1. Introduction

This book, which contains five chapters and an introduction, aims to present proper syntactic analyses of English focus constructions exemplified in (1)-(3), based on independently motivated mechanisms and principles of grammar:

1. A man came into the room with blond hair.
   b. John met a man at the party who was from Philadelphia.

2. a. Into the room walked John.
   b. At the head of the table sat Bill.
   c. Standing in front of her was Mary.
   d. Happiest to see her was her mother.

3. a. John invited to the party his closest friends.
   b. There walked into the room a tall man with blond hair.

The sentences (1a, b) are instances of PP and Relative Clause Extraposition from NP (EX). Those in (2) are analysed as being derived by Stylistic Inversion (SI). (3a) illustrates Heavy NP Shift (HNPS), and (3b) Presentational \textit{there} Insertion (PTI). These constructions share the property of identifying a specific phrase in the sentence as the location of a constructional focus, a focus obligatorily interpreted as presentational (new) (for details with respect to focus interpretation, see Rochemont (1986)).

The rules which derive these sentences are called “stylistic rules” in Rochemont (1978). According to Rochemont, “stylistic rules” are viewed as a class of rules applying in the PF component, and typically involving a rightward movement of a phrase. R&C in this book, however, will eliminate from the syntactic theory the class of “stylistic rules” in the sense used by Chomsky and Lasnik (1977) and Rochemont (1978), and explain char-
acteristic properties of these constructions, without recourse to “stylistic rules”. Furthermore, based on much syntactic evidence, they argue that, as far as EX and SI are concerned, there is no rightward movement involved.

In their discussion of focus constructions, R&C group these sentences into three classes: EX (the examples of (1)), SI (the examples of (2), and NP Shift (the examples of (3)). Under the account presented in this book, they are derived prior to S-Structure by independently motivated syntactic mechanisms, in interaction with principles of Universal Grammar. For example, the well-known “frozen” character of focus constructions for further movement rules, one of the motivations for “stylistic rules” taking place in the PF component, can now be accounted for, based on the Empty Category Principle (ECP), Subjacency, and other theoretical assumptions.

In the sections which follow, I will examine R&C’s syntactic analyses of EX, SI, and NP Shift in this order. The theoretical assumptions which they adopt will be introduced in the relevant places of discussion in this review.

2. EX

This section examines R&C’s account of the first class of focus constructions, namely Extraposition from NP (EX):

(4) a. A man came into the room with blond hair.
   
   b. John met a man at the party who was from Philadelphia.

R&C’s main claim for EX is that extraposed complements in EX are not derived by movement but are base-generated in their S-Structure positions and related to their antecedents by an S-Structure interpretive rule.¹

The standard prior work on EX (Ross (1967), Akmajian (1975), Baltin (1981), Guéron (1980), and Johnson (1985)) generally assumes that EX involves a movement operation, in order to account for the discontinuous dependencies between the extraposed phrase and the antecedent NP, and for Subjacency effects illustrated in (5), where CP may be related to t' but not to t (Chomsky (1986: 40)). The latter fact has been considered a strong diagnostic for movement.

(5) [many books [with stories t] t'] were sold [CP that I wanted to read]

Furthermore, according to Guéron (1980), the movement hypothesis can explain the ungrammaticality of the following sentences:

¹ R&C’s account of EX in this book is mainly based on Rochemont and Culicover (1988), and Culicover and Rochemont (1990).
(6) a. *A man met a woman yesterday from two different regions of India.
b. *A man met a woman yesterday who were similar.

(7) a. A man is here who is carrying a large package.
b. *The man is here who is carrying a large package.

Under the movement analysis, (6), instances of split antecedents,² are ruled out because the extraposed Ss have no possible source. The ill-formedness of (7b), Guéron argues, is due to the Name Constraint, which requires that a Name, a complete referring expression, may not contain a trace which is not bound within it.

Contrary to these pieces of evidence for movement, R&C’s argument for the non-movement account with respect to EX goes as follows: the structural and distributional properties of EX can be characterized without recourse to movement, given the X-bar schema for phrase structure in (8), and the Complement Principle (CP)—an interpretive principle which must be satisfied at S-Structure:

(8) \( X_j \rightarrow \ldots X_i \ldots, i \leq j \leq 2 \)

(9) The Complement Principle

\( \beta \) is a potential complement of \( \alpha \) (\( \alpha, \beta = X_{\text{max}} \)) only if \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) are in a government relation.³

(8) allows the base-generation of adjoined configurations which house extraposed phrases: in EX cases, IP- and VP-adjoined structures. The CP can capture “discontinuous dependencies” between EX and its possible source. The government relation required between \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) in (9), further-

² Sometimes split antecedents are observable particularly with EX in coordinate IP structures like (i):

(i) A man came in and a woman went out who were quite similar.

These data should be dealt with differently from those in (6), where split antecedents appear within a single IP structure. For the proper treatment of these antecedents, see R&C (p. 38).

³ The requirement that the antecedent (=\( \alpha \)) and the complement (=\( \beta \)) be in government relation simply specifies that one must be governed by the other, and thus “it does not specifically require that the complement be governed by the antecedent (Culicover and Rochemont (1990)).”

The specific definition R&C adopt for government is: \( \alpha \) governs \( \beta \) iff \( \alpha \) c-commands \( \beta \) and for every \( \gamma (\gamma = X_{\text{max}}) \) that dominates \( \beta \) and excludes \( \alpha \), either

(i) \( \beta = \gamma^0 \), or
(ii) \( \beta = \text{SPEC}, \gamma \), or
(iii) there exists a segment of \( \gamma \) that does not dominate \( \beta \).
more, explains the bounded character of these dependencies, that is, Subjacency effects (see (5)).

Split antecedents are ruled out in the CP theory, too. According to (9), \( \alpha \), namely, the antecedent of the complement \( \beta \), is \( X^{\text{max}} \). In (6), there is no \( X^{\text{max}} \) constituent which acts as \( \alpha \). Thus extraposed phrases will not be associated with any host phrases, hence a violation of the Principle of Full Interpretation. Under R&C's theory, (7b) will be excluded semantically without appeal to the Name Constraint and movement. Extraposed phrases are semantically understood as modifiers of the host NPs. A definite NP, in general, cannot be modified, though (e.g., *John who I saw). The unacceptability of (7) may be attributed to this requirement of modification.

R&C note that, since both (8) and (9) are independently necessary, other things being equal, the non-movement hypothesis should be favored to the movement analysis, by Occam's razor. As to (8), it is necessary to produce a predication structure like (10):

\[
(10) \quad \text{John } [\text{vp}[\text{vp ate meat]}] \text{ raw}. 
\]

According to Guéron (1980), an interpretive principle like the CP again is independently necessary in the grammar to explain why, in (11), the PP *by three authors* is construed with *book*, not with *review*.

\[
(11) \quad [\text{np a review of } [\text{np a book } [\text{pp by three authors}] ] ] 
\]

I basically agree with R&C's base-generation account of EX. It has a number of advantageous consequences. Before turning to these favorable aspects of the CP, I would like to critically examine the CP and propose its revision. First, the CP predicts that an extraposed phrase from the subject position (SX) may be adjoined to either IP or VP, since the SX in either position can respect the CP: SX\(^1\) governs NP and NP governs SX\(^2\) (cf. fn. 3).

\[
(12) 
\]

According to R&C, in accordance with the CP, SX may be adjoined to VP. Consider the following examples:
(13)  
a. A man came in with blond hair, and a woman did [e] too.

b. A man came in who had lived in Boston, and a woman did [e] too.

(14)  
a. Some women came in from Chicago as quickly as possible.

b. A man came into the room that Mary recognized as quickly as he could. (Culicover and Rochemont (1990))

The fact that SX patterns with VP in VP Deletion as in (13), and the relative order of SX and VP adverbial phrases in (14) show that SX is included within VP. The sentences (15) are excluded because of the lack of the proper government relation between the antecedent and SX which is required by the CP:

(15)  
a. *They said that a man would come in with blue hair, and [come in with blue hair] a man did.

b. *They said that a man would come in who had lived in Boston, and [come in who had lived in Boston] a man did.

c. *What a man did was come into the room with blue hair.

In Nakajima (1990), however, it is convincingly argued that the examples of (13)-(14) do not constitute positive evidence for the VP-attachment of SX. According to Nakajima, with regard to (13), there is another possibility of analysis which does not assume VP-adjunction of SX: (13) are derived through two operations, first VP Deletion and subsequently Adjunct Deletion. The latter operation deletes the SX left by VP Deletion. This is independently motivated to derive (16), where possibly is construed with the second conjunct.

4 According to R&C, (13) should be read with a sentence accent placed on a man and a woman, if it may receive an intended reading: i.e., a woman has blond hair. Erteschik-Shir (1991), however, is skeptical of R&C’s judgment of (13). Even if read in this way, she states, it is difficult to accept the relevant reading.

5 The contrast of (ia, b) has often been considered to suggest that the landing sites of SX and OX are different. Under R&C’s base-generation hypothesis, the relative order of SX-OX in (ib) should be allowed, since SX as well as OX could appear in the VP adjoined positions:

   (i)  
a. A man came into the room last night [that I had just finished painting] [who had blond hair.]

   b. *A man came into the room last night [who had blond hair] [that I had just finished painting.]

R&C attribute the ungrammaticality of (ib) to the general nesting requirement for the linking by the CP (§2.3):

   (ii)  
a. John, ate the meat, raw, nude;

   b. *John, ate the meat, nude, raw.

For the argument against this requirement, see Nakajima (1990).
(16) John possibly will come tomorrow, and Bill will too.  
(Nakajima (1990))

As to (14), Nakajima points out the fact that the reversed order of SX and the VP adverbial as in (17) is obviously better than (14a):

(17) Some women came in as quickly as possible who were from Chicago.

Furthermore, Nakajima provides positive evidence for the attachment of SX to IP instead of VP. The CP predicts that OX and SX would appear in the same configuration, namely the VP-adjoined position. According to Nakajima, however, this is not true. Unlike OX, SX cannot occur before VP-constituents like manner adverbs as in (18), where the general crossing constraint (see fn. 4) is irrelevant:

(18) a. John read papers yesterday on Extraposition from Subject very carefully.
    b. *A man came in with a funny hat stealthily.

Furthermore, SX cannot appear before the although clause modifying the matrix S, unlike extraposed sentential clauses, which are standardly viewed as staying in VP (Terazu (1979), Baltin (1982), Reinhart (1983), etc.):

(19) a. It shocked Rosa that she lost the case, although she had no reason to believe she would win.
    b. *A man came in who looked very threatening, although the office was officially closed. (Reinhart (1983: 51))

If SX were to be a VP-constituent, the SX in (19b) should be permitted in this position, like the extraposed sentential clause in (19a).

From the discussion above, I would like to revise the CP as follows:

(20) The Revised Complement Principle (RCP)

\[ \beta \text{ is a potential complement of } \alpha (\alpha, \beta = X^{max}) \text{ only if } \alpha \text{ and } \beta \text{ m-command each other.} \]

According to the RCP, the attachment sites of SX and OX will be different: the former is in the IP-adjoined position, and the latter is in the VP-adjoined position. Under this theory, SX must appear outside of the VP-

---

6 Nakajima (1989b) proposed that the predicate and its subject must mutually m-command. Hence the contrast in (i):

(i) a. John has [vp left the room] angry.
    b. *John has [vp left, angry, the room].

My claim is that the mutual m-command requirement may be generalized to constrain the EX-antecedent relation.

7 That SX is an IP constituent and OX is a VP constituent is widely accepted (cf. Terazu (1979), Baltin (1981, 1982), Reinhart (1983), and Nakajima (1989a)).
constituents, hence the contrasts in (14a) and (17), and in (18a, b). The contrast in (19a, b) may well be attributed to some principle which distinguishes the structural differences in these sentences.

Thus our theory consists of two basic assumptions: i) EX is base-generated as a modifier, and ii) EX is subject to the RCP at S-Structure. The RCP has a number of favorable consequences. First, the mutual m-command requirement of the RCP explains why an extraposed phrase related to an object NP (OX) must adjoin to the VP immediately dominating the antecedent and may not be adjoined any higher:

(21) *She, invited many people to the party that Mary, didn’t know.

Under the assumption that OX stays within VP, the coreference relation between Mary and she in (21) can be ruled out as a violation of the binding theory. In contrast, a movement (Subjacency) account would stipulate that VP is a bounding node particularly for rightward movement (Extraposition) but not for leftward movement. This leftward and rightward distinction is otherwise unmotivated, however.

Second, the RCP accounts for the contrast in (22a, b):

(22) a. Sue examined a painting at the Met by Frans Hals before Bill did.
   b. *John calls people up whom he has never met before, and Bill does whom he has never met before too.

In general, VP deletion need not include all complements as in (23):

(23) a. John was hit by Bill and Sue was by Mary.
   b. John lied to Sue and Bill did to Mary.

The OX, in contrast, cannot be left with respect to VP deletion as in (22b) at S-Structure. The obligatory deletion of the OX can be explained in the CP theory as follows: there is no host NP for the OX in (22b), hence a violation of the RCP.

Third, as Wexler and Culicover (1980) observe, Extraposition does not yield a frozen structure (as in (24a,b)), as does Complex NP Shift (as in (25a,b)), which is standardly analyzed as involving movement. Thus it may be that EX is base-generated in its S-Structure position, not derived through movement.

(24) a. Mary is the person that I gave a book to about Fred.
   b. Who, did that editor talk to from the New York Times?

(25) a. *Who did John give to [the picture that was hanging on the wall]?
   b. *Bill, John gave to [the picture that was hanging on the
Fourth, R&C’s theory will explain the fact pointed out by Grimshaw (1990) without any stipulation. According to Grimshaw, modifiers can extrapose from NPs as in (26)-(27), but the PPs of grammatical argument cannot, as in (28b):

(26)  a. A book by Chomsky was published last year.
     b. A book was published by Chomsky last year.

(27)  a. An attack by the enemy occurred.
     b. An attack occurred by the enemy.

(28)  a. The destruction of the city by the enemy occurred.
     b. *The destruction of the city occurred by the enemy.

Our theory is that extraposed phrases are base-generated as modifiers. Consequently, (28b) will be excluded because the PP by the enemy is not a modifier and therefore cannot be construed with the antecedent NP.

Fifth, R&C assume that the relation between the extraposed phrase and its antecedent is that of modification. According to Grimshaw (1990: 97), the relation of modification can also be established by predication across a copula. Then, R&C’s theory predicts that extraposed phrases will occur in the typical context of predication. This is correct as in (29)-(30). Here, the PPs co-occur with copulas in indisputably base-derived configurations, and act as modifiers predicated of the antecedents. Incidentally, the PP adjuncts of argument status cannot appear in the same context as is apparent from (31):

(29)  a. The picture was of Bill.
     b. The book is by Bill.

(30)  Their conclusion/belief/hypothesis/proposal was that there is no relevant data.

(31)  a. *The destruction was of the city.
     b. *The destruction of the city was by the enemy.

In summation, we can conclude that there are good grounds for supposing the base-generation of EX and the RCP.

3. SI

This section will concern R&C’s formulation of Stylistic Inversion (SI), which is considered to produce the following sentences:  

8 The processes involved in (32a,b) are called here Directional/Locative Inversion. The examples of (33) exemplify Preposing around be.
(32)  

a. Into the room walked John.  
b. In front of her sat her mother.

(33)  

a. Sitting in front of her was her mother.  
b. Happiest to see him was Bill.  
c. Under the table was a large box.  
d. Found at the scene of the crime was an axe.

These constructions have been standardly analyzed as exemplifying two processes: preposing of PP, AP, or VP, and postposing of the subject NP. According to R&C, however, SI decomposes into the following three components: VP Topicalization, V-raising to INFL (V-to-I), and Inversion of I around the subject, each of which, R&C argue, is independently motivated for English and other languages. The main feature of R&C’s theory is their claim that all the initial constituents in (32)-(33) are VP (instead of simply PP or AP), and that it is not the subject but the verb that will be inverted.

Under R&C’s hypothesis, in (32a, b) for example, it is not PP but VP that has been topicalized. Let us examine a few of their arguments for this view. First turn to (34):

(34)  

a. Into the room nude walked John.  
b. In front of her smiling stood Bill.

A predicate adjunct generally does not make up a constituent with PP, and thus could not be moved along with the PP, as in (35b):

(35)  

a. Into which room did John walk nude?  
b. *Into which room nude did John walk?

However, in (34), the PP + predicate adjunct sequence can be preposed. This behavior of the predicate adjunct with respect to SI can be explained, if, as R&C argue, the fronting of the initial sequences is achieved by VP Topicalization, the same process involved in (36):

(36)  

They said John would come into the room nude, and [come into the room nude] he did.⁹

R&C’s analysis also accounts for their judgement of (37) as ungrammatical, by the general restriction on VP which prohibits its appearance in COMP, as in (38):

⁹ According to R&C, predication relations also satisfy the requirements of the CP, but, in these cases, the CP operates at LF, not at S-structure, unlike EX cases (p. 57). Following R&C, I assume that the structural relation between nude and he required by the RCP will be respected at LF after the predicate undergoes reconstruction.
(37)  a. *Into which room walked John?
b. *I asked into which room walked John.

(38)  a. *Walk into which room will John?
b. *I asked walk into which room John will.

Though the verb is missing in the preposed VP in (32), according to R&C, this is due to V-to-I, which has applied prior to VP Topicalization. After VP Topicalization, Inversion of I will apply to finally derive SI sentences. Thus the derivation of (32a) would proceed in the following order:

(39)  i) John \([_{VP} \text{walked}_i}] \text{[VP}_i \text{ti into the room nude}_j] \). (V-to-I)

ii) John \([_{I/V} \text{walked}_i}] \text{[VP}_i \text{ti into the room nude}_j] \text{[IP}_i \text{John}_i \text{[I/V} \text{walked}_i}] \text{[t}_j] \). (VP Topicalization)

iii) \([_{IP} \text{[VP}_i \text{ti into the room nude}_j] \text{[IP}_i \text{[I/V} \text{walked}_i]\text{John}_i \text{[t}_i] \text{[t}_j] \])\). (Inversion of I)\(^{10,11}\)

R&C assume that, in (iii), VP adjoins to IP. This IP-adjoined position, they argue, is the most viable for the landing site of VP. COMP for example cannot be its landing site, because VP is prohibited from the COMP position as is clear from (38).

Inversion of I explains the relative order of the subject and the predicate adjunct in (40b), where VP Topicalization has applied to the inner VP leaving the predicate adjunct, which belongs to the outer VP (R&C assume that the predicate adjunct here is adjoined to VP):

(40)  a. *Into the room walked nude John.
b. Into the room [\text{[I} \text{walked}_i]\text{John}_i \text{t}_i \text{nude}].

Their claim that a constituent fronted by SI is actually VP seems attractive especially in the face of (34) and (35). In fact, the SI examples of (33a, d) illustrate VP fronting. It is, however, doubtful that VP Topicalization is involved in all SI cases. Under R&C’S account, the possibility of SI would depend not on the apparent constituent status of the fronted sequence but on whether it could form VP along with the vacated V. This is dubious, however.

\(^{10}\) Notice here that Inversion of I adjoins I to the inner IP. The difficulty of this operation and its solution are discussed in R&C (pp. 90ff.).

\(^{11}\) In R&C’s framework, the government and binding domains of X\(^0\) extend to its highest maximal projection. Consequently, t\(_i\) satisfies the ECP of conjunctive version (see Lasnik and Saito (1992)): I/V lexically and antecedent governs t\(_i\).
If, as R&C argue, a fronted constituent in SI is VP, the contrast in (41a, b) cannot be accounted for.

(41) a. ?*Down the aisle with Margaret paraded Harpo.
   b. Down the aisle paraded Harpo with Margaret.

(Jackendoff (1973))

In (42a), which underlies (41), the V-PP-PP sequence forms a constituent of VP as is obvious from (43a, b). Thus V-to-I ((42b)), VP Topicalization, and Inversion of I could apply in this order to yield (41a). This derivation is excluded, however.

(42) a. Harpo paraded down the aisle with Margaret.
   b. Harpo \[i paraded_t][VP_i PP PP]\.

(43) a. We hoped that Harpo would parade down the aisle with Margaret, and \[VP_i parade down the aisle with Margaret\] he did.
   b. What Harpo did was \[VP_i parade down the aisle with Margaret\].

It is clear from (44a, b) that the contrast of (41a, b) can be attributed to the constituency of the fronted element(s). In fact, two PPs which form a single constituent as in (45) may be fronted in SI sentences as in (46):

(44) a. ?*It was \[down the aisle with Margaret\] that Harpo paraded.
   b. It was \[down the aisle\] that Harpo paraded with Margaret.

(45) a. The garbage collector ran \[down the street toward Harpo\].
   b. It wasn’t \[down the street toward Harpo\] that the garbage collector ran.

(46) Down the street toward Harpo ran the garbage collector.

Thus, in spite of R&C’s argument for VP Topicalization, I will still assume that the fronted constituent in (34) is PP. That is, what is topicalized in (34) is the PP accompanied by a secondary predicate. Indeed, there is evidence for this analysis:

(47) a. Into the room nude Susan walked. (p. 179, fn. 16)
   b. Into the meeting late John walked.

(48) i) \[IP_i NP_j [i V_j][VP_t_i ...]]
   ii) \[IP_i VP_j [IP_i NP_j V_j t_j]]

According to R&C, in (47) too, V-to-I was applied first ((48i)), and subsequently VP Topicalization has taken place as in (48ii). This analysis, however, cannot be carried over to the following data, where V-raising is irrelevant and it is clear that PP is moved with a predicate adjunct. Thus a predicate adjunct is not necessarily a VP-marker. Consequently, these sentences
undermine R&C’s argument for the involvement of VP fronting in SI:

(49) a. On the top of the tower naked, we saw a man.
    b. Near me lying in a coil, I saw a snake.

(50) Into the wagon high, John loaded the hay.

Below, I would like to propose an alternative (tentative, though) analysis to R&C’s.\(^\text{12}\) According to Hoekstra and Mulder (1990), for verbs of motion, a shift from unergative to ergative is observable in Dutch and Italian, especially when these verbs take PP complements of Location. In these contexts, the verbs show properties characteristic of ergatives, e.g., with respect to the use of the perfective auxiliary and the syntax of *ne*. For these verbs, they propose the analysis represented in (51):

(51) \([e\ V \ [\ SC\ NP\ PP]]\)

Their specific claims are: i) the verb is ergative, i.e., does not assign an external role, ii) the S-Structure subject forms a small clause (SC) with the PP complement, and iii) the surface subject is actually an argument of this PP-predicate. Based on these assumptions, Hoekstra and Mulder present (52c) as the underlying structure of (52a, b).

(52) a. A man walked into the room.
    b. Into the room walked a man.
    c. \([e\ \text{walked} \ [\ SC\ [NP\ a\ man]\ [PP\ into\ the\ room]]]\)

(52a) is derived by raising NP to the subject position, and (52b), by preposing PP.

In Stowell (1978) and Safir (1985), it is argued that the copula verb *be* also takes an SC complement. Following these proposals, I assume that the D-Structure of (33) is as follows:

(53) \([e\ \text{be} \ [NP\ XP]]\)

Thus, the preposed constituent in SI constructions is the predicate phrase XP of SC. The preposing of XP is independently motivated (see (54)-(55)). Furthermore, XP can be accompanied by secondary predicates as in (56). The examples of (57) show that the predicate phrase of SC can be preposed with a secondary predicate.

(54) a. I saw \([three\ birds\ sitting\ on\ the\ fence]\).
    b. \([\text{Sitting on the fence}],\ I\ saw\ [three\ birds\ r_1]\).

(55) a. I found \([an\ escaped\ convict\ hiding\ in\ my\ room]\).

\(^{12}\) The discussion developed below is from Maruta (1991).

\(^{13}\) Another ergative approach to SI is developed in Coopmans (1989).
b. [Hiding in my room], I found [an escaped convict r].
   (Bowers (1981: 269)

(56)  a. I saw [a snake near me lying in a coil].  
       b. We saw [a man on top of the tower naked].

(57)  a. Near me lying in a coil, I saw a snake.  
       b. On top of the tower naked, we saw a man.

From the discussion above, I would like to propose the following under-
lying structures for (34a, b):

(58)  a. [e] walked [SC NP [PP [PP into the room] nude]]  
       b. [e] stood [SC NP [PP [PP in front of her] smiling]]

If XP preposing is applied to (58), (34a, b) will be derived. If raising is 
applied to NP, the following sentences will be derived:

(59)  a. John walked into the room nude.  
       b. Bill stood in front of her smiling.

In this framework, the preposed element is simply the XP of SC itself, 
and so, unlike R&C’s VP Topicalization hypothesis, the contrast between 
(41a) and (46) can be explained based on the constituency of the preposed 
material. Furthermore, this theory is preferable to R&C’s in that it needs 
less machinery to attain the effect of Subject Inversion, i.e., only XP 
preposing from the small clause.

4. NP Shift

Now let us turn to the third class of focus constructions like (60), which, 
R&C argue, are derivationally related to the respective sentences in (61):

(60)  a. John bought for his mother a painting that he liked.  
       b. There walked into the room a man with long blond hair.

(61)  a. John bought a painting that he liked for his mother.  
       b. A man with long blond hair walked into the room.

The processes which form (60a,b) have been typically referred to as Heavy 
NP Shift (HNPS) and Presentational there Insertion (PTI), respectively. 
According to R&C, these processes can be reduced to the rightward appli-
cation of Move-α, which they call NP Shift for convenience. As to PTI, it 
must furthermore undergo Presentational there (P-there) Insertion, which, 
they argue, is restricted to the lexically ungoverned position ((62a, b), 
(63b)) and prohibited elsewhere as in (62c) and (63a):

(62)  a. There walked into the room a man with long blond hair.  
       b. *Walked into the room a man with long blond hair.
c. *John bought there for his mother a picture that he liked.

(63)  
   a. I consider (*there) stupid anyone who would support a Socialist bid for power.
   b. I'd prefer *(?there) to walk into the room early someone who no one there will recognize.

The complement subject position of Exceptional Case Marking (ECM) verb consider, a lexically governed position, does not allow P-there Insertion as predicted, though the corresponding position of non-ECM verb prefer more or less requires P-there Insertion.

Now let us turn to the landing site of NP Shift. R&C argue that the shifted NP must respect the following condition:

(64)  *Local government condition on rightward movement: In a configuration C where $t$ is the trace of rightward movement and $t$ is governed by $\beta=X^0$, $\beta$ must govern the head of the chain containing $t$.

Condition (64) is to explain the strict boundedness of rightward movement. It requires that, in the structure of (65) below, the attachment site of NP$_2$ will be $\beta$ and that of NP$_1$ $\alpha$. In the former case, V governs both NP$_2$ and its ultimate landing site, namely $\beta$, and, in the latter case, I governs both NP$_1$ and $\alpha$. (64) will block the shift of NP$_2$ to $\alpha$ since V will not govern $\alpha$ in this case. Furthermore, (64) will block successive upward movement of NP$_1$ and NP$_2$ via adjunction. Thus the long distance movement of these NPs will be prohibited.

(65)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{IP} \\
\text{IP} \quad \alpha \\
\text{NP}_1 \quad I' \\
\text{I} \quad \text{VP} \\
\text{VP} \quad \beta \\
\text{V} \quad \text{NP}_2
\end{array}
\]

Condition (64) correctly blocks the adjunction of NP$_1$ to any higher position than the most local IP as in (66). The contrast between (67) and (68)

\[14\text{ The Shift of NP}_1 \text{ to } \beta \text{ is prohibited since, according to R&C, the trace left by NP}_1 \text{ must be subject to the requirement of antecedent government as well (p. 117).} \]
illustrates the prediction by (64) that the landing site of NP2 must be $\beta$:

\[ (66) \quad \text{It was believed that there walked into the room by everyone a man with long blond hair.} \]

\[ (67) \]

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. John gave to Mary a picture of Lyndon Johnson, and Bill did too.
  \item b. What John did was buy for Mary every book he could find.
\end{itemize}

\[ (68) \]

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. *John bought for Mary a picture of her father, and Sally did every book she could find.
  \item b. *What John did every book he could find was buy for Mary.
\end{itemize}

Condition (64) also accounts for a well-known restriction against the preposition stranding in HNPS cases, as in (69), where the stranded P ($=\beta$ in (64)) does not govern the shifted NP adjoined to VP:

\[ (69) \]

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. *Mary put the money [on t] yesterday a tablet that was sitting at the entrance to the hall.
  \item b. *John threw a look [at t] as he was walking by a man who was standing outside his office.
  \item c. *I mailed a letter [to t] on my way to work an old friend from high school.
\end{itemize}

Finally, let us see how (64) will predict the landing site of NP Shift from small clauses and Exceptional Case Marking (ECM) environments, where the trace left by NP Shift is governed by the main verb:

\[ (70) \]

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. John saw [t leaving the room] a man with long blond hair.
  \item b. I believe [t to be intelligent] all the students who can solve this problem.
\end{itemize}

(64) predicts that the NP may be adjoined to either the embedded clause or the matrix VP since either position is governed by the main verb. Though it is difficult to substantiate this theoretical consequence, the following data may indicate that the moved NP does not adjoin to the higher VP because this NP may not follow material that belongs to the matrix VP as in (71):

\[ (71) \]

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. *I believe [t to be a nice guy] very strongly [my favorite stepfather from Port Huron].
  \item b. *I believe [t to have quit] without understanding it [all the cheerful and friendly waitresses at Ken's Pub].
\end{itemize}

\((\text{Johnson (1985: 87-88)})\)

\begin{itemize}
  \item c. *John wants in New York on Monday every actor who has ever worked for him. (p. 137)
\end{itemize}

Thus, these data suggest a stricter bounding condition to the effect that NP Shift adjoins material to the maximal projection immediately dominating
it, and no farther (Johnson (1985: 84)).

The grammaticality judgement of these sentences may be delicate, though. Consider the following examples, where the italicized adverbials can be construed with the higher verbs:

(72) a. I'll consider [t to be fools] in the weeks [all those who drop this course]. (Bresnan (1982))
    b. John saw [t leaving the room] last night [a man with long blond hair]. (p.191)
    c. For the first time I believed [t to be intelligent] because of this [those students majoring in linguistics]. (Nishikawa (1990))

These data, in contrast, are in accordance with condition (64). I have no idea, though, of whether these differences in grammaticality are ideolectal or the reflection of some basic principle.

5. Summary

R&C's major goal in this work is, in their words, "to investigate the structural properties of a class of English stylistic constructions, and to reduce the analysis of these constructions to independently motivated principles of grammar, including Move α" (p. 7). In other words, their project is to construct a null hypothesis for this construction class. R&C's main claim is that the existing mechanisms and principles of grammar suffice to make these constructions possible in English, and, as a consequence, a class of "stylistic rules" in the PF component can be eliminated. That the properties of SI can equally well be stated in terms of syntactic rules and LF conditions without appeal to the PF component has recently been standard, e.g., Rochemont (1986), Newmeyer (1987), and Coopmans (1989). Compared with these former works on the same line, this book is worthy of more attention particularly for the in-depth analyses it provides for the English focus constructions within the "non-stylistic framework."

In this review, I have especially examined controversial and intriguing proposals made by R&C. These are summarized as follows:

EX : base-generation of EX as a modifier, and the CP.
SI : VP Topicalization, V-to-I and Inversion of I, hence no rightward movement of the subject NP.
NP Shift : NP Shift analysis of PTI, and the local government condi-
tion on rightward movement.

With regard to EX, following R&C, I have shown a number of reasons for preferring the non-movement analysis to the movement analysis. I have also proposed (20), the revised version of the CP.

As to SI, I have argued against their account in terms of V-to-I and VP Topicalization, and suggested an alternative analysis.

R&C’s analysis of both PTI and HNPS is based on the rightward application of Move $\alpha$. They argue that NP Shift in PTI is an adjunction to IP, and that of HNPS an adjunction to VP, as required by the ECP, Subjacency, and condition (64). I have indicated, however, that (64) may make incorrect predictions with respect to the NP Shift in ECM and small clause environments.

REFERENCES


REVIEW ARTICLE


Faculty of Humanities
Yamagata University
Kojirakawa-machi, Yamagata-shi
Yamagata, 990