**Continuative Relative Clauses as Ellipsis Remnants**

**Conjecture:** We propose a unification of the syntax of continuative relative clauses (CRC, (1)) and the one of appositive relative clauses (ARC) in German, which previously was argued to require a differential treatment (Holler 2003, 2005, 2007, 2008).

(1) Max will Orgel spielen, {was/*das} Anna übrigens auch will.  
Max wants organ play which/D-PRON Anna by-the-way also wants  
‘Max wants to play the organ, which Anna wants as well by the way.’

Building on recent advance in understanding the structure of appositions in English and German (Ott & Onea 2015 and Ott forthcoming), we show that a biclausal ellipsis analysis (BEA) sheds new light on various aspects of CRCs and unifies them with ARCs while retaining the cut that empirically distinguishes them. By BEA, CRCs comprise two main clauses, CP1 and CP2 (2):

(2) [\(\text{CP}_1\) Max will Orgel spielen \(\mid \text{CP}_2\) [das ist es \[i was Anna übrigens auch will]]]  
CP2 is a cleft-like construction \(\text{das ist es . . . }\) which is juxtaposed to CP1, which contains a demonstrative pronoun and which undergoes ellipsis, save the relative. The relative inside CP2 thus emerges as an ARC, structurally anchored by the demonstrative; it is the latter which establishes the discourse anaphoric relation to abstract semantic entities of various sorts (facts, events, amounts, etc.) in CP1. (3) shows that this option is independently available:

(3) Max will Orgel spielen. \(\text{Das ist es }\) {was/*das} Anna übrigens auch will.  
Under the current perspective, CRCs are fragments of full-fledged (main) clausal structures. Some implications: That the relative pronoun is confined to the \(\text{WH}\)-type with (neuter) demonstrative pronominal heads in non-headed CRCs like (1) is on a par with the fully pronounced variant in (3) lending indirect support for the approach. As is well-established (Fabricius-Hansen 1981:27f, Brandt 1990:9), CRCs have independent illocutionary force from the host clause as illustrated in (4) (next to information-structural and prosodic independence). Since by BEA, the relative is embedded in a declarative CP2, this independence follows.

(4) Ist Fritz jetzt eigentlich mit Maria verheiratet, was er ja schon immer wollte?  
is Fritz now actually with Mary married which he PRT already always wanted  
‘Is Fritz now actually married to Mary (which he had always wanted after all)?’

Likewise, the free standing occurrence of CRCs (5) Holler 2008) is unsurprising under BEA:

bring you father to home what-for I grateful would-be  
‘Would you bring father home? I’d be grateful for that.’

It is the (elliptical) main clause CP2 \(\text{Das ist es . . . }\) which is the host clause of the CRC and which introduces the new sentence – i.e. the CRC is not an exceptional subordinate clause with root properties. Relatedly, Holler (2007:268) observes that CRCs can take multiple anchors in sequences of host sentences, partly schematized here:

(6) S1-S2-S3 was alles zu einer äußerst brisanten Situation im Lande  
S1-S2-S3 which all to a remarkably explosive situation in-the country  
beitrug  
contributed  
‘. . . all of which contributed to a remarkably explosive situation in the country.’

Again, this parallels (7) lending plausibility to BEA:

(7) (Das ist es) was alles zu einer äußerst brisanten Situation im Lande beitrug.  
Holler (2003) observes that unlike ARCs (8-a) CRCs do not show Principle C effects (8-b) or allow for bound variable readings, motivating her to invoke an “orphan” analysis of CRCs: they are “dependent on a matrix clause without being embedded into it.” The current proposal retains the account for such asymmetries: CRCs are invariably introduced by CP2, which does not
contain a c-commanding coindexed antecedent for the R-expression, automatically obviating Principle C.

(8) a. *Er mag diese Krawatte, die übrigens Emil gehört.
    he likes this tie which by-the-way Emil belongs-to
b. Er mag diese Krawatte, was Emil, nicht davon abhält, sie wegzuschmeißen.
    he likes this tie which Emil not thereof prevent she to-dump

The distribution of CRCs is subject to debate: Holler claims that CRCs are confined to the rightmost periphery of the main clause (9-b), i.e. cannot surface clause-medially (9-a).

(9) a. *weil Oskar Maria getroffen hat, die er dann nach dem Weg fragte, als . . . since Oskar Mary met has who he then for the way asked when he
b. weil Oskar Maria getroffen hat, als . . . , die er dann . . . since Oskar Mary met has when who he then

Brandt (1990:20/23), by contrast, gives examples like (10).

(10) Wenn sie kommen, was ich hoffe, werden wir ins Gebirge fahren.
    if they come which I hope will we into-the mountains drive
‘If they come, which I hope we will drive into the mountains.’

We know independently that heads need to be pronounced linearly prior to RCs as e.g. the contrast between full-VP-fronting (11-a) vs. remnant VP-fronting (11-b) shows.

(11) a. *[VP Nochmal das Buch lesen] das ihm gut gefallen hat wollte er.
    once-more the book read which he well liked had wanted he
    ‘He wanted to read the book once more which he had liked.’

b. *[VP Nochmal t_t lesen] das ihm gut gefallen hat wollte er [i das Buch]

In CRCs a similar state of affairs obtains: If the anchor is fully mentioned or recoverable at the point the relative clause is spelled-out, examples improve. Thus it is fine to intersperse a CRC clause-medially in VP-fronting (12) if the CRC modifies only the book reading event.

(12) Bücher lesen – das ist es, was Emilie sonst gerne tut, hat sie diesmal nicht können.
    books read which Emilie otherwise pleasantly does has she this-time not could
CRC’s distribution might thus be governed by discourse-pragmatic principles suggested in Ott & Onea 2015: If at a given point during the parse a Potential Question is licensed, to which the CRC can function as an answer, its interpolation into the host clause is OK. In light of options like (12), the biclausal analysis predicts that a pronounced CP2-like clause can be parenthetically integrated in the relevant position, which is borne out (13).

(13) Bücher lesen – das ist es, was Emilie sonst gerne tut – hat sie diesmal nicht können.
    With the notion Potential Questions we can also derive an ambiguity noted by Brandt (1990:20) and shown in (14), where ten Marks can give rise to a specific reading (14-a) or an amount reading (14-b).

(14) a. Er gab mir zehn Mark, für die ich mir eine Fahrkarte kaufen sollte.
    he gave me ten marks for which I me a ticket buy should
    ‘He gave me ten marks, for which I was supposed to buy a ticket.’

b. Er gab mir zehn Mark, war damals viel Geld war.
    he gave me ten marks which back-then a-lot-of money was
    ‘He gave me ten marks, which was a lot of money back then.’

At the point ten Marks is pronounced, Potential Questions include (15-a) and (15-b) alike, and the relatives in (14) are elliptical answers to these.

(15) a. What about those (specific) ten Marks?

b. What about ten Marks (in general)?