

金城学院大学 論集

通巻第144号

英米文学編（第33号）

- 英文学におけるソネット概観
—— ワーズワスの観点から —— 五十嵐美智（1）
- ヴィクトリア朝大論争（その二）：
ヴィクトリア朝中産階級の女子教育をめぐる
—— Linton夫人の「当世娘」とその反響—— … 楚輪松人（29）
- ユージン・オニールと『夜への長い旅路』（1）
—— オニールの手紙（抄）—— 中村英一（51）
- Impersonal Passives in English and French 丹羽卓（67）
- Speech Errors and Japanese Case-Marking 橋本知子（87）
- Virginia Hamilton の *The Planet of Junior Brown* :
「商品」としての児童文学とその戦略の具体例として
..... 藤森かよこ（109）
- 中世騎士物語『マビノギオン』訳注
CYFRANC LLUD A LLEUELYS (5)
シーズとセヴェリスの物語（5）
＝「四つの独立した土着の物語」第2話＝ 水谷宏（137）
- Locative/Temporal vs. Manner/Reason Phrases 村杉恵子（153）
- 英国英語の Dialect Continuum における
postvocalic/r/ について
—— 社会言語学的試論 —— 若月剛（171）
- Imitation, Emulation, Creation: Using Models
to Teach Creative Writing Nancy E. James（195）
- Towards a Theory of Contrastive Analysis James A. Matchett（217）

金城学院大学

1991

Locative/Temporal vs. Manner/Reason Phrases

Keiko Murasugi

1. Introduction: Huang (1982) on Locative/Temporal WH Phrases

The purpose of this paper is to investigate asymmetries between locative/temporal phrases and manner/reason phrases. A typical example of this kind of asymmetry is discussed in Huang (1982). As shown in (1)–(2), complement WHs, but not adjunct WHs, can be left in situ.

- (1) a. $\text{who}_i t_i$ bought what
b. why_i did you buy what t_i
- (2) a. * $\text{who}_i t_i$ bought the book why
b. * $\text{who}_i t_i$ fixed the car how

Huang provides an ECP account for this contrast. Compare (3) with (2).

- (3) a. $\text{who}_i t_i$ bought the book where
b. $\text{who}_i t_i$ bought the book when

These examples show that *where* and *when* pattern with complements. If they are adjuncts, as Huang assumes, then this fact is surprising.

In order to solve this problem, Huang first suggests that *where/when*, as opposed to *why/how*, are NPs. For example, the former can appear as complements to P, but not the latter.

(4) a. since when/from where

b. *for why/by how

Then, he suggests that the structure of (3a), for example, is more precisely as in (5a).

(5) a. who_i t_i bought the book [PP[PE]_[NP where]]

b. who_i t_i bought the book [PP(AdvP) why]

In (5a), *where* appears as a complement to an empty P, and hence we expect them to behave as a complement. Given that *why/how* are PPs (or AdvPs), there is no position for an empty P in (5b). Thus, the ECP account for (2) can be maintained. This analysis is quite attractive, because the examples in (3) are analyzed exactly as those in (6).

(6) a. who_i t_i bought the book for what reason

b. who_i t_i solved the problem by which method

In (6), *what reason* and *which method* are complements to P.

In this paper, I will discuss the asymmetry between locative/temporal phrases and manner/reason phrases observed in Japanese relative clauses and topic sentences. In Section 2, I will briefly discuss the analysis of Japanese relative clauses proposed in Murasugi (1991a). There, I will suggest that locative/temporal phrases, as opposed to manner/reason phrases, have argument status, and hence, Huang's empty P hypothesis is not necessary to account for examples such as (3a–b). In Section 3, I will consider extraction of PPs out of NPs in English, and present a direct argument against the empty P hypothesis. In Section 4, I will discuss implications of the conclusions obtained in Sections 2 and 3 for the analysis of topicalization in Japanese. I will suggest here that base-generated topic sentences in Japanese may be analyzed exactly as left-dislocation in English.

2. Relative Clauses and pro in Japanese

It is well known that Japanese relativization is not constrained by Subjacency. Thus, (7) and (8) are grammatical.

(7) [IP[NP[IPe_i e_j kiteiru] yoohuku_j] ga yogoreteiru] sin_i
is-wearing suit nom is-dirty gentleman
(a gentleman who [the suit that he is wearing] is dirty)

(Kuno (1973))

(8). ?[NP[S[NP[se_i e_j syuppan sita] kaisy_a]_j] ga kazi de
published company nom fire by
yakete-simatta] hon_j
was-burned-down book

(a book which the company that published (it) was burned down by a fire.)

Perlmutter (1972) proposes to assimilate this fact to another well known fact of Japanese, i.e., that it is a pro-drop language. According to his analysis, empty category in (7) need not be a trace but can be pro. Thus, Japanese relativization need not involve movement, and hence, is not constrained by Subjacency.¹⁾

Saito (1985) notes that relativization of locative/temporal phrases patterns with argument relativization as in (7), but relativization of manner/reason phrases does not. Relevant examples are shown in (9)–(10).

(9) a. [IP[NP[IPe_j e_i mensetu o uketa] gakusei_j] ga minna ukatta]
interview acc had student nom all passed

hi_i

day

(the day_i that [all the students who had an interview then_j] passed the exam)

b. [IP[NP[IPe_j e_i siken o uketa] gakusei_j] ga minna ukatta]
exam acc took student nom all passed

kyoositu_i
 classroom
 (the classroom_i that [all the students who took the exam there]_i
 passed)

- (10) a. [_{IP}[_{NP}[_{IP}*e*_j *e*_i*(sore de) kubi ni natta] hito_j] ga minna
 it by was fired person nom all
 okotteiru_i riyuu_i
 is angry reason
 (the reason_i that [all the students who was fired for it_i] are
 angry)
- b. [_{IP}[_{NP}[_{IP}*e*_j *e*_i*(sore de) mondai o toita] hito_j] ga minna
 it by problem acc solved person nom all
 siken ni otiru_i hoo_ihoo_i
 exam in fail method
 (the method_i that [all the students who solve problems by it_i]
 fail the exam)

Saito notes further that relativization of manner/reason phrases is subject to a severe locality condition; it is clause-bound. (11)–(12) illustrate this generalization.

- (11) a. [_{IP}Mary ga *e*_i kubi ni natta] riyuu_i
 nom was fired reason
 (the reason for which Mary was fired *e*)
- b. [_{IP}John ga [_{CP}Mary ga *(sore_i de) kubi ninatta to]
 nom nom it by was fired COMP
 omotteiru_i riyuu_i
 think reason
 (the reason for which John thinks [that Mary was fired *e*])
- (12) a. [_{IP}Mary ga *e*_i sono mondai o toita] hoo_ihoo_i
 nom that problem acc solved method
 (the method by which Mary solved the problem *e*)
- b. [_{IP}John ga [_{CP}Mary ga (sore_i de) sono mondai o toita
 nom nomit by that problem acc solved

to] omttoteiru_i hoo_ihoo_i
 COMP think method
 (the method by which John thinks [that Mary solved the
 problem *e*])

In Murasugi (1991a), I followed Perlmutter's (1972) analysis, and drew the conclusion in (13) on the basis of the contrast between (9) and (10).

- (13) The empty pronoun *pro* is allowed in the position of temporal/locative phrases, but not in the position of manner/reason phrases.

As shown in (14), temporal phrases, but not locative phrases can appear as bare NP.²⁾

- (14) a. Taroo wa sono hi (ni) siken o uketa
 top that day on exam acc took
 (Taroo took an exam on that day)
- b. Taroo wa soko *(de) siken o uketa
 there in exam acc took
 (Taroo took the exam there)

Thus, (13) implies that there is *pro* of the category PP and this PP *pro* appears in the position of a locative phrase in examples such as (9b).³⁾

Given the analysis stated above, a question arises as to why a PP *pro* is allowed in the position of locative phrases but not in the position of manner/reason phrases. The most straightforward hypothesis is that *pro* is allowed only in argument positions, and that locative phrases, but not manner/reason phrases, are arguments. Since it is known that *pro* can appear in argument positions, and manner/reason phrases are clearly adjuncts (non-arguments), this hypothesis seems quite plausible. And if it is correct, it eliminates the necessity to assume an empty P in examples like (3a). *Where*, in this example, being an argument, will be lexically governed without empty P. Thus, the examples in (9) pose some doubts on

Huang's empty P hypothesis.⁴⁾

On the basis of (11)–(12) and acquisition data on Japanese relative clauses, I argued in Murasugi (1991a) that relative clauses are not CPs but IPs in Japanese.⁵⁾ According to the analysis presented there, relativization of manner/reason phrases is completely disallowed in Japanese. Let us consider (11a), repeated below as (15).

(15) [Mary ga e_i kubi ni natta] riyuu_i
nom was fired reason

(the reason for which Mary was fired e)

This example cannot be base-generated as a relative clause since e , being a reason phrase, cannot be base-generated as *pro*. Hence, it must be derived by movement. But if (15) involves movement and relative clauses are IPs in Japanese, the example has the configuration in (16).

(16) ...[_{IP}OP_i [_{IP}... t_i ...]]...

Since the trace in (16) is an adjunct trace, the ECP requires that it be antecedent governed. But it is argued in Lasnik and Saito (1991) that only X-zero categories can be antecedent governors. In (16), the only potential antecedent governor is the empty operator, and it is not an X-zero. Hence, (16) is ruled out by the ECP.

Given this conclusion, I proposed in Murasugi (1991a) that (11)–(12) should be analyzed as instances of pure complex NPs like those in (17).

(17) a. the reason for John's leaving

b. the reason for Mary's saying that John left

Note that in (17b), 'the reason' cannot be construed with 'John left'. Thus, this analysis correctly predicts the "clause-boundedness of adjunct relativation" in (11)–(12).

3. Movement of Locative/Temporal PPs: Evidence Against Empty P

It was shown in the preceding section that the facts of relativization in Japanese raise some doubts on the empty P hypothesis. In this section, I will present a direct argument against empty P, and suggest that locative/temporal PPs are arguments of (lexically governed by) INFL or V.

Let us first consider the following contrast from Chomsky (1977):

(18) a. who_i did you see [a picture of t_i]

b. ?*who_i did you destroy [a book about t_i]

This contrast follows from Subjacency if the NP-internal PP is a complement in (18a), but not in (18b). That is, the latter involves extraction out of a non-properly governed PP, and hence, is an example of a CED effect.

Let us next consider (19). This example involves an extraction of an adjunct PP out of an NP. Examples like this are worse than those like (18b), and as noted by Stowell (1989), have the status of an ECP violation.

(19)*about whom_i did you destroy [a book t_i]

It basically corresponds to (20c) discussed in Stowell (1989).

(20) a. who_i did you sell [a picture of t_i]

b. who_i did you sell [Mary's picture of t_i]

c. *by whom_i did Frans sell [a picture t_i]

d. **why_i does Jane regret [Bob's dismissal of her t_i]

(Stowell (1989))

Stowell (1989) proposes an ECP account for (20c), adopting the DP structure in (21).

(21) [_{DP} [_{D'}a [_{NP}picture [_{PP}by whom]]]]

When the PP is moved, its trace must be antecedent governed, since

the PP is an adjunct. But the NP within DP is not L-marked, and hence, is a barrier for antecedent government. (DP also becomes a barrier by inheritance.) Thus, whether or not the PP moves through the DP SPEC, its initial trace violates the ECP, as illustrated in (22).⁶⁾

(22) by whom_i...[_{DP} (*t_i*) [_{DP} a [_{NP} picture *t_i*]]]

Given Stowell's ECP account for (20c) and (19), let us consider (23).

(23) a. ?*which basket_i do you like [the food in *t_i*]
(Subjacency (CED) violation)

b. *in which basket_i do you like [the food *t_i*]
(ECP violation)

This contrast is straightforwardly predicted. (23a) exhibits CED effect, and (23b) violates the ECP. Now, let us turn to the crucial example (24).

(24) *where_i do you like [the food *t_i*]

This example, in which *where* is extracted out of an NP, has the status of (23b), and hence, should be an ECP violation. But if we assume Huang's empty P analysis, then the structure of (24) can be as in (25).

(25) where_i do you like [the food [_{PP} [_P *e*] *t_i*]]

Here, there is no ECP violation: Recall that given Huang's assumption that locative PPs are adjuncts, an empty P cannot be subject to the ECP. This is so, since, then, (5a) would be an ECP violation. Also, an empty P should be able to lexically govern the trace, since according to Huang, this is exactly why (5a) does not violate the ECP. Hence, (24) should be a mere Subjacency violation, contrary to the fact. (24), thus, constitutes straightforward evidence against the empty P hypothesis.

The same argument can be constructed on the basis of the examples in (26).

(26) a. who_i *t_i* read [the books on which shelf]

b. *who_i *t_i* read [the books where]

c. *who_i *t_i* remembered [the TV show when]

In (26a), the WH phrase *which shelf* is a complement of the P *on*. Hence, it is grammatical exactly as (1) and (6). Interestingly, (26b) and (26c) are ungrammatical. Given the empty P hypothesis, this is quite surprising, since (26b), for example, should be able to have the structure in (27).

(27) who_i *t_i* read [the books [_{PP} [_P *e*] where]]

Here, the WH phrase *where* is a complement to an empty P. Thus, (26b) should be grammatical in exactly the same way that 'who bought the book where' is.

The contrast between (26b–c) and (3a–b) indicates not only that there is no empty P, but also that *where/when* are lexically governed in sentences but not in NPs. Thus, we are led to the hypothesis that the lexical governor for *where/when* in (3) is INFL or V.

(28) a. No empty P.

b. The lexical governor for *where/when* in (3) is INFL or V.

The conclusions of this section, listed in (28), provide strong support for our previous conclusion that Japanese has PP *pro*, and that Japanese allows *pro* in argument positions.

Before we conclude this section, let us briefly consider the categorial status of *where/there* and *when/then*. Let us first consider the examples in (29).

(29) a. the requirements last year/in that year

b. last year's/*in that year's requirements

They show that PP modifiers are allowed postnominally, but, unlike NP modifiers, cannot appear in prenominal position with 's. The examples in (30) show that *then* behaves like a PP in this respect.

(30) a. the requirements then

b. *then's requirements

If *then* is an NP, it is not clear why (30b) should not be as good as

'last year's requirements'. (31) shows that the same is true of *there*.

(31) a. the books on the desk/there

b. *on that desk's/there's books

There, like PPs, can appear postnominally, but not prenomirally with 's. I tentatively conclude that the category of *where/there* and *when/then* is PP.

Note also that locative/temporal PPs appear more easily in the subject position of a sentence than manner/reason PPs. This is shown in (32) and (33).

(32) a. under the table is a nice place to hide

b. after the meeting is the best time to meet

(See Jackendoff (1977), Stowell (1981).)

(33) a. ?? by deduction is the best way to prove the theorem

b. ?*for the satisfaction of intellectual appetite is the best reason to do the research

The subjects in these examples are clearly all PPs. Yet, (32) is better than (33). I speculate that locative/temporal PPs, for some reason, are more easily allowed in argument positions than manner/reason PPs, and that this is related to the possibility of expressions like 'since then' and 'from there'.

4. Speculations on "Aboutness" and pro

In this section, I will briefly discuss the differences between locative/temporal phrases and manner/reason phrases in Japanese topicalization.

Recall that I argued that (34a) is a pure complex NP, like (34b).

(34) a. [_{IP}Mary ga kubi ni natta] riyuu

nom was-fired reason

(the reason for Mary's having been fired)

b. the reason for John's leaving

This suggests that the relation between the embedded sentence and

the head N in (34a) is that of modification, rather than that of "aboutness."

As is well known Kuno (1973) proposed that the topic in (35) is licensed by some sort of "aboutness relation" with the rest of the sentence.

(35) sakana wa tai ga ii

fish top red snapper nom good

(As for fish, red snapper is the best)

The ungrammaticality of (36) confirms our conclusion that there cannot be any "aboutness relation" between NPs such as *riyuu*, *hoohoo*, and sentences.

(36) a. *sono riyuu wa Mary ga kubi ni natta

that reason top nom was-fired

(As for that reason, Mary was fired for it)

b. *sono hoohoo wa Mary ga teiri o syoomeisita

that method top nom theorem acc proved

(As for that method, Mary proved the theorem with it)

These examples cannot be derived by movement, since Japanese does not allow P stranding and the topics do not accompany a P. (Even if Japanese allowed P stranding, the examples should be out since there is no stranded P in these examples.) If the topics are followed by P, then the examples are in fact grammatical, as shown in (37).

(37) a. sono riyuu de wa Mary ga kubi ni natta

that reason for top nom was-fired

(For that reason_i, Mary was-fired t_i)

b. sono hoohoo de wa Mary ga teiri o syoomeisita

that method by top nom theorem acc proved

(By that method_i, Mary proved a theorem t_i)

The ungrammaticality of (36) shows that they cannot be derived by base-generation either. This implies that the topics cannot be licensed by the "aboutness relation."

Now, interestingly enough, the examples corresponding to (36) with locative/temporal topics are grammatical, as shown in (38).

- (38) a. sono kyoositu wa Mary ga siken o uketa
 that classroom top nom exam acc took
 (As for that classroom, Mary took an exam there)
- b. sono hi wa Mary ga siken o uketa
 that day top nom exam acc took
 (As for that day, Mary took an exam)

(38a), in particular, cannot be derived by movement for the same reason that (36) cannot. If it is derived by movement, then the topic must contain the postposition *de*, since Japanese does not allow P stranding. Hence, the grammaticality of this example show that it can be base-generated, and more specifically, that the locative topic can be licensed by the “aboutness relation.” Then, we found another contrast between locative phrases and manner/reason phrases.

Recall here our conclusion that *pro* can appear as locative PP, but not as manner/reason PPs. If we hypothesize that a topic can be licensed by the “aboutness relation” only when there is a coindexed pronoun in the rest of the sentence, we are able to unify the two asymmetries between locative and manner/reason phrases.

- (39) a. sakana_i wa [sono/*pro*_i tai] ga ii (cf. (35))
 its
- b. sono kyoositu_i wa Mary ga soko de/*pro*_i siken o uketa
 there in (cf. (38a))
- c. sono riyuu_i wa Mary ga sore de/**pro*_i kubi ni natta (cf. (37a))
 it for

(39b) with an overt pronoun is fine because this pronoun enables the topic to be licenced by the “aboutness.” It is also fine without an overt pronoun because a *pro* can appear in its place. (39c), on the other hand, is good only with an overt pronoun. When the overt pronoun is absent, there cannot be any empty pronoun *pro* that is coindexed with the topic. Hence, the topic cannot be licenced by the

“aboutness relation.” According to this hypothesis, the topic in (35) should be licensed by means of a *pro* modifying *tai*, as illustrated in (39a).

If this speculation is on the right track, then it may be possible to eliminate “aboutness relation” as a Japanese-specific way of licensing a topic. The base-generated topic sentences can be analyzed in exactly the same way as English left-dislocation. As is well known, left-dislocation is allowed only when there is a pronoun coindexed with the topic, as shown in (40).

- (40) a. John_i, I like him_i
 b. *John_i, I like Mary

Muraki (1974), for example, proposed that there is nothing language-specific about Japanese topicalization, and that they are derived by movement exactly like English topicalization.⁷⁾ The suggestion made here is somewhat similar to Muraki's. But it states that Japanese topic sentences can involve movement like English topicalization, and at the same time, can involve base-generation like English left-dislocation. The apparent differences between the two languages are to a large extent reduced to the fact that Japanese allows *pro*. That is, the pronoun required in left-dislocation structure can be empty in Japanese.

There is one more fact on Japanese topicalization that I would like to consider here. Saito (1985) argues that examples with PP topic cannot be base-generated, but necessarily involves movement. Thus, PP topicalization always exhibits Subjacency effect. This seems to be true even when the topic is a locative PP, as shown in (41).

- (41) a. ? sono kyoositu_i wa Mary ga [[e_j e_i siken o uketa] hito_j]
 that classroom top nom exam acc took person
 ni atta
 to met
 (As for that classroom, Mary met a person who took an

exam there)

- b. ?*sono kyoositu_i de wa Mary ga [[e_j e_i siken o uketa]
that classroom in top nom exam acc took
hito_j] ni natta
person to met

(As for that classroom, Mary met a person who took an exam there)

According to Saito, PP topics in general cannot be licensed by the “aboutness relation” and this is why PP topicalization must involve movement. He points out that the impossibility of licensing PP topics by “aboutness” is confirmed by examples such as (42). If PP topics can be licensed by “aboutness,” there is no reason that the P *de* should not be allowed in these examples.

- (42) a. ? sono kyoositu (?*de) wa Mary ga soko de siken o
that classroom in top nom there in exam acc
uketa
took
(Lit. As for “in that classroom”, Mary took an exam there)
b. ?*sono riyuu (?*de) wa Mary ga kubi ni natta
that reason for top nom was fired
(Lit. As for “for that reason,” Mary was fired for it)

If this analysis is correct, then the existence of a coindexed pronoun does not necessarily allow a topic to be licensed by the “aboutness relation.” The empty PP in (11b), being a locative, can be *pro*. Yet the example cannot be base-generated. In particular, PP topics, whether or not they are coindexed with a pronoun, cannot be licensed by “aboutness.” It is generally believed that left-dislocation is allowed, when the topic is coindexed with a pronoun. Thus, the fact in (11b), which indicates that PP topics in Japanese cannot be licensed by “aboutness” even when it is coindexed with *pro*, may be taken as evidence that base-generated topic sentences in Japanese have properties different from those of left-dislocation. However, PP

topics are difficult in English left-dislocation also, as shown in (13) and (11).

- (43) a. ?? that store_i I bought a book there_i
b. ?*at that store_i, I bought a book there_i
(44) a. ?? Tuesday_i, I will finish the paper then_i
b. ?*on Tuesday_i, I will finish the paper then_i

For some unknown reason, *there* and *then* are more marginal as resumptive pronouns than NP pronouns such as *it*, *he*, *she*, and *they*. Thus, (43a) and (44a) are marginal to begin with. But (43b) and (44b) are worse. This indicates that Saito’s observation on Japanese topicalization carries over to English left-dislocation. That is, PPs seem to resist left-dislocation in both languages. Hence, the contrast in (41) can be taken as evidence, not against, but for the similarity between Japanese topicalization and English left-dislocation.

5. Summary

In this paper, I investigated relative clauses in Japanese and WH movement out of NPs in English, and argued for the following conclusions:

- (45) a. Japanese has PP *pro*, but allows *pro* only in argument positions.
b. There is no empty P.
c. Locative/temporal PPs are arguments (Lexically governed by V or I.)

Then, I went on to discuss a consequence of these conclusions for the analysis of Japanese topicalization. I suggested specifically that the base-generated Japanese topic sentences may be analyzed exactly as left-dislocation in English. If this hypothesis can be maintained, there is no need to appeal to the vague notion of “aboutness” to capture the differences between topicalization in Japanese and English. The superficial differences can instead be basically derived

from the fact that Japanese, but not English, has empty pronouns.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This is a shortened version of the paper presented at the 1991 Tokyo Linguistics Forum (Murasugi, 1991b). Part of the material in this paper is based on joint research with Mamoru Saito at the University of Connecticut (Murasugi and Saito, 1991). I am indebted to him, and to Yasuaki Abe, Mona Anderson, Kazuko I. Harada, James Huang, Howard Lasnik, Diane Lillo–Martin, and Timothy Stowell for valuable comments and suggestions. This research was supported in part by the *Tokubetsu kenkyuu joseihi*, funded by Fubokai at Kinjo Gakuin University, which is hereby gratefully acknowledged.

NOTES

- 1) See Saito (1985) for a detailed discussion of this hypothesis.
- 2) Locative phrases can appear as bare NP in limited contexts.
For example:
(i) [[e_i soko (ni) ikitai] hito_i] wa...
there to want-to go person top
(Those who want to go there...)
I will not discuss this fact, since it does not affect the analysis here.
- 3) See also Miyamoto (1991) and Yang (1991) for independent arguments for PP pro.
- 4) See Murasugi (1991b) for more detailed arguments for this hypothesis.
- 5) See also Sakai (1990) for the IP hypothesis of Japanese relative clauses.
- 6) If one adopts the ECP as formulated in Lasnik and Saito (1991), then this account must be slightly modified. According to them, an antecedent governor must be contained within the maximal projection immediately dominating the minimal barrier for the trace. Thus, the intermediate trace in (22) is local enough to antecedent govern the initial trace. But as noted above, Lasnik and Saito (1991) propose that only X–zero categories can be the antecedent governors. So, the potential governor in (22) is not the intermediate trace, but the head D. If the Head D does not receive the index *i* through SPEC/Head agreement, as seems plausible, then antecedent government fails. Alternatively, it is possible that a PP cannot move to DP SPEC. There is independent evidence that NP movement is possible only from an argument position. As shown in (i), a measure phrase cannot be passivised.
(i) *three pounds are weighed by this book
See Cinque (1990) for relevant discussion.

- 7) See also Kameshima (1990) and Ishii (1991) for a similar proposal on Japanese relativization and much relevant discussion.

REFERENCES

- Chomsky, N. (1977) "WH–Movement," in P. Culicover, T. Wasow and A. Akmajian, eds., *Formal Syntax*, Academic New York.
- Cinque, G. (1990) *Types of A'–Dependencies*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Huang, C. –T. J. (1982) *Logical Relations in Chinese and the Theory of Grammar*. Ph. D. Dissertation, MIT.
- Ishii, Y. (1991) *Operators and Empty Categories in Japanese*, Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Connecticut.
- Jackendoff, R. (1977) *X' Syntax: A Study of Phrase Structure*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Kameshima, N. (1990) "On 'Aboutness Conditions'," In H. Hoji, ed., *Japanese/Korean Linguistics*, SLA, Stanford.
- Kuno, S. (1973) *The Structure of Japanese*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Lasnik, H. and M. Saito (1991) *Move–alpha: Conditions on its Application and Output*, ms. University of Connecticut.
- Miyamoto, Y. (1991) "Distributivity: A Comparative Study of English and Japanese," ms. University of Connecticut.
- Muraki, M. (1974) *Presupposition and Thematization*, Kaitakusha, Tokyo.
- Murasugi, K. (1991a) *Noun Phrases in Japanese and English: A Study in Syntax, Learnability and Acquisition*. Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Connecticut.
- Murasugi, K. (1991b) "Empty Postpositional Phrases," 1991 Tokyo Linguistics Forum.
- Murasugi, K. and M. Saito (1991) "Locative and Temporal WH–phrases," Theoretical East Asian Linguistics Workshop. University of California, Irvine.
- Perlmutter, D. (1972). "Evidence for Shadow Pronouns in French Relativization," in P. M. Paranteau, et al. eds., *The Chicago Which Hunt*, CLS, Chicago.
- Saito, M. (1985) *Some Asymmetries in Japanese and their Theoretical Implications*, Ph. D. Dissertation, MIT.
- Sakai, H. (1990) "Complex NP Constraint and Case–Conversion in Japanese," ms. University of California, Irvine.
- Stowell, T. (1981) *Origins of Phrase Structure*, Ph. D. Dissertation, MIT.

- Stowell, T. (1989) "Subjects, Specifiers, and X-Bar theory," in M. M. Baltin and A. Kroch, eds., *Alternative Conceptions of Phrase Structure*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Yang, S. -Y. (1991) "*Dative Alternation*" in *Chinese and English*, Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Connecticut.