

JANE IS TOUGH TO BUY THE SAME KIND OF RING
THAT WAS BOUGHT CATHERINE

Kenji KANNO

0. (1) can never be acceptable, since neither (2) nor (3) is acceptable.

(1)***Jane is tough to buy the same kind of ring that
was bought Catherine.

(2)**Jane is tough to buy the ring.

(3)*The ring was bought Catherine.

The aim of this paper is to consider the unacceptability of (2) and (3) in Sections 2 and 3, respectively.

1. There are three constraints on object fronting in English double-object constructions.

(4)The Semantic Constraint:

The Thematic Hierarchy Condition on Dative Movement (i.e. 1.GOAL, 2.BENEFACTIVE) is also true of Tough-movement and Passivization.

(5)The Syntactic Constraint:

Indirect Object must be phonetically-realized in the context [_{VP} V ___ NP], where the NP (i.e. Direct Object) may be a trace.

(6)The Functional Constraint:

Direct Objects in double-object constructions are difficult to make subjects, and are impossible to make topics.

These three constraints can predict the acceptability and unacceptability of object fronting in double-object constructions satisfactorily, except for (2) and (3).

2. Since Jane is the indirect object of buy in (2), (5) predicts that (2) is unacceptable, which is not wrong. The extreme unacceptability of (2) is explained by the following contrast.

(7) Indirect Object of buy

*The girl for John to buy the ring ran away.

(8) Indirect Object of buy and Subject of be

a.**The girl for John to buy the ring was bought the necklace by Harry.

b.**The girl is tough for John to buy the ring.

(2) and (8b) are extremely unacceptable (i.e. less acceptable than (7)) because the indirect object fronted by Tough-movement must be the subject of be as well as the indirect object of buy as in (8a).

3. (3) is never acceptable in any dialects, even in (9).

(9)a. The girl was given the book by the boy.

b. The book was given the girl by the boy.

c. The girl was bought the book by the boy.

d.*The book was bought the girl by the boy.

(4) predicts that (9c) and (9d) are less acceptable than (9a) and (9b), and (6) predicts that (9b) and (9d) are less acceptable than (9a) and (9c). The fact is, however, that not only (9a) but also (9b) and (9c) are perfectly acceptable in (9). Hence, the metarule (10) is necessary.

(10) The Metarule:

In certain cases, if there are two heterogeneous principles (two rules or a principle and a rule), only the sentence that violates both of them is unacceptable.

If (10) as well as (4) and (6) is assumed, (9d) is unacceptable because it violates both of (4) and (6) whereas the others in (9) are acceptable because they meet at least either of (4) and (6).