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1. The aim of this paper is to propose three constraints on object fronting by tough-movement (TM) and to solve four problems.

In this paper, indirect object (IO) and direct object (DO) mean IO and DO in (2), respectively.

(1) John gave the book to the girl. (to PPC)

      to dative-movement (to DM)

(2) John gave the girl the book. (to DOC)

DO is the focus of (2).

(3), (4), and (5) are tough constructions, to which TM is applied.

(3) John is easy to please.
(4) The girl is tough to give the book to.
(5) *The girl is tough to give the book.
Subjects of tough constructions have dual grammatical relations: *John* in (3) is the object of *please* and the subject of *be*, *the girl* in (4) is the object of *to* and the subject of *be*, and *the girl* in (5) is the IO of *give* and the subject of *be*.

2. Three constraints are proposed on independent grounds.

2.1. (6) Constraint I: IO's are impossible to move as IO's.

Constraint I is due to a general principle that as a rule IO's must be placed after verbs immediately before DO's. This comprehensive principle predicts the unacceptability of (7) correctly.

(7) *John gave the girl yesterday the book.*

2.2. (8) Constraint II: DO's are difficult to make subjects.

Constraint II is one of the special cases of a principle that focus elements cannot be topic elements and vice versa in the same sentence. DO cannot be fronted by topicalization of topic, either.

(9) *The book, John gave the GIRL.*

2.3. (10) Constraint III: Making IO's and DO's subjects (i.e. TM and passivization) is parallel to DM.

TM, passivization, and DM, which change grammatical relations, are all topicalizing rules in the sense of Creider (1979).

3. Four problems with IO and DO fronting by TM are solved.

3.1. Why is IO fronting by TM impossible?
IO fronting by TM is impossible as IO fronting by infinitival relativization (IR).

(11) *The girl is tough to give the book.
(12) *She is the girl for John to give the book.

The explanation of the impossibility of IO fronting by TM is (13).

(13) Since the girl is the IO of the complement verb in (11) and (12), fronting the girl either by TM or by IR violates Constraint I.

3.2. Why is DO fronting by TM difficult?

DO fronting by TM is difficult like DO fronting by passivization.

(14) ( ? ) The book is tough to give the girl.
(15) ( ? ) The book was given the girl by John.

The reason for the difficulty of DO fronting by TM is (16).

(16) Since the book is the subject of the main verb in (14) and (15), fronting the book either by TM or by passivization violates Constraint II.

3.3. Why is object fronting by TM tougher in forDOC than in toDOC?

Object fronting by TM is tougher in forDOC than in toDOC.

(17) IO fronting

a. *The girl is tough to give the book. (toDOC)
b. **The girl is tough to buy the book. (forDOC)
a'. The girl was given the book by John. (toDOC)
b'. (*) The girl was bought the book by John. (forDOC)
(18) DO fronting
   a. (?) The book is tough to give the girl. (toDOC)
   b. *The book is tough to buy the girl. (forDOC)
   a'. (?) The book was given the girl by John. (toDOC)
   b'. *The book was bought the girl by John. (forDOC)

Hawkins (1981) proposes (19) as a condition on DM.

(19) Thematic Hierarchy
   1. GOAL (to prepositional phrase)
   2. BENEFACITIVE (for prepositional phrase)

What is meant by (19) is that forDM is more difficult than toDM. And since what is meant by Constraint III is that the more difficult DM is, the more difficult TM or passivization is, the acceptability gap between toDOC and forDOC is made clear by (20).

(20) According to Constraint III, object fronting in forDOC is difficult because of difficult DM (forDM) and object fronting in toDOC is easy because of easy DM (toDM).

3.4. Why is IO fronting by TM absolutely impossible?

Langendoen, et al. (1976) points out that even people who accept IO fronting by wh-question can never accept IO fronting by TM, in other words, that there is such a dialect as (21).

(21) a. Who did John buy the book?
    b. *The girl is tough to buy the book.

Now (24) is less acceptable than (22).

(22) IO fronting by IR (IO of buy)
*The girl for John to buy the book ran over there.

(23) Passivization (subject of be)

(?) The girl was bought the pen by Harry.

(24) IR+passivization (IO of buy and subject of be)

(*) *The girl for John to buy the book was bought the pen by Harry.

(24) and (25) are the same in having dual grammatical relations.

(25) IO fronting by TM (IO of buy and subject of be)

**The girl is tough to buy the book.

(25) is also less acceptable than (22), so the absolute impossibility of IO fronting by TM is due to (26).

(26) IO fronting by TM violates Constraint I as IO fronting by IR (or wh-question), and the IO fronted by TM must be the main subject as a passivized subject.
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トレースの異化
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言語理論における「異 (allo)」の概念は、文法レベルの組織化の中に影響的ながら常に適正な位置づけを帯びているものの一つである。生成文法の中核部門の組織化の作業にあたって、Move-α を認める立場と、これを認めない立場とでは、
同時発生的に作動する他の制約条件群の有効性の尊重という点で全く異質の文法モデル論を招来することになる。

本論考は、可能な構造変化の位相を最小におきる方向の根幹に位置づけられる Move-α を認める立場に立ちはだか、α が WH 句と NP とに二種の発現様式として分化するとき、それぞれ独自の現象にいかに内部的特質が具体化するかを観察した上で、両者のトレースに共通する性質を規定し直し、allo 化の理論上の妥当性がこれまでに提出されて来ているいくつかの「仮案」を否定し去ることにつながり、空の文法カテゴリーを尊重する伝統的なトレース理論こそが十分な有効性をはらむ言語理論であることを立証しようとする試みである。

1. 二つのトレースの性質発現

三つの空カテゴリー {PRO, WH トレース, NP トレース} は一定の統語上の分