LEFTWARD EXTRACTION PHENOMENA IN ENGLISH

KANEAKI ARIMURA

*Konan University**

Three Investigations of Extraction, by Paul M. Postal, MIT Press, Cambridge MA, 1999, x+215pp.

Keywords: L-extraction, resumptive pronoun, antipronominal context, selective island, Ross's principle

In this book, Postal investigates three areas of extraction; Leftward extraction (L-extraction), extractions involving coordinate structure, and Right Node Raising (RNR). Chapter 1 is an introduction where the arguments offered for the three areas in the later chapters are summarized and extended, although most of the pages are devoted to L-extractions with the result that the remaining two areas are only briefly summarized. In Chapter 2 Postal argues that L-extraction phenomena could be better understood in terms of Ross's (1967) ideas of the resumptive pronoun. Chapter 3 is a defense of the Coordinate Structure Constraint, proposed by Ross (1967), which Lakoff (1986) argues should be abandoned in favor of his frame semantic approach. In Chapter 4, Postal argues against McCawley's (1988) interpretation of RNR in terms of his "multiple mother" nodes which denies the move-

* I should like to thank two anonymous reviewers for their comments and suggestions which played a significant role in improving this article. I am also indebted to the following people for helpful discussions; Joe Emonds, Minoru Fukuda, Yukio Oba, Paul R. Ross, David W. Rycroft and Kazuhiko Tajima. Errors or misunderstandings, if any, are my own responsibility. This work is partially supported by the funds from the Interdisciplinary Research Institute of Konan University.

ment analysis, and presents a lot of evidence which he argues proves that RNR involves rightward movement. Appendix A is allotted to the critical examinations of 7 specific analyses where “unlocked islands” are mistaken for nonislands, Appendix B is additional arguments for the extraction analysis of RNR, and Appendix C is a response to the criticisms from “one of two MIT Press referees.”

Postal’s arguments are based on abundant examples; actually, according to Grohmann (1999), this book contains “a total of 539 numbered examples (many of which [come] with more than three sentences).” Readers already familiar with Postal’s arguments will be convinced of his attitude towards syntax. Most of his arguments are clearly (and, in fact, pleasantly) stated and his criticisms against the opposing analyses are acute. Actually, I completely agree with Postal when he criticizes Lakoff’s (1986) understanding of the coordinate structure constraint in Chapter 3. However, he is not always explicit about his alternative ideas; in some places he even talks about the tentative and sketchy nature of his ideas. This tentativeness often prevents me from fully understanding what he is trying to say; for example, when he examines the compounded “unlocked islands” (to be discussed later) and presents his own solutions, he says “the scheme just sketched remains entirely informal; it is moderately complex; and certainly not all of its components have been extensively justified. The task of developing these ideas in a truly serious way is beyond this book.” (p. 15) This reserved attitude turns out to be a barrier to understanding when we should like to ask what brings about such a difference between the “rigid” and the “flexible” unlocked islands.

This book treats three areas of extraction, each of which is intriguing and exciting, but in this review I confine myself to L-extraction, which covers chapters 1–3, partly because of space restriction and partly because I believe it constitutes one of the most important focuses of this book. The organization of this review is as follows. Section 1 is an overview of Postal’s main ideas. In Section 2, I point out the problems or obscurities inherent in this book. In Section 3, I discuss the island sensitivity of argument NPs. In Section 4, I examine one of the most interesting features of Postal’s proposal, that is, the antipronominal contexts (ACs, hereafter), and explore an alternative interpretation of the phenomena. Section 5 is a conclusion. Although critical about Postal’s ideas in this review, I must add that I am impressed by his deep knowledge of and insight into the English language (or language,

for that matter) and that I pay due respect to his strenuous efforts to discover new facts, which I believe are one of his major contributions to the study of English syntax.

1. Overview of Postal's proposal on L-extraction

It has been noted in the literature that there are differences among what is subsumed under a single *wh*-movement in Chomsky's (1977) seminal paper. For example, the cleft sentence and non-restrictive relative clause formation, both of which are treated as special cases of *wh*-movement by Chomsky, are immune from restrictions imposed on the *wh*-question or restrictive relative clause formation (Emonds (1979), Cinque (1990), Koster (1987), Lasnik and Stowell (1991), Obenauer (1984) among others). To account for the discrepancies observed in *wh*-extraction phenomena, Postal heavily relies on Ross's (1967: 236) principle that "chopping rules are subject to the constraints of Chapter 4 (i.e. island constraints, KA); copying rules are not." To rephrase this principle, island constraints are violable when a pronominal copy (i.e. a resumptive pronoun) is left behind in an island just like Left dislocation. Ross was concerned only with the overt resumptive pronoun when he formulated his principle above, but recent studies on empty categories have led to the assumption that the resumptive pronouns can be empty. Actually there have been proposals in the literature which utilize empty pronominal status of the trace; for example, Obenauer (1984), Koster (1985) and Cinque (1990) discussed L-extraction on the basis of empty pronouns in the GB framework. Cinque (1990), in particular, explored what he calls "A-bar bound pro" to account for the insensitivity of L-extraction to weak islands. These authors, however, did not always explicitly recognize Ross's insights (for instance, Obenauer (1984) did not even cite Ross's (1967) dissertation) and Lakoff (1968) explicitly denied the presence of the coordinate structure constraint as a syntactic constraint. But Postal places Ross's principle in the fore front and further explicates the L-extraction phenomena by reinterpreting it from a new perspective. One of the important purposes of the book under review is to devote itself to the justification of Ross's original proposal with respect to the empty resumptive pronoun in English L-extraction phenomena.

1.1. Extraction Types and Islands

Postal subclassifies English extraction types into three (p. 6).

- (1) a. A1-extractions; *wh*-question, Restrictive relative, Pseudo-cleft, Negative-NP extraction
- b. A2-extractions; Comparative, Exclamatory sentence, Free relative, *the more ... the more*, *such N as*, *the same N as*, *a different than*¹
- c. B-extractions; Topicalization, Non-restrictive relative, Cleft

All of the extraction types in (1) share common properties; that is, extractions from the most unmarked argument positions are always possible when there is no intervening island boundary and impossible when there is an intervening locked (or strong) island, i.e. non-restrictive relative clause in the b-sentences below.²

- (2) A1-extraction
 - a. Who did they nominate *t* to be director? (1-1a)
 - b. *The woman who they notified Jack, who lived with *t*, was missing. (1-20a)
- (3) A2-extraction
 - a. Stella tickled more chimps than (what) I said that Dwight tickled *t*. (1-1e)
 - b. *What a lovely woman they notified Jack, who lived with *t*!
- (4) B-extraction
 - a. Frank, I would never hire *t*. (1-1h)
 - b. *Linda, they notified Jack, who lived with *t*. (1-20b)

However, the three types of L-extraction above exhibit different be-

¹ Postal does not list all the types of extractions in this form, particularly with respect to A2-extractions. Almost all of the A2 types are mentioned on page 6, Chapter 1, except for exclamatory sentences and free relatives. As for exclamatory sentences, there is no place in which Postal specifically mentions them as A2-extractions, but we can infer from his exemplification on pages 6-7. Free relatives are first introduced as A2-extraction on page 46, Chapter 2.

² In what follows, I shall omit Postal's rather complicated notation of indexing unless ambiguity arises. The parenthesized number is added at the end of the example to identify the place of appearance; e.g. (1-1a) means that the example is cited as (1a) in Chapter 1.

havior when they cross what Postal calls an “unlocked” or “selective” island.³ He identified 8 varieties of unlocked islands; (i) interrogative clauses, (ii) irrealis *if* complements, (iii) complements of factive predicates like *regret*, (iv) rationale clauses, (v) clausal complements of (certain) nouns (p. 61), (vi) non-finite adjuncts, (vii) non-finite subjects, and (viii) quantified restrictive relative clauses (p. 20).⁴ A1- and B-extractions are characterized by the immunity from the presence of the locked island and A2-extractions by the sensitivity to it.

- (5) a. the guy who they asked Jane whether the policed questioned t (1-9a)
- b. What spy did the police arrest everyone who had contacted t? (1-10a)
- (6) a. That car, they never asked me whether I had seen t. (2-81a)
- b. That car, they would have preferred it if I had bought t. (2-81b)
- (7) a. *They are looking for more cars that (what) they asked me whether I had seen t. (2-75e)
- b. *whatever pilots we would prefer it if she contacted t (2-78c)
- c. *The more stars he dates the more stars (that) he asks me whether you have dated t. (2-79c)
- d. *No matter what they would prefer it if she did t, ... (2-80c)

³ Postal uses both “selective” islands and “unlocked” islands but on p. 12 he says that “what are called selective islands ... will all be unlocked islands.” He goes on to say that the double terminology is not redundant because “the notion ‘unlocked’ provides the beginning of a theoretical account of what determines that an island falls into the purely descriptive category ‘selective’” (ibid.). In this review I shall use the terms “locked” or “unlocked” islands for the sake of consistency except in original citation.

⁴ Notice that unlocked islands are roughly weak islands in the sense of Cinque (1990: 1). However, there are some differences; for example, Cinque (ibid.) classifies a complex NP (an NP modified by a relative clause) and an adjunct island (non-finite adjuncts, for Postal) as “strong,” although Postal considers only quantified relative clauses to be unlocked.

Unlocked islands are violated in the cases of restrictive relative clause formation and *wh*-question (both being A1-extraction) and of topicalization (B-extraction) whereas A2-extraction is impossible across the island boundary of whatever sort.

1.2. Antipronominal Contexts

Postal's important proposal is that the compatibility or incompatibility of a weak definite pronoun is deeply involved in the L-extraction phenomena. He enumerates 14 circumstances where the pronoun fails to occur (p. 4)⁵; (i) the focus position of existential *there* construction, (ii) the change-of-color context, (iii) the name position, (iv) the inalienable possession context, (v) the predicate nominal, (vi) adverbial NPs, (vii) extraposed prepositional phrases, (viii) infinitival extraposition, (ix) exceptive shifting, (x) temporal NPs, (xi) the idiomatic Verb+NP structure, (xii) the locative case, (xiii) the object of *tell* (in the sense of "determine") and the manner-of-speaking verbs *grunt/whine*, and (xiv) the language-designating object of the preposition *in* after *speak*. Postal calls these "antipronominal contexts" (ACs).

The most salient property of ACs is the fact that B-extraction, as opposed to A-extraction, is impossible even when there is no intervening island boundary. The following cases illustrate the point.

- (8) Focus position of existential *there* construction
 - a. No such chemicals did he know that there were *t* in the bottle. (2-2b)
 - b. *Such chemicals, he knew that there were *t* in the bottle. (2-2c)
 - c. There are such apples (*them) on the table. (2-28a,b)
- (9) Change-of-color contexts

He painted the car green/that color. →

 - a. What color did he paint the car *t*? (2-4b)
 - b. *Green/That color, he never painted the car *t*. (2-4d)
 - c. *They painted their porch [green]₁ but I refused to paint mine *it*₁. (2-30)

⁵ In Chapter 2 Postal is concerned with only 12 ACs, but in Chapters 1 and 3 he recognizes two more contexts (xiii) and (xiv) in the text. This is because he noticed the latter two after he wrote the original version of Chapter 2.

These examples show correlations between the pronominal ban in the c-sentences, on the one hand, and the possibility of A-extraction (negative-NP extraction in (8a) and question extraction in (9a)) and the impossibility of B-extraction (topicalization in (8b) and (9b)), on the other. In other words, an AC is recognized as such iff an overt weak definite pronoun fails to occur and B-extraction is impossible. Thus, according to Postal, an AC is a relative notion; if either one requirement fails, the position cannot be an AC.⁶

Another important correlation between the AC and the extraction fact is that extraction is always impossible when the extractee is separated from the trace in the AC by an unlocked island, irrespective of the extraction types. In Chapter 3, Postal goes on to argue that an AC is one of the contexts from which long distance extraction is forbidden across an unlocked island (although they are not antipronominal). In addition to ACs, he recognizes 4 more cases which have similar properties with respect to long distance extraction across an unlocked island (p. 20).

- (10) If a constituent C external to a selective island V is extracted from site S internal to V, then
- a. Setting aside certain cases of prepositional phrase extraction, C is an NP.
 - b. S is not a finite subject position.
 - c. S is not an AC.
 - d. C is not reflexive.
 - e. C is not inherently unpassivizable (i.e. the complement NP which resists passivization)

⁶ Postal makes a further distinction between *wide* and *narrow* pronominal bans; wide bans “apply to both visible and invisible pronouns” whereas the narrow ones “block only visible pronouns in surface positions” (p. 40). This is based on the antipronominal contexts (ia) which allow B-extractions as in (ib).

- (i) a. *Kaite attends [Yale]₁ but Amanda does not attend it₁. (2-53a)
 b. Yale, Katie would never attend t. (2-54a)

This means that the object position of *attend* (or *apply to*) is a narrow AC. The same applies to the double object construction as in (ii).

- (ii) a. John gave him a book/*it.
 b. The present, Mary said that she gave him t.

Therefore, the contexts (i)-(xiv) in the text are all wide ACs.

In other words, this implies that constituents are not extractable when they are non-NPs (11), when they are in the finite subject position (12) or in the AC (13), and when they are reflexive pronouns (14) and inherently unpassivizable NPs (15). For ease of reference, I collectively name these 5 instances as “designated constituents and sites” (DC/S, for short). Below I shall offer only a few examples to show DC/S’s sensitivity to unlocked islands, but any combination of DC/S and unlocked islands results in ungrammaticality (the following examples are only of A1-extraction type, but other extraction types are equally ungrammatical).

- (11) Non-NP extraction/interrogative clause
 - *the person with whom I asked them whether Carla played t (3-29d)
 - cf. the person who I asked them whether Carla played with (3-29c)
- (12) Finite subject/Irrealis *if* complement
 - *the nurse who I would prefer it if t hired you (3-30b)
 - cf. the person who I would prefer it if you hired t (3-30a)
- (13) AC/factive complement
 - *What sort of gorilla did he regret (that) there was t in the meadow? (3-38a)
 - cf. the person who I regret (that) Carla tickled t (3-31a)
- (14) Reflexive/rational clause
 - *Herself, I never went there (in order) to talk to Jane about t. (3-39d)
 - cf. Which scientist did Ed go to England (in order) to consult with t? (3-32a)
- (15) Unpassivizable NP/clausal complements of nouns
 - *the rocks which she formulated a plan to feel t move (3-43e)
 - cf. Which doctor did he formulate a plan to prove Joan had betrayed t? (3-33a)

Notice that the condition (10) is stated without regard to the extraction types; this means that ungrammaticality results whenever the following configuration obtains.

- (16) [XP_i ... [Unlocked Island ... t_i ...]], where the trace position is associated with DC/S.

In other words, any extraction is excluded when the extraction site is of the DC/S type.

1.3. Extraction Types and Extractees

Postal makes an interesting claim that what appears to be A1-extraction turns out to be A2-extraction. He argues that what is at issue is both the extractee and what remains at the extraction site. This view is reflected in his examples at the end of Chapter 2 which suggest that apparent *wh*-extractions of the NP type exhibit different patterns depending on the nature of the moved constituents.

- (17) a. What size steak would you prefer it if we ordered t?
(2-90a)
- b. *How big a steak would you prefer it if we ordered t?
(2-90b)
- c. *How big he would prefer it if the steak was t is unknown. (2-94a)

He argues that "NP question extraction involving *how*+adjective seems to be subject to much the same restrictions as a corresponding *how*+non-NP extraction" (p. 49). Although the examples in (17a, b) appear to be derived by the same process, (17a) is an A1-extraction and (17b) is A2-extraction because the latter is sensitive to the unlocked island; that is, the irrealis *if* complement. If this distinction is real, then it casts doubts on the analyses based on the ECP (Cinque (1990), Obenauer (1984) or Rizzi (1990)) because, although (17a, b) both involve *wh*-movement from the argument position which is invariably protected by the lexical governor, (17b) patterns with (17c) where non-NP movement is involved.^{7, 8} However, it should be noted that the similar view

⁷ This observation is also based on the extraction differences brought about by the internal construction of the extractees of *who* and *whose*+N. The former can be extracted from the AC (as in *the (only) people who there were t at the party* (2-84a)) whereas the latter cannot be extracted from the same context (as in **the (only) people whose parents there were t at the party* (2-84b)). This contrast means that the latter is the B-extraction. From these considerations, Postal concludes that "the assignment of question extractions to types depends on the internal structure of the questioned NP" (p. 49).

⁸ Following Postal's arguments, we might expect that there should be similar contrasts between *too big a N* and *a very big N* forms with respect to A1-extraction.

(i) What I would prefer it if he offered her t (What they make a claim that he offered her t/What I wonder whether he offered her t) is *too large a house for her family/a very large house*.

These sentences were all judged as ungrammatical by my informants; they showed a

is already entertained by Pesetsky (1987: 107–109), where D-linking or non-D-linking is a crucial factor in determining the quantificational force of the *wh*-phrases, and by Heycock (1995: 561–565), where referentiality of the *wh*-phrases contributes to a distinction with respect to *wh*-extraction. What is new is the discovery of new areas of evidence from a different perspective.

1.4. Comparisons among the Extraction Types

Postal's main ideas will schematically be summarized in the following table (UL=unlocked and L=locked).

	Non-islands /ACs	UL-Islands /non-DC/Ss	UL-Islands /DC/Ss ($\ni$ ACs).	L-Islands
B-extractions	*	OK	*	*
A1-extractions	OK	OK	*	*
A2-extractions	OK	*	*	*

The first column shows that B-extraction of the constituents in ACs is not possible even if there are not island boundaries. The second column shows that A2-extraction of the non-DC/Ss is not allowed out of unlocked islands, as opposed to B-extraction and A1-extraction. The third column shows that extractions of the DC/Ss cannot be allowed out of unlocked islands irrespective to the extraction types. The fourth column shows that locked islands are completely frozen. From this Postal concludes that “selective islands are absolute islands, that is, just islands” (p. 45), which can be violated under the presence of RP, contrary to Cinque's (1990) relativized notion that islands are differenti-

strong sensitivity to islands in these cases.

On the other hand, topicalization or cleft formation should be grammatical because they are of the B-extraction type because A1-/B-extractions behave the same way with respect to unlocked islands.

- (ii) *Too large a house for her family/A very large house* I would prefer it if he offered her *t* (they make a claim that he offered her *t*/I wonder whether he offered her *t*).

Of these, both forms of the *wh*-island case was more acceptable than the irrealis *if* complement or the complex NP cases. Anyway, there is no perceivable difference between *too big a N* and *a very big N* forms. If the contrast noted in (17a, b) is real (as it is according to my informants), then it is only perceivable when the extractees are of the *wh*-question type.

ated depending on their inherent “strength.” For Postal, islands are simply islands; their violability does not depend on their nature but on the nature of the extractees.⁹

1.5. Invisible Resumptive Pronouns and Unlocked Islands

In Chapters 1 and 3, Postal proposes the characterization of each L-extraction type in order to explain the facts summarized in the table just above on the basis of Ross’s (1967: 236) principle.

- (18) a. A B-extraction requires resumptive pronouns (RPs) in its extraction site.
 b. An A1-extraction allows RPs in its extraction site.
 c. An A2-extraction forbids RPs in its extraction site.

Notice the intended ambiguity of the verb “allow” in (18b); there may be, or may not be, an RP in the extraction site of the A1-extraction. It shares properties both with B-extraction with respect to the presence of an RP and with A2-extraction with respect to the absence of an RP. According to Postal (p. 7) this characterization has the following consequences.

[1] B-extraction from an AC is impossible because the extraction site excludes a (weak definite) pronoun despite the requirement (18a). Thus ungrammaticality in (8b) and (9b) follows in a straightforward manner. On the other hand, A-extractions are compatible with the AC, because the requirements in (18b, c) do not force the presence of an RP in their extraction sites (see (8a) and (9a)).

[2] Given Ross’s (1967) principle, the requirement (18c) forbids A2-extraction out of an island boundary because it forbids an RP. Thus the island sensitivity of A2-extraction is accounted for. On the other hand, the requirements in (18a, b) do not forbid an RP and therefore A1- and B-extractions are insensitive to unlocked islands. This accounts for the contrast observed in (5)–(6) and (7).

[3] Because an AC is incompatible with an RP, which is required by Ross’s principle in the case of extraction across an unlocked island, extraction from an AC necessarily results in ungrammaticality, irrespec-

⁹ Postal assumes that islands are “absolute” islands even if they were classified as unlocked, but I wonder in what sense the “absolute” islands can be violated. Isn’t it the case that saying that islands can be violated means that they are “relativized” with respect to an RP in Postal’s idea?

tive of the extraction types. Thus ungrammaticality of (13) follows by the interaction of Ross's principle and the nature of ACs.

Postal assumes that there are two RPs in the cases of A1- and B-extraction; a primary RP and a secondary RP. Based on this assumption, he reinterprets Ross's principle as (1-27a): "the [*primary*] (controlled) RP left by an extractee ... extracts via non-A2-extraction (i.e. itself links to a *secondary* (controlled) RP); a primary RP is ... a controlled RP linked to an extractee that is not an RP" (p. 12). This extraction view of RPs is schematically represented as follows (island boundaries being indicated by angle brackets).

- (19) a. What the secret police arrested everyone <who saw t> was a video. (1-24a)

- b. What_t primary RP₁ { ... } <(secondary RP₁) who saw t₁> was a video (1-29)

The primary RP moves to the sister position of the extractee *what*_t because it must be controlled (presumably because of its invisible nature) and the secondary RP moves "to the boundary of the lowest island" (p. 13). The unlocked island (i.e. the quantified restrictive relative clause) is not a barrier for the extraction of the primary RP, but the locked island (i.e. the non-restrictive relative clause) constitutes a barrier which rules out the following extraction.

- (20) a. *The woman who they notified Jack, who lived with t, was missing. (1-18a)

- b. who_t primary RP₁ { ... } <secondary RP₁ who lived with t₁>, ... (1-30)

It should be noted that Postal stipulates that a tertiary RP is entirely excluded (1-27d), because otherwise an additional RP in the extraction site would freely salvage any extraction under the faithful interpretation of Ross's claim shown above.

However, notice that inability of DC/Ss other than ACs to cross an unlocked island is beyond the scope of the conditions (18) and needs a separate account. Let us look at (12), where the finite subject is extracted out of an irrealis *if* complement. Since the finite subject position is not antipronominal in the obvious sense, there is nothing in Postal's proposal which prohibits (12) except for the explicit statement in (10b). Let us consider (21b) which is intended to be a representation of (21a).

If the “extraction site” referred to the trace position in (22b), this representation would predict (22a) to be grammatical, because there is no pronominal in the original AC. Rather, what counts is the presence in the island of the secondary RP which is related to the anti-pronominal position. The fact that Postal presents the derivations (21) and (22) without referring to his conditions (18) makes his proposals unclear. This in turn means that there are no motivated relations between his various proposals, which makes this book difficult to follow. Furthermore, he does not touch on the representation of the A2-extraction with respect to RP extraction. From the definition in (18c) we can infer that no RP extractions are involved from the beginning in this case. Then the violation of Ross’s principle is obvious. However, there is an equally possible alternative interpretation within Postal’s proposal. We could assume, as the null hypothesis, that RPs are involved in all the extraction types. Under the suggested reinterpretation of the condition (18c) that the secondary RP cannot stay within an unlocked island in the case of A2-extraction because it forbids PRs in an island, it

has to move out of an unlocked island—leading to an island violation. If this line of reasoning is plausible, island sensitivity of A2-extraction is explained on the basis of the absence of an RP in an island, along the lines of Ross's principle.

2.2. Redundancy

We could point out some redundancies among the generalizations Postal offers. As I noted in section 1, his (18) coupled with Ross's principle has three consequences, one of which is the impossibility of extraction out of an unlocked island from ACs. In order for an extractee to cross an unlocked island, there has to be an RP in the island, but the RP is incompatible with an AC by definition. This is certainly an attractive and coherent account (although I return to the ACs in section 4). However, notice that (10c) covers an AC, one of those I dubbed as DC/Ss above. This condition simply states that the extraction site of the constituent which is external to an island could not be an AC. But this is exactly what (18) predicts. As before, when he summarizes the conditions on extraction as (10), he never mentions (18). Postal might argue that the conditions in (10) are nothing but restatements of the conditions mentioned at various places, but an unnecessary redundancy is not avoidable.

Another similar case is the explanation of island sensitivity of A2-extraction from an AC. A relevant example is the comparative formation of the predicate nominal out of an island: **John is even taller than Harry realizes Bill is* (Carden (1977: 589)). There are two possible accounts for this. First, this is directly excluded by the recourse to the condition (10c), which states that extraction from an AC, one of which is the predicate nominal position, cannot cross an island (i.e. factive island, in this case). Second, remember that the comparative formation is of the A2-extraction type. The condition (18c) has an implication that A2-extraction cannot cross an island boundary because an RP is forbidden in the extraction site of A2-extraction. Thus the condition (18c) excludes the example under consideration. This is a clear redundancy which does not exist in extraction from a non-AC like **The more stars he dates, the more stars (that) I would prefer it if I dated t* (2-79b). This is impossible only because A2-extraction crosses an island (i.e. irrealis *if* clause island), as predicted by (18c). I am no longer sure whether the two accounts are independent or whether they can be reduced to some other principle at a deeper level.

2.3. Finite Subject

The third problem is concerned with the condition (10b). It picks up the subject of the finite clause (generally, the nominative subject) which cannot be a gap left by extraction across an unlocked island. This explains the ungrammaticality of (23) in a straightforward way.

- (23) a. *the person who I asked them whether (they believed) t
tickled Melissa (3-29b)
b. *the nurse who I would prefer it if t hired you (3-30b)

Reference to the finite subject position in (10) necessarily predicts that it is possible to extract the subject of a non-finite clause or, in other words, that there is an asymmetry with respect to extraction of the finite and non-finite subject. However, the asymmetry does not necessarily hold. For example, A1- and B-extraction seem to be equally possible in the following cases.¹⁰

- (24) a. Who are you sorry that they saw t stealing an apple?
b. Who do you wonder whether they saw t stealing an apple?
c. It is that boy that I am sorry that they saw t stealing an apple?
(25) a. Who are you sorry that he expected t would win?
b. It is that candidate that I am sorry that she expected t would win.
c. That candidate, I am sorry that she expected t would win.

Although Postal's approach predicts (24) as grammatical and (25) as ungrammatical, there are no perceivable differences between them (I owe this observation to Joe Emonds (personal communication)).

¹⁰ Surprisingly, according to Emonds's judgment, (24b) is questionable (??) if not starred. This might be taken as indicating that there is more to be studied about the distinction between the *wh*-island and the factive island, both of which are collectively referred to "weak" or "selective (unlocked)" islands.

Incidentally notice that contrary to my assumption that the perception verb construction in (24) involves exceptional case marking (and hence the trace is lexically governed), Declerck (1982: 16-19) and Felser (1998: 354-355) present an analysis where the predicate *stealing an apple* in (24) is a "predicative adjunct" and the actor of the perceived event is a direct object of the perception verb (I thank an anonymous reviewer for bringing my attention to these papers). Either analysis explains why the sentences in (24) are grammatical.

Furthermore, Postal observes that “S cannot be the highest finite subject position in the island” and that “[e]xtraction of nohighest finite subjects is less degraded” (note 17, Chapter 3, p. 188). Aside from the question of how the height of the finite subject is to be incorporated into his theory, this additional stipulation does not say anything about the grammatical status of (25).

Notice that exactly the same applies to the traditional ECP account which assumes a disjunctive condition; either lexical government or antecedent government.¹¹ In this sense, Postal’s condition (10b) repeats the spirit of the traditional ECP. However, in Lasnik and Saito’s (1992) theory, where lexical government is dispensed with, the traces in (24) and (25) are gamma-marked because of their argument status. Thus what is relevant is a weak subjacency violation; i.e. 1-subjacency. This appears to be responsible for some sort of resistance native speakers feel when faced with the type of sentences in (24) and (25). In this sense, we may argue that the analysis proposed by Lasnik and Saito comes closer to the facts than the former ECP accounts and Postal’s proposal.

2.4. Secondary RP Extraction

The fourth problem is the unclear status of the secondary RP. The first problem is why the secondary RP must move. Postal’s answer is that it should be subject to control because it is invisible. It is understandable that the primary RP must extract to a position sister to the extractee in order to be controlled, but it is not always clear why the secondary RP must extract to the left boundary of the lowest island. Postal assumes that the secondary RP is controlled by the extracted primary RP. However, the control relation is not local but rather through the boundary of an island. If so, the controlled secondary RP can be taken as an A-bar bound pro in the sense of Cinque (1990).

¹¹ Chomsky (1986: 37) makes an additional assumption that the most deeply embedded “tensed IP is an inherent barrier (possibly weak) to *wh*-movement, over and above the system.” This would predict, as Postal’s idea does, the asymmetry in (24) and (25); 1-subjacent in (24) and 2-subjacent in (25). Remember that Chomsky mentions the cumulative effects of subjacency (1986: 38). However, this approach, together with Lasnik and Saito’s (1992), predicts that (23) should be mildly ungrammatical, a prediction which seems to be unrealistic. I am indebted to Minoru Fukuda for the discussions about (24)–(25).

Thus, the two control relations (i.e. between the extractee and the primary RP, on the one hand, and between the primary RP and the secondary RP, on the other hand) are different in nature. Moreover, importantly, Postal stipulates that secondary RPs never extract from islands (1-27c).

Postal mentions two cases where the secondary RP is crucially involved; compounding of unlocked islands and topicalization. He says that a successive occurrence of unlocked islands presents a more complex phenomenon than observed by Cinque (1990: 109), who argues that crossing more than one weak island produces ungrammaticality. Postal subclassifies unlocked islands into two varieties; rigid and flexible. A flexible unlocked island is a quantifier headed relative clause or factive complement and a rigid unlocked island is a non-finite adjunct clause or subject complement. Extraction is prohibited when two rigid islands are compounded, but it is allowed in other combinations. In the following examples, a flexible and a rigid island are marked as F and R, respectively.

- (26) a. *the book that we left Russia (_R without being arrested
 (_R after distributing t)) (1-40b)
 b. It was Lucille that Mike went home (_R without criticizing
 (_F anyone who defended t)). (1-48c)
 c. It was Lucille that Mike criticized (_F everyone who went
 home (_R without defending t)). (1-48d)
 d. the book which Greta is sorry (_F that Mike is sorry
 (_F that Sally is sorry)) that you read t (1-41)

Rigidity or flexibility is defined in terms of the possibility of extraction of a secondary RP to the left boundary of the island; an island is rigid "if and only if any constituent extracted from an island must link to an RP at the left boundary of the island" ((2-42) on page 18). This means that the rigid island requires the presence of the secondary RP at its left periphery and that the flexible island does not. Therefore, an RP does not need to stay at the left boundary of the flexible island in the cases of (26c, d) whereas it has to be there in the cases of (26a, b). On the other hand there is a stricter restriction imposed on the secondary RP that it cannot cross an island ((2-26c) on page 12). (26a) is correctly excluded, because extraction of the secondary RP crosses an inner rigid island, hence requiring the tertiary RP to be present in the lowest island in order to satisfy Ross's principle, but a tertiary RP is prohibited as mentioned in Subsection 1.5 above. (26c) is grammatical

because the secondary RP stays in the inner island, and the outer flexible island does not require the presence of RP. (26d) is also possible because the secondary RP can stay in the inner flexible island, its presence being not required in the outer flexible island. However, (26b) poses difficulties to Postal's system. The outer rigid island needs the secondary RP at its left periphery, which means that the secondary RP crosses an island. Therefore, in order to satisfy Ross's principle, there must be a offending tertiary RP in the inner flexible island. After taking into consideration the possibilities of weakening the assumptions, Postal concludes the discussion without reaching a particular solution.

Looking at the paradigm in (26), there seems to be an easy way to explain the facts. What is crucial is how many rigid island boundaries are crossed. It appears that crossing the rigid island boundary more than once results in ungrammaticality. This reminds us of the subadjacency condition, although the basic ideas are essentially different. If we follow the suggested line of argument within Postal's system, the problem is whether the secondary RP extraction is necessary. It seems to be possible to assume that there is single extraction of a *wh*-phrase, for instance, which leaves behind an RP in its extraction site. Extraction cannot cross a locked island, but may cross an unlocked island with the proviso that more than one rigid island cannot be crossed. Moreover, extractions are subject to the conditions in (18) without any modification.

The second case which Postal says crucially involves the secondary RP extraction is topicalization. On page 15, Postal, noticing the sensitivity of B-extraction of a DC/S to the unlocked island (as in **Mike, they regret t married Mary.*), argues that it is explainable under the double RP extraction view. Topicalization of the finite subject out of an unlocked island is ruled out "because ... it manifests an instance EXCB (extraction control B, [KA]) (involving the secondary RP) as well as an instance of EXCA (extraction control A, [KA])." Postal identifies two kinds of control, by saying that "EXCA requires the presence of the controlled RP at the surface locus of the controlling extractee ... and EXCB does not." It is difficult to understand why the island sensitivity of topicalization is accounted for by saying that it involves not only an extractee but also an EXCB, but I take this remark as meaning that extraction of the secondary RP is subject to stronger restrictions (the EXCB appears again on page 65). Even if this understanding is correct, then what is explained by positing a secondary RP

extraction? Remember here the example cited just above is ungrammatical because topicalizing a finite subject out of an island is illegal as his condition (10b) dictates. If so, the ungrammaticality has nothing to do with the presence of the secondary RP, unless he tries to integrate the conditions in (10) into the double RP extraction theory—an enterprise which seems too vague to ascertain its plausibility.

Postal admits that his account is “moderately complex: and certainly not all of its components have been extensively justified” (p. 15). Despite his reserved attitude on this point, I should like to ask; why does the extractee have to cross an island as well as the primary RP followed by the secondary RP extraction which is defined to be strictly clause bound? Is a single extraction and a single RP enough? This “moderate” complexity seems to be based on the dubious assumptions of the double extraction of RPs.

3. Island Sensitivity

3.1. Postal's Account

Among Postal's important discoveries are the following two facts: (i) that extraction of DC/Ss out of an island results in ungrammaticality independently of the extraction types and (ii) that only the A2-extraction type exhibits island sensitivity with respect to extraction of non-DC/Ss (see the table in 1.4). Let us see how Postal explains these facts. As for the second fact, his theory goes well; it is captured by (18c), which says “An A2-extraction forbids RPs in its extraction site.” Coupled with Ross's generalization that islands are violable when there is an RP in the extraction site, (18c) easily predicts the prohibition of extraction out of an island because an RP is not allowed at the A2-extraction gap. However, the explanation he offers for the first fact is not so elegant. Consider the following sentences; (27a) involves extraction from an AC and (27b) involves extraction from a finite subject position.

- (27) a. *How many flights did he ask you whether they canceled
t last year to Cuba? (3-37f)
- b. *Which doctor did he formulate a plan to prove t had
been betrayed Joan? (3-33b)

(27a) is predicted as ungrammatical because there is an island boundary between the extractee and the gap in the AC (a site from which the prepositional phrase (*to Cuba*) is extraposed; see 4.2). This is a nat-

ural consequence of Ross's island constraint; the gap position is incompatible with an RP. On the other hand, (27b) is excluded for a completely different reason; a finite subject (10b) is extracted out of an unlocked island (complex NP). As far as I can see, the latter explanation is entirely detached from the considerations of an RP and hence a natural condition of (18). Rather (27b) is ungrammatical because the extraction site is the finite subject; to the question of why extraction from the finite subject position cannot cross an island boundary, Postal appears to say that the result is ungrammatical. Thus the conditions in (10), which are merely a list of extraction prohibitions as they are given in his book, have no theoretical motivations, except for ACs in (10c).

In fact, on page 65 Postal briefly touches on the relevance of the control view of the RPs to the conditions (10). He says the conditions in (10) "can be taken as conditions on a certain type of (nonsubject) control characteristic not only of selective islands but also of ... object raising, object control, and P-gaps (parasitic gaps, KA) structures." This is the type of control referred to as EXCB in chapter 1. Remember that EXCB is a control by the primary RP of the secondary RP which is extracted at the left boundary of an island. I must confess that I failed to understand his intention after reading the relevant portions more than 10 times, because he stops here without further explications probably because they are "beyond the scope of this book" (p. 15). I am quite dissatisfied with this. His "alternative theory" is too sketchy and tentative for us to examine its plausibility despite his severe criticism of the GB framework.

3.2. Island Sensitivity and Non-ACs

Limiting our attention only to NP-extractions (as Postal does), we are left with three types of extraction; (i) object extraction from non-ACs, (ii) object extraction from ACs and (iii) subject extraction. When islands are involved in these cases of extraction, A1-, A2- and B-extractions are all excluded except when an object is extracted from non-ACs by A1- and B-extractions. In this sense, the dependency created by A2-extraction is local, and that created by A1- and B-extraction can be non-local under certain definable circumstances. Looking at these descriptive generalizations, we might be tempted to argue that island violations arise because of the subjacency condition except for the non-local nature of the cases of A1- and B-extractions which needs a separate account. However, I do not commit myself to this position,

must not be bound in the local domain because of its pronominal nature. Cinque (1990: 99) notes that this option is “a more marked option alongside the ordinary movement strategy, but it is the only option available whenever Move α is excluded on independent grounds.” The recognition that the A-bar bound pro strategy is “marked” will help to account for the unstable status of the examples which show island violations. For example, sentences like *What would they prefer it if you had bought t?* (2-76a) tend to be frowned upon and those like *the things which they asked me whether I had seen t* (2-75b) are unnatural at best, if not unacceptable, although those like *Which doctor did he formulate a plan to prove Joan had betrayed t?* (2-76b) are readily accepted by my informants. Actually one of them never accepted extraction out of the *make the claim* island; for example, *What did he make a claim that John saw t?* (Chomsky (1977: 127)) although he accepted a sentence *the person who I regret (that) Clara tickled t* (3-31a) or *Which scientist did Ed go to England (in order) to consult with t?* (3-32a). On the other hand, extraction of an object without crossing an island is invariably judged as natural. According to Cinque, the trace left behind by this extraction is non-anaphoric and non-pronominal (i.e. a true variable). This is the most unmarked option irrespective of the extraction types, as opposed to the extraction discussed at the preceding paragraph.

4. ACs Reconsidered

In this section I shall examine the AC which is one of Postal's important points. I specifically argue that the island sensitivity can be accounted for in terms of the GB framework, when we examine all the cases of ACs in detail.

4.1. Non-argument NPs

The 14 ACs which Postal documents can be divided into two major categories. The first category, which covers 6 types, is the class of NPs which are not arguments but predicates or adjuncts; (i) change-of-color contexts (e.g. *He painted the car that color.* (2-24b)),¹² (ii) name posi-

¹² An anonymous reviewer pointed out that the resultative phrase in what Postal

This has to be grammatical on a par with (i), according to Carrier and Randall's (1992: 176) proposal that the structure of the resultative is "ternary"; [VP paint [the boat] [green]].

that non-referential reading is not available for extraction out of *wh*-islands. We could extend this analysis to the cases in (i)–(vi) above without modification. However, in Postal's category dependent explanation, where the ungrammaticality of (30) is explained in terms of the non-NP status of the extractees, the facts in (30) are dissociated from the considerations of ACs. Categorical preference is the reason why Postal does not take the above 6 cases as predicates or adjuncts.¹³

4.2. Argument NPs

The remaining 8 ACs appear to involve apparent argument NPs: (i) focus position of existential *there* construction, (ii) inalienable possession context (e.g. They touched him on *the ear*.), (iii) extraposed prepositional phrases (e.g. They published a scurrilous review *of this book* last week. → They published a scurrilous review last week *of this book*.), (iv) infinitival extraposition (e.g. I did not perceive a definite wish *to retire* in Sylvia. → I did not perceive a definite wish in Sylvia *to retire*.), (v) exceptive shifting (e.g. He handed something *other than the gun* to Rita. → He handed something to Rita *other than the gun*.), (vi) locative case (e.g. Ed was born in *Argentina*.), (vii) the object of *tell* (in the sense of "determine"), and the manner-of-speaking verbs *grunt/whine* and (viii) the language-designating object of the preposition *in* after *speak*. According to Postal, the relevant NPs cannot be replaced by a weak definite pronoun (e.g. There are *gorillas*/**them* in the meadow. (3–34a), He said the delegates were speaking in *Thai* and they were speaking in *the language*/**it*. (3–35–c)). Postal tries to reduce the impossibility of topicalization (i.e. a B-extraction) of the relevant NPs (e.g. **Something (dangerous)*, he might have handed to Rita

¹³ An anonymous reviewer pointed out the apparently grammatical sentences in (i).

- (i) a. ?How flat do you wonder whether they hammered the metal *t*?
(McNulty (1988: 165))
- b. ?How shiny do you wonder which gems to polish *t*?
(Carrier and Randall (1992: 185))

If this judgment is true, it casts a serious doubt on my and Postal's account because the extractee seems to be non-referential and its category is non-NP. However, this is also a difficulty to Heycock's (1995) proposal. At the present, I would prefer to leave this as an open question.

—*other than the gun*. (2–23h)) to the nature of the positions as ACs. In the following subsections I shall show that other alternative accounts are possible for the first 5 cases and the remaining 3 cases are recognized as true ACs which are lexically governed phenomena. Notice that the accounts proposed here are based on otherwise necessary theoretical tools, rather than simply isolating the antipronominal contexts.

4.2.1. Predicates

I shall show in this subsection that what appear to be arguments in the 8 categories above in fact turn out to be predicates. The most noticeable property of these constructions is that some sort of internal relation obtains in these cases except for (vi)–(viii).

First consider the PP inalienable possession construction. According to Vergnaud and Zubizarreta (1992: 638–624), the PP inalienable possession construction contains what they call “metonymic binding chain” between the direct object (the binder) and the definite determiner in the object of the preposition (the bindee). More specifically they argue that “A D that heads an inalienable phrase is bound to the category denoting the whole if and only if a metonymic relation holds at the interpretive level between the inalienable part and the whole” (ibid.: 640).¹⁴ Aside from the technical details, they essentially assume that predication is established between the direct object and the object of the preposition (i.e. the predicate). Their proposed structure is roughly represented as follows.

(31) [kiss [the children]_i [PP on [DP₂ [D_{1/2} the] [N_{j(x)/1} cheek]]]]

If Vergnaud and Zubizarreta are correct in assuming that the object of the preposition in the case of the PP inalienable construction is a predicate on a par with the predicate ACs in the previous subsection, then it is no wonder why it is sensitive to an island; it is to be licensed by a mechanism different from what licenses argument (i.e. antecedent-government).

¹⁴ Their proposal is to account for the fact that the definite determiner in the PP complement has a metonymic reading (e.g. *John kissed the children on the cheek.*) but it does not allow this in the direct object position (e.g. *The children raised the hand.*) although the French counterpart of the latter construction exhibits the reading (e.g. *The children raised their hands.*).

Second, let us consider the “focus” position of existential *there* construction. Safir’s (1987: 84–90) argument is relevant to our discussion. He argues that the associate is contextually defined as a predicate. In a sentence like *There is a man sick.*, if the expletive is coindexed with its associate, then a Condition C violation should arise. In order to avoid this difficulty, Safir proposes a Predicate Principle, which says that “a potential referring expression is a predicate or else free” (p. 87). Since the associate is defined as a predicate, it is immune from the Condition although it is a referring expression. This apparent Condition C violation arises when the definiteness restriction (DR) is observed; thus Safir derives the DR by the recourse of Predicate Principle. This explanation also takes care of the relation holding in the predicate nominal (e.g. *John_i is a fool_i.*). As for the theta-marking in the chain (*there, a man*), Safir argues that “the head of the chain, *there*, is in an argument position, only lacking the semantic content necessary to qualify as an argument, whereas *a man*, lower in the chain, is a nonargument only functionally, while possessing the content to qualify as an argument” (p. 88). Thus the theta-criterion is observed. The predicate analysis of the associate is significant in considering the island sensitivity of the associate. If it is the case, as Safir says, that the relation holding of the predicate nominal is the same as that holding of the existential sentence, the associate of the existential sentence is sensitive to island, just as a predicate nominal is.

4.2.2. Extraposed PPs and the Proper Binding Condition

In this subsection we are concerned with what Postal calls “extraposed PPs,” “infinitival extraposition,” and “exceptive shifting.” What is common to these three cases is the fact that the modifier is detached from the modified head noun. Let us take extraposed PPs for example.¹⁵

- (32) a. They published a scurrilous review t_1 last year [of his book]₁. (2–21b) →
 b. [No such scurrilous review t_1]₂ did they publish t_2 last year — [of his book]₁. (2–21e)

¹⁵ I thank an anonymous reviewer for clarifying my thinking about the discussion here.

- c. *[Such a scurrilous review t_1]₂, they published t_2 last year
— [of his book]₁. (2–21f)
- d. *[How many flights t_1]₂ did he ask you whether they canceled t_2 last year [to Cuba]₁?. (3–37f)

B-extraction (32c) is ungrammatical as opposed to A-extraction under the absence of an island (32b), while A-extraction cannot cross an island boundary as in (32d). This result is predictable in Postal's proposal (see the table in 1.4). However there is another explanation. Under the assumption that the extraposed PP is adjoined to IP, following Nakajima (1989: 329–330), the extraposed PP is able to c-command the *wh*-phrase in [Spec, CP] because the category which immediately dominates it is CP rather than IP (the IP above it being nothing but a segment of IP).¹⁶ Thus the proper binding condition is satisfied in (32b). But it is not satisfied in (32d) because the position of the extraposed PP is too low to c-command the *wh*-phrase in the highest Spec of CP.

The remaining question is: why is (32c) not grammatical? If topicalization (B-extraction) and *wh*-question result in the same structural configuration, there is no way to distinguish between the two with respect to the proper binding condition. Tajima and Arimura (1988) argue that topicalization involves null operator movement, which is associated to the topic phrase by some means with which we do not have to be concerned. If this argument is plausible, the topicalized phrase is positioned outside of the CP whose Spec position is occupied by the null operator. This CP boundary arguably prevents the extraposed PP from c-commanding the topicalized phrase itself, because the

¹⁶ Or alternatively we could consider that the extraposed PP is adjoined to VP (originally Gueron (1980: 640), Baltin (1983) and subsequently extended by Nakajima (1993)). Then we have to account for the grammaticality of (32b) in other terms, because the trace included in the *wh*-phrase in [Spec, CP] is not c-commanded by its antecedent. A solution, which immediately comes to mind, is reconstruction; the *wh*-phrase is reconstructed to its original position, leaving behind the genuine *wh*-term alone in [Spec, CP], but the resistance of reconstruction in the case of topicalization is observed in Tajima and Arimura (1988). However, (32d) poses a problem. In order to account for the island sensitivity of the extraction in (32d), we have to say that reconstruction cannot cross an (unlocked) island—an assumption whose validity I am not sure of.

latter is positioned higher than the latter.

Thus, the facts in (32) can be explained by independently needed mechanisms, without recourse to an additional notion of the AC.

4.2.3. Non-predicate ACs without Co-indexation

The remaining 3 classes of ACs are arguments in the sense that they are not predicates without co-indexation; locative case, the object of *tell* (in the sense of “determine”) and the manner-of-speaking verbs *grunt/whine* and the language-designating object of the preposition *in* after *speak*. Postal shows the following facts to show that the relevant object position is an AC.

- (33) a. *They said Ed was born in Argentina but he wasn’t born in it. (2–42)
- b. *They said they could tell how he did it, and they could tell it. (3–36a)
- c. *He said the delegates were speaking in Thai and they were speaking in it. (3–36c)

He tries to connect these facts to the impossibility of extraction across an island boundary. However, as for the locative case and the language-designating object of *in*, the extraction facts do not seem to support his contention. My informants tend to accept the following sentences which are totally unacceptable to Postal.

- (34) a. What country did he ask whether she was born in t? (3–37c)
- b. That is the language which they probably regret they were speaking in t. (3–38i)

If this is true then the correlation between pronominal facts in (33) and island sensitivity in these cases seems to be very dubious, particularly when we consider the facts concerning B-extraction which does not involve an island (see 4.3 below).

On the other hand, the object of *tell*, *grunt* or *whine* seems to be a genuine case of island sensitivity. All of my informants agree with Postal’s judgment.¹⁷ The relevant examples are the following.

¹⁷ However, Grohmann (1999), who talks about his uneasiness about Postal’s judgment particularly with respect to the object of *tell*, argues that “I dare to object to the ungrammaticality of ‘tell’.”

- (35) a. *What they asked me whether I could tell *t* was whether he was a vampire. (3-37g)
 b. *What do you most regret that you couldn't tell *t*? (3-38g)
 c. *That's what they asked me whether he grunted *t*. (3-37h)
 d. *What they really regret that he grunted *t* was "To hell with the president." (3-38h)

Cinque (1990: 30) argues that the complements of the manner-of-speaking verbs "must not be dominated by *V'*"; in other words, although theta-marked by the verbs, they are not L-marked in the sense of Chomsky (1986: 14) where L-marking is defined on the basis of direct theta-marking by the head. This is exactly parallel to the status of the factive complement. If it is true that the object position of the manner-of-speaking verbs is not protected by the head-government, it is predicted that their extraction out of an island is impossible because of their failure of antecedent-government.

4.2.4. Summary

The discussions in this subsection show that the facts presented by Postal are accountable without singling out special contexts as ACs. They are largely the consequences of the proposals made in the literature of the GB framework. This in turn means that ACs are nothing but a descriptive generalization of no particular theoretical import with respect to the extraction phenomena.

4.3. B-extraction from ACs

Finally, let us briefly discuss Postal's argument that an AC is inaccessible to B-extraction. Since there are no reasons why B-extraction is prevented from applying to a particular position within a non-island as far as grammatical principles are observed, the phenomena Postal presents should receive independent explanations. One of them might be based on the ACs, if the facts are really as Postal says that they are. In this subsection, I point out the cases which are in conflict with his arguments.

Postal says that B-extraction (topicalization, for instance), as opposed to *wh*-extraction, is impossible from the change-of-color context (e.g. **That color, he never painted the car t*. (2-4d)). However, Quirk et al. (1985: 1385) exemplify sentences of clefting (another variety of B-ex-

traction) like *It's dark green that we've painted the kitchen* (similar facts are documented in Carrier and Randall (1992: 305, fn. 39)). Moreover, the same holds of the temporal NP; although Postal says it fails to occur at a topic position (e.g. **That much time, Frank could never stay t in Ireland.* (2-24c)), native speakers tend to accept sentences like *It is only two weeks that I stayed t in Ireland, but not two months.* Quite the same holds of Postal's argument of the inalienable possession context. Although **His ear, they never touched him on t.* (2-9b) is ungrammatical for Postal, my informant admits that a suitable context ameliorates it like "*Did they touch him on a forehead? Did they touch him on the nose? Did they touch him on the ear? His ear, he never touched him on.*" Moreover, my informant does not hesitate to accept the topicalization which involves the locative case, *That house, our president is said to have been born in t.* (2-26d) and the clefting and the non-restrictive relative clause which involve the language-designating object of the preposition *in* after *speak*; *It is English that the president spoke in at the banquet./The language, which the president spoke in at the banquet, was actually French.*¹⁸ When Postal touches on this case on page 33, Chapter 2, he does not give an ungrammatical counterpart of B-extraction. But his theory predicts the sentence in the text to be ungrammatical.

The examples above, admittedly not exhaustive, show that Postal's argument based on B-extraction is not conclusive or worse it is considerably weakened by these "exceptions." I am not saying that ACs are totally independent of the inaccessibility of B-extraction, but there may be more to be examined before arriving at as strong a conclusion as he does.

5. Concluding Remarks

As far as the accounts for L-extractions (with which I am concerned in this review) are concerned, Postal is tentative or sketchy at some

¹⁸ Furthermore, the fact Postal presents is not as is predicted by his theory with respect to the infinitive extraposition context; for example the discourse "They had a conception to visit their uncle infrequently. Such a conception I never had—to visit him infrequently" is perfect to Joe Emonds (personal communication).

crucial points. It is true that resumptive pronouns are involved in island violations of arguments extraction, but his double RP extraction theory turns out to be not as attractive as it initially appears to be. Moreover, there is a considerable overlap in the conditions he offers at various parts of the book. Sometimes the conditions or restrictions are nothing but a listing of the prohibited cases or, worse, a rephrasing of the proposals which were already introduced in the generative tradition.

I rather think Postal's contributions lie in the discovery of various sorts of examples which have been unnoticed up to the present and the criticisms aimed at current accounts of the apparent island violations (particularly found in Appendix A). What he is dissatisfied with in the current analyses seems to be the fact that the nature of the extractees and the environment of the extraction site have not sufficiently been taken into consideration. The most interesting case is the discovery of the distinction between the two meanings of the verb *tell*; the one meaning is the usual "speak" sense whereas the other meaning is the "determine" sense. Postal argues that the object position of *tell* in the latter sense is an AC, extraction from which is sensitive to an island, although it is apparently an argument, as in **What_{t1} they tried to mention t₂ to John — [the possibility of him being able to tell — t₁]₂ was her IQ*. (Appendix-7b). This is an example which contradicts Kayne's (1994: 74) contention that elements can be extracted from the shifted heavy NP as in *Mary is the only girl who₁ I dared mention t₂ to John — [the possibility of him going out with t₁]₂*. Although what he enumerates as ACs seem to be rather "marked" (actually some of which are not arguments despite their categorial status of NP), what he points out should not be ignored by those who commit themselves to the assumptions he criticizes.

REFERENCES

- Baltn, Mark (1983) "Extraposition: Bounding versus Government-Binding," *Linguistic Inquiry* 14, 155–162.
- Carden, Guy (1977) "Comparatives and Factives," *Linguistic Inquiry* 8, 486–490.
- Carrier, Jill and Janet H. Randall (1992) "The Argument Structure and Syntactic Structure of Resultatives," *Linguistic Inquiry* 23, 173–234.
- Chomsky, Noam (1977) "On *Wh*-movement," *Formal Syntax*, ed. by Peter W.

- Culicover, Thomas Wasow and Adrian Akmajian, 71-132, Academic Press.
- Chomsky, Noam (1986) *Barriers*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (1990) *Types of A'-dependencies*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Declerck, Renaat (1982) "The Triple Origin of Participial Perception Verb Complements," *Linguistic Analysis* 10, 1-26.
- Emonds, Joseph (1979) "Appositive Relatives Have No Properties," *Linguistic Inquiry* 10, 211-243.
- Felser, Claudia (1998) "Perception and Control: A Minimalist Analysis of English Direct Perception Complements," *Journal of Linguistics* 34, 351-385.
- Frampton, John (1991) "Relativized Minimality, a Review," *The Linguistic Review* 8, 1-48.
- Grohmann, Kleanthes K. (1999) "Review: 3 *Investigations of Extraction*," The LINGUIST List 10.934.
- Gueron, Jacqueline (1980) "On the Syntax and Semantics of PP Extraposition," *Linguistic Inquiry* 11, 637-678.
- Heycock, Caroline (1995) "Asymmetries in Reconstruction," *Linguistic Inquiry* 26, 547-570.
- Kayne, Richard S. (1994) *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Koster, Jan (1987) *Domains and Dynasties*, Dordrecht, Foris.
- Kuno, Susumu (1970) "Some Properties of Non-referential Noun Phrases," *Studies in General and Oriental Linguistics: Presented to Shiro Hattori on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. by Roman Jakobson and Shigeo Kawamoto, 348-373, TEC Company, Tokyo.
- Lakoff, George (1986) "Frame Semantic Control of the Coordinate Structure Constraint," *CLS* 22, 152-167.
- Lasnik, Howard and Mamoru Saito (1992) *Move- α* , MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Lasnik, Howard and Tim Stowell (1991) "Weakest Crossover," *Linguistic Inquiry* 11, 687-720.
- McCawley, James D. (1988) *The Syntactic Phenomena of English*, Vols. 1-2, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- McNulty, Elaine M. (1987) *The Syntax of Adjunct Predicates*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut.
- Nakajima, Heizo (1989) "Bounding of Rightward Movement," *Linguistic Inquiry* 20, 328-334.
- Nakajima, Heizo (1993) "Another Type of Antecedent Government," *Linguistic Inquiry* 23, 313-328.
- Obenauer, Hans-Georg (1984) "On the Identification of Empty Categories," *The Linguistic Review* 4, 153-202.
- Pesetsky, David (1987) "Wh-in-situ: Movement and Unselective Binding," *The*

- Representation of (In)definiteness*, ed. by Eric J. Reuland and Alic G. B. ter Meulen, 98–129, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sydney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvik (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*, Longman, London.
- Rizzi, Luigi (1990) *Relativized Minimality*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Ross, John R. (1967) *Constraints on Variables in Syntax*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Safir, Ken (1987) “What Explains the Definiteness Effect?” *The Representation of (In)definiteness*, ed. by Eric J. Reuland and Alic G. B. ter Meulen, 71–97, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Tajima, Kazuhiko and Kaneaki Arimura (1988) “Two Types of Variables; A D-Structure Adjunction Approach to Null Operator Constructions,” *CLS* 24, 362–376.
- Vergnaud, Jean-Roger and Maria L. Zubizarreta (1992) “The Definite Determiner and the Inalienable Constructions in French and in English,” *Linguistic Inquiry* 23, 595–652.

Department of English
Konan University
8–9–1 Okamoto, Kobe 655–8501
e-mail: arimura@konan-u.ac.jp