*.

*What is most highly valued* in the tribe is valour.

[1]

This is *what I can't understand*.  
 She'll do *whatever you say*.  
 Choose *whichever you like best*.

[2]

[3]

[4]

In the case of definite personal reference, the only pronoun is *whoever*:

\*Who      }      Whoever      }      helped me has gone. [5]

A personal pronoun + a relative pronoun, on the other hand, is possible only in archaic or very formal contexts:

*He who* made this possible deserves our gratitude. [6]

It is more acceptable if *he* has generic reference, as in [7], which however also sounds archaic:

*He who* helps the handicapped deserves our support. [7]

The normal expressions are [7a] and [7b]:

Anyone      }      who helps the handicapped deserves our support. [7a]  
 Anybody      }  
 Those who help the handicapped deserve our support. [7b]

Replacement is impossible with plural \**they who/which*, and also with singular \**it which*:

What      }      I can't understand is this: . . . [2a]  
 \*It which      }

*That* is acceptable with *which* only in very formal style:

*That which* is most highly valued in the tribe is valour. [1a]

Note In relation to \**it which* . . ., there is a similar constraint on postmodification by some other structures: [8]

?*He in the corner* is my new boss. [8a]

\**It in the corner* is an antique.

Postmodification following *you* is possible in informal and peremptory vocatives (cf 10.53): [8b]

*You in the corner*, stop chattering!

### Restrictive relative clauses

**17.13** The choice of relative pronoun is dependent, in particular, on the following three factors:

(a) the relation of the relative clause to its antecedent: restrictive [1] or nonrestrictive [2], eg:

The woman *who is approaching us* seems to be somebody I [1]  
 know.

The Bible, *which has been retranslated*, remains a bestseller. [2]

(b) the gender type of the antecedent: personal [3] or nonpersonal [4] (cf 17.11f), eg:

the person *who* I was visiting [3]  
 the book *which* I was reading [4]

(c) the function of the relative pronoun as subject, object, complement, or adverbial (including its role as prepositional complement) or as a constituent of an element in the relative clause, *ie* as a determiner (*in whose house*; *cf* 17.14).

In the following discussion of choice of relative pronoun, we will first make a division into restrictive and nonrestrictive relative clauses, and then consider other factors, such as medial or final position of the relative clause in relation to the superordinate clause, and length of the relative clause.

The set of relative pronouns has been given in 6.32ff. It is in the nonrestrictive relative clauses that the most explicit forms of relative pronoun, *ie* the *wh*-series (*who*, *whom*, *which*, *whose*) are typically used (*cf* 17.22). In restrictive clauses, frequent use is made of the *wh*-pronouns and also *that* or 'zero' relative. *That* differs from the *wh*-series:

- (a) in not having gender marking and thus being independent of the personal or nonpersonal character of the antecedent;
- (b) in not having an objective form (like *who/whom*);
- (c) in not having a genitive (like *whose* of *who* and *which*), thus not being able to function as a constituent of an element in the relative clause.

17.14 In restrictive relative clauses, the pronouns given in the survey below are used. When we indicate a parenthesized relative pronoun, it means that there is the option between *that*-relative and 'zero':

This is the book (*that*) I bought at the sale.

When we use parentheses only ' ( ) ', this is to indicate 'zero':

This is the book ( ) I bought at the sale.

S, O, C, A in the survey below means that the relative pronoun functions respectively as subject, object, complement, and adverbial (or complement in a prepositional phrase functioning as adverbial) in the relative clause with personal and nonpersonal antecedents:

S: They are delighted with { the book { *which* } that \*() } has just appeared.

O: They are delighted with  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{the person } \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{who}(m) \\ \text{that} \\ ( ) \end{array} \right\} \\ \text{we have appointed.} \end{array} \right\}$

the book { *which*  
*that*  
*( )* } she has written.

C: She is the perfect accountant  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{which} \\ \text{*who} \\ \text{*that} \end{array} \right\}$  her predecessor was not.

C: This is not the type of modern house  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{which} \\ * \text{that} \\ * ( ) \end{array} \right\}$  my own is.

A: He is the policeman  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{at whom} \\ \text{who(m)} \\ \text{that} \\ ( ) \end{array} \right\}$  the burglar fired the gun *at*.

A: She arrived the day  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{on which} \\ \text{that} \\ ( ) \end{array} \right\}$  I was ill (*on*).

A: I make cakes the way  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{in which} \\ \text{that} \\ ( ) \end{array} \right\}$  my mother made them.

With a personal antecedent, the relative pronoun can show the distinction between *who* and *whom*, depending on its role as subject of the relative clause, or as object, or as prepositional complement:

the person	<i>who</i> spoke to him	[subject]	[1]
	<i>to whom</i> he spoke	[prepositional complement]	[2]
	<i>who(m)</i> he spoke to	[prepositional complement]	[2a]
	<i>who(m)</i> he met	[object]	[3]

When the governing preposition precedes its complement, as in the rather formal [2], the choice of *whom* is obligatory. When it does not, as in [2a], or when the relative pronoun is the object of the verb, as in [3], there is some choice between *who* or *whom*: the latter is preferred in formal English, the former is preferred in informal use, where however the zero form is by far the most common.

If the pronoun is a possessive determiner of the noun phrase, the form is *whose*:

The woman *whose daughter* you met is Mrs Brown. ['The woman is Mrs Brown; you met her daughter.'] [4]

The house *whose roof* was damaged has now been repaired. ['The house has now been repaired; its roof was damaged.'] [5]

In cases like [5] where the antecedent is nonpersonal, there is some tendency to avoid the use of *whose* (presumably because many regard it as the genitive only of the personal *who*), but avoidance involves stylistic difficulty. There is the stiffly formal and cumbersome *of which*:

The house *the roof of which* was damaged . . . [5a]

Other variants are clumsy or unacceptable in standard English:

?The house *that* they damaged *the roof of* . . . [5b]

\*The house *that* *the roof* was damaged *of* . . . [5c]

Satisfactory alternatives can however be found, such as [5d], or even [5e]:

The house *that had its roof damaged* . . . [5d]

The house *with the damaged roof* . . . [5e]

In any case, in some fields of discourse such as mathematics, no evasion is felt to be necessary:

Let ABC be a triangle *whose sides* are of unequal length. [6]

The *of which* construction is sometimes placed before its head (like *whose*). Thus we have [7] besides the more usual [7a] and [7b]:

The investigation  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{of which the results will soon be published} \dots \\ \text{the results of which will soon be published} \dots \\ \text{whose results will soon be published} \dots \end{array} \right. \quad \begin{array}{l} [7] \\ [7a] \\ [7b] \end{array}$

### Relative pronoun as subject and object

**17.15** When the antecedent is personal and the pronoun is the subject of the relative clause, *who* is favoured, irrespective of the style and the occasion; thus [1] rather than [1a], though there is nothing wrong or odd about the latter:

People *who* live in new houses ... [1]  
People *that* live in new houses ... [1a]

Zero cannot replace the subject in a relative clause such as [2] and [3]:

\*The table ( ) stands in the corner has a broken leg. [2]  
\*The man ( ) stands over there I know. [3]

However, constructions are encountered that are arguably exceptions; for example, in very informal speech where the antecedent is an indefinite pronoun:

?Anybody ( ) does that ought to be locked up. [4]

The reason for putting a question mark in [4] is, first, that it is of doubtful acceptability; secondly, that many speakers would condemn it as slovenly; thirdly, that it may result from the subaudibility of a relative pronoun *who* or *that* and thus not strictly be zero at all.

A commoner type of example is to be found in existential and cleft sentences (*cf* 18.44ff, 18.25ff):

There's a table ( ) stands in the corner. [5]

It's Simon ( ) did it. [6]

Sentences [5] and [6] would again be very colloquial, and the use of *that* or a *wh*-item would be regarded as more acceptable:

There's a table  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{that} \\ \text{which} \end{array} \right\}$  stands in the corner. [5a]

It was Simon  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{that} \\ \text{who} \end{array} \right\}$  did it. [6a]

However, there are good reasons for distinguishing such *that/which*-clauses from adnominal relative clauses. The obligatory nature of such portions of existential or cleft sentences would argue against our equating them with postmodifications in noun-phrase structure (*cf* 18.48).

*That* as subject and *that* or zero as object are preferred to *which* when the antecedent is nonpersonal *all*, *anything*, *everything*, *nothing*, *little*, or *much*:

All                    }  
 Anything            }  
 Everything        } *{ that* strikes you as odd . . .  
*{ (that)* you find odd . . .

There was *little that* ['not much that'] interested him at the motor show.

*Much that* ['much of what'] has been said tonight will soon be forgotten.

When the antecedent is modified by a superlative or by one of the post-determiners *first*, *last*, *next*, *only*, the relative pronoun as subject is usually *that*, and, as object, *that* or zero rather than *which* or *who(m)* (cf 5.22):

She must be one of the most remarkable women *that ever* lived.

They eat the finest food *{ that* is available.  
*{ (that)* money can buy.

In such sentences, an alternative to a postmodifying copular relative clause with an adjective as complement is pre- or postposition of the adjective (cf 7.21):

They eat the finest *{ available food.  
*{ food available.**

Note [a] The pronunciation of *that* as a relative pronoun is generally reduced to /ðət/, whereas the demonstrative *that* (cf 6.40) has the full form /ðæt/.

[b] One reason why zero relative subject is unacceptable may be related to perception. In example [2], it is only when encountering the verb *has* (the seventh word in the sentence) that the reader/hearer can interpret this sequence as a relative construction, instead of an expected *SVA* structure ending with *corner*, as in [2a]:

The table stands in the corner. [2a]

Compare the situation with the acceptable zero construction of nonsubject function in [2b], where it is clear on reaching *you* (the third word) that *you* begins a new construction: [2b]

The table you see standing in the corner has a broken leg.

### Relative pronoun as object and prepositional complement

17.16 With the antecedent still personal but with the pronoun now object of a verb or prepositional complement, there is a much stronger preference for *that* or zero, perhaps to avoid the choice between *who* and *whom*. Thus [1] rather than [1a]:

People (*that*) I *{ visit . . .  
*{ speak to . . . }** [1]

People *who(m)* I *{ visit . . .  
*{ speak to . . . }** [1a]

Again, there is nothing actually wrong about [1a]; but *whom* here would seem pedantic to many people, while *who* as object in relative clauses is informal and tends to be regarded as incorrect. Since, therefore, neither *who* nor *whom* is wholly satisfactory, *that* (and particularly zero) is frequently used despite a personal antecedent.

Avoidance of *whom* may not be the only factor influencing *that* as object with personal antecedent. Grammatical objects are more likely to be nonpersonal, or to carry nonpersonal implication, than subjects.

There are several other factors influencing the selection of a pronoun that is object or prepositional complement in the relative clause, especially when the antecedent is nonpersonal. One is the proximity of the relative clause to the head of the antecedent phrase; another is the degree of complexity of the subject of the antecedent phrase.

When complex phrases or clauses intervene between the antecedent head and the relative pronoun, *which* is generally preferable to *that* and very much preferable to zero:

I have [[*interests* outside my immediate work and its problems] *which* I find satisfying].

When the antecedent of the relative clause is no more complex than determiner + head, *that* is by many preferred to *which* and zero:

I'll take you to [the building [*that* all elderly university teachers prefer]].

On the other hand, when the subject of the relative clause is a personal pronoun, zero is preferred to either *which* or *that*, especially if the relative clause itself is fairly short and simple:

Who's drunk [the milk [( ) I bought]]?

Finally, other things being equal, more informal discourse will tend to have a preference for zero. In the following example from an informal conversation, the zero construction could not appropriately have been replaced by any of the other relative pronouns that are available in the system (*who*, *whom*, *that*):

You learn a lot about [authors [you didn't know too much about to start with]].

### Relative pronoun as adverbial

**17.17** When the relative pronoun is the complement of a preposition (and, together with the preposition functioning as A), some choice exists in placing a preposition which has a *wh*-pronoun as its complement. No such choice exists with *that*, where postposition with deferred preposition represents the sole pattern:

the lady	$\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{towards whom the dog ran} \\ \text{who(m)} \\ \text{that} \\ ( ) \end{array} \right\}$	the dog ran <i>towards</i>
the table	$\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{under which the boy crawled} \\ \text{which} \\ \text{that} \\ ( ) \end{array} \right\}$	the boy crawled <i>under</i>

The choice of relative clause structure involves stylistic distinctions. In

general, it is certainly true that *wh*-pronouns with initial preposition are used predominantly in formal English:

The person *to whom* any complaints should be addressed is . . . [1]

Initial prepositions are normally avoided in more informal use, where they would be felt to be stilted or pompous. A deferred preposition is more generally used with prepositional verbs:

That's the book ( ) he's been looking *for*. [2]

But many prepositions (especially those dealing with temporal and other abstract relations) cannot easily be deferred (*cf* 9.6):

?That was the meeting (*that*) I kept falling asleep *during*. [3]

One might find [3a], but in familiar speech an adverbial relative with *when* or *where* (*cf* 17.18) would be preferred to *during which*:

That was the meeting *during which* I kept falling asleep. [3a]

Prepositions expressing spatial relations allow a deferred preposition even when the preposition is complex:

This is the house he stood *in front of*. [4]

However, clarity of expression would often influence us in the direction of a construction otherwise regarded as formal if a final preposition leads to clumsiness. Consider the following sentence:

It was in a book that a former teacher of mine thought of at one time presenting me with some quotations from. [5]

Hearing or reading it, we may successively have to reject the interpretations, first, that the former teacher thought of the book; second, that the teacher thought of presenting me with the book, before the belated *from* enables us to achieve the correct interpretation ('. . . *from which* a former teacher . . .').

A deferred preposition may be the only natural choice when there is coordination of one prepositional and one nonprepositional construction in the relative clause. Thus instead of the clumsy [6], zero relative and a deferred preposition would be far more natural, as in [6a]:

You should restrict yourself to words *with which* you are familiar and *which* you can use confidently. [6]

You should restrict yourself to words ( ) you are familiar *with* and can use confidently. [6a]

But note that [6a] requires subject ellipsis, since coordination with zero relatives is not fully acceptable:

?You should restrict yourself to words ( ) you are familiar *with* and ( ) you can use confidently. [6b]

17.18 In adverbial expressions of place, time, and cause, there is a wide range of choice in addition to what was stated in 17.17 for the relative pronoun as adverbial. The preposition + pronoun can be replaced by special adverbs (*cf* 7.53), *eg*:

That's *the place*  $\left\{ \begin{smallmatrix} \text{in which} \\ \text{where} \end{smallmatrix} \right\}$  she was born. [1]

That was *the period*  $\left\{ \begin{smallmatrix} \text{during which} \\ \text{when} \end{smallmatrix} \right\}$  she lived here. [2]

That's *the reason*  $\left\{ \begin{smallmatrix} \text{?for which} \\ \text{why} \end{smallmatrix} \right\}$  she spoke. [3]

Note that *for which* in [3] has limited acceptability.

However, there are considerable and complicated restrictions on these *wh*-forms which operate in relative clauses expressing place, time, and cause. Many speakers find their use along with the corresponding antecedent somewhat tautologous – especially the type *the reason why* – and prefer the *wh*-clause without antecedent, *ie* a nominal relative clause (*cf* 15.8f):

Is this *where* she was born? [1a]

That was *when* she lived here. [2a]

That's *why* she spoke. [3a]

There is no relative *how* parallel to *where*, *when*, and *why* to express manner with an antecedent noun [4], but only [4a]:

\*That's *the way how* she spoke. [4]

That's  $\left\{ \begin{smallmatrix} \text{how} \\ \text{the way (that)} \end{smallmatrix} \right\}$  she spoke. [4a]

The following patterns can be distinguished for time expressions in a sentence such as '... was Thursday'.

Pattern 1: antecedent + preposition + *wh*-pronoun:

*the day on which* she arrived

Pattern 2: antecedent + *wh*-pronoun + deferred preposition:

*the day which* she arrived *on*

Pattern 3: antecedent + *that* + deferred preposition:

*the day that* she arrived *on*

Pattern 4: antecedent + zero relative + deferred preposition:

*the day* she arrived *on*

Pattern 5: antecedent + *wh*-adverb:

*the day when* she arrived

Pattern 6: antecedent + zero relative + zero preposition:

*the day* she arrived

Pattern 7: antecedent + *that* + zero preposition:

*the day that* she arrived

Pattern 8: *wh*-clause without antecedent (*ie* a nominal relative clause, *cf* 15.8f):

*when* she arrived

17.19 There are also restrictions on the antecedent nouns. With relative clauses where the antecedent denotes cause or reason, *reason* is virtually the only possible antecedent; where the antecedents denote place and time, the most generic nouns (*place*, *period*, *time*, etc) also seem to be preferred. Thus pattern 5 is acceptable:

*the office where he works*

However, many would prefer alternative expressions (patterns 1, 2, 3, 4, where pattern 1 is most formal and pattern 4 least formal):

the office	<i>at which he works</i>	[pattern 1]
	<i>which he works at</i>	[pattern 2]
	<i>that he works at</i>	[pattern 3]
	<i>( ) he works at</i>	[pattern 4]
the day	<i>on which she was born</i>	[pattern 1]
	<i>which she was born on</i>	[pattern 2]
	<i>that she was born on</i>	[pattern 3]
	<i>( ) she was born on</i>	[pattern 4]

Place adjuncts in relative clauses admit of two further patterns: one with *where* and omission of the preposition (pattern 5), the other with the deferred preposition *at* (pattern 9):

the place	<i>where she works</i>	[pattern 5]
	<i>?where she works at</i>	[pattern 9]

Pattern 5 is acceptable, whereas pattern 9 is of doubtful acceptability. It requires a fairly specific antecedent, *eg*:

*the government building where she works at*

With a general antecedent, such as *place*, we may find the following patterns, which however are not acceptable to all speakers:

(?) <i>That's the place</i>	<i>she stays when she's in London.</i>	[1]
	<i>she works.</i>	[2]
	<i>she studies.</i>	[3]

However, a final *at* (pattern 4) would be fully acceptable, at least in familiar usage:

That's the place	<i>she stays at when she's in London.</i>	[1a]
	<i>she works at.</i>	[2a]
	<i>she studies at.</i>	[3a]

With a generalized antecedent such as *way*, expressing direction, we usually have zero rather than *that*:

*Was that the way she went? ['Was that where she went?']*

17.20 In expressions of time, omission of the preposition is usual whether the pronoun is *that* or zero:

What's *the time* { (that) she normally arrives (at)?  
 when she normally arrives?  
 \*when she normally arrives *at*?

What was *the day* (that) she left (*on*)?

When (less frequently and more formally) the pronoun is *which*, however, the preposition must be expressed in all three instances, and it would be usual to make it precede the pronoun (pattern 1):

5.30 is *the time at which* she normally arrives.

I don't remember *the day on which* she left.

He worked for the whole three months *during which* he lived there.

With expressions of manner and reason, the zero construction is usual (occasionally *that*), and there is no preposition (patterns 6 and 7):

That's *the way (that)* he did it. ['That's how he did it.'] [4]

Is this *the reason (that)* they came? ['Is this why they came?'] [5]

In more formal style, we might find pattern 1:

That's *the way in which* he did it. [4a]

The rare use of *for which* after *reason* strikes most people as clumsy and unnatural, while *the reason why* seems tautologous; there is general preference for zero [5a] or a nominal relative clause [5b]:

Is that { *the reason they came?* [5a]  
 why they came? [5b]

However, after other nouns which express adverbial-related meanings similar to *reason* and *way*, no *that* or zero construction without preposition is possible. Thus not [6] and [7] but only [6a] and [7a]:

{ \*This is *the style* he wrote it. [6]  
 This is *the style* he wrote it *in*. [6a]

{ \*Is this *the {cause motive}* she came? [7]

{ Is this *the cause of {motive for}* her coming? [7a]

There is a tendency to favour *when* or *where* if the antecedent is already the complement of a prepositional phrase, ie [8] rather than [8a] (to avoid repetition of the preposition):

He died *on the day* { *when his son arrived.* [8]  
 on which his son arrived. [8a]

Occasionally plural antecedents can be met with, as in:

It would be wise to leave doctors *ways* ( ) they could add personal touches to their treatment.

Note Constructions with time nouns + zero relative clause (eg: *The moment you do something . . .*) may be ambiguous up to a certain point in the sentence, in that the noun phrase can be either adverbial, as in [9], or subject, as in [10]:

*The moment ( ) you do something they disagree with* they are at your throat . . . [9]  
*The moment ( ) you realize the importance of animal psychology* will be embarrassing [10]  
 to you.

Type [9] is normal; type [10] seems to be rare when, as here, the subject is 'heavy', but compare [11]:

*The day she arrived at the congress was sunny.* [11]

### Telescoped relative clauses

**17.21** The distinction between restrictive and nonrestrictive is valuable, but we should be prepared to view it as a gradient rather than as a dichotomy between two homogeneous categories. One type of relative construction which demonstrates the need for this approach can be illustrated by the following example of TELESCOPED relative construction:

All this I gave up for *the mother who needed me*. [1]

In [1], *mother* may be seen as having an appositional relation to a noun phrase whose head is a general noun such as *person*, accompanied by a relative clause as postmodifier:

All this I gave up for *a person who needed me*, ie *my mother*. [1a]

Another example:

This book is about *a Bloomsbury I simply don't recognize*. ['about a place I simply don't recognize; but I ought to recognize because I know Bloomsbury and the book says it is Bloomsbury'] [2]

### Nonrestrictive relative clauses

**17.22** In nonrestrictive relative clauses, the most explicit forms of relative pronouns, ie the *wh*-series, are typically used. The relative pronoun can be subject, object, complement, or adverbial. Here is a survey of the different forms for personal and nonpersonal antecedents:

S: I spoke to Dr Spolsky,  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{who} \\ * \text{that} \\ * ( ) \end{array} \right\}$  was unwilling to give further details.

S: This excellent book,  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{which} \\ ? \text{*that} \\ * ( ) \end{array} \right\}$  has only just been reviewed, was published a year ago.

O: I spoke to Dr Spolsky,  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{whom} \\ ? \text{who} \\ * \text{that} \\ * ( ) \end{array} \right\}$  I met after the inquest.

O: This excellent book,  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{which} \\ ? \text{*that} \\ * ( ) \end{array} \right\}$  Freda has only just received for review, was published a year ago.

C: Anna is a vegetarian,  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{which} \\ *\text{who} \\ *\text{that} \\ *( ) \end{array} \right\}$  no one else is in our family.

C: She wants low-calorie food,  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{which} \\ *\text{that} \\ *( ) \end{array} \right\}$  this vegetable curry certainly is.

A: This is a new type of word processor,

$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{about which} \\ \text{which} \\ *\text{that} \\ *( ) \end{array} \right\}$  there has been so much publicity *about*.

As can be seen, the choice of pronouns is restricted to *who(m)* and *which*. Nonsubject *who* is thought by many to be more objectionable in nonrestrictive than in restrictive clauses (cf 17.14). Zero cannot occur, and *that* is very rare.

With nonrestrictive relative clauses, we usually have a tone unit boundary, often accompanied by a pause, before the relative clause; and, often, a repetition at the end of the relative clause of the nuclear tone of the tone unit preceding the relative clause. In writing, nonrestrictive relationship is usually marked off by commas (cf App III.19). Compare:

WRITTEN: Then he met Mary, *who invited him to a party*.

SPOKEN: Then he |met MARY| – *who invited him to a PARTY*|

By contrast, with restrictive relative clauses, there is usually no tone unit boundary or pause before the relative clause; nor in writing is the relative clause separated by a comma from what precedes. Compare:

WRITTEN: That's the girl (*that*) *he met at the party*.

SPOKEN: |That's the girl (*that*) *he met at the PARTY*|

It must be emphasized that these are typical rather than obligatory prosodic features. The following example is exceptional in having a prosodic boundary before the relative clause though it is unquestionably restrictive:

but in the |LÒNG RÙN| – |these are FÒRCES| that will |ÙLTIMATELY| – |win SUPPORT| from the majority of the people in this CÒUNTRY|

17.23 Nonrestrictive relationship is often semantically very similar to coordination, with or without conjunction (cf 13.1ff), or adverbial subordination (cf 15.17ff). Both types are indicated by paraphrases in the following examples:

Then he met Mary  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} , \text{who invited him to a party.} \\ , \text{and she invited him to a party.} \\ ; \text{she invited him to a party.} \end{array} \right\}$  [1]

Here is John Smith  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} , \text{who(m) I mentioned the other day.} \\ ; \text{I mentioned him the other day.} \\ , \text{who(m) I talked about the other day.} \\ ; \text{I talked about him the other day.} \end{array} \right\}$  [2]

[1]

[1a]

[1b]

[2]

[2a]

[2b]

[2c]

He got lost on Snowdon	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} , \text{which} \text{ was enveloped in fog.} \\ ; \text{ it was enveloped in fog.} \\ , \text{when it was enveloped in fog.} \end{array} \right.$	[3] [3a] [3b]
She read a paper on lampreys	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} , \text{which} \text{ she has studied.} \\ ; \text{ she has studied} \text{ them.} \\ , \text{which} \text{ she has done research} \text{ on.} \\ , \text{on which} \text{ she has done research.} \\ ; \text{ she has done research} \text{ on} \text{ them.} \end{array} \right.$	[4] [4a] [4b] [4c] [4d]
My brother, <i>who</i> has lived in America since boyhood, can still speak fluent Italian.		[5]
My brother can still speak fluent Italian, <i>and he</i> has lived in America since boyhood.		[5a]
My brother can still speak Italian <i>although he</i> has lived in America since boyhood.		[5b]

Note A nonrestrictive interpretation is occasionally introduced by *that* when a premodifier or determiner would make a restrictive clause absurd, but when *which*, on the other hand, might imply too parenthetical a relation:

I looked at *Mary's sad face*, *that* I had once so passionately loved. [6]

In [6] we seem to have an elliptical form of an appositive expression:

I looked at *Mary's sad face*, *a face that* I had once so passionately loved. [6a]

Here the appositive *a face* justifies the restrictive clause that follows.

Usually the use of nonrestrictive *that* shows that a writer has muddled what he has wanted to set down, as in the following example from a serious article:

One of the most important recent developments in neutral hydrogen studies of our Galaxy has been the discovery of high velocities in the centre and in regions away from the plane, *that* I have mentioned.

Despite the comma – and the corresponding prosodic separation if this is read aloud (a separation that is essential if *plane* were not to be thought the antecedent head) – it seems likely that the writer originally wanted the relative clause to be restrictive, as it could readily have been if placed earlier:

... has been *the discovery that* I have mentioned of high velocities...

However, this position of the relative clause violates the rule that prepositional phrases precede relative clauses as postmodifiers, producing a rhetorically unacceptable sentence (*cf* 18.39f).

**17.24** Where the relative pronoun is a determinative in a noun phrase, there is again less choice than in restrictive clauses. Expressions with *which* tend to be uncommon except in formally precise writing. The preposition usually precedes *which*, and explicitness often extends to completion of the prepositional phrase by a general noun, locative or temporal, as the case may be (making *which* a relative determiner, *cf* 5.14):

In 1960 he came to London, *in which city* he has lived ever since. [1]

He came in 1960,  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{at which time} \\ \text{in which year} \end{array} \right\}$  there was ... [2]

More commonly, we find *where* or *when* instead of the *which* expression:

... to London, *where* ... [1a]

... in 1960, *when* ... [2a]

This is a point at which there is little distinction between adnominal relative

clauses and adverbial clauses of place and time in complex sentence structure (*cf* 15.25ff).

Note the possible variations in word order with *of*-pronouns (*some, each, all, both, etc*; *cf* 6.48ff):

There are two schools here,  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{both of which} \\ \text{of which both} \end{array} \right\}$  are good.

There are several schools here,  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{all/some of which} \\ \text{of which I can recommend} \end{array} \right\}$  I can recommend.  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{all/some} \\ \text{of which I can recommend} \end{array} \right\}$

For *both* there is also the possibility of the order *which are both good* (but hardly *?\*which I can all recommend*).

Note also the use of the construction with *of*-pronouns when they modify the complement of a preposition:

The hospital admitted several patients that month,

$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{for all of whom} \\ \text{*of whom} \\ \text{*whom} \end{array} \right\}$  chemotherapy was the appropriate treatment.  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{for all} \\ \text{for all of} \end{array} \right\}$

### Relative pronoun as complement

**17.25** When the relative pronoun functions as nonprepositional complement in the relative clause, the choice is limited to *which* for both personal and nonpersonal antecedents, in both restrictive clauses (*cf* 17.14) and nonrestrictive clauses (*cf* 17.22):

He is a teetotaller, *which* I am not.

This is a powerful car, *which* my last car was not.

### Appositive clauses

**17.26** The remaining type of finite verb clause that plays a part in postmodification is the appositive (*cf* 17.35, 17.65ff). This resembles the restrictive relative clause in being capable of introduction by the unstressed *that /ðət/*:

She objected to *the fact that a reply had not been sent earlier*. [restrictive appositive clause]

The appositive clause differs from the relative clause in that

- (i) the particle *that* is not an element in the clause structure (functioning as subject, object, etc, as it must in a relative clause) but a conjunction, as is the case in nominal *that*-clauses generally;
- (ii) the nonrestrictive appositive clause has the same introductory item as the restrictive, *i.e.* *that* (*cf* 17.33):

She rejected *their excuses*, even this last one, *that* investigations had taken several weeks. [nonrestrictive]

- (iii) the head of the noun phrase must be a general abstract noun such as *fact, idea, proposition, reply, remark, answer*, and the like (*cf* 16.84):

*The fact that he wrote a letter to her* suggests that he knew her. [1]  
*The belief that no one is infallible* is well-founded. [2]

I agree with the old saying that absence makes the heart grow fonder. [3]  
 He heard the news that his team had won. [4]

As with apposition generally (cf 17.65ff), we can link the apposed units with *be* (where the copula typically has nuclear prominence):

The fact *is* that he wrote a letter to her! [1a]  
 The belief *is* that no one is infallible. [2a]  
 The old saying *is* that absence makes the heart grow fonder. [3a]  
 The news *was* that his team had won. [4a]

We should also note that nouns like *belief* with *that*-clauses correspond to verbs with object clauses (cf 16.30ff):

He believes that no one is infallible. [2b]

With both restrictive and nonrestrictive appositive clauses, an antecedent noun is often a nominalization (cf 17.51ff):

The police reported that the drugs had been found. [5]  
 The police report that the drugs had been found (appeared in the press yesterday). [5a]

These restrictive examples have the definite article before the head noun. This is normal, but by no means invariable (except with a few nouns referring to certainty, especially *fact*):

A message that he would be late arrived by special delivery. [6]  
 The union will resist any proposal that Mr Johnson should be dismissed. [7]  
 Stories that the house was haunted angered the owner. [8]

Plural heads, as in [8], are also rare with appositive postmodification, and are usually regarded as unacceptable with *belief*, *fact*, *possibility*, etc. We may contrast [9] with the perfectly acceptable plural head with relative clause postmodification [9a]:

?Her mother was worried at the possibilities that her daughter was lazy and (that she) disliked school. [9]  
 The possibilities that she was now offered seemed very attractive. [9a]

However, we occasionally find examples of plural nouns with appositive postmodification, such as *facts* in the following:

The reason probably lies in the facts that the Intelligence Service is rather despised, that the individual members change rapidly and are therefore inexperienced, and that they feel bound to put their own special interests first.

We have seen in 16.70 that certain verbs with *that*-clauses have a construction with putative *should* or with a mandative subjunctive, eg:

They recommended that she (should) be promoted. [10]

When such verbs are nominalized (cf 17.51ff), the object clause becomes an appositive clause, retaining the putative *should* or the mandative subjunctive:

There was *a recommendation that she (should) be promoted.* [10a]

The nominalized verb may be separated from the appositive clause under the conditions for discontinuous noun phrases (*cf* 17.122, 18.39):

*The suggestion that the new rule (should) be adopted* came from the chairman. [11]

*The suggestion* came from the chairman *that the new rule (should) be adopted.* [11a]

**17.27** Despite the limited number of noun head types that may be postmodified by an appositive clause, the superficial similarity to relative clause postmodification can sometimes cause momentary difficulty. Total ambiguity, however, is rare since so many factors of selection have to be involved before anything like [1] can occur:

A report *that he stole* was ultimately sent to the police. [1]

The two interpretations ('he stole a report' or 'the report was that he stole') depend upon the possibility that *a report* can be a physical object or an abstraction (that is, nominalizing the verb *report*); upon *steal* being permissibly transitive or intransitive; and several other factors: *made* in place of *sent*, for example, would prevent the ambiguity (though it might not prevent the hearer or reader from having temporary difficulty).

Nonrestrictive appositive clauses like [2] can less easily resemble relative clauses since, irrespective of nonrestrictiveness, they still involve the particle *that*, in sharp contrast with nonrestrictive relative clauses:

This last fact, (namely) that *that* is obligatory, should be easy to remember. [2]

In illustrating the previous point, example [2] also illustrates the next point, (namely) that appositive indicators *namely* or *viz* can be optionally introduced in the nonrestrictive appositions, as can *that is (to say)* or *ie* (*cf* 17.73). It also illustrates the fact that with this type of clause, the antecedent head noun may be freely premodified by adjectives and with a choice of determiners. It will be recalled that, with restrictive appositives, *the* was obligatory before *fact*, and it may now be added that the only adjectives admissible would be nonrestrictive in scope (*cf* 17.3ff). Contrast [3], where the restrictive clause permits only the nonrestrictive adjective, with [3a], where the nonrestrictive clause permits a restrictive adjective:

*The ugly fact that he was holding a gun indicated his guilt.* [3]

*The more relevant fact, that the gun had not been fired, was curiously ignored.* [3a]

**Note** The nonrestrictive apposition may be closely related to a nonrestrictive relative clause (*cf* appositive *wh*-interrogative clauses, 15.5). Compare:

His last request,  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{(ie)} \\ \text{(viz)} \end{array} \right\}$  *which was* that his wife should come and visit him, was never granted.