

A-movement Locality in Applicative Constructions

In this paper, I show that both locality condition and anti-locality condition constrain A-movement. Languages can be classified into symmetric passive languages (e.g. Norwegian, Swedish, Chaga) and asymmetric passive languages (e.g. American English, Japanese, Icelandic) in terms of the restriction on A-movement as to which internal argument raises to the subject position in the passivization of ditransitive constructions. The recent literature on ditransitive passives suggests that locality condition constrains A-movement of internal arguments to the subject position (McGinnis 1998, Anagnostopoulou 2003). In such an approach, the contrast between the theme-passivization (1b) and the goal-passivization (1c) in asymmetric passive languages follows from the assumptions that the goal argument c-commands the theme argument and that the higher intervening dative goal NP blocks the movement of the lower theme NP over it in (1b), the schematic form of which is illustrated in (3b). In Norwegian, a symmetric passive language, theme-passivization (2b) is also possible, which suggests that the intervention effect of a goal NP can be relaxed. This circumvention of the intervention effect has been attributed to an ‘escape hatch’ strategy in the case of symmetric passive languages.

McGinnis (2002) proposed an analysis based on Pylkkänen (2002) s’ theory of applicatives and Chomsky (2000, 2001a, 2001b) s’ phase-theory. In McGinnis (2002) s’ approach, ditransitives in symmetric passive languages are a high applicative structure (4a), and those in asymmetric passive languages are a low applicative structure (4b). A phase-EPP, which requires a specifier, can be added to a high applicative head in the passive since a high applicative is assumed to be a phase head, just like C and ν heads, thus allowing an escape hatch. Asymmetric passive languages have low applicatives and a low applicative head lacks a phase-EPP feature, thus the raising of the lower argument is blocked due to the lack of an escape hatch. In McGinnis (2002), the phasal/non-phasal split is linked to a high/low applicative distinction in this way.

In this paper, I agree with McGinnis (2002) in that the distinction between high applicatives and low applicatives, based on lexical semantics and argument structure, underlies a difference in pattern for A-movement to the subject position, but I criticize McGinnis (2002) s’ reliance on the theory of phases and linking of phasal/ non-phasal split to a high/low applicative as a stipulation. Even though she argues that high applicative heads show different properties from low applicatives it is stipulative to assume that these structural differences correspond to differences in phasehood. In other words, we can dispense with the idea that a high applicative head is a phase head, while a low applicative head is not, and that the (non)phasehood is responsible for the asymmetries in passivizing A-movement. It is crucially necessary to stipulate an additional specifier position in the domain of a high applicative phrase in any approach but we need not necessarily count on the phasehood of a high applicative head for this purpose. I show that the unavailability of a theme-passivization in low applicative structures also does not have to count on the assumption that it is a non-phase head, since even if it were a phase head with optional phase EPP-feature, such a feature cannot be checked by its own complement, i.e. both a goal IO and a theme DO are in the same low applicative phrase, and raising a complement to its own (outer) specifier is not a valid syntactic operation, which is an ‘anti-locality’ effect (5) (Grohman 2003). I present arguments against a possible objection to the idea of ‘anti-locality’ effect, based on discussions involving wh-theme-movement in ditransitives and asymmetries in raising A-movement in experiencer applicative constructions in Italian and Icelandic. To sum up the gist of the proposal, a symmetric passive language has a high applicative structure and an escape hatch in the specifier position of a high applicative phrase makes the apparent non-local derivation possible. In an asymmetric passive language, which has a low applicative structure, the movement of a theme over a goal is prohibited by locality condition and the movement via specifier of a low applicative head is also blocked by anti-locality, blocking even the escape hatch strategy.

In this paper, I show that there is a way of deriving typological variations of passivization pattern without resorting to the theory of phases but by assuming anti-locality condition, which seems to have an independent motivation for its presence in UG. Both locality and anti-locality are at work in A-movement. In other words, movement must be local but not too local. I also present how we can formalize the locality and anti-locality conditions.

(1) American English Ditransitive Passives (Asymmetric passive language)

- a. John passed Mary the magazine. [active]
- b. ?* The magazine was passed Mary. [theme-passivization]
- c. Mary was passed the magazine. [goal-passivization]

(2) Norwegian Ditransitive Passives (Symmetric passive language)

- a. Jon ble gitt en bok. [goal-passivization]
John was given a book
Jóhn was given a book. '
- b. En bok ble gitt Jon. [theme-passivization]
A book was given John
?* A'book was given John '

(3) a. [DP₁ ... [t₁ ... DP₂]] (goal-passivization (1c))

- b. * [DP₂ ... [DP₁ ... t₂]] (theme-passivization (1b))
?

(4) a. High applicative

[AppHP IO_{goal} ApplH [VP V DO_{theme}]]

b. Low applicative

[VP V [AppLP IO_{goal} [AppL DO_{theme}]]]

(5) Anti-locality constraint

* [X_P YP [X t_{YP}]]

References

- Anagnostopoulou, Elena (2003) *The Syntax of Ditransitives*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin/New York.
- Chomsky, Noam (2000) Minimalist Inquiries: the Framework, in R. Martin, D. Michaels, and J. Uriagereka (eds.), *Step by Step*, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam (2001a) Derivation by Phase, in M. Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: a Life in Language*, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam (2001b) Beyond Explanatory Adequacy, Ms. MIT.
- Grohmann, Kleanthes K. (2003) Symmetries in Locality, in Claudia Maienborn, (ed.), *(A)symmetrien — (A)symmetries*. Tübingen: Stauffenberg.
- McGinnis, Martha (1998) *Locality in A-movement*, PhD dissertation, MIT.
- McGinnis, Martha (2002) Object Asymmetries in a Phase Theory of Syntax, in John T. Jensen and Gerard van Herk (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2001 CLA Annual Conference*, Cahiers Linguistiques d'Ottawa, pp. 133-144.
- Pylkkänen, Liina (2002) *Introducing Arguments*, PhD Dissertation, MIT.