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Abstract

Order domains were originally proposed to deal with constituent order, but have recently been concerned with more than just linearization. This paper seeks to contribute to this discussion by considering the possibility of analysing word forms in terms of order domains. We focus on the distribution of the English relative and interrogative pronouns *who* and *whom*. It is shown that a small number of constraints can accommodate the seemingly complex body of data. In particular, a linearization-based constraint can provide a straightforward account for the quite puzzling distribution which *who* and *whom* show in one of the register types.

1 Introduction

Within Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar (henceforth, HPSG), recent years have seen the emergence of a view in which linear order is independent to a considerable extent from constituency and is analysed in terms of a separate level of ‘order domains’.* This approach has begun to provide promising analyses of a variety of linearization phenomena (e.g., Pollard et al. 1994; Reape 1994; and Kathol 2000). More recently, order domains have been concerned with more than just linearization: e.g., Yatabe (2001; semantic composition), Borsley (2005; Welsh agreement), Yoshimoto (2000, 2003; phonology), Jaeger (2003) and Maekawa (2004; information structure). In this paper we would like to contribute to this discussion by considering the possibility of analysing certain word forms in terms of order domains. The empirical domain which we will be focusing on is the English interrogative/relative pronouns *who* and *whom*.

It has been traditionally accepted as a prescriptive rule that *who* is the form for a subject and subject complement and *whom* is the form for a verbal or prepositional object. This rule would require that *who* should be employed in the following sentences.

---
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(1) a. Who/*whom wrote the editorial?
   b. the man who/*whom came to dinner

In (1) who is a subject of the following finite verb, and therefore whom is prohibited. The prescriptive rule would also require the occurrence of who in the following examples.

(2) a. We feed children who/*whom we think are hungry.
   b. the man who/*whom I believe has left.
   c. the man who/*whom it was believed had left.

In (2) who is a subject of the lower clause, so whom is excluded.

With regard to non-subject positions, however, there is an alternation between who and whom. As illustrated by the following examples, whom alternates with who as object of a verb or preposition in main clauses (3), embedded clauses (4), and in situ (5). The prescriptive rule would predict the occurrence of whom, not who, in these contexts.

(3) a. those whom/who we consulted.
   b. someone whom/who we can rely on
   c. He didn’t say whom/who he had invited.

(4) a. Whom/who did you meet?
   b. Whom/who are you referring to?

(5) a. Who will marry whom/who?
   b. Who is buying a gift for whom/who?
   c. It was whom/who?

The important point that we should note is that the prescriptive rule only works in the formal register. In the informal register, speakers do not stick to this rule and they use who in any syntactic environment. This would predict the occurrence of whom and the impossibility of who in (6).

(6) a. To whom/*who are you referring?
   b. someone on whom/*who we can rely

1 The copular verb be requires an accusative complement, except for the formulaic use of nominative as in It was I.

(i) a. In this picture, the person in the purple shorts in me/*I.
   b. It was just us/*we

See Sobin (1997) and Lasnik and Sobin (2000) for details.
In (6), *who*/whom is in the complement position of a fronted PP. The impossibility of *who* in this position will be able to be attributed to the fact that this kind of construction, i.e., pied-piping, is confined to the formal register. Given that the construction itself is in the formal register, the prescriptive rule captures the occurrence of *whom* in (6) since it is a prepositional object.

Thus, if we assume separate rules for the formal and the informal register, we can keep the prescriptive rule for the formal register; for the informal register, *who* is the only available form.

There is, however, a striking fact about the formal register: for many speakers, the distribution of *who* and *whom* does not conform to the prescriptive rule. They allow an alternation of *who* and *whom* for the subject of the lower clause in (2).

(7) a. We feed children *who*/whom we think are hungry.
    b. the man *who*/whom I believe has left.
    c. the man *who*/whom it was believed had left.

As we noted above, the prescriptive rule would predict only the occurrence of *who* in such a syntactic environment. It seems that not all native speakers of English accept this use of *whom*; for example, Quirk et al (1985: 368) cites the following example as hypercorrection.

(8) * The ambassador, whom we hope will arrive at 10 a.m., …

They also mention, however, that this kind of use of *whom* is ‘common’ (1985: 368), and it is indeed acceptable for many English native speakers.² In these sentences *whom* occurs in a position where its source is the subject of a lower finite clause. If we just assumed the above prescriptive rule for the formal register, it would lead to the wrong prediction that *who* is the only form that appears in such a syntactic context. A satisfactory analysis of the *who*/whom distinction in the formal register should be able to ensure that some native speakers of English accept *whom* and others reject it in (7); the latter category can be said to manage to conform to the prescriptive rule.

As has been clear, the behaviour of *who*/whom appears to be rather complex. In section 2, however, we will show that if we distinguish three

² See Jespersen (1924; 1927), Swan (1995), Lasnik and Sobin (2000), Huddleston and Pullum (2002), etc.
separate register types, that is, informal type, prescriptive type, and non-prescriptive type, the apparent complexity of the data is restricted to just non-prescriptive type, and who/whom in the other two types show a rather straightforward behaviour. Section 3 will show that the general framework of HPSG can accommodate the who/whom distinction in the informal and prescriptive types without any additional theoretical apparatus beyond those proposed in previous work. In section 4 it will be shown that a linearization-based constraint can provide a straightforward account for the quite puzzling distribution which who and whom show in the non-prescriptive type. Lasnik and Sobin’s (2000) analysis within Virus Theory will be discussed and compared with our HPSG analysis in section 5. Section 6 is the conclusion.

2 Three types of register

On the basis of the observation so far, the distribution of who and whom can be summarised as in (9).

(9) Distribution of who and whom by register type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environments</th>
<th>Formal</th>
<th>Informal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>non-prescriptive</td>
<td>prescriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj in a fronted PP</td>
<td>whom</td>
<td>whom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-subj in embedded clauses</td>
<td>whom</td>
<td>whom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-subj in main clauses</td>
<td>whom</td>
<td>whom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-subj in situ</td>
<td>who</td>
<td>who</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subj of a lower clause</td>
<td>who</td>
<td>who</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subj of the first following V</td>
<td>who</td>
<td>who</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We assume that there are two registers: formal and informal. We further assume that there are two types for the formal register: the prescriptive type and the non-prescriptive type. Thus we have three types of register: prescriptive, non-prescriptive and informal. (9) makes it clear that each of the three register types has its own version of the who/whom distribution. The informal register employs who in every syntactic environment except for the object position of a fronted PP.
In the prescriptive type of formal register, *whom* is employed in all the non-subject contexts and *who* is employed for subjects, whichever clause it is originated from, the upper or the lower clause (i.e., (1) and (2)). What we should note here is that for this type the choice of *who* works in the same way as assignment of nominative case; any theory of filler-gap dependencies would predict that a filler associated with a gap in the lower clause has the case that is assigned to the position of the gap.

Turning to the non-prescriptive type, *whom* is employed in all cases except where a filler is the subject of the first following V: *whom* is used for a filler that corresponds to the subject of the lower clause (i.e., (7)). This would be totally unexpected if the non-prescriptive type were governed by the same constraints as the prescriptive type. A separate analysis should therefore be provided on the *who/whom* distribution in this type.

The next section will deal with the informal and prescriptive types, and then in section 4 we will move on to the non-prescriptive type.

### 3 Informal and prescriptive types of register

This section shows that no additional theoretical apparatus will be needed beyond those proposed in previous work to give an account for the *who/whom* distribution in the informal and the prescriptive types of register.

#### 3.1 Informal register

As discussed in the last section, the informal register employs *who* only. We can give the following description to this lexical item (cf. Wilcock 1999: 383).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{PHON } \langle \text{who} \rangle \\
\text{CASE } \text{case} \\
\text{REGSTR } \text{informal}
\end{align*}
\]

Following Wilcock (1999), we represent register variation in terms of the feature REGISTER (REGSTR), which is appropriate for CONTEXT. The REGSTR feature takes a value of sort *register*, which has two subtypes, *formal* and *informal*.

The underspecification of the CASE value in (10) indicates that the
informal register always employs *who* whatever case it has. Thus, the occurrence of *who* in (1) to (5) is captured by this constraint.

(11) a. *Who/*whom wrote the editorial? (1a)  
     b. We feed children *who/*whom we think are hungry. (2a)  
     c. those *who/*whom we consulted. (3a)  
     d. *Who/*whom did you meet? (4a)  
     e. Who will marry *who/*whom? (5a)  
     f. To *whom/*who are you referring? (6a)

*Who* in (11a,b) is nominative, and that in (11c,d,e) is accusative. The constraint in (10) licenses these occurrences of *who* since its CASE value is underspecified and is compatible with both nominative and accusative. The unavailability of *whom* in the informal register can be accounted for by assuming that this register does not employ this lexical item whatsoever. The impossibility of *who* in pied-piping in (6) can be attributed to the fact that the formal status of pied-piping conflicts with the [REGSTR informal] specification of *who*. Wilcock (1999) has provided an argument along the same lines, which is entirely compatible with our approach. Wilcock’s (1999) analysis of pied-piping will be summarised in Appendix.

3.2 Prescriptive type of formal register

Let us turn to the prescriptive type of formal register. As discussed earlier, *who* appears not only in an informal style but also in a formal style when it is a subject of the nearest following verb as in (1), and when it is a subject of the lower clause as in (2).

(12) a. *Who/*whom wrote the editorial? (1a)  
     b. We feed children *who/*whom we think are hungry. (2a)

In these syntactic environments, *whom* is excluded. In all the non-subject environments, however, *whom* is employed.

(13) a. those *whom/*who we consulted. (3a)  
     b. *Whom/*who did you meet? (4a)  
     c. Who will marry *whom/*who? (5a)  
     d. To *whom/*who are you referring? (6a)

The distribution of *who* and *whom* in this type can be formalised along the
same lines as an ordinary case assignment. We propose that the grammar of the prescriptive type of formal register includes the following constraints.

(14) a. \textit{who} (prescriptive type)

\[
\begin{array}{|c|}
\hline
\text{PHON} \langle \text{who} \rangle \\
\text{CASE} \ nom \\
\text{REGSTR} \ formal \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

b. \textit{whom} (prescriptive type)

\[
\begin{array}{|c|}
\hline
\text{PHON} \langle \text{whom} \rangle \\
\text{CASE} \ acc \\
\text{REGSTR} \ formal \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

\textit{Who} in (12a) is nominative, so it is licensed by (14a). (14b), which only licenses use of \textit{whom} when accusative, excludes \textit{whom} from this environment. The SLASH mechanism requires the LOC value of the filler to be the same as that of the gap, and therefore a filler associated with a gap in lower clause is assigned the case that is assigned to the position of the gap. In the case of \textit{who} in (12b), the filler has nominative case since the SLASH mechanism ensures that it has the same LOC value and hence the same case as the gap. Thus, these two constraints and the HPSG view of unbounded dependencies capture the occurrence of \textit{who} in the prescriptive type of formal register, in such examples as (1) and (2). \textit{Whom} in (13) occurs in positions where accusative nominal is expected. Therefore, the lexical constraint (14b) licenses \textit{whom} in these positions, but \textit{who} is excluded due to (14a).

In this section, we have shown that existing, independently motivated theoretical apparatus within HPSG can capture the \textit{who}/\textit{whom} distribution in the prescriptive and informal types. In the next section, we will move on to the non-prescriptive type of formal register in which \textit{who} and \textit{whom} show an apparently puzzling behaviour as discussed in the earlier sections.

---

3 For the HPSG literature on case, see Heinz and Matiasek (1994), Meurers (2000), Pollard (1994), Przepiórkowski (1999), etc.
4 The non-prescriptive type of formal register

The characteristics of the non-prescriptive type of formal register are illustrated by the following minimal pair.

(15)  
  a. the man who/*whom has left
  b. the man whom/*who I believe has left

It is impossible to adopt the case marking strategy proposed for the prescriptive type in the last section since the SLASH mechanism would allow the CASE value of the both types of subject to have the same range of choice.

We look at the pair in (15) from the point of view of linear order: who is employed for the subject of the nearest following verb and whom for the subject of a later verb. In this section, we will formalize this observation. Before that, however, some theoretical assumptions will be introduced in the first sub-section.

4.1 Linearization-based HPSG

The analysis to be presented below will be based on a version of linearization-based HPSG. In this framework, linear order is represented in a separate level of ‘order domains’, to which ordering constraints apply (see, e.g., Pollard et al. 1993; Reape 1994; and Kathol 2000). Order domains are given as the value of the attribute DOM(AIN). At each level of syntactic combination, the order domain of the mother category is computed from the order domains of the daughter constituents. We assume, along with Reape (1994), Donohue and Sag (1999), Kathol (2000: 101), and Jaeger (2003), that an order domain consists of an ordered list of signs, which we will call ‘DOM elements’. The domain elements of a daughter may be compacted to form a single element in the order domain of the mother or they may just become elements in the mother’s order domain. In the latter case the mother has more domain elements than daughters.

Each element of a clausal order domain is uniquely marked for the region that it belongs to (Kathol 2000; see also Borsley and Kathol 2000; Chung and Kim 2003; Kathol 2002; and Penn 1999). The assignment of

---

4 The assumption that DOM elements are signs might involve some problems. See Kathol (2000) for discussion.

5 In the case of German, this partitioning of the clausal domain directly encodes the
each element in a clause can be summarised as follows (Kathol 2002).

(16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>first</th>
<th>second</th>
<th>third</th>
<th>fourth</th>
<th>fifth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Who</td>
<td>did</td>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>see?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Never</td>
<td>would</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>eat</td>
<td>those cookies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Will</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>sneeze?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>will eat</td>
<td>those cookies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Who</td>
<td>ate</td>
<td>those cookies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Wh*-phrases which are not the subject of the verb in *fourth* are assigned to *first*. Thus, the clause-initial element in verb-second clauses, such as the *wh*-phrase in (16a) and the negative phrase in (16b), are in *first*. In these clause types, finite verbs are assigned to *second*. Finite verbs in verb-first clauses such as polar questions (16c) are also in *second*. Verbs which are not in *second* are in *fourth*, whether they are finite or non-finite. Complements of the verb in *fourth* are in *fifth*. Finally, subjects of the verb in *fourth* are in *third*, whether they are a filler or an ordinary subject. If we do not treat a subject *wh*-phrase as a case of extraction (Pollard and Sag 1994; see also Gazdar 1981), this positional assignment will easily be incorporated into the Head-Subject Schema. Evidence has recently been put forth, however, that a subject *wh*-phrase is an instance of true extraction (Bouma et al. 2001; Ginzburg and Sag 2000; Levine and Hukari 2003). Therefore, we assume the following additional constraint on head-filler structures: if the LOC value of the filler is token-identical with that of the single element in the SUBJ list of the verb in *fourth*, then it is assigned to *third*.

In this framework, *Who wrote the editorial?* has the representation in (17) at the next page.\(^6\) The NP *the editorial* has two daughters, and two DOM elements, *the* and *editorial*. The VP *wrote the editorial* has two daughters and its order domain contains two DOM elements, one for *wrote* and one for *the editorial* which has been compacted to a single element. The top S node has two daughters but its order domain contains three DOM

\(^6\) The combinatorial structure represented here is based on Ginzburg and Sag (2000: 236ff), but it is simplified.
elements, which are for who, wrote and the editorial, respectively. According to the assumptions for position assignment outlined above, who is assigned to third, wrote to fourth, and the editorial to fifth.

\[
\begin{align*}
(17) & \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{S} \\
\text{DOM} \left\langle \begin{array}{c}
\text{third} \\
\text{NP} \\
\langle \text{who} \rangle \\
\langle \text{wrote} \rangle \\
\langle \text{the editorial} \rangle
\end{array} \rightangle \\
\text{LOC [1]} & \quad \text{DOM} \left\langle \begin{array}{c}
\langle \text{who} \rangle
\end{array} \right\rangle \\
\text{SUBJ} \langle [2] \rangle & \quad \text{SLASH} \langle [1] \rangle \\
\text{COMPS} \langle [3] \rangle & \quad \text{SLASH} \langle [4] \rangle \\
\text{DOM} \left\langle \begin{array}{c}
\langle \text{wrote} \rangle
\end{array} \right\rangle \\
\text{SUBJ} \langle [2] \rangle & \quad \text{gap} - ss \\
\text{LOC [1]} & \\
\text{DOM} \left\langle \begin{array}{c}
\text{DET} \\
\langle \text{the} \rangle \\
\langle \text{editorial} \rangle
\end{array} \right\rangle \\
\text{DOM} & \quad \text{DOM} \left\langle \begin{array}{c}
\text{DET} \\
\langle \text{the} \rangle
\end{array} \right\rangle \\
\text{DOM} & \quad \text{DOM} \left\langle \begin{array}{c}
\text{N} \\
\langle \text{editorial} \rangle
\end{array} \right\rangle
\end{array}
\end{align*}
\]

4.2 A linearization-based HPSG account

We are now in a position to account for the who/whom distribution in the non-prescriptive type of register. We assume that the grammar of this register type include the following lexical constraints for who and whom, instead of (14a,b) for the prescriptive type.
The lexical description (18a) allows who to occur only in third. Due to the lexical description (18b) for whom, it is allowed to occur anywhere else.

The DOM value of the top S node of (15a) looks as follows (Recall the combinatorial structure of (1a) given in (17)).

In the order domain, who occurs in third as its LOC value is token-identical to that of the single element of the SUBJ list of the verb. The representation in (20) is not well-formed since whom occurs in third, which violates the constraint (18b).

The nominative whom in (15b) can be accounted for in the following

\[ \text{DOM} \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
\text{third} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{PHON} \{\text{whom}\} \\
\text{LOC} [1] \\
\text{REGSTR} \ formal \\
\end{array} \right\}, \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
\text{fourth} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{PHON} \{\text{wrote}\} \\
\text{SUBJ} \left\{ \text{gap-ss} \right\} \\
\text{LOC} [1] \\
\end{array} \right\} \]

\[ \text{DOM} \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
\text{third} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{PHON} \{\text{who}\} \\
\text{LOC} [1] \\
\text{REGSTR} \ formal \\
\end{array} \right\}, \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
\text{fourth} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{PHON} \{\text{wrote}\} \\
\text{SUBJ} \left\{ \text{gap-ss} \right\} \\
\text{LOC} [1] \\
\end{array} \right\} \]

\[ \text{DOM} \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
\text{third} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{PHON} \{\text{whom}\} \\
\text{LOC} [1] \\
\text{REGSTR} \ formal \\
\end{array} \right\}, \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
\text{fourth} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{PHON} \{\text{wrote}\} \\
\text{SUBJ} \left\{ \text{gap-ss} \right\} \\
\text{LOC} [1] \\
\end{array} \right\} \]

\[ \text{DOM} \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
\text{third} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{PHON} \{\text{whom}\} \\
\text{LOC} [1] \\
\text{REGSTR} \ formal \\
\end{array} \right\}, \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
\text{fourth} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{PHON} \{\text{wrote}\} \\
\text{SUBJ} \left\{ \text{gap-ss} \right\} \\
\text{LOC} [1] \\
\end{array} \right\} \]

\[ \text{DOM} \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
\text{third} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{PHON} \{\text{who}\} \\
\text{LOC} [1] \\
\text{REGSTR} \ formal \\
\end{array} \right\}, \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
\text{fourth} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{PHON} \{\text{wrote}\} \\
\text{SUBJ} \left\{ \text{gap-ss} \right\} \\
\text{LOC} [1] \\
\end{array} \right\} \]

\[ \text{DOM} \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
\text{third} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{PHON} \{\text{who}\} \\
\text{LOC} [1] \\
\text{REGSTR} \ formal \\
\end{array} \right\}, \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
\text{fourth} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{PHON} \{\text{wrote}\} \\
\text{SUBJ} \left\{ \text{gap-ss} \right\} \\
\text{LOC} [1] \\
\end{array} \right\} \]

\[ \text{DOM} \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
\text{third} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{PHON} \{\text{who}\} \\
\text{LOC} [1] \\
\text{REGSTR} \ formal \\
\end{array} \right\}, \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
\text{fourth} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{PHON} \{\text{wrote}\} \\
\text{SUBJ} \left\{ \text{gap-ss} \right\} \\
\text{LOC} [1] \\
\end{array} \right\} \]

\[ \text{DOM} \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
\text{third} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{PHON} \{\text{who}\} \\
\text{LOC} [1] \\
\text{REGSTR} \ formal \\
\end{array} \right\}, \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
\text{fourth} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{PHON} \{\text{wrote}\} \\
\text{SUBJ} \left\{ \text{gap-ss} \right\} \\
\text{LOC} [1] \\
\end{array} \right\} \]

\[ \text{DOM} \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
\text{third} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{PHON} \{\text{who}\} \\
\text{LOC} [1] \\
\text{REGSTR} \ formal \\
\end{array} \right\}, \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
\text{fourth} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{PHON} \{\text{wrote}\} \\
\text{SUBJ} \left\{ \text{gap-ss} \right\} \\
\text{LOC} [1] \\
\end{array} \right\} \]

\[ \text{DOM} \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
\text{third} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{PHON} \{\text{who}\} \\
\text{LOC} [1] \\
\text{REGSTR} \ formal \\
\end{array} \right\}, \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
\text{fourth} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{PHON} \{\text{wrote}\} \\
\text{SUBJ} \left\{ \text{gap-ss} \right\} \\
\text{LOC} [1] \\
\end{array} \right\} \]
way. The top S node of (15b) has the DOM list of the following sort.  

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{DOM} &\begin{cases}
\text{first} & \\
\text{PHON} \langle\text{whom}\rangle & \\
\text{REGSTR} \langle\text{formal}\rangle & \\
\text{third} & \\
\text{NP} & \\
\text{PHON} \langle\text{I}\rangle & \\
\text{fourth} & \\
\text{V} & \\
\text{PHON} \langle\text{believe}\rangle & \\
\text{fifth} & \\
\text{S} & \\
\text{PHON} \langle\text{has, left}\rangle & \\
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
\]

As stated earlier, we assume that a wh-phrase which is not the subject of the verb in fourth is assigned to first. In (21) whom is not the subject of believe, and therefore it occurs in first. This is compatible with constraint (18b) that specifies its occurrence in this position. Due to (18a), however, who is not allowed in this position in the non-prescriptive type since the occurrence of who is restricted just to third.

Constraint (18b) can capture the occurrence of whom in (3) to (6). Let us look at each case.

(22) a. those whom/*who we consulted. \hspace{1cm} (3a)
b. Whom/*who did you meet? \hspace{1cm} (4a)
c. Who will marry whom/*who? \hspace{1cm} (5a)
d. To whom/*who are you referring? \hspace{1cm} (6a)

Positional assignment of the elements in each of these sentences is as follows.

(23)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>first</th>
<th>second</th>
<th>third</th>
<th>fourth</th>
<th>fifth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(22a)</td>
<td>whom</td>
<td>we</td>
<td>consulted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22b)</td>
<td>Whom</td>
<td>did</td>
<td>you</td>
<td>meet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Who</td>
<td>will</td>
<td>marry whom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22d)</td>
<td>To whom</td>
<td>are</td>
<td>you</td>
<td>referring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

8 It is assumed that an embedded clause is totally-compacted when it is combined with a higher clause. Thus, the clause has left is a single compacted DOM element in (21). See Ginzburg and Sag (2000: 180ff) for details of the constituent structure of this sort of construction.
(23) shows that whom in (22a,b) is in first, and whom in (22c,d) is included in a domain element in fifth. Thus, every occurrence of whom in (22) conforms to (18b) which determines its occurrence in positions which are not third. On the other hand, use of who in these environments are excluded by (18a), which restricts its occurrence to third.

The following examples where there is an adverb intervening between who and the verb can also be accounted for by our analysis.

(24) a. a man who/*whom never sleeps
   b. Who/*whom often saw John?

The order domain of the relative clause in (24a) has the following representation.

(25)

We follow Kathol (2002) in assuming that preverbal adverbials as in (24) are assigned to fourth, along with the verbs. In (25), although there is an intervening adverb never, sleeps is in fourth, and who is its subject (i.e., its LOC value [1] is token-identical with the LOC value of the single element in the SUBJ list of sleeps). Who is therefore assigned to third, and that is licensed by constraint (18a); whom is banned because of its positional specification as [¬third] in (18b).

We assumed earlier that verbs which are not in second are in fourth. This means that verbs in third can be not only finite, as all the examples so far, but also non-finite (i.e., infinitive, base, participle; see Ginzburg and Sag 2000: 24). We further assumed that the element positioned in third is a

---

9 We assume wh-phrases to occur in first in embedded clauses in English, unlike German (Kathol 2000, 2001). In the embedded clause of (i), second is occupied by would, and hence it is natural to assume that what (as well as under no circumstances) is in first.

(i) I wonder [what under no circumstances would John do for Mary].
subject of the verb in fourth. It is predicted, therefore, that who can be a subject of the non-finite verb in third. This is borne out by the following example.

(26) A: What did Kim do?
B: What did who do?

The utterance B is an example of an echo question. In this sentence who is followed by an non-finite verb do. The DOM list of the lower S (i.e., [did who do]) would look like the following.

As we assumed earlier, finite verbs in verb-second clauses such as *wh*-questions are in second. The non-finite verb do is in fourth, and who is its subject (i.e., its LOC value [4] is token-identical with the LOC value of the single element in the SUBJ list of sleeps). Who is therefore in third, and that is licensed by (18a); whom is excluded since (18b) states that its positional specification is $\neg$third.

4.3 Summary

In this section, we have provided an account for the seemingly puzzling distribution of who/whom in the non-prescriptive type. The lexical descriptions of who (18a) and whom (18b) incorporate the specification of the position where they should occur: who is restricted to third while whom is specified to occur in the positions other than third. What is significant is that we abandoned the idea that the who/whom distinction is a matter of case marking, and that makes it possible to accommodate the occurrence of whom.

---

in the cases where nominative case is normally expected, as in (15b).

5 Lasnik and Sobin’s (2000) approach

In this section we consider the ability of another approach to capture the relevant facts. A recent attempt to provide a theoretical account of the who/whom distinction is Lasnik and Sobin’s (2000). They argue that who is the basic form of the wh-pronoun, which can check either nominative (NOM) or accusative (ACC) case. The suffix -m of whom is assumed to be associated with an additional ACC feature and has to be checked independently of the ACC feature associated with the stem who. This additional ACC feature carried by the suffix is checked by the rules with the status of ‘grammatical viruses’, characterised as extra-grammatical devices, entirely independent of ordinary case marking mechanisms. They serve to license prestige forms. Rule (28) licenses the occurrence of whom as object of a verb or preposition, as in (5) and (6).

(28) The Basic ‘whom’ Rule (Lasnik and Sobin 2000: 354)
If: 
\[ V/P \] who-m
\[ [\text{ACC}] \ [\text{ACC}] \]
1 2 3
then: check ACC on 3

Rule (29) licenses the occurrence of initial whom in any type of wh-construction where the wh-pronoun functions as the object of a verb (3a, c) and (4a), stranded preposition (3b) and (4b), or the subject of an embedded clause (7).

(29) The Extended ‘whom’ Rule (Lasnik and Sobin 2000: 359)
If: whom- -m … NP, where
\[ [\text{ACC}] \]
1 2 3
a) 3 is the nearest subject NP to 2, and
b) ‘…’ does not contain a V which has 1–2 (a single word whom) as its subject,

---

11 See also Kayne (1984) and Radford (1988).
then: check ACC on 2.

The unacceptable occurrences of whom in (1) are ruled out by the fact that they are not compatible with the sequential arrangement of (28) or (29).

However, their approach involves some problems. First, it is not clear whether the who/whom distinction should be treated as a matter of case. Two different forms of a lexeme should not necessarily be seen as two different case forms. If they are not realisations of case, it will not be necessary to assume that the stem who- and the affix -m have two different cases. Other things being equal, it would be preferable not to have such a counter-intuitive assumption.

Second, as Lasnik and Sobin (2000: 362) themselves note, (29) is fairly complex; especially it includes the stipulations about 3 and about what can appear between 2 and 3. A rule that is acquired in a special way may be complex than an ordinary grammatical rule, and, as they suggest (2000: 362), such complexity may be a reason for being a prestige usage. Complexity, however, is a potential source of suspicion, and it is indeed suspicious in this case since the stipulations included are questionable. First, it is not obvious how ‘the nearest subject NP to 2’ is to be identified within Principles and Parameters assumptions. Next, their analysis includes the stipulation about what can appear between 2 and 3: the V should be a theta-role assigner and must not be an auxiliary verb. It is not clear why a theta-role assigning ability is relevant here. Our HPSG analysis is clearly simpler which is free of any questionable stipulations.

6 Concluding remarks

In this paper, we have been concerned with the distribution of the English interrogative/relative pronouns who and whom. We have first described the distribution of who and whom, which appears to be complex. In section 2, we showed that the apparent complexity of the data is restricted to just non-prescriptive type if we distinguish three separate register types: informal type, prescriptive type, and non-prescriptive type. Section 3 illustrated that the general framework of HPSG can accommodate the who/whom distinction in the informal and prescriptive types without any additional theoretical apparatus beyond those proposed in previous work. In section 4 we showed that a linearization-based constraint can provide a straightforward account for
the quite puzzling distribution which *who* and *whom* show in the non-prescriptive type. Section 5 discussed Lasnik and Sobin’s (2000) analysis within Virus Theory and it was compared with our HPSG analysis.

The most important point to note is that the constraints in (18), which are responsible for the use of *who* and *whom* in the non-prescriptive type of formal register, is formalised in terms of order domains. If our analysis is on the right track, it suggests that order domains are important not only for analysing linearization phenomena but also for the analysis of certain word forms. This matches the recent development of linearization-based HPSG, in which order domains have been concerned with more than just linearization.

**Appendix: Wilcock’s (1999) analysis of *whom* in pied-piping**

The impossibility of *who* in pied-piping in (6) is due to the fact that the formal status of pied-piping conflicts with the [REGSTR *informal*] specification of *who*, along the lines of Wilcock (1999; cf. Paolillo 2000).

(6)  

   a.  To whom/*who* are you referring?  
     b.  someone on whom/*who* we can rely

This appendix will summarise Wilcock’s (1999: 384ff) approach to this issue.

Wilcock (1999) notes systematic covariation between register and nonlocal features of preposition. This is formalised as lexical constraints in which register restrictions are associated with PP construction subtypes.

(30) requires prepositions with non-empty REL (30a) and non-empty QUE
(30b) to have the formal register. The combination of these lexical constraints with the Register Amalgamation Constraint (31) provides an account for the distribution of who/whom in (6).

(31) Register Amalgamation Constraint (Wilcock 1999: 382)

\[
\text{word} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix}
\text{ARG-ST} \left( \begin{bmatrix}
\text{REGSTR} [1]
\end{bmatrix} \right) \\
\text{REGSTR} [1]
\end{bmatrix}
\]

The SLASH Amalgamation Constraint requires that the non-empty QUE of whom should be amalgamated into the QUE value of with. The preposition has thereby a non-empty QUE, so constraint (30b) requires it to have the formal register. The Register Amalgamation Constraint (31) requires the REGSTR value of the argument to be unified with that of the head. This requirement is indeed satisfied here since whom is lexically specified as [REGSTR \textit{formal}] by (14b).\footnote{In order to ensure that a phrase inherits the REGSTR values of its daughters, Wilcock (1999: 377) introduces the Contextual Head Inheritance Principle, which states that in a head-nexus-phrase and a head-adjunct-phrase the phrase’s CONTEXT is by default token-identical to that of its contextual head daughter.}

Let us turn to ungrammaticality of who in (6). The representation of
the head of the filler PP in (6a) is something like the following.

(33) *

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\text{que - prep} \\
\text{PHON} \langle \text{to} \rangle \\
\text{ARG-ST} \langle 2 \rangle \begin{bmatrix}
\text{QUE} \langle 1 \rangle \\
\text{REGSTR} \text{ informal} \\
\end{bmatrix} \\
\text{QUE} \langle 1 \rangle \\
\text{REGSTR} \langle 3 \rangle \text{ formal}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

The SLASH Amalgamation Constraint requires the non-empty QUE of *who* to be amalgamated into the QUE value of *to*, which is tagged [1] in (33). The preposition has thereby a non-empty QUE, so constraint (30b) requires it to have the formal register. However, the REGSTR value of *who* cannot be unified with that of *with: informal* and *formal*, respectively. This is a violation of the Register Amalgamation Constraint (31).
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