

## The ban on rightward P-stranding is a global constraint

*Alex Drummond, University of Maryland*

English does not permit Heavy DP Shift (HDPS) of the complement of a preposition:

- (1) \* I talked to  $t_1$  yesterday [someone I'd met before]<sub>1</sub>.

This snippet will present evidence that this constraint cannot be stated in a “Markovian” fashion. Instead, it must be stated as a “global” constraint along the following lines:

- (2) Heavy DP Shift may not apply to a DP which has been — *at any stage in the derivation* — the complement of a preposition.

Evidence for (2) comes from ECM subjects, which marginally undergo HDPS:

- (3) ? I expect  $t_1$  to do well [every boy who enters the competition]<sub>1</sub>.

The complement of P can be promoted to ECM subject position via pseudopassivization:

- (4) I believe [every prisoner who tried to escape]<sub>1</sub> to have been shot at  $t_1$ .

Surprisingly, however, such derived ECM subjects cannot subsequently undergo HDPS — (5). In this respect they contrast with the derived ECM subjects of ordinary passives — (6):

- (5) a. \* I believe  $t_1'$  to have been shot **at**  $t_1$  [every prisoner who tried to escape]<sub>1</sub>.  
 b. \* I'll have  $t_1'$  shot **at**  $t_1$  on sight [any prisoner who tries to escape]<sub>1</sub>.
- (6) a. ? I believe  $t_1'$  to have been shot  $t_1$  [every prisoner who tried to escape]<sub>1</sub>.  
 b. ? I'll have  $t_1'$  shot  $t_1$  on sight [any prisoner who tries to escape]<sub>1</sub>.

This cannot be because A-movement in general fails to feed HDPS, as (7)-(8) demonstrate:

- (7) \* I gave  $t_1$  free books [every student in the class]<sub>1</sub>.
- (8) ? I believe  $t_1'$  to have been given  $t_1$  free books [every student in the class]<sub>1</sub>.

Here we see that although the first object in the English double object construction cannot undergo HDPS, promotion to ECM subject position renders subsequent HDPS as acceptable in (8) as it is in (3). Thus, it is only the ban on rightward P-stranding which cannot be obviated via A-movement. Consequently, (1) cannot be unified with (7) (as proposed e.g. by Kayne (1984, 200), who argues that the first object in (7) is the complement of a null P).

As a final speculation, I suggest that (2) may — given somewhat tendentious assumptions regarding phasehood — follow from Drummond, Hornstein & Lasnik's (2010) analysis of (1). DH&L propose that PP is a strong phase in English. This implies that any phrase extracted from PP must pass through [Spec,PP]. Thus, the shifted DPs in (5) must have moved to the ECM subject position via [Spec,PP]. DH&L note that if specifiers are always on the left, then the linearization algorithm of Fox & Pesetsky (2004) predicts that no phrase which has passed through [Spec,PP] should be able to undergo subsequent rightward movement. In contrast, if passive vP is a weak phase (Chomsky 2001, cf. Chomsky 2008), then both passivization and HNPS are plausibly taken to occur within the same strong phase in (6) (matrix vP). If so, there is no linearization conflict.

**References**

- Chomsky, N. 2001. "Derivation by Phase." In *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, M.J. Kenstowicz (ed.), MIT Press, 1-52.
- Chomsky, N. 2008. "On Phases." In *Foundational Essays in Linguistic Theory: Essays in Honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*, R. Frieden, C. Otero & M.L. Zubizarreta (eds.), MIT Press, 133-166.
- Drummond, A, N. Hornstein & H. Lasnik. 2010. "A Puzzle About P-Stranding and a Possible Solution." *Linguistic Inquiry* 41:689-692.
- Fox, D. & D. Pesetsky. 2004. "Cyclic Linearization of Syntactic Structure." *Theoretical Linguistics* 31:1-46.
- Kayne, R. 1984. "Datives in French and English." In *Connectedness and Binary Branching*. Foris: Dordrecht, 193-202.