1 Some Data

1.1 Clitic Climbing

clitics restricted to their own clause...

(1) a. Luis insistió en comer *las
   ‘Luis insisted on eating them’
   b. * Luis *las insistió en comer ;

...except for some “trigger” verbs

(2) a. Luis quiere comer *las
   b. Luis *las quiere comer
   ‘Luis wants to eat them’

Also with some object-control verbs (and causatives)

(3) a. Juan le permitió arreglar *la (a Pedro)
   Juan allowed Pedro to repair it
   b. Juan se *la permitió arreglar (a Pedro)

1.2 German Long Distance Scrambling

(4) a. ...daß niemand [PRO den Kühlschrank zu reparieren] versprochen hat
   ...that no-oneNOM the refrigeratorACC to repair promised has
   ...that no-one has promised to repair the refrigerator
   b. ...daß [den Kühlschrank], niemand [PRO ti zu reparieren] versprochen hat
   ...that [the refrigerator]ACC no-oneNOM to repair promised has
   ...that no-one has promised to repair the refrigerator

1.3 Range of the “trigger” verbs

1. “restructuring” verbs - core of modals, aspectuals, motion (as above), after that it gets iffy.
   seems to be larger for German, with more subject-control verbs.

2. object-control verbs - seems similar in Spanish and German (all object-control verbs?)

3. causatives

1.4 Unbounded(?)

(5) a. Juan *la quiere poder comprar (S)
   Juan it wants to be able to buy
   ‘Juan wants to be able to buy it’
(6) ...daß den Kühlschrank, niemand [PRO [PRO [PRO ti zu reparieren] zu
   ...that the refrigeratorACC no-oneNOM to repair to
   versuchen] zu versprechen] bereit ist
   try to promise is ready
...that no-one is ready to promise to try to repair the refrigerator
that ACC4i NOM1 [ PRO [ PRO [ PRO t, V4 ] V3 ] V2 ] V1 1

Harder to find examples of reduced constructions in Romance involving more than three verbs.
Easier in German. Perhaps because the range of trigger verbs is larger.

1.5 Other stuff
Other aspects of restructuring not discussed here - long reflexive passive, long tough movement. In some ways even worse for TAG.

2 TAG and Restructuring
Some common approaches:

- Argument Composition/Clause Union - put clauses, say they’re one, and continue (relational grammar, HPSG)
- Defective Complements - long history going back to Strozer ’77. Trigger verbs take smaller complements, and this allows wiggle room. Moore ’91 for Spanish, Wurmbrand ’98 for German, etc.
- Movement to create extended domain - trigger verbs take CP complement, but tense node of lower clause moves to the higher clause, allows wiggle room with shortest-move
- All three approaches have in common combining two clauses, and then permit movement of a type not ordinarily permitted across the two clauses
- Can’t do this in TAG - combine two elementary trees, and then move something. Elementary tree for Mary quiere, another for ver lo, combine them, and then put lo higher up.
- Could just say that the trees are bigger, and clitics are built in. Actually Cinque says this, I think. Doesn’t get rid of problem for German. Could make trees bigger as well, since there must be some limit, but the whole point of TAG is that recursion is separated. Might as well say that raising verbs are built in and so on and be done with it.

2.1 Bleam ’94
TAG version of defective complement analysis: (grossly simplified version leaving out many interesting things)
with no clitic climbing:

(7)

1The bold-face line below the translation is meant to illustrate the basic scheme of the movement of the NPs in the sentence. For example, ACC4 is the accusative verb from the fourth verb’s clause.
2.1.1 Problem

What if the trigger verb is a raising verb?

(13) a. Luis suele comerlas
b. Luis las suele comer
   Luis them tends to eat
   ‘Luis tends to eat them’

- kind of want something like

(14) (a)  
   Luis I’ suele comer
   I I’ V VP
   suele_i V t_i

(15)  
   IP
   Luis I’
   I I’ V VP
   IP
   las_j suele_i V t_i
   V t_j
   comer
Similarly, can do extraction out of a clause with a clitic climbing

(16) a. Juan quiere mostrar telos
    Juan wants to show them to you
b. Juan telos quiere mostrar

(17) a. Que quiere mostrar te Juan
    What wants to-show-to-you Juan
    What did Juan want to show to you?
b. Que te quiere mostrar Juan

(18) a. A quien quiere mostrar los Juan
    To-whom want to-show-them Juan
    To whom did Juan wants to show them?
b. A quien los quiere mostrar Juan

2.2 Rambow '94

Rambow developed an approach in which a clause is represented as a multi-component tree set, and the scrambled elements can “float” up to the higher clauses. However, he argued that the type of locality enforced by tree-local or set-local must be abandoned, for essentially the same reason as just discussed. In this context it is simultaneous long distance topicalization and long-distance scrambling

(19) [Dieses Buch]i hat [den Kindern]j bisher noch niemand [ PRO tj ti zu geben]
    [this book]ACC has [the children]DAT so far yet no-one NOM to give
    versucht
    tried
    So far, no-one has tried to give this book to the children

(20)

(21) (a) CP
    Dieses Buch (this book)
    C'  C VP
    hat
    C*' VP
    NP nieman no-one
    versucht
    (b) VP
    VP*
    NP den Kindern (the children)
    PRO zu geben (to give)
It is interesting to note that although Owen does not discuss the difference between trigger and non-trigger verbs, or the “defective complement” analysis, he does seem to be making implicit use of such an analysis and corresponding distinction between trigger and non-trigger verbs. He places the integrity constraint on all CP nodes. This prevents a scrambled NP from moving past the CP node. At the same time, if trigger verbs take IP complements, then there is nothing that prevents NPs from scrambling out of such complements, since there is no CP node with an integrity constraint.
3 Similarities

- Q: What does a “defective complement” mean in TAG, when the defective complement projects to include a subject or WH word?

- A: It means the verb taking a defective complement has a tree with a recursive part that adjoins in lower than it might otherwise. All interclausal movement in TAG is the same, having a recursive part that adjoins in at different points and stuff left over on top to somehow unify with stuff on the tree the recursive part adjoins into.

\[(23)\] (a) CP

\[(24)\] CP

Constraint. But then there would be nothing to prevent movement out of the nonfinite complement of a non-trigger verb either, if such a complement was only an IP. However, if such complements are CP instead of IP, then movement out of them would be blocked as well. It therefore seems implicit in Owen’s analysis that the complements of non-trigger verbs are CP clauses (and so with an integrity constraint) while those of trigger verbs are IP clauses (and so without an integrity constraint).
4 Locality Constraints on Raising, Clitic Movement, Scrambling

4.1 Raising

(30) * John seems it is certain to like pizza

- Can’t do it with 31b), because it’s bogus

(31) (a) IP (b) I’

- Cat’d do it by putting (a) and (b) together firt

(32) (a) IP (b) I’

(33)
Basically, TAG mechanism rules out an IP between an I’ being stretched apart

4.2 Clitic movement

Should be the same for constraints on clitic movement

(34) Juan la quiere poder comprar
    Juan it wants to be able to buy
    ‘Juan wants to be able to buy it’

(35) a. Juan cree que Luis la quiere comprar
    Juan believes that Luis wants to buy it
    b. * Juan la cree que Luis quiere comprar

basically the same story, except for fuzziness over how stuff gets put together at top. But main point is that C’ cannot be in a recursive part stretching apart la from quiere