CLAUSAL PIED PIPING: A PROBLEM FOR GB*

0. INTRODUCTION

In principle, as a consequence of the very generalized statement of movement rules allowed by the Government Binding (henceforth GB) framework, any constituent may undergo syntactic movement. Much current research has hence been devoted to eliminating illicit representations that result from such freedom of movement. In the case of relativization, Wh-movement and pied piping have been widely discussed. But given the generalized rule of Move α, it is clear that constituents other than simple PPs and NPs, in particular Ss, may also be pied piped in the syntax. It is this phenomenon of clausal pied piping which is the focus of this paper. It will be claimed below that while a subset of the data seems to exhibit standard violations of the Empty Category Principle, (ECP), and hence to be correctly ruled out by mechanisms that are already available, another subset of the data appears to escape explanation by the GB framework. Instead of presenting a solution to this problem, however, in the following paragraphs I will clarify the nature of the problem and claim that no unified solution can be found at present. Although accounting for the totality of the data discussed here is a difficulty for any theoretical framework, I will consider it only from a GB perspective. I will also limit the discussion largely to pied piping in relative clauses.

In the first section below, then, I begin by introducing the clausal pied piping construction. Apart from the work of Nanni and Stillings (1978), data of this type have not received much attention in the literature. Grammatical examples of clausal pied piping are of the type shown in (1), while ungrammatical examples are represented in (2a, b).

(1) the parties, to be invited to one of which was a privilege
(2)a. *the men, for whom to be invited to the parties was a privilege
   b. *the parties, for the men to be invited to one of which was a privilege

In order to support my claim that a subset of the data (specifically, of type (2a)) shows ECP effects, it is necessary to propose a means of deriving the Logical Form (LF) representations of clausal pied piping constructions since I will assume, with Chomsky (1981a), that the ECP applies at LF.
Since relatively little research has been done concerning the LF derivation of even simple pied piping constructions, a plausible approach is presented in section 2. The LF representations that result from the proposal of section 2 are then examined closely in section 3. There it is shown that the distinction between data of type (1) and (2a) can be accounted for by the ECP applied to the LF representations derived in section 2. It is then shown that the ECP cannot exclude ungrammatical examples of type (2b). The problem of accounting for this recalcitrant data is isolated and highlighted in section 4. Section 5 of this paper offers a brief discussion of several conceivable solutions to the problem posed by clausal pied piping data. It is concluded that none of the proposals considered is satisfactory and that the paradigm represented by (1)–(2) escapes a unified account.

1. CLAUSAL PIED PIPING

First introduced by Ross (1967), the term PIED PIPING refers to the situation in which lexical material in addition to just the target Wh-word (question word or relative pronoun) is moved via Wh-fronting. Examples of what I will refer to as simple pied piping are shown in (3) below.¹

(3) [To whom] shall we send this book?  
    [In which room] is the grand piano?  
    the man [with whom] you were talking  
    the pillow [under which] she hid her diary

There is another type of pied piping, which I have called CLAUSAL PIED PIPING. As its name implies, this type of pied piping involves the fronting of a clausal constituent that contains the target Wh-word. The example in (4) is taken from the work of Nanni and Stillings (1978).

(4) The elegant parties, [to be admitted to one of which] was a privilege, had usually been held at Delmonico’s.

The above example illustrates, obviously, the pied piping of an infinitival clause. In the following discussion, we will be concerned additionally with the pied piping of tensed clauses, absolute and participial clauses, and gerundive constituents, as shown in (5)–(7) below.²

¹ In this paper, I consider primarily cases of relativization and not question formation, as I have already pointed out.
² See McCawley (1983) and Ishihara (1982) for argumentation that absolute constructions are syntactically clausal. I collapse absolute phrases with participles here for ease of exposition. As for including gerundive constructions in this discussion, I cite the parallels drawn by Chomsky (1970) between gerundives and clausal constructions.