

"Syntax Position Paper"
On the Locality of Movement
Howard Lasnik
University of Connecticut

- (1) "...the rise and subsequent change of grammatical structures is always functionally motivated..." Givón (1995)
- (2) "It is possible, though hardly necessary, that general properties of grammar might be explained, at least in part, in terms of the exigencies of performance." Chomsky and Lasnik (1977)
- (3) Ross's (1967) Complex NP Constraint: No element in a sentence dominated by a noun phrase with a lexical head noun may be moved out of that noun phrase by a transformation.
- (4) The hat [which [I believed [(?*the claim*) that Otto was wearing _]]] is red
- (5) Ross's (1967) Sentential Subject Constraint: No element dominated by an S may be moved out of that S if that node S is dominated by an NP which itself is immediately dominated by S.
- (6) *The hat [which [[that I brought _] seemed strange to the nurse]] was a fedora
- (7) *Who did [stories about _] terrify John
- (8) ?*What did she wonder [where [John put _ _]]
- (9) Chomsky's (1973) Subjacency: No rule can move Y to X if Y is not subjacent to X.
- (10) Y is subjacent to X if there is at most one cyclic category (NP or S) that contains Y and does not contain X.
- (11) (12) and (13) "are difficult to process because the grammatical-functional relations in the deeply embedded clause are hard to reconstruct, given the deletion, the lack of morphological indicators, and the fact that there is a large gap between the head noun the man (object of bit) and the verb of which it is the object." Givón (1979)
- (12) *The man who I saw the dog that bit _ fell down
- (13) *Who did you see the dog that bit _
- (14) Subjacency entails that apparent long movement is composed of a series of short movements (via Comp, under Chomsky's specific proposal).
- (15) S' -> Comp S
- (16) ?*What did [_S she wonder [_S where [_S John put _ _]]]

- (17) What did [_S she think [_S [_S John put _ on the table]]]
- (18) What did [_S she think [_S that [_S John put _ on the table]]]
- (19) Clausal structure restated in terms of the generalized X'-theory of Chomsky (1986):
- (20) What did [_S she think [_{CP} [_C that [_S John put _ on the table]]]]
- (21) *Who did [stories about _] terrify John
- (22) Who did you hear [stories about _]
- (23) Evidence for the stepwise decomposition of long movement:
- (24) +Irish complementizer alternation (McCloskey (1991)):
- (25) Dúirt sé [gur bhuaill tú é]
said he COMP struck you him
"He said that you struck him"
- (26) an fear [a bhuaill tú _]
the man [COMP struck you _]
"The man that you struck"
- (27) an rud a shíl mé a dúirt tú a dhéanfa
the thing COMP thought I COMP said you COMP do [Cond
S2]
"the thing that I thought you said you would do"
- (28) +Spanish verb fronting (Torrego (1984)):
- (29) Marta quiere café
"Martha wants coffee"
- (30) Marta quiere qué
"Martha wants what?"
- (31) Qué quiere Marta?
"What does Martha want?"
- (32) *Qué Marta quiere?
- (33) Qué pensaba Juan que le había dicho Pedro que había publicado la revista?
"What did John think that Peter had told him that the journal had published?"
- (34) *Qué pensaba Juan que Pedro le había dicho que la revista había publicado?
- (35) +Spanish complementizer alternation (Torrego (1983)):
- (36) Lamento (que) no estés contenta con tu trabajo.
"I lament (that) you are not happy with your job."
- (37) La película que de veras siento (que) no llegasa a ver es *El matrimonio de Maria Braun*.
"The movie that I am really sorry that you didn't get to see is *The Marriage of Maria Braun*."
- (38) La película que de veras siento *(que) no intentarás que proyectaran en tu clase es *El matrimonio de Maria Braun*.
"The movie that I am really sorry that you did not try to have shown in your class is *The Marriage of Maria Braun*."
- (39) Is absolute distance the determining factor in

- acceptability of long movement?
- (40) The hat [which [I believed [(?*the claim) that Otto was wearing _]]] is red
- (41) The hat [which [I believed [that Mary claimed [that Otto was wearing _]]] is red
- (42) What did you say that John and the other boys really believe that the old drunken sailor actually saw
- (43) Spanish long movement with no 'trail' (and in spite of potential ambiguity):
- (44) En qué medida Juan había pensado que Pedro le había asegurado que la revista se arriesgaría a publicar eso?
"To what extent had John thought that Peter assured him that the journal would risk publishing that?"
- (45) *Por qué no sabes [qué libro te harbrán regalado _ _]
Why don't you know [what book they have given _ to you _]
- (46) 'Covert' movement of WH in situ. An argument for a processing account? (Pritchett (1991))
"While there seems no natural way to capture this in grammatical theory, a processing account offers a clear explanation. It is, as we have seen, the actual overt dislocation of the Wh-word and the necessity of locating its D-structure position online that is the source of the difficulty. LF movement involves the movement of an unambiguous in situ Wh-word to an unambiguous adjoined position. In other words the parser need not fill a gap and consequently, no 'Subjacency' effect results."
[p.334]
- (47)
- ```

 D-structure
 |
 Transformations
 |
 S-structure
 / \
Phonetic Form Logical Form

```
- (48) ?\*What did she wonder [where [John put \_ \_]]
- (49) Who wondered [where [John put what \_]]
- (50) \*What did you meet the woman that wrote
- (51) Who met the woman that wrote what
- (52) Ni xiangxin Lisi mai-le sheme de shuofa?  
"You believe the claim that Lisi bought what?"
- (53) John-wa Mary-ga nani-o katta kadooka siritagatte iru no?  
"John wants to know whether Mary bought what?"
- (54) BUT...there are island effects with adjuncts in situ (Huang (1982); Lasnik and Saito (1984;1992)):
- (55) \*Ni xiangxin Lisi weisheme lai de shuofa?  
"You believe [the claim [that [Lisi came why]]]?"

- (56) \*John-wa Mary-ga naze sore-o katta kadooka siritagatte iru no?  
"John wants to know [whether [Mary bought it why]]?"
- (57) The Empty Category Principle (ECP) - another locality constraint defined in terms similar to those of Subjacency. It particularly constrains the movement of non-arguments. (58) violates Subjacency. (59) violates both Subjacency and ECP.
- (58) ?\*What do you wonder [whether [John read \_]]
- (59) \*Why do you wonder [whether [John read the book \_]]
- (60) Why do you think John read the book
- (61) ?\*What do you believe [the claim [that John read \_]]
- (62) \*Why do you believe [the claim [that John read the book \_]]
- (63) Chomsky's alternative functional explanation: extraction of adjuncts out of islands creates 'garden paths', because, as noted earlier, there are numerous structural positions from which an adjunct could have fronted.
- (64) "I do not attempt to argue that all deviant Wh-movements are attributable to a processing-based explanation but restrict my attention to those...which have necessitated the introduction of some notion of bounding at surface structure...Consequently, ungrammaticality attributable to the ECP at LF will be assumed to be handled within the grammar as usual."  
[Pritchett (1991) pp.334-335]
- (65) The  $\theta$ -criterion attempts to be satisfied at every point during processing given the maximal  $\theta$ -grid.
- (66) What do you believe  $\phi$  John burned  $e$
- (67) Theta Reanalysis Constraint (TRC): Syntactic reanalysis that reinterprets a Theta-marked constituent as outside of its current  $\theta$  domain and as within an existing  $\theta$  domain of which it is not a member renders a sentence unacceptable.
- (68)  $\theta$  domain:  $\alpha$  is in the  $\gamma$   $\theta$  domain of  $\beta$  iff  $\alpha$  receives the  $\gamma$   $\theta$ -role from  $\beta$  or  $\alpha$  is dominated by a constituent that receives the  $\gamma$   $\theta$ -role from  $\beta$ .
- (69) Locality and A-movement:
- (70) John was arrested \_
- (71) The women are likely [ \_ to solve the problem]
- (72) The students are believed [ to be likely [ \_ to solve the problem]]
- (73) The women are likely both to solve the problem
- (74) The students are believed both to be likely to solve the problem
- (75) The students are believed [ \_ to be likely [ \_ to solve the problem]]
- (76) John injured himself

- (77) \*John thinks that Mary injured himself  
 (78) The students criticized each other  
 (79) \*The students think Mary criticized each other
- (80) The students seem to be likely to criticize each other  
 (81) The students seem to each other to be likely to criticize Mary  
 (82) The students are likely to seem to each other to be clever
- (83) John injured him [\*with him understood as John]  
 (84) \*John thinks that Mary injured him [OK with him understood as John]  
 (85) \*The students<sub>i</sub> seem to be likely to criticize them<sub>i</sub>  
 (86) \*The students<sub>i</sub> seem to them<sub>i</sub> to be likely to criticize Mary  
 (87) \*The students<sub>i</sub> are likely to seem to them<sub>i</sub> to be clever
- (88) What forces A-movement to be short? Possibly this is the result of a constraint in the Subjacency family. Or perhaps it is merely a consequence of the independent (formal) requirement that subject position be filled (at some stage of the derivation):  
 (89) \*(It) is raining  
 (90) \*(It) seems that Mary solved the problem  
 (91) \*(There) is a solution
- (92) Who do you think [ \_ solved the problem]  
 (93) Mary seems [ \_ to have solved the problem]  
 (94) There seems [ \_ to be a solution]
- (95) "The assertion of 'inutility' in the case of any organ...is not, and can never be, the statement of fact, but merely an expression of our ignorance of its purpose or origin." [A. R. Wallace (1867)]
- (96) "As my conclusions have lately been much misrepresented, and it has been stated that I attribute the modification of species exclusively to natural selection, I may be permitted to remark that in the first edition of this work, and subsequently, I placed in a most conspicuous position - namely, at the close of the Introduction - the following words: 'I am convinced that Natural Selection has been the main but not exclusive means of modification.' This has been of no avail. Great is the power of steady misrepresentation." [Darwin (1872)]

#### References

- Baker, C. L. 1970. Notes on the description of English questions: The role of an abstract question morpheme. *Foundations of Language* 6:197-219.  
 Chomsky, Noam. 1964. *Current issues in linguistic theory*. The Hague: Mouton.

- Chomsky, Noam. 1973. Conditions on transformations. In *A festschrift for Morris Halle*, eds. Stephen Anderson and Paul Kiparsky, 232-286. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.  
 Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on government and binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.  
 Chomsky, Noam. 1986. *Barriers*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.  
 Chomsky, Noam, and Howard Lasnik. 1977. Filters and control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11:1-46. [Reprinted in *Essays on restrictiveness and learnability*, Howard Lasnik, 42-124. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1990.]  
 Darwin, Charles. 1872. *On the origin of species by means of natural selection* Sixth edition. London: Murray.  
 Givón, Talmy. 1979. *On understanding grammar*. New York: Academic Press.  
 Givón, Talmy. 1995. *Functionalism and grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.  
 Gould, Stephen Jay. 1980. *The panda's thumb*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.  
 Hannay, Michael. 1985. *English existentials in Functional Grammar*. Dordrecht: Foris.  
 Huang, C.-T. James. 1982. *Logical relations in Chinese and the theory of grammar*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.  
 Lasnik, Howard, and Mamoru Saito 1984. On the nature of proper government. *Linguistic Inquiry* 15: 235-289. [Reprinted in *Essays on restrictiveness and learnability*, Howard Lasnik, 198-255. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1990.]  
 Lasnik, Howard and Mamoru Saito. 1992. *Move  $\alpha$* . Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.  
 Marquis, Réjean Canac. 1992. On the obligatory character of inversion in Spanish. In *The Proceedings of the Tenth West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. Dawn Bates, 309-318. Stanford Linguistics Association.  
 McCloskey, James. 1989. Resumptive pronouns, A'-binding, and levels of representation in Irish. In *Syntax and semantics 23: The syntax of the modern Celtic languages*, ed. Randall Hendrick, 199-248. New York: Academic Press.  
 Newmeyer, Frederick. 1983. *Grammatical theory: Its limits and its possibilities*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.  
 Nishigauchi, Taisuke. 1986. *Quantification in syntax*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.  
 Pritchett, Bradley. 1991. Subjacency in a principle-based parser. In *Principle-based parsing: Computation and psycholinguistics*, eds. R. C. Berwick et. al. 301-345, Dordrecht: Kluwer.  
 Rizzi, Luigi. 1978. Violations of the wh island constraint and the subjacency condition. *Montreal Working Papers in Linguistics* 11 (1980). [Reprinted in *Issues in Italian syntax*, Luigi Rizzi, 49-76, Dordrecht: Foris (1982).]  
 Rizzi, Luigi. 1990. *Relativized Minimality*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.  
 Ross, John Robert. 1967. *Constraints on variables in syntax*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.  
 Sportiche, Dominique. 1988. *A theory of floating quantifiers and*

- its corollaries for constituent structure. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19:425-449.
- Torrego, Esther. 1983. More effects of successive cyclic movement. *Linguistic Inquiry* 14: 561-565.
- Torrego, Esther. 1984. On inversion in Spanish and some of its effects. *Linguistic Inquiry* 15: 103-129.
- Tsai, Dylan. 1994. On economizing the theory of A'-dependencies. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Van Valin, Robert. 1981. Review of T. Givón, *On understanding grammar*. *Lingua* 54: 47-85.