

syntactic underlying structure in anything other than a completely ad hoc way?

ON THE CYCLICITY OF
EXTRAPPOSITION-FROM-THE
CLAIM

Brian Joseph,
Harvard University

Much attention has recently been paid to the question of the cyclicity of Extraposition rules (cf. Jacobson and Neubauer (1974; 1976), Baltin (1975), Hankamer (forthcoming)), with the main focus being sentential Extraposition from subject NPs. Jacobson and Neubauer (1974), though, argue for the cyclicity of other Extraposition rules, such as Extraposition of PP, Extraposition from NP (of relative clauses), and what they called Extraposition-from-the claim. This squib will provide a further argument for the cyclicity of this last rule, namely Extraposition of the sentential complement of complex NPs whose head noun is a definite NP such as *the claim*, *the rumor*, etc., which is exemplified in (1):

- (1) a. The claim was made by Columbus that the earth was round.
- b. The suggestion was advanced that we meet here next week.

No claims will be made concerning the other Extraposition processes, since the data to be given here do not provide any clues regarding their nature.

The observation that is crucial to this argument is that Extraposition-from-the claim is generally impossible (or produces distinctly odd sentences) when the complex NP is a direct object. This constraint is apparent from a number of different situations.

First, it holds when the complex NP is an underived direct object in a simplex sentence. This is shown by sentences (2) through (5), whose (a) versions are acceptable, demonstrating that the sources of these sentences are well-formed; whereas the (b) versions, in which the sentential element has been extraposed, are all unacceptable to some discernible degree:¹

- (2) a. I believe the claim that she is innocent with all my heart.
- b. ??I believe the claim with all my heart that she is innocent.
- (3) a. John propounded the theory that the earth is flat in all seriousness.

¹These judgments are fairly delicate, but I believe they are essentially correct. They represent the consensus of 8 out of 10 speakers with whom I checked these sentences. Given the delicateness of the judgments, it is a very striking fact that such a high degree of agreement was reached.

- b. ??John propounded the theory in all seriousness that the earth is flat.
- (4) a. He denied the rumor that a mad dog was on the loose most adamantly.
- b. ??He denied the rumor most adamantly that a mad dog was on the loose.
- (5) a. Bill squelched the rumor that he wears pink socks very quickly.
- b. ??Bill squelched the rumor very quickly that he wears pink socks.

Second, when the complex NP is a derived object within a simplex sentence, due to the application of the rule of Dative Movement, again the sentential element cannot be extraposed:

- (6) a. John gave almost no support to Mary's claim that she had won.
- b. John gave Mary's claim that she had won almost no support.
- c. *John gave Mary's claim almost no support that she had won.

It is of course possible that there is some other explanation for (6c), but its unacceptability is certainly consistent with the constraint evident from (2) through (5). The fact that there may be other processes at work in (6c) might explain why this sentence is so much more unacceptable than the (b) sentences of (2) through (5).

Third, when the complex NP is an underlying object of a verb that governs both an NP object and a sentential complement (i.e. an Equi-from-Object-NP structure, as with the verb *persuade*), Extraposition from that NP is impossible. The verb *make* appears to be such a verb, since it does not allow fake NPs as its object underlyingly:^{2,3}

² There is one fact about *make* that suggests that this may not be the correct structure for the verb, namely its ability to take Weather-*it* as an object:

(i) Zeus made it rain on us mortals.

However, in view of the facts in (7), I choose to regard (i) as being revealing about Weather-*it* and not about *make*.

³ Note also that the *it* of Extraposition found frequently with *make*, as in (i).

(i) Bill made it clear that he wouldn't eat the pie.

is probably due to the application of the noncyclic rule of Extraposition-from-Object NPs, which creates islands (cf. **What do you regret it very much that Bill said ϕ ?*) and does so with *make* also:

(ii) **What did Bill make it clear that he wouldn't eat ϕ ?*

Since sentence (10) is unacceptable while (i) is grammatical, we may also conclude that Extraposition-from-the *claim* and Extraposition-from-Object NPs cannot be the same process (as someone who would try to collapse all Extraposition rules into a single one might claim), a fact that is consistent with the former being cyclic and the latter noncyclic.

- (7) a. *John made there be a riot at the ballpark last night.
- b. *Max made the cat be out of the bag.
- c. *The CIA made tabs be kept on all potential informers.

However, in order to show conclusively that the proposed restriction holds for the underlying object of *make* also, it is necessary that the embedded predicate be one that allows Extraposition-from-the *claim* over it, for otherwise the restriction could be stated in terms of the material over which the Extraposition takes place. *Come up* is such a predicate, as (8) shows:

- (8) The proposal came up that we meet again next week.

Furthermore, it can be embedded under *make*:

- (9) John made his proposal come up at the meeting last night.

But, when a complex NP of the type under discussion here is the underlying object of *make*, Extraposition-from-the *claim* is impossible:⁴

- (10) *John made his proposal come up that we meet again soon.

Thus, from the evidence of the above paragraphs, we see that there is a general restriction against extraposing the sentential complement to NPs such as the *claim*, when that NP is a direct object. It is worth noting that such extraposition is possible from an NP that is a subject:

- (11) The claim has been advanced that the Phoenecians discovered America.
- (12) The proposition was first set forth by Jefferson that all men are created equal.

Given, then, that there is this restriction, it is interesting to note that in sentences in which the complex NP has become a direct object through the operation of Subject-to-Object-Raising, Extraposition-from-the *claim* is possible:

- (13) I believe the suggestion to have been advanced that we meet again in the near future.

⁴ Consider the nearly synonymous verb *let*, which is probably a Subject-to-Object-Raising verb because it allows fake NPs as objects:

- (i) Bill let there be some competition for the prize.
- (ii) The President let tabs be kept on all potential informers without the approval of Congress.

Let contrasts with *make* on the point of allowing Extraposition-from-the *claim* in the relevant configuration, suggesting that the problem with (10) cannot be a semantic one:

- (iii) John let the proposal come up that we meet again soon.

- (14) I expected the proposition to be set forth that men are the superior sex.
 (15) John expected the proposal to come up that we table the discussion for now.

These sentences provide the argument for the cyclicity of Extraposition-from-the *claim*. If the rule is cyclic, then the acceptability of these sentences follows automatically, because the rule will apply on the lower cycle, when the complex NP is still subject, and Extraposition is permitted. If, however, the rule were not cyclic, then the observed constraint on extraposing when the NP is an object would have to be discarded, (or else be given global power) so that it would not apply just in case the object NP had been a subject at an earlier stage in the derivation. However, this amounts to a global encoding of behavior that is clearly cyclic in that it refers to a stage at which the NP was in a configuration defined on an S-node. Thus, if the rule were not cyclic, either approach would lead to complications in the grammar, complications not entailed by the cyclic hypothesis.

Therefore, the evidence of sentences such as (13) through (15) shows that Extraposition-from-the *claim* is cyclic. One objection that might be raised at this point, though, is that if the rule is cyclic, then later rules should be able to apply to its output, for example, *It*-Clefting. However, this is not the case:

- (16) a. It is the suggestion that we meet again next week that I believe to have been advanced.
 b. *It is the suggestion that I believe to have been advanced that we meet again next week.

Facts such as these at first appear to run counter to the cyclic hypothesis. However, there is an explanation for this phenomenon. Extraposition generally places new, nonpresupposed information at the end of the sentence, whereas what is left over after *It*-Clefting is generally old, presupposed information. Thus the two rules are mutually exclusive in terms of their function, and we should therefore not expect *It*-Clefting to apply to a sentence that has undergone Extraposition-from-the *claim*. Furthermore, we claim that any rule that has the function of placing one constituent in a focus position will not be able to move the head NP after Extraposition-from-the *claim*; Topicalization is such a rule, and our prediction is correct:

- (17) *The suggestion, I believe to have been advanced that we meet again next week.

We can therefore conclude that Extraposition-from-the *claim* is a cyclic rule, and that the position of Jacobson and Neu-

bauer (1974) regarding this rule finds support in other facts from English.

References

- Baltin, M. (1975) "On the Cyclicity of Extraposition," *Linguistic Inquiry* 6, 465-468.
- Hankamer, J. (forthcoming) "The Cyclicity of Extraposition," (presented in class lectures, Harvard University, 1974-1976).
- Jacobson, P. and P. Neubauer (1974) "Extraposition Rules and the Cycle," *Berkeley Studies in Syntax and Semantics*, Vol. 1.
- Jacobson, P. and P. Neubauer (1976) "Rule Cyclicity: Evidence from the Intervention Constraint," *Linguistic Inquiry* 7, 429-461.

ON THE PASSIVE OF SENSORY VERB COMPLEMENT SENTENCES Robert S. Kirsner, UCLA

1. Sentences (1b) and (2b) below are typically analyzed as passives of sensory verb complement sentences of the form (1a) and (2a); cf. Palmer (1966, 168) and Bolinger (1968, 125, fn. 7):

- (1) a. Sam saw John cross the street.
b. John was seen (by Sam) to cross the street.
- (2) a. We heard the President utter an expletive.
b. The President was heard to utter an expletive.

Nevertheless, little attention has been given to the fact that such passives are far less synonymous with their corresponding actives than are, for example, passives such as (3b) and (4b) below, containing causative verbs:

- (3) a. Tom forced Sue to cross the street.
b. Sue was forced (by Tom) to cross the street.
- (4) a. Mother made Billy do the dishes.
b. Billy was made to do the dishes.

The purpose of this note is threefold: first, to explicitly characterize the contrast between active and passive sensory verb complement sentences; second, to draw attention to the problem it raises for our understanding of the passive form; and third, to outline a possible solution.

2. Passives of sensory verb complement sentences differ from their formally corresponding actives in suggesting (i) that the perception process is accidental, and (ii) that the event perceived was not intended by its agent to be witnessed. The contrast is best seen in pairs such as (5) through (8), whose lexical content does not by itself favor interpretations of