

Rightward Movements in Double Complement Constructions

Suzuki, Yubun

Institute of Languages and Cultures, Kyushu University : Assistant Professor

<https://doi.org/10.15017/6796327>

出版情報 : 言語科学. 30, pp.81-88, 1995-02-25. The Institute of Languages and Cultures, Kyushu University

バージョン :

権利関係 :



Rightward Movements in Double Complement Constructions*

Yubun Suzuki

1. Introduction

The aim of this paper is twofold: one is to provide examples where both complements of double complement construction are affected by rightward movements and the other is to give a proper syntactic account of these cases while mentioning the insufficiency of two foregoing accounts of rightward movement phenomena.

2. Single Movement

It is widely assumed in the literature that Extraposition from NP and Heavy NP Shift are subject to strict locality. Rochemont and Culicover (1990), for example, propose *the Complement Principle* and *the Local Government Condition on Rightward Movement*. The former principle requires an extraposed material to govern, or to be governed by, the NP it is associated with. An element extraposed from an object, then, can not appear higher than VP, since VP obstructs the government of its object by VP-external constituents and since the object fails to m-command, hence never governs, VP-external material.¹ The latter condition requires a Heavy-NP-Shifted NP to be governed by the X⁰ that governs its base-generated position. A shifted object is prohibited from occupying a VP-external position, since a shifted object in such a position eludes the government by the head V, the governor of its base-generated position. The following array of examples, however, points to a further constraint:

* This paper is partly based on my presentation at the workshop 'Uhooidookoobun no Koozoo to Kinoo - GB Riron to Kinooshugi - (Structures and Functions of Rightward Movement Constructions - GB Theory and Functionalism)' held during the 11th National Conference of the English Linguistic Society of Japan, Kyoto University, November 1993. I am grateful to John Casey, Jack Kimball and Brian Quinn, who acted patiently as informants. Any remaining errors are of course my own.

¹ The definition of *government* in Rochemont and Culicover (1990) departs from a standard version like that in Chomsky (1986b). It is not relevant here, though, which version we follow.

- (1) a. I sent Mary [a book ti] yesterday [by an American novelist]i. (Takami 1991: 7)
- b. I gave a book [to [a man ti]] yesterday [who had red hair]i.
- c. Mary talked to Lucy [about [a book ti]] yesterday [which she bought long ago]i.
- (2) a. I sent Mary ti yesterday [a book by an American novelist]i.
- b. I gave a book ti yesterday [to a man who had red hair]i.
- c. Mary talked to Lucy ti yesterday [about applied linguistics]i.
- (3) a. *I sent [a man ti] an interesting book yesterday [with blue eyes]i. (Takami 1993: 1)
- b. I gave [a book ti] to Mary yesterday [about African music]i. (Takami 1993: 2)
- c. *Mary talked [to [a man ti]] about the book yesterday [who had blond hair]i.
- (4) a. *I sent ti a book yesterday [a man who I think you know]i.
- b. I gave ti to John [a book about French cooking]i.
- c. Mary talked ti about the book yesterday [to a man who had blond hair]i.

As long as these sentences are derived through VP-internal applications of an extraposition or a shift, the two conditions above are satisfied and never predict the ungrammaticality of (3a), (3c) and (4a).

Takami (1993) captures (3a) as violating *the More/Less Important Information Condition on Rightward Movement*: "A sentence involving rightward movement is acceptable if and only if the rightward moved constituent is interpreted as being more important than the rest of the sentence" (p. 2). The extraposed portion in (3a), with blue eyes, which belongs to the first object, is less important than the second object against this condition, since the natural flow of information has it that the second complement is usually more important than the first one. (3b), on the other hand, is well-formed in spite of the extraposition from the first object, because the first indefinite object, a book (about African music), whose referent is unknown to the hearer, presents more important information than the second specific (hence known) object, Mary. This situation, though, seems to be problematic in the light of a natural flow of information. The

solution Takami adopts is *the Markedness Principle for Discourse-Rule Violations*: "Sentences that involve marked (or intentional) violations of discourse principles are unacceptable. On the other hand, sentences that involve unmarked (or unintentional) violations of discourse principles go unpenalized and are acceptable" (Kuno (1978)). Takami also assumes that dative constructions like (3b) are basic forms from which double object constructions are derived. The non-derived nature of (3b) renders its 'unnatural' flow of information unavoidable (unintentional) and permissible, whereas, in (3a), such a flow is avoidable by choosing a basic dative construction and hence is repugnant.²

Takami (1991) explains the ungrammaticality of (4a) in a similar fashion. Takami notes that a Heavy-NP-Shifted element conveys the focus (most important information) of the sentence (p. 21). The shifted portion in (4a), a man who I think you know, however, can not bear the most important information, because this is the first object in a derived double object construction, which may not have unintentional great importance.

Takami's explanation, though intriguing, is unable to predict the ill-formedness of (3c). In the absence of the evidence indicating its derived status, the 'unnatural' flow of information in (3c) (the first indefinite complement is more important than the second definite complement) would wrongly be allowed to enable the extraposition out of the first complement.

3. Double Movement

What is far more troublesome to Takami's approach seen in the last section, is the cases where both of the two complements are affected by rightward movements, because each of the two complements, contradictorily, ought to be more important than the other. Although double applications of an extraposition is not allowed, double applications of a shift is not always precluded, as we can observe in the contrast between (5)-(6) and (7)-

² This means that examples like (3a) do not improve even when the second object is replaced with a definite NP to render the first object more important, since such a flow of information is difficult to accept even without extraposition because of its derived nature, as we can observe in (i):

(i) ??John gave a girl the book. (Takami 1993: 2)

(8):³

- (5) a. *I sent [a man ti] [a book tj] yesterday [who I think you know]i [about applied linguistics]j.
- b. *I gave [a book ti] [to [a man tj]] yesterday [about French cooking]i [who had red hair]j.
- c. *Mary talked [to [a man ti]] [about [a book tj]] yesterday [who had blond hair]i [on linguistics]j.
- (6) a. *I sent [a man ti] [a book tj] yesterday [about applied linguistics]j [who I think you know]i.
- b. *I gave [a book ti] [to [a man tj]] yesterday [who had red hair]j [about French cooking]i.
- c. *Mary talked [to [a man ti]] [about [a book tj]] yesterday [on linguistics]j [who had blond hair]i.
- (7) a. *I sent ti tj yesterday [a man with blond hair]i [a book by an American Novelist]j.
- b. ??I gave ti tj yesterday [a book about French cooking]i [to a man who had red hair]j.
- c. Mary talked ti tj yesterday [to a man who had blond hair]i [about a book on linguistics]j.
- (8) a. *I sent ti tj yesterday [a book by an American novelist]j [a man with blond hair]i.
- b. ??I gave ti tj yesterday [to a man who had red hair]j [a book about French cooking]i.
- c. Mary talked ti tj yesterday [about a book on linguistics]j [to a man who had blond hair]i.

As for cases where some element is extraposed from one complement while the other complement is shifted, examples with an extraposed element at the end of the

³ We have no ready explanation for the degraded status of (7b) and (8b).

sentence are ruled out while those with a shifted complement in that position are often acceptable, as the contrast between (9)-(10) and (11)-(12) designates:

- (9) a. *I sent ti [a book tj] yesterday [a man who I think you know]i [about applied linguistics]j.
 b. *I gave ti [to [a man tj]] yesterday [a book about French cooking]i [who had red hair]j.
 c. *Mary talked ti [about [a book tj]] yesterday [to a man who had blond hair]i [on linguistics]j.
- (10) a. *I sent [a man ti] tj yesterday [a book about applied linguistics]j [who I think you know]i.
 b. *I gave [a book ti] tj yesterday [to a man who had red hair]j [about French cooking]i.
 c. *Mary talked [to [a man ti]] tj yesterday [about a book on linguistics]j [who had blond hair]i.
- (11) a. ?I sent [a man ti] tj yesterday [who I think you know]i [a book about applied linguistics]j.
 b. ?I gave [a book ti] tj yesterday [about French cooking]i [to a man who had red hair]j.
 c. ?Mary talked [to [a man ti]] tj yesterday [who had blond hair]i [about a book on linguistics]j.
- (12) a. *I sent ti [a book tj] yesterday [about applied linguistics]j [a man who I think you know]i.
 b. ?John gave ti [to [students tj]] yesterday [who came from Asian countries]j [copies of his new book on physics]i.⁴ (Nakajima 1990: 44)
 c. ?Mary talked ti [about [a book tj]] yesterday [on linguistics]j [to a man who had blond hair]i.

Ungrammatical examples among these sentences are classified into two groups. One of them consists of (a) examples of (4), (7), (8) and (12) while the other is made up of

⁴ The question mark is mine. This kind of sentences are far from perfect and no better than other examples with a single question mark.

(3a), (3c), (5), (6), (9) and (10). The sentences in the first group have one thing in common: the first object is shifted in a double object construction. We suspect that their ill-formedness can be attributed to the Uniformity Condition, which "amounts to the requirement that inherent Case must be realized on NP under government by the category that θ -marks NP at D-structure" (Chomsky 1986a: 194). The first object NP in a double object construction is inherently Case-marked with Dative by a verb, which, however, can not govern a shifted object NP adjoined to its maximal projection under the formulation of government in, for example, Chomsky (1986b). The condition in question is necessary in any case for other deviant examples like (13):⁵

- (13) a. *Who_i did you give t_i the books?
 b. *Johni's appearance [t_i to have left]

The ungrammatical sentences in the other group are further divided into two subgroups, (3a) and (3c) forming one subgroup and (5), (6), (9) and (10) the other. The sentences in the latter subgroup have something in common: an extraposed or shifted element intervenes between the extraposed material at the end of the sentence and the complement it is associated with. This reminds us of the relativized minimality effect on links of adjunct chains (Rizzi 1990). In (14), the *wh*-phrase in the A-bar specifier position of the embedded CP, a possible antecedent governor of the adjunct trace, intervenes between the adjunct *wh*-phrase and its trace:

- (14) *How_i do you wonder [_{CP}which problem_j to solve t_j t_i]?

We suspect that just as the intervening element in the A-bar specifier position causes the A-bar adjunct chain (*how_i*, *t_i*) to be ruled out in (14), so the extraposed or shifted element (the intervener), which is adjoined to VP and hence is in an A-bar position, prevents the extraposed adjunct at the end of the sentence from forming a well-formed A-bar adjunct chain with the trace within the complement it is associated with. We have to interpret the relativized minimality effect, then, so that an element in an A-bar position adjoined to a maximal projection as well as A-bar specifier element might count as a

⁵ Note that Genitive is also an inherent Case. We ignore here the possibility of inherent Oblique assigned by prepositions.

possible antecedent-governor. This is in fact the possibility pursued in Nakajima (1992). This interpretative extension is not far-fetched, for we have cases like (15), where a topicalized element, probably adjoined to IP, is the relevant intervener:⁶

(15) *How_i do you think that Mary_i, Bill told t_i [that John solved the problem t_j] ?

(Lasnik and Saito 1992: 97)

We should also notice that the moved element at the end of the sentence in (7), (8), (11) and (12) is immune to this kind of relativized minimality effect. It is not an adjunct but a complement, which is easier to extract out of a syntactic island and therefore is usually considered not to be dependent on antecedent-government subject to relativized minimality effect.

4. In Place of Conclusion

What remains to be accounted for is (3a) and (3c). Compare (3) with the following contrast:⁷

(16) a. *This letter_i was written [_{NP}my aunt] [_{NP}t_i] yesterday. (Stowell 1981: 441)

b. John_i seems [_{PP}to me] [_{NP}t_i] to be happy.

c. *John_i was talked [_{PP}about Bill] [_{PP}with t_i]. (Stowell 1981: 451)

(16) could be thought of as something like a mirror image of (3), if we pay attention to the relation between the extraposed element and the NP it is associated with. We leave these cases unsolved only claiming that there might be some way of common explanation to (3) and (16).

⁶ Often in (i) should not be an intervener:

(i) How_i does John often claim [that CIA killed his sister t_i]?

This problem can be evaded by the base-generation of VP-adverbials in V'-adjoined position under the assumption that elements in V'-adjoined positions, unlike those in V^{max}-adjoined positions, do not count as an intervener.

⁷ The grammaticality judgment of sentences like (16a) is subject to contextual fluctuation.

REFERENCES

- Chomsky, Noam (1986a) *Knowledge of Language: Its Nature, Origin, and Use*, Praeger, New York.
- Chomsky, Noam (1986b) *Barriers*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Kuno, Susumu (1978) *Danwa no Bunpoo (Grammar of Discourse)*, Taishukan, Tokyo.
- Lasnik, Howard and Mamoru Saito (1992) *Move- α : Conditions on Its Application and Output*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Nakajima, Heizo (1990) "Against the Interpretive Nesting Requirement," *Metropolitan Linguistics* 10, 40-54.
- Nakajima, Heizo (1992) "Another Type of Antecedent Government," *Linguistic Inquiry* 23, 313 - 328.
- Rizzi, Luigi (1990) *Relativized Minimality*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Rochemont, Michael S. and Peter W. Culicover (1990) *English Focus Constructions and the Theory of Grammar*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Stowell, Timothy (1981) *Origins of Phrase Structure*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Takami, Ken-ichi (1991) "Against the Complement Principle," *Metropolitan Linguistics* 11, 1-26.
- Takami, Ken-ichi (1993) "A Functional Constraint on Rightward Movement," the paper read at the workshop 'Uhooidookoobun no Koozoo to Kinoo - GB Riron to Kinooshugi - (Structures and Functions of Rightward Movement Constructions - GB Theory and Functionalism -)' held during the 11th National Conference of the English Linguistic Society of Japan at Kyoto University in November 1993.