Lightfoot, David W. "A Restructuring Rule." *Linguistic Inquiry* , Vol. 9, No. 4 (Autumn,
1978) , pp. 717-719.

Collection Permanent Link: http://hdl.handle.net/10822/707740

Squibs
and
Discussion

A Restructuring Rule
David Lightfoot,
  McGill University

Grosu (1977) queries the proposal that an Idiom Formation rule should restructure *make the claim* into a single complex lexical item (Chomsky (1975, chapter 3, footnote 24)). Such a rule, applying to *make the claim* but not to *discuss the claim*, would permit the extraction of a *wh*-element without violating Subjacency.

(1) a. who did John claim that Mary saw t
    b. *who did John discuss [$_{NP}$ the claim [$_{S'}$ that Mary saw t]]
    c. who did John [$_V$ make the claim] [$_{S'}$ that Mary saw t]

Grosu notes (p. 727) that

> The putative complex verb...appears to be exceptional in one respect: (apparently) unbounded extraction operations...may not affect the object complement of *make the claim* (as illustrated in the (b) sentences of (2)-(4)).

(2) a. That John may be a thief(,) no one has ever claimed/written down.
    b. That John may be a thief(,) no one has ever made the claim.
    c. *That John may be a thief(,) no one has ever believed the claim.
(3) a. What I have never claimed/written down is that John was a thief.
    b. *What I have never made the claim is that John was a thief.
    c. *What I have never believed the claim is that John was a thief.
(4) a. That John is a thief, which no one has ever claimed/written down, happens to be true.
    b. *That John is a thief, which no one has ever made the claim, happens to be true.
    c. *That John is a thief, which no one has ever believed the claim, happens to be true.

There is a very simple answer to this problem, which Grosu comes close to hinting at. Under the proposals of Chomsky (1977), all these sentences would be derived by application of *Wh* Movement, and not by what had hitherto been regarded as distinct rules of Topicalization and Pseudocleft. Therefore, if *make the claim* is treated as an intransitive verb (accounting for the ungrammaticality of *I [v *made the claim*] *Mary*), there will be no source for the (a) and (b) sentences of (2)-(4), no position from which the *wh*-element could have been fronted. For example, the potential sources of (2) would have to be (2′), with the Topic base-generated in its surface, sentence-initial position.

(2′) a.   [TOP that John may be a thief] [S′ COMP no one has ever claimed wh]

b.   [TOP that John may be a thief] [S′ COMP no one has ever [v made the claim] wh]

c.   [TOP that John may be a thief] [S′ COMP no one has ever [v discussed] the claim wh]

(2b) and (2c) are impossible if [v *make the claim*] is subcategorized as intransitive and *discuss* as able to occur only in the frame [NP _____ NP]. Likewise, the source for (3b) and (4b) would have to contain the impossible *COMP* ...[v *make the claim*] *wh*.

Grosu claims (p. 728) that the same problem also arises for "(apparently) bounded reordering processes (as shown in (5)), unbounded deletion processes (...(6) and (7)), and copying processes (...(8) and (9))." The same solution is also available. (The examples that follow are the (b) sentences of Grosu's (5)-(9).)

(5)   *That John was a thief has been made the claim by a number of people.

(6)   *That John is a thief is too improbable for us to make the claim.

(7)   *That John is a thief is hard for me to make the claim.

(8)   *That John is a thief, no one has ever made the claim it.

(9)   *No one has ever made the claim it, that John may be a thief.

Specifying [v *make the claim*] as intransitive would allow no object position from which the surface subject of (5) could have been fronted, no position for the *wh*-element needed for (6) and (7) (assuming again with Chomsky (1977) that such infinitival adjective phrases are derived by *Wh* Movement), no position for the anaphoric *it* in (8) and (9) (assuming with Chomsky and Grosu (note 3) "that Left- and Right-Dislocation do not exist and that structures like [(8) and (9)] are base-generated").

Parallel facts also hold for the other constructions dis-

cussed in Chomsky (1977) and subsumed under *Wh* Movement, comparatives and relative clauses. Again there is no source available for the *wh*-element.

(10) *the man who I made the claim wore pink
(11) *John dated more gorillas than I made the claim (cf. than I claimed).

Therefore, far from showing the inadequacy of the Idiom Formation rule, Grosu's data can be interpreted as illustrating yet another set of correct predictions that follow from the proposal that "rules" of Topicalization, Pseudocleft, Deletion in adjectivals, *Tough* Movement, and Left- and Right-Dislocation do not exist and that the relevant sentences are derived by a general rule of *Wh* Movement that obeys the Subjacency Condition.

References

Chomsky, N. (1975) *Reflections on Language,* Pantheon, New York.
Chomsky, N. (1977) "On *Wh*-Movement," in P. Culicover, T. Wasow, and A. Akmajian, eds., *Formal Syntax,* Academic Press, New York.
Grosu, A. (1977) "Is *make the claim* a Complex Lexical Item?", *Linguistic Inquiry* 8, 726-729.

THE COMPLEMENTIZER IN
MIDDLE ENGLISH
APPOSITIVES*
Joan M. Maling,
  Brandeis University

1. Appositive relative clauses in modern English do not have the full range of complementizers that restrictive relatives do. Compare the restrictive relative in (1) with the nonrestrictive appositive in (2):

(1) We found just the person $\left\{\begin{matrix}\text{who}\\\text{that}\\\phi\end{matrix}\right\}$ we need to edit the journal.

(2) Bill, $\left\{\begin{matrix}\text{who}\\\text{*that}\\\text{* }\phi\end{matrix}\right\}$ we really ought to invite to the party, seems very depressed these days.

An explanation for the nonoccurrence of *that* in appositive relatives has been suggested by Chomsky and Lasnik (hence-