

Clause-Mate Conditions

Howard Lasnik
University of Maryland

I. "Classic arguments" Based on Postal (1974)

- (1) Within classic generative theorizing of the 1960's and early 1970's, many processes and relations were thought to obey a 'clause-mate' restriction. That is, no process or relation of this class could involve X and Y if X and Y were separated by a clause boundary. On this point of view, the following phenomena constituted strong evidence for a process of 'subject raising to object position' in what came to be called Exceptional Case Marking (ECM) constructions.

Passive

- (2)a Jack believed Joan
b Joan was believed by Jack
(3)a Jack believed Joan to be famous
b Joan was believed to be famous by Jack

Reflexive

- (4) Jack believed himself
(5) Jack_i believed himself_i to be immoral

Reciprocal

- (6) They believed each other
(7) They believed each other to be honest

Compare:

- (8) *Joan was believed was famous by Jack
(9) *Jack_i believed himself_i was immoral
(10) *They believed each other were honest

- (11) Chomsky (1973) advanced a different perspective on such phenomena, arguing that the relevant structural issue is not **whether** there is a clause boundary separating the two NPs, but rather **what sort** of clause boundary there is. An infinitival clause boundary is in the pertinent sense weaker than a finite clause boundary. This was the Tensed Sentence Condition (TSC).

- (12) Postal also sketched certain other arguments for raising in which the derived structure **height** of the lower deep structure subject is implicated.

- (13)a ?The DA proved [the defendants to be guilty] during each other's trials
- b ?The DA accused the defendants during each other's trials
- c ?*The DA proved [that the defendants were guilty] during each other's trials Lasnik and Saito (1991), roughly based on Postal (1974)
- (14) Given usual assumptions, the antecedent of a reciprocal must c-command the reciprocal. Thus, the lower subject must have raised into the higher clause in these examples.
- (15) No one saw anything
- (16) *Anyone saw nothing
- (17) The DA accused none of the defendants during any of the trials
- (18) ?The DA proved [none of the defendants to be guilty] during any of the trials
- (19) ?*The DA proved [that none of the defendants were guilty] during any of the trials

II. An ECM construction with word order effects [Kayne (1985), Johnson (1991)]

- (20) Mary made out that John is a fool
- (21) Mary made John out to be a fool
- (22) Mary made out John to be a fool
- (23) Joan was made out to be famous by Jack
- (24)a Jack made himself out to be immoral
- b *Jack made out himself to be immoral
- (25)a They made each other out to be honest
- b *They made out each other to be honest
- (26) ?Jack called up himself
- (27) ?They called up each other

III. A distributional constraint on [not Q n] Postal (1974)

- (28) Not many gorillas have learned to tap-dance
- (29) ?*Joe kissed not many models
- (30) ?*They gave not many students books
- (31) ?*They talked about not many articles
- (32) (?*)Harry proved not many of those formulas to be theorems
 cf. Harry proved that not many of those formulas were theorems

- (33) ?They made out not many articles to have been published
 (34) *They made not many articles out to have been published

IV. ECM configurations and Condition B

- (35) *John_i injured him_i
 (36) *John_i believes him_i to be a genius
 (37) John_i believes Mary to admire him_i
 (38) John believes that he is a genius
 (39) *Mary injured him_i and John_i did too
 (40) ?Mary believes him_i to be a genius and John_i does too
 (41) Suppose Postal (1966), Postal (1974) was right (contra Chomsky (1973)) that the relevant structural configuration for such obviation is based on the notion clause-mate. (For related discussion, see Lasnik (2002))
 (42) Weak pronouns must cliticize onto the verb. Oehrle (1976)
 (43) The detective brought him in
 (44) *The detective brought in him Chomsky (1955)
 (45) Failure to cliticize in (40) is repaired by ellipsis.
 (46) In (39), on the other hand, the pronoun and its antecedents are clause-mates independent of cliticization.

V. An 'anti-reconstruction' effect

- (47) All that glitters isn't gold
 (48) Negation can sometimes take scope over a universal quantifier that is seemingly higher than that negation.
 (49)a (it seems that) everyone isn't there yet
 b I expected [everyone not to be there yet]
 c everyone seems [t not to be there yet]
 (50) "Negation can have wide scope over the Q in [(49)a], and it seems in [(49)b] but not in [(49)c],.... reconstruction in the A-chain does not take place, so it appears." Chomsky (1995, p.327)
 (51) Negation and the universal quantifier evidently must be clause-mates.
 (52) The mathematician made every even number out not to be the sum of two primes
 (53) The only reading is the implausible one where the

mathematician was engaged in the futile activity of trying to convince someone that no even number is the sum of two primes (and not the far more plausible one where she is merely trying to convince someone that Goldbach's conjecture is false).

- (54) The mathematician made out every even number not to be the sum of two primes

VI. A constraint on certain Negative Polarity Items

- (55) They don't know jack/squat/dick (=They don't know anything)

- (56) *They know jack/squat/dick

[Context: A food company has claimed to have proved that many of their products are healthy. A critic says:]

- (57) ?They didn't prove squat to be healthy

- (58) *They didn't prove that squat was healthy

[Context: That same food company is being sued for allegedly trying to mislead consumers into thinking that many of their products are healthy. Their lawyer says:]

- (59) ?They didn't make squat out to be healthy

- (60) *They didn't make out squat to be healthy

- (61) *They didn't make out that squat was healthy

References

- Chomsky, Noam. 1955. The logical structure of linguistic theory. Ms. Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. and MIT, Cambridge, Mass. [Revised 1956 version published in part by Plenum, New York, 1975; University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1985].
- Chomsky, Noam. 1973. Conditions on transformations. In *A festschrift for Morris Halle*, ed. Stephen Anderson and Paul Kiparsky, 232-286. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Johnson, Kyle. 1991. Object positions. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 9: 577-636.
- Kayne, Richard. 1985. Principles of particle constructions. In *Grammatical representation*, ed. Jacqueline Guéron, Hans-Georg Obenauer, and Jean-Yves Pollock, 101-140. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Lasnik, Howard. 2002. Clause-mate conditions revisited. *Glott International* 16: 94-96.
- Lasnik, Howard, and Mamoru Saito. 1991. On the subject of infinitives. In *Papers from the 27th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society, Part I: The general session*, ed. Lise M. Dobrin, Lynn Nichols, and Rosa M. Rodriguez, 324-343. Chicago Linguistic Society, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
- Oehrle, Richard. 1976. *The grammatical status of the English dative alternation*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Postal, Paul M. 1966. A note on understood transitively. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 32: 90-93.
- Postal, Paul M. 1974. *On raising: One rule of English grammar and its theoretical implications*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.