1.1. This paper is intended to serve two purposes: the first is to solve a problem posed by the pattern of extractions from NP in Romance, the problem being that the possibility of applying Wh-Movement (Wh-M henceforth) to the constituents of an NP seems to be governed by the Specified Subject Constraint (SSC). The problem has been raised by Cinque 1979 for Italian and shown by Zubizarreta 1979 to extend to French.

The second purpose is to raise a problem: which is that subjacency, as defined for example by Chomsky 1977, is not sufficient in predicting whether a language will or will not allow Wh-M to apply inside NP's.

The solution I propose for the first problem is that, in French and Italian, the possibility of applying Wh-M to the constituent of an NP depends on the possibility of extracting that constituent from the NP into the clause by a rule other than Wh-M, a rule which, unlike Wh-M, is subject to SSC. Thus no need arises to specify which wh-traces are subject to opacity and which ones are not: under the analysis proposed in this paper no wh-trace is subject to opacity.

But our solution raises a problem as severe as the one it solves: why is it that Wh-M cannot apply, in Italian and French, directly inside NP's, without the intermediary of another rule? Both French and Italian are, by the tests devised by Rizzi 1978, languages in which S but not S is bounding: if subjacency had been both necessary and the sufficient condition governing the possibility of extraction from NP's one would expect there to be no problem in the application of Wh-M inside NP's. Therefore if we can show that in fact Wh-M cannot apply directly inside NP's we will have shown that, at least in French and Italian, it is not the sufficient condition.

But is it at least a necessary condition? More simply put: does subjacency have anything at all to do with the application of Wh-M inside NP's? None of the data discussed in this paper will speak to this question. However in the inter
of giving this discussion what I think is the right prospective I will begin by reviewing some evidence which indicates that one should abandon the idea that subadjacency governs the possibility of extraction from NP's.

1.2. Goldsmith 1979 has presented the following pattern of question formation strategies in Igbo:

(a) Questions contain a preposed question word and either:

(i) a gap in the subject or object position if it is the subject or the object that is the focus of the question; or

(ii) a resumptive pronoun in the position of the object of a preposition or in the position of an NP embedded indefinitely down in a (non-complex) NP.

(b) Questions obey CNPC and the wh-island constraint in the sense that one cannot question whether by leaving a gap or a resumptive pronoun either a constituent of a complex NP or one of a wh-clause.

For our purposes the crucial contrasts are the ones tabulated in (1) below:

(1) Acceptable questions

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{only with gap} & \quad \text{only with pro} \\
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
S \quad V_P \\
\end{array} \\
\begin{array}{c}
S \quad \underline{NP} \\
\end{array}
\end{array} & \quad \\
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
S \quad \underline{NP} \\
\end{array} \\
\begin{array}{c}
S \quad \underline{NP} \\
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{align*}
\]

Notice the contrast between a configuration like \( \frac{S}{S} \underline{NP} \underline{NP} \) and one like \( \frac{S}{S} \underline{NP} \underline{NP} \) and one like \( \frac{S}{S} \underline{NP} \underline{NP} \), a contrast which is unexpected under subadjacency regardless whether \( S \) or \( S \) or \( \underline{S} \) and \( S \) are bounding in Igbo.

Now the sensitivity to wh-islands suggests, by a Rizzi-type argument, that Igbo is an S-language. The fact that extractions out of embedded clauses are possible suggests that \( \underline{S} \) is not a bounding node in Igbo. Putting these two conclusions together we can point out that the sequence of bounding nodes
which blocks the operation of movement or interpretation in the CNPC cases is \[ \frac{[\_\_\_\_\_]}{S \ (S) \ \text{NP} \ S} \]. Exactly the same sequence of bounding nodes does allow the movement or interpretation rule to operate in the case of questioning inside non-complex NP's: \[ \frac{[\_\_\_\_\_]}{S \ (S) \ \text{NP}} \].

How can we interpret the Igbo facts? The first observation is that the CNPC effect is shown by this data to be the manifestation of a constraint that governs both the binding relation between a question word and a gap and that between a question word and a pronoun: CNPC violations are ungrammatical in Igbo regardless of whether they have a gap or a resumptive pronoun in the target position. This suggests that in languages like Arabic or Modern Persian the relation between the wh-word and the pronoun that occupies the target position is free (i.e., not subject to CNPC) not because one of the terms of the relation is a pronoun rather than a gap but instead because the relation itself is not one of syntactic binding.

The second conclusion one can derive from the Igbo facts is that the constraint on syntactic binding for the existence of which CNPC is a symptom does not rule out the binding relation between a question word and a pronoun embedded (indeinitely down) inside a non-complex NP. Therefore whatever mechanism one devises to rule out CNPC violations should not either disallow or allow binding into NP's: it should leave that possibility entirely open.

And finally we should note that there is a problem in the operation of Wh-M inside NP's in Igbo, even if the problem is not of the same type as a violation of CNPC: no gap can appear inside NP's as a result of the application of Wh-M.
2.1.1. How to relativize possessors in Romanian without pied-piping.

The purpose of this digression into the Romanian long distance rule system is to outline a strategy of relativizing constituents from NP's which, we shall claim, is essentially that used in all the three Romance languages under discussion: French, Italian, Romanian.

Romanian is introduced as the paradigmatic case of this strategy because it is the language in which the greatest number of direct arguments support our view. Once the strategy is illustrated in the transparent form that it takes in Romanian we shall turn to Italian and French to discover that it is used there too, in a slightly disguised form.

2.1.2. There are two strategies used in Romanian for relativizing constituents of an NP: the most widely used is pied-piping the highest NP or PP in which the wh-word is nested:

\[(3a). \text{ Omul } \left[ \frac{a}{\text{al căruia frate [a plecat ... ]}} \right] \]

the man whose brother has left...

b. \( \text{ Omul } \left[ \frac{\text{cu [al căruia frate] [am vorbit ... ]}}{\text{mâпу}}} \right] \)

the man with whose brother I-have talked...

c. \( \text{ Popescu} \left[ \frac{\text{entuziasmul [mătuşii căruia]} }{\text{ne surprindea pe toţi}} \right] \)

Popescu, the enthusiasm of the aunt whose us surprised all

\( \text{ părea jenat.} \)

seemed embarrassed.

( P., the enthusiasm of whose aunt was a surprise to all of us...) further

We shall not discuss this type of wh-movement here.

The second strategy, the one we are interested in, yields sentences like (4):

\[(4a). \text{ Popescu} \left[ \frac{\text{căruia credeam [a-i, cunoscusem toate mătuşile -i ]}}{\text{și}} \right] \]

\( P \) whom I-thought that-him I-had-met all the aunts

\( \text{ ini rezerva o surprizi.} \)

to-me reserved a surprise.
b. Sticlele căror-\[\text{carora}\] îi \[\text{le} \] vărsasem \[\text{vărsasem} \] \[\text{continutul} \] \[\text{în chiuveta} \ldots \] 
the bottles whom I had emptied the contents in the sink ...

Relative clauses like (4) have a number of special properties that I summarize below:

(5)a. The relative pronoun is marked dative.

b. A dative clitic corresponds in the extraction clause to the relative pronoun.

c. The relative pronoun can only be interpreted as being the possessor of the NP in the extraction clause with which it is construed (in a loose sense of possession that I shall leave undefined here).

d. Relative pronouns like the ones in (4) can be construed with an NP only if: (i) the NP is a direct object, a subject, a predicate nominative, or the object of a preposition;

(ii) the NP does not bear an overt case mark.

Before illustrating each of the properties listed in (5) let me put some order in the list: (5) a and b are properties shared by any relative clause whose target is a dative NP:

(6)a. Popescu căruia credeam \[\text{caruia}\] \[\text{credeam}\] \[\text{care}\] îi \[\text{le}\] dedicasem câteva română ...]]]
P. whom I thought that-him I had dedicated a few songs...

b. Matusile căroră mi-era teama \[\text{carora}\] \[\text{mi-era}\] teasă \[\text{le}\] pentru prea emancipată ... 
the aunts to whom I was afraid to them to appear too liberated...

(I will not discuss here the mechanism responsible for the presence of the clitics in the extraction clause; see Steriade 1980)

2.1.3. The Possessive Dative construction

(5) c and d are properties shared by a clause bound construction that I shall call the Possessive Dative (PD). We shall investigate in this section some of the most salient properties of PD with the purpose of showing that the căruia-relatives in (4) are transforms of PD sentences, more precisely, that the relativized constituent in (4) is a possessive dative which, at the time
when Wh-M operates is no longer a constituent of the NP with which it is construed. The conclusion of this section will be that the căruia-relatives in (4) are derived in two steps, as diagrammed below:

\[
\begin{align*}
(7a) \quad & S \text{ COMP} \\ & \quad [X \left[ \begin{array}{c}
N_i \\
NP_j
\end{array} \right] \text{ Y } ]
\end{align*}
\]

b. \[
\begin{align*}
&S \text{ COMP} \\ &\quad [X \left[ \begin{array}{c}
N_i \\
NP_j
\end{array} \right] \text{ Y } ]
\end{align*}
\]

by the PD rule

\[
\begin{align*}
c. \quad & S \text{ COMP} \\ &\quad [X \left[ \begin{array}{c}
N_i \\
NP_j
\end{array} \right] t_i \text{ Y } ]
\end{align*}
\]

by Wh-M

Since my immediate purpose is only to show that the apparent case of extraction from NP in (4) is in fact a case in which the target of Wh-M is not embedded in an NP, I will make no attempt to explain the extremely interesting properties of PD. This should be the subject of a separate paper.

There are three restrictions on PD, all shared by the căruia-relatives:

(8a) The rule is clause bound in the sense that the dative clitic and the possessed NP must be clause mates.

b. The possessed NP must not be overtly case marked.

c. Subject NP’s may enter the rule (i.e. be interpreted as possessed) only if they are the subjects of (a subset of) intransitive verbs.

The intransitive verbs allowing PD are exactly the same as those allowing căruia-relatives.

The condition in (8a) is illustrated below:

(9a) Nu-ți pot \[
\begin{align*}
&VP \\ &NP \end{align*}
\]
not-you\text{ dat.} I-can see the umbrella. (I can’t see your umbrella)

b. Cel căruia nu-i puteam \[
\begin{align*}
&VP \\ &NP \end{align*}
\]
the one whom\text{ dat.} not-him\text{ dat.} I-could see the umbrella...

c. *Nu-ți pot \[
\begin{align*}
&S \text{ COMP} \\ &\quad [să \text{ văd} \left[ \begin{array}{c}
N_i \\
NP_i
\end{array} \right] ]
\end{align*}
\]
not-you I-can SUBJUNCTIVE see umbrella

d. *Cel căruia nu-i puteam \[
\begin{align*}
&vp \\text{ COMP} \\ &\quad [să \text{ văd} \left[ \begin{array}{c}
N_i \\
NP_i
\end{array} \right] ]
\end{align*}
\]
the one whom I could see the umbrella

I assume without further argument that the relevant difference between (9)a,b and (9)c,d is that the complement of can is sentential in (9)c,d whereas in (9)a,b can is an auxiliary verb and see the umbrella belong to the main VP.

The (8)b restriction requires some introduction to the Romanian case marking system: what is relevant for our purposes is that indirect objects are marked dative, non-prepositional NP constituents and objects of certain prepositions are marked genitive; direct objects, if specific and either pronominal or human, are marked accusative, that is preceded by the particle pe. Neither dative nor genitive nor pe-marked nouns can undergo PD. Subjects, under the restrictions in (8)c, non-pe-marked objects, predicate nominals and, somewhat marginally, non-genitive objects of prepositions can all undergo PD. The generalization seems indeed to have to be stated in terms of presence vs. absence of an overt case mark. More arguments for this below.

(10)a. *ți (1)-am spus [nevestei] a place.

you dat -I-have told wife dat to leave

(I have told your wife to leave)

b. *ți-am găsit [papucul [vărului]]

you dat -I-have found the slipper of the cousin gen.

(I have found the slipper of your cousin)

c. *ți s-a ascuns [îndărâturul [grajdului]]

you dat -he has hidden behind the stable gen (he has hidden behind your stable)

d. *ți-am cunoscut-o [pe nevăsta]

you dat -I-have met-her ACC wife.

(I have met your wife)

(11)a. ți-a plecat [nevăsta]

you dat -has left the wife.

(Your wife has left)
b. Ti-elm cunoscut[nevasta-]_{NP} 
(same as (10)d above)
c. Mi s-a declarat[un prieten]_{NP} la toți cunoscuții. 
me_{dat} self-has declared friend to all acquaintances.
(He declared himself a friend of mine to all acquaintances.)
d. Mi s-a ascuns[în grajd-]_{NP} 
me_{dat} has hidden in the stable.

The corresponding căruia-relatives follow exactly the same pattern. The crucial contrasts suggesting the case-marking generalization are (10)c vs. (11)d and (10)d vs. (11)b. But arguing further for this falls beyond the scope of this paper: the facts which are essential for our claim about the source of căruia-relatives come only from the total parallelism between the possibility of interpreting a dative clitic or NP as possessor of an NP in the clause and the possibility of having a corresponding căruia-relative.

The last restriction on PD is that only a limited set of subject NP's can undergo it: a subset of intransitive subjects:

(12)a. Ai lipește[o pagina]_{NP} toscrisorii ăsteia]_{NP} 
it_{dat} is-missing a page letter_{dat} this_{dat}
(A page of this letter is missing)
b. Scriitorii[astărea]_{NP} Ai lipește[o pagina]_{NP} +
the letter which_{dat} it_{dat} is missing a page...
c. Îi se topeau[sandalele de căldură]_{NP} lui Popescu]_{NP}
him_{dat} were melting the sandals because of the heat P_{dat}
(P's sandals were melting ...)
d. Popescu[caruia]_{NP} îi se topeau[sandalele de căldură, insistă sa plece.]
P, who_{dat} him_{dat} were melting the sandals ..., insisted to leave.

(13) a. Soarta lui le preocupă.

fate his them preoccupies. (His fate preoccupies them)
b.*I le preocupă soarta.

him dat them preoccupies the fate

c.*Căruia i le preocupă soarta ...

the one whom dat him dat them preoccupies the fate

d. Nevășă-să te cunoaște.

wife his you knows.

e.*I te cunoaște nevasta.

him dat you knows the wife.

f.*Căruia i te cunoaște nevasta...

the one whom dat him dat you knows the wife...

(14)a. Un prieten de-al meu cânta.

a friend of mine was-singing.

b.*Îmi cânta un prieten. ( * on the possessive reading only)

me dat was-singing a friend.

c.*Căruia îi cânta un prieten ... ( * on the possessive reading only)

the one whom dat him dat was-singing a friend.

As noted above, a dative relative pronoun can be interpreted as possessor of a subject NP in its extraction clause just in case the corresponding PD sentence without extraction is grammatical: this is the generalization underlying the contrast between (12)a,b, (12)c,d and (13)b,c, (13)e,f, (14)b,c.

Let sum up the results of this section: we have two parallel constructions in Romanian: a clause bound construction, PD, in which a dative NP or a dative clitic is interpreted as the possessor of another NP. And a class of relative clauses in which a dative relative pronoun is interpreted as the possessor of an NP in its extraction clause. Both constructions are subject to a single set of complex restrictions on the form and grammatical function of the possessed NP. This makes it extremely plausible to claim that the căruia-relatives are derived from the PD sentences and that the parallelisms noted in (12)a,b, (12)c,d, (13)b,
c, (13) a, f, and (14) b, c stem from the fact that (12) a is contained in (12) b at the relevant stage in the derivation (before Wh-M), (12) c is contained in (12) d etc.

Are there alternative accounts? Suppose for example that the NP's which cannot enter the FD rule and the căruia-construction were in some sense islands of an unprecedented type. This doesn't sound promising but let us examine the consequences of such a move anyway: if an independent notion of island NP's can be defined to incorporate case marked NP's and subjects of transitive verbs and of intransitives like sing (cf. (11)) then the separate and parallel ungrammaticality of (13) b, c, (14) b, c, (13) e, f will follow without any need for deriving one from the other. The prediction is made however that the non-island NP's will be accessible to Wh-M of any sort and not only to the removal of the possessor NP. Thus parallel to the grammatical (10) a, b, (4) a, b, c we would expect to find grammatical relatives on the pattern of (15), in which a non-possessor constituent of the non-island NP has been extracted:

(15) a.*Popescu [pe care] căruia [mul te studente [suparate -]] : ... 
  S pp  S np  np  np  np  np
  with whom I had met many students angry

b. * Orașul căruia [ii regretam [distrugerea -]] : ...
  S np  S np  np
  the city whom I regret the destruction it

c. * Curtea [din care] regretam [copacii -] : ...
  S pp  S np  np
  the courtyard from which I regret the trees.

In (15) a the PP complement of an AP embedded in a non-island NP has been extracted. The ungrammaticality of the result cannot be explained by subjacency: AP is not a bounding node, as shown in (16):

(16) Popescu [pe care] mai studente păreau [suparate -]] : ...
  S pp  S np  np
  with whom several students appeared angry...

Thus (15) a qualifies as a test-case for the island NP hypothesis and shows it to be wrong. (15) b shows that a non-possessive genitive cannot be extracted from an
NP, no matter whether the NP is island or not. (15)c further confirms what (15)a was supposed to show: that no PP constituent of an NP can be extracted by Wh-M, whether through an intermediate AP node, as in (15)a, or not.

The data in (15), in addition to discrediting the already implausible looking hypothesis of the island NP's, shows what has been implied all along in this section: that no constituents can be extracted out of NP's in Romanian, apart from the possessors extracted by the PD rule.

Before concluding this section let me point out that any analysis in which the căruia-relatives are derived independently of the PD construction will face additional problem of generating the obligatory dative clitic which appears in the extraction clause: the existence of the dative clitic follows, on our account, from the fact that căruia is a dative NP which, like all datives in the VP, must trigger Clitic Doubling. If căruia had been extracted by Wh-M directly from inside the possessed NP the existence of the dative clitic in the extraction clause would become a mysterious fact: it is never the case that a genitive or dative noun embedded in an NP triggers Clitic Doubling. Therefore, under the direct out-of-NP theory, the appearance of the clitic in the căruia-relatives can only be a consequence of Wh-M. But then this is again mysterious: it can be shown (see Steriade 1980) that all the clitics found in the extraction clauses of wh-constructions are the consequence of the local operation of Clitic Doubling. In this context the difficulty posed by the dative clitics of căruia-relatives becomes apparent.

2.2. Having thus concluded that căruia-relatives are not in fact an instance of Wh-M applying inside NP's and having shown in the process that it is never the case that NP's are accessible to Wh-M in Romanian we can now see if this fact has any significance from the point of view of our evaluation of subadjacency. As mentioned above, the fact that NP's are not in a given language accessible to Wh-M could be compatible with subadjacency if both S and NP were bounding nodes in that language. Now the answer to the question of whether 3 or S is bounding
to simplify the discussion I will assume in the rest of the paper that Romanian does not present a direct problem for subjacency. The relevance of the căruia-relatives will be strictly that of providing the paradigm of an indirect, two-step strategy of relativizing constituents of an NP.

Since Rizzi's paper (1977) the test for whether $\tilde{S}$ or $S$ is bounding in a language has become the tolerance of that language towards a limited class of wh-islands violations. What turns out to be the case in Romanian is that a much larger class of wh-island violations are acceptable than in Italian; in fact the crucial contrasts which Rizzi used to differentiate between his $\tilde{S}$-bounding theory and an alternative doubly-filled-comps account are absent from Romanian. Both types of extractions are grammatical, at the same level of perceptual difficulty. Below I give the main two pairs of structures used by Rizzi, in Romanian translation:

(17a) Acestă sarcină, [în care] nu cred că ai putut ghiçi că o voi da...
   this task ACC which not I-think that you-could guess whom
   it I-will give...

(17b) Aceasta sarcina [în care] nu stiu cine a putut ghiçi că o voi da...
   this task Acc which not I-know who could guess whom it I-will
give.

(18a) Prima mea carte [în care] cred că stiţi că am dedicat-o...
   my first book, Acc which I-think you-know whom
   I-have dedicated
   it.

(18b) Prima mea carte [în care] stiţi că crezi că am dedicat-o...
   my first book, Acc which I-know whom you-think that I-have
dedicated
   it.

The lack of contrast between (17)a and b, (18)a and b suggests that the wh-island violations of Romanian cannot be attributed to the fact that $\tilde{S}$ rather than $S$ is bounding; but this of course doesn't tell us directly that $S$ is bounding.
Rather, since the assumption of $\overline{S}$ as bounding does not have the same advantages as in Italian we could simply conclude that, until more is said, the Romanian pattern of wh-islands violations could be counted as compatible with the idea of subjacency that $S$ is bounding, in which case no interesting conclusions would follow from the facts presented in 2.1. The grammaticality of sentences like (17) and (18) could be attributed, not implausibly, to the possibility of having doubly filled COMPs.

3.1. The interest of the Romanian căruia-relatives lies in their close resemblance to the genitival relatives of French and Italian, the two Romance languages for which arguments exist to the effect that $\overline{S}$ and not $S$ is a bounding node. In the following section I will try to show that the (genitival) di cui-relatives of Italian and the dont-relatives of French in which the wh-word appears to correspond to an NP internal constituent have to be derived by the same two-step strategy as the căruia-relatives of Romanian. What is important is not to show that some di cui or dont-sentences are derived in this way but rather that there is no other available derivation for these constructions. If we can show this we would have achieved what we set out to do: show that the accessibility of NP's to Wh-M in a certain language is not predictable from the set of bounding nodes of that language.

The argument is organized as follows: I show first, using the French dont-relatives, that certain constructions of the form $\text{NP}[\text{d}}ont_i [\overline{S} \ X \ \text{NP}\{\overline{N}_i\} Y]$ must be analyzed as being derived in two steps: first by the application of a clause bound rule of extraction from NP (similar but not identical to the Romanian PD), then by Wh-M, which applies to the constituent already extracted. I then turn to the question of whether all dont-relatives of the form must be analyzed in this way: the argument that this must be the case is based on an important observation made by G. Cinque on the Italian di cui-relatives, an observation that has been extended to French by M.-L. Zubizarreta. The observation is that the restrictions on extraction by Wh-M from NP are such as to suggest that...
the trace of Wh-M is subject to the Specified Subject Constraint (SSC).

This is never the case in general (see Rizzi 1977). My argument will therefore be that we must assume that a rule different from Wh-M and subject to SSC has positioned the don't or the di cui phrase out of NP. Wh-M will then apply only to the don't and di cui extracted by this rule.

Before embarking on this argument let me point out that if we can show that NP's are not accessible to Wh-M in an 5-language, we will merely have confirmed M.-L. Zubizarreta's observation that there is no correlation between the pattern of wh-island violations in a certain dialect (of French or English, two languages where there is some individual variation with respect to the wh-island constraint) and the pattern of extraction from NP: she has pointed out (1979) that if wh-island violations are the diagnostic for whether 5 or S is bounding and if extractions from NP are possible only in 5 languages speakers of English who freely violate the wh-island constraint should accept sentences like (19):

(19) A man by whom a book has recently appeared ...

and French speakers who reject all wh-island violations should reject (20):

(20) L'homme dont le premier livre est récemment paru ...

the man whose the first book has recently appeared...

In fact neither correlation holds, thus making it quite implausible that in the dialects of these French and English speakers a unique parameter is involved in determining the island status of wh-clauses and NP's.

3.2. Both Italian and French possess constructions somewhat similar to the Romanian PD sentences. The Italian construction, called Clitic Movement by Cinque 1979 is exemplified in (21), the French one, analyzed under the name of En Avant by Kayne 1975: 191-193 in (22):

(21)a. Aprezziamo la sua generosità.

we-appreciate his generosity
(22) a. Je connais son auteur. b. J'en connais l'auteur
I know its author. same

In the following section I will restrict myself to a discussion of the French rule, assuming that no significant difference exists between it and the corresponding Italian rule.

3.2.1. I will propose here that the En Avant effect is in fact the result of the application of two rules: the first is a rule of extraction from NP and is subject to SSC. It applies to any syntactic subject of an NP: possessor, ((23)a), subject of an active abstract nominal ((23)b), subject of a passive abstract nominal ((23)c):

(23)a. J'en ai aperçu le manteau à l'entrée.
I have seen the coat at the entrance.

b. J'en ai applaudi la décision d'envoyer des armes aux Baluchis.
I have welcomed the decision of sending arms to the B's.

c. J'en ai déploré la destruction.
I have deplored the destruction.

The rule is not restricted to pronominal subjects: we could assume that it applies to any genitival phrase, be it [+pro] [+wh], both or neither. In fact J.-C. Milner (1978) provides examples where non-pronominal subjects of an NP are seen out of their NP but still inside their clause:

(24)a. Il a été publié, de Zola, plusieurs livres avant 1900.
there were published of Z's several books before 1900

b. J'ai vu, d'artistes célèbres, des œuvres remarquables.
I have seen, by famous artists, remarkable works.

c. D'amis sincères, la visite fait toujours plaisir.
of true friends the visit is always pleasant.

I will argue that this very general rule is involved in the derivation of (23)
(24) and unit of the corresponding relatives?

(25)a. L'inspecteur dont j'avais aperçu le manteau à l'entrée...

the inspector whose...

b. Le gouvernement dont nous avions applaudi la décision d'envoyer des armes aux Balucis avait en fait cédé aux pressions des groupes industriels.

trial groups.

c. Zola dont il a été publié plusieurs livres avant 1900...

d. Les artistes célèbres dont tu prétends avoir vu les œuvres...

e. Les amis dont la venue te fait plaisir...

If so, then a second rule is necessary in order to account for the contrast between the fully acceptable dont-relatives like (26)a, (27)a and the literary sounding ((26)b) or downright ungrammatical ((27)b) en-sentences corresponding to them (the b-sentences adapted from Kayne's 368, 369):

(26)a. Le roman dont la première partie n'était pas admirable...

the novel whose the first part was not admirable...

b. La première partie en, était pas admirable.

(27)a. Le roman dont la première partie rappelle des romans policiers...

the novel whose the first part reminds one of detective novels...

b. 'La première partie en rappelle des romans policiers.'

Notice that (24)c shows that whatever is wrong with (26)b and especially (27)b is restricted to en-constructions and cannot be interpreted as a general restriction on the rule of extraction from NP. This should be enough to show that the ungrammaticality of En Avant as applied to preverbal subjects is not an argument against our proposal. Nevertheless a statement in the grammar of French is required for (26)b and (27)b and I shall propose the filter (28) as a candidate for such a statement:
(28) $\left[ \begin{array}{c}
S \\
NP \\
N \\
X \\
e_1 \\
z \\
\end{array} \right]$ $\Rightarrow$ $\Rightarrow$ $\Rightarrow$ $\Rightarrow$ $\Rightarrow$ $\Rightarrow$

unless I begins with être
(this condition is absent from non-literary dialects.)

I leave it an open question whether (28) can be derived from more general principles: given the striking similarities between (28) and the Romanian restrictions on PD as applied to subject NP's, given also the Italian restrictions of Clitic Movement to postverbal subjects (see Cinque 1979: 2) it seems to me very likely that a general principle is indeed at work. One possibility is that rules like PD, Clitic Movement, En Avant or their Romance ancestor used to be applicable only to postverbal constituents (counting therefore, quite plausibly, the subjects of Romanian verbs like intransitive miss, drawn as underlingly postverbal). If so, Romanian and, to a lesser extent, Italian, were PD and Clitic Movement continue to be subject to this restriction, preserve an older state of affairs. French on the other hand has evolved in the following way: the restriction to postverbal NP's has split from the Extraction from NP rule and has become an independent surface filter. This allows a great many more structures to be derived by the Extraction from NP rule and to escape the filter: for example (24)c has been derived, under this analysis, by extracting d'amis sincères from the preverbal subject and then by fronting it. By the time filter (28) applies the configuration it mentions is no longer to be found in (24)c.

3.2.2. I will present here three arguments that for at least certain types of dont-relatives the extraction of the genitival dont out of its NP is effected by the rule responsible for structures like (23) and (24).

The first argument is based on relatives like (29):

(29). Une femme dont [la beauté] dépasse [la vertu]...
a woman whose the beauty surpasses the virtue...
In (29) both la beauté and la vertu are obligatorily interpreted as belonging to la femme. I am here interested in the dialects of French in which (29) contrasts with (30):

\[
(30)^* \text{Une femme} \left[ \text{dont} \left[ \text{la beauté} \right] \right] \text{est égale à} \left[ \text{la vertu} \right] \right] \]

a woman whose the beauty is equal to the vertue...

The contrast is easily interpretable by assuming that whatever grammatical process is responsible for the anaphoric link between dont and la beauté is the same process as the one responsible for the anaphoric link between dont and la vertu. This process, whether Extraction from NP and Wh-M, as I argue, or just Wh-M, cannot extract a constituent embedded in a structure like [PP NP]

as shown in (31)a,b,c:

\[
(31)^a. j'en\text{ai parlé} \left[ \text{au} \left[ \text{père} \right] \right] \\
I\text{-his have spoken to the father}
\]

\[
(31)^b. \text{Quelqu'un} \left[ \text{dont} \left[ \text{j'ai parlé} \left[ \text{au} \left[ \text{père} \right] \right] \right] \right] \\
somebody whose ....
\]

\[
(31)^c. \text{Il a été annoncé, de Mitterand} \left[ \text{à} \left[ \text{plusieurs adversaires} \right] \right] \\
it was announced of M. to several opponents ...
\]

While there seems to be no or little dialectal variation with respect to (31), the contrast between (29) and (30) characterizes only certain dialects of French. Grevisse (1964: 480) cites a multitude of double dont sentences similar to (30) with respect to the structural position of the second gap bound by dont:

\[
(32)^a. \text{Un écrivain} \left[ \text{dont} \left[ \text{l'oeuvre} \right] \right] \text{est à peu près inséparable} \left[ \text{de} \left[ \text{la vie} \right] \right] \\
a writer whose the work is almost inseparable from the life...
(M. Arland Essais Critiques)
\]

\[
(32)^b. \text{L'abbé Firmin} \left[ \text{dont} \left[ \text{le breviaire} \right] \right] \text{gonflait} \left[ \text{la large poche} \left[ \text{de} \left[ \text{la} \right] \right] \right] \\
whose breviary distended the large pocket of the cas...
(M. Arnoux Les Crimes Innocents)
\]

In the dialects in which structures like (32) are acceptable the double dont
sentences like (29) show little about the derivation of genitival relatives in French since it is unclear what mechanism relates the second gap to the relative pronoun. However, for the dialects in which the right contrast exists between (29) and (30), (32) the following argument can be made: given the fact that both positions bound by dont are subject to the same restrictions one must assume that the rule (or one of the rules) responsible for the binding effect has applied to the two positions. In the theory put forward in this paper the rule that could have applied to the two positions is the clause bound Extraction from NP. Alternatively Wh-M could have applied directly and independently to the two underlying dont's. The immediate outputs of these alternative derivations are given in (33):

\[
(33) \text{a. une femme} \left[ \frac{S}{S} \right] \text{[ la beauté de wh }_1 \text{]} \text{ dépasse } \left[ \frac{NP}{NP} \right] \text{ la vertu de wh }_1 \\
\text{b. une femme} \left[ \frac{S}{S} \right] \text{[ la beauté e de wh }_1 \text{ de wh }_1 \text{ dépasse } \left[ \frac{NP}{NP} \right] \text{ la vertu e } \\
\text{c. une femme} \left[ \frac{S}{S} \text{ de wh }_1 \text{ de wh }_1 \left[ \frac{NP}{NP} \right] \text{ la beauté e } \text{ dépasse } \left[ \frac{NP}{NP} \right] \text{ la vertu e }
\]

In (33)b Extraction from NP has not only removed the two possessor PP's out of the NP's but also moved them into a preverbal position where they are adjacent. The motivation for assuming that Extraction from NP has this effect comes partly from the argument I am developing here and partly from the second argument that I will bring in favor of a derivation like (33)b.

In (33)c Wh-M has independently applied to each of the de wh phrases in the sentence and moved them into CONF. My argument in favor of (33)b over (33) is based on an indication that the reduction of the two coindexed de wh phrases can only occur in the position where they are shown in (33)b. I will call the reduction rule Napolology (H).

Suppose that H has not applied preverbally in (29), as it would if (33)b were the correct derivation. Then one expects that a double dont-sentence in which the two de wh phrases originate in two different clauses will be, ceteris paribus...
as grammatical as (29). In fact this is not the case, as (34) shows:

(34) *Un étudiant [dont le professeur dit que la thèse est bonne a student whose the teacher says that the thesis is good

In (34) the two positions out of which de-wh has been extracted are not disjoint in reference:

(35) a. Son professeur dit que la thèse de Jean est mauvaise.

b. Le professeur de Jean dit que sa thèse est mauvaise.

Moreover the second position is in itself accessible to Wh-M:

(36) Un étudiant [dont je pense que la thèse est mauvaise... And, of course the first position is also accessible.

This helps pin down the source of the unacceptability of (34): one of two things may have gone wrong, either of which is an intrinsic feature of the derivation of double dont-relatives sketched in (33c). Either there is a constraint against double wh-movement or else the only position where H can legitimately apply is when the two phrases are adjacent and in preverbal position. The derivation of (34) in a direct-out-of-NP Wh-M theory could be either (37)a or (37)b:

(37) a. Un étudiant [le professeur de wh₁ dit que [la thèse de wh₁]...

Haplology

Wh-M
downarrow

Wh-M

b. Un étudiant [le professeur de wh₁ dit que [la thèse de wh₁]...

Haplology
In (37) a \( H \) applies at a distance and there is a single application of Wh-M for the entire relative clause. In (37)b there is a double Wh-M application on the higher cycle and \( H \) applies locally, in the higher COMP. The reader has probably noticed that both (37)a and (37)b are derivations that would pose problems even if their output was an acceptable sentence. But since (34) is not acceptable we need not go into those problems: the unacceptability of (34) is the most straightforward way of showing that neither of the derivations shown in (37) is legitimate. Returning now to the derivation of (29), which is acceptable, we observe that the derivation shown in (33)c or the alternative derivation shown in (33)d below, in which \( H \) has applied before Wh-M, have the same features as the illegitimate derivations of (34) shown in (37):

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{(33)d. une femme} \quad \underline{\text{S}} \quad \underline{\text{S NP}} \quad \underline{\text{la beauté de wh}}_1 \quad \underline{\text{égal}} \quad \underline{\text{le vertu de wh}}_2 \quad \underline{\text{NP}} \quad \underline{\emptyset} \\
\hline \\
\text{by Wh-M} \\
\text{by } H
\end{array}
\]

It follows then that what differentiates (34) from (29) is the fact that a derivation like (33)a is possible for (29) but not for (34). Since (33)a is derived via Extrac tion from NP this argument establishes both the necessity of letting this rule apply to wh-phrases and the necessity to formulate the rule in such a way as to ensure that the two de wh phrases are moved into adjacent positions.

Notice that given filter (28) we do not expect to find grammatical sentences in which en corresponds to the double dont in (29). But the fact that for any given clause there is a single en slot suggests that this unique slot is the motivation for the Haplogology rule. This observation leads to our second argument.

3.2.3. Suppose that the en slot is already occupied in the source sentence of a dont-relative. If Wh-M applies directly to the de wh constituent embedded in the NP the fact that the en slot is occupied shouldn't matter: the two
features of the sentence (presence of en; Wh-M applied to a constituent inside an NP) do not interact. On our account however, Wh-M cannot apply directly inside an NP: and if, as we argue, the dont-relative must go first through a stage when de wh is positioned in the en slot then we predict that the derivation cannot be successfully completed, unless H can apply. Suppose H is blocked: either because it cannot apply if the two phrases are not lexically identical (as they are in (29))—and en is not lexically identical to dont—or because H applies only to phrases which bear the same referential index (as they do in (29)). Below we have exactly such a case: the en slot is filled by an en whose referential index must be distinct from that of the extracted dont:

\[(38) \text{La France} i_{1} \left[ \text{je connais} \right] \left[ \text{peu de \ pères} \ [\text{dont}] \left[ \text{les enfants} \ e_{j} \right] \right] \ \text{(en, sont fiers.)} \]\n
France, I know few fathers whose children are proud of it.

Let us check now that (38) is the correct test case for our hypothesis: the construction linking la France to en is analyzed by Hirschbuhler 1977 under the name of Lefthand NP's. Hirschbuhler shows that the anaphoric link between LNP's and the coreferent pronouns is not subject to subjacency and in particular that it is not subject to the Complex NP Constraint (CNPC). This property is illustrated by (39):

\[(39) \text{La France} i_{1} \left[ \text{je connais bien} \right] \left[ \text{ceux} \left[ \text{qui} \ [\text{en} \ _{1} \text{son fiers.}} \right] \right] \]\n
France, I know well those who are proud of it.

Since (39) is acceptable the ungrammaticality of (38) cannot be due to a CNPC violation. Also in (38) the dependencies are nested rather than overlapping, which ensures that Fodor's Nested Dependency Constraint has not been violated. Again the conclusion must be that what went wrong with (38) is something not related with Wh-M as such but to the operation of Extraction from NP: in this case, the fact that on the output of this rule H should have applied and was not able to apply, due to either or both of the two
reasons mentioned above.

Our first argument had established the possibility of deriving dont-relatives by Extraction from NP followed by Wh-M. The second argument shows that at least for structures like (38) only such a two step derivation is possible. If a derivation involving just Wh-M had also been available to the source of (38) its output should have been grammatical. This comes fairly close to showing that the only way of applying Wh-M to the (former) constituent of an NP is to have that constituent extracted out of NP. More arguments for this in the last section. In the last part of this section we shall investigate a prediction made by the hypothesis that the target of Wh-M in a genitive dont-relative is a position outside NP.

3.2.4. Rizzi's important study of wh-islands violations in Italian contains a brief consideration of the predictions of his S-bounding theory for the extraction from NP: he notes that if but not S is bounding then applications of Wh-M to NP constituents should result in acceptable structures if the extracted constituents are moved into the first COMP:

\[
(40) \left[ \begin{array}{c} \mathcal{S} \\ \mathcal{S} \end{array} \right] \left[ \begin{array}{c} \mathcal{N} \alpha \\ \mathcal{NP} \end{array} \right]
\]

directly.

If however the extracted constituents are moved into the next COMP up the resulting sentence should be as ungrammatical as other violations of subjec-
cency:

\[
(41) \left[ \begin{array}{c} \mathcal{S} \\ \mathcal{S} \end{array} \right] \left[ \begin{array}{c} \text{wh} \\ \mathcal{S} \end{array} \right] \left[ \begin{array}{c} \mathcal{N} \alpha' \\ \mathcal{NP} \end{array} \right]
\]

In other words, in a language where S and NP (but not S) are bounding nodes wh-island violations and Wh-M out of NP should be grammatical separately, but not combined, as they are in (41).

The Italian pattern of extractions from NP seems to support Rizzi's predictions (though he admits that the relevant contrasts aren't clear): this of course should count as a counterargument to my proposal that Italian di cui
relatives should be derived via Clitic Movement. If Wh-M applies to a
di cui phrase only after it has been positioned outside of NP, there is
no reason why this constituent should not be moved into the second COMP
above it:

\[
(42) \begin{array}{c}
  S \\
  S \\
  S \\
  S \\
  +Wh \\
  N \langle - e \rangle \\
  N P
\end{array}
\]

\text{Wh-M \qquad Clitic Movement}

This may or may not be proof that the two step relativizing strategy is
not appropriate for Italian: what is important to show is that the contrasts
between genitival dont-relatives with and without wh-island violations
do not exist in French.

Consider sentences like (43):

\begin{align}
(43)a. \quad & \text{L'enfant} \left[ \text{dont} \right] \text{je ne sais plus} \left[ \text{à qui} \right] \left[ \text{j'ai donné} \right] \left[ \text{les habits} \right] \left[ \text{NP} \right] \\
& \text{the child whose I can\text{'t remember to whom I gave the clothes...}
\}

b. \quad & \text{L'enfant} \left[ \text{dont} \right] \text{je ne sais plus} \left[ \text{ou} \right] \left[ \text{j'ai mis} \right] \left[ \text{les habits} \right] \left[ \text{NP} \right] \\
& \text{the child whose I can\text{'t remember where I put the clothes...}
\}

\text{c. Get homme} \left[ \text{dont} \right] \left[ \text{j'ignore} \right] \left[ \text{si vous êtes} \right] \left[ \text{l'ami} \right] \left[ \text{NP} \right] \\
& \text{this man whose I don\text{'t know if you are the friend}
\}
\end{align}

\text{(from Grevisse 1964b:478)}

The total acceptability of (43) seems to indicate directly that a genitival
dont can be extracted out of a wh-island. However, Dominique Sportiche has
reminded me that the derivation of (43) according to the scheme in (42)
should not be taken for granted: this is due to the existence of very similar
dont-relatives in which it can be shown that no extraction has taken place at all.

\begin{align}
(44)a. \quad & \text{Un luxe dont j'imaginer aujourd'hui qu'il devait être affreux...}
& \text{a luxury about which I imagine today that it must have been in very}
& \text{bed taste...} \quad (\text{François Mauriac \textit{Nœud de vipères}})

b. \quad & \text{Celui dont nous savons qu'un feu étrange le dévore...}
& \text{the one about whom we know that a strange flame devours him}
\end{align}
c. Une monstrueuse erreur dont je me demande si elle ne lui avait
a monstrous mistake about which I wonder if it had not been
pas été soufflée par le diable...
prompted to him by the devil...

(A.Billy Madame)  all examples from Grevisse
(1964:478-479)

The structures in (44) can be more generally represented in the following
way:

\[
(45) \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{NP} \\
\text{S} \\
\text{S} \\
\text{S} \\
\text{S}
\end{array} \right] \quad \text{don't}_1 \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{S} \\
\text{S} \\
\text{S} \\
\text{S} \\
\text{S}
\end{array} \right] \left[ \begin{array}{c}
[+\text{wh}] \\
\text{...pron}_1 \\
\text{...}
\end{array} \right]
\]

Dont has no extraction source either in the embedded sentence or in the
main sentence: the fact that don't cannot correspond to a subject or direct
object position and the fact that resumptive pronouns appear in what one
might think of as the gap show that don't has not originated in the lower
sentence. The fact that expressions like j' Imagine de lui qu'il ..., je me
demande d'elle si elle ... are at the very best awkward shows that don't
has not originated in the higher sentence either. Let us suppose then that
the dont-relatives in (44) represent a resumptive pronoun strategy of for-
ming relative clauses – whose invariable complementizer is don't – very
much like the resumptive pronoun strategy of Arabic or Modern Persian.

The question that we need to answer is whether sentences like (43)
belong to the same category as (45) – in which case they are useless for
our claim that genitival dont-phrases can come out of wh-islands – or
whether they are derived as in (42) by regular Wh-M.

The first and most obvious observation in favor of a derivation like
(42) is the fact that (43) contain no resumptive pronouns. Compare (43)
with the relative in (46) below, which follow the pattern of (45):

(46) Ainsi chuchotaient au chevet de Mathilde Casenave son mari
thus were whispering at M.C.'s bedside her husband
et sa belle-mère dont entre les cils, elle guettait sur les murs
and her mother in law whose between the eyelashes she was watching
leur deux ombres énormes et confondues...

on the walls their two shadows huge and united ...

(François Mauriac Genitrix from Grevisse 1964: 479)

Another argument can be built on the observation that the resumptive
pronoun strategy is not subject to island constraints:

(47a) Quelqu'un dont j'imagine que mon initiative de saluer

somebody about whom I imagine that my initiative to greet him

will bring me a lot of trouble

b. Quelqu'un dont j'imagine que mon initiative de saluer

somebody about whom I imagine that my initiative to greet

sè sera mal interprétée ...

his mother in law will be misunderstood...

The subject la décision de saluer NP is an island, as can be shown in (48):

(48) * Quelqu'un que la décision de saluer causera des ennuis ...

somebody who the decision to greet will bring trouble...

The same restriction applies to a dont relative which has a gap in the
target position rather than a pronoun:

(49) * Quelqu'un dont la décision de saluer la belle-mère e

somebody whose the decision to greet the mother-in law

sera mal interprétée ...

will be misinterpreted...

What is the significance of these facts? Imagine that a dont-relative with
a gap, like (50):

(50) (= (43)a ) L'enfant dont je ne sais plus à qui j'ai donné les
habits ...

is generated in fact by the resumptive pronoun strategy. Now are we to account for the disappearance of the resumptive pronoun? The comparison between (49) and (47) shows that if there is a rule deleting the resumptive pronoun in such dont-relatives that rule must be sensitive to the same island constraint to which Wh-M itself is sensitive. This makes it quite unlikely that an ad hoc deletion rule rather than regular Wh-M is involved in the derivation of (50). We must therefore conclude that, since (50) was derived by Wh-M, the extraction of the genitival dont out of a wh-island is grammatical in French. The consequence of this is obvious: either the genitival dont has been extracted in violation of subjacency directly out of its NP:

\[
(51) = (41) \quad S \leftarrow S \leftarrow S \leftarrow S \leftarrow S \leftarrow S \leftarrow \left[ \left[ \left[ \left[ \left[ \left[ N \quad \text{de wh} \right] \right] \right] \right] \right] \right]
\]

or else the target of Wh-M was a syntactic position outside of the NP.

In either case we have a problem for subjacency but our previous arguments rule in favor of the second solution.

I conclude therefore that Extraction from NP is involved in the derivation of all the grammatical dont-sentences considered so far. This, as mentioned above, comes close but is not equivalent to saying that Extraction from NP is a necessary step in the relativization of any NP constituent. I will try to establish this in the next section.

4.1. It was shown by Cinque (1979) for Italian and, following him, by Zubizarreta (1979) for French that the extraction of constituents from an NP is subject to restrictions that are strongly reminiscent of SSC.
This is the context in which G. Cinque's finding about the pattern of genitive extractions in Italian become significant: the finding can be summarized by saying that the extraction of constituent from NP is subject to restrictions strongly reminiscent of SSC.

Thus, to review only a few of the facts considered by Cinque, only di cui PP's can be extracted from NP and this only when they qualify by independent tests as being the syntactic subjects of the NP:

(52)a. * Una persona[a c[i  a l'attaccamento — ]potrebbe rovinarci ...]

a person to whom the attachment could ruin us

b. * Una pianeta[su cui [e m atteraggio s] sarebbe pericoloso ]...

a planet on which the landing would be dangerous

(from Cinque 3b and 3c)

c. * L'icona[d i c[i h] hanno scoperto [i l f u r t o _ d e l c u s t o d e ]]

the icon of which they have discovered the theft of the custodian

(Cinque's (17)a)

d. * Giorgio, [d i c[i [ a b b a i m o m e s s o i n r i d i c o l o [ l a t u a d e s c r i z i o n e _ ] ] ]

G. of whom we have ridiculed your description

add the corresponding Clic Movement example
me and that the French mean of Cettie. Moreover, we have to assume that all NP's have identical...

(55a). J'en ai toujours apprenn[e] [la haine] pour les Juifs...

(55b). j'en ai toujours apprenn[e] la haine — pour les Juifs...

c. * Un portrait d'Aristote — for the Jews.

d. * Aristote, dont le portrait — de Rembrandt...

e. * Les Juifs [la haine — avayaient] les Nazis...

(59a). De Rembrandt j'ai vu seulement le portrait — de Delacroix...

(59b). De Rembrandt j'ai vu seulement le portrait — de Delacroix...

(59c). J'ai vu le portrait — de Rembrandt...

(59d). J'ai vu le portrait — de Rembrandt...

(59e). J'ai vu le portrait — de Rembrandt...

(59f). J'ai vu le portrait — de Rembrandt...

(59g). J'ai vu le portrait — de Rembrandt...
Notice that the existence of NP's like the one in (53) (Cinque's 21) seems to show that the string position can not always identify the extractable di cui as the rightmost one:

(53)a. la descrizione di Giorgio dei particolari del'incidente

b. Giorgio, [di cui [la descrizione dei particolari del'incidente] ...]

c.* Gli particolari del'incidente [di cui [la descrizione di Giorgio ...]]

Cinque notes that the same restrictions on what constituents can be removed from an NP hold for Clitic Movement as well as for WH-M (Cinque's view being that WH-M of the genitival di cui proceeds from inside of the NP). The same can be shown to be the case for the French En-Avant sentences ((55) below) as well as for the French sentences in which a de NP phrase which is not a wh-phrase has been extracted from its NP (56):
I believe Cinque's conclusion is inevitable: the crucial factor in distinguishing the grammatical extractions from NP from the ungrammatical ones is whether the extracted constituent is the subject of the NP or not.

At the end of his paper Cinque writes:

- One non trivial theoretical problem remains: namely the crucial assumption that the trace of Wh-Movement behaves the same way as the trace of Clitic Movement with respect to opacity. Although in other domains of facts the motivated conclusion seems to be that the trace of Wh-Movement (...) is not sensitive to opacity (...) here the opposite assumption appeared to have the right consequences in underlining, among other things, the exactly symmetrical behavior of extraction through Clitic Movement and Wh-Movement."

From the point of view presented in this paper the exact parallelism between Clitic Movement and Wh-M are not mysterious and do not pose theoretical problems (or, more precisely, do not pose the theoretical problems that Cinque was thinking of): we have presented evidence that Clitic Movement (or the French version of this rule) is involved in the derivation of genitival re-
The fact that Wh-M appears to be possible only when Clitic Movement is can be accounted for by admitting that Clitic Movement is involved in the derivation of all genitival relatives. Recall that we already had an indication (page 22-23) that this had to be the case. Thus the question of whether the trace of Wh-M is subject to opacity can be answered: uniformly not.

4.2. Does this solution really apply to Italian?

So far Italian has played only a minor role in our argument for the independence of the constraint on Wh-M out of NP from subjacency. This is partly because I have no way of explaining the contrast reported by Rizzi 1978 between a relative where the genitival di cui comes out of an indirect question and a relative where the genitival di cui comes out of a -wh clause (see page 23). Also because our first argument from French based on the double dont relatives can be extended to Italian only if there are speakers of Italian who distinguish between the equivalent of (29), (Une femme dont la beauté dépasse la vertu ...), and the equivalent of (30), (Une femme dont la beauté est égale à la vertu...). So far I haven't found such speakers, probably because when the genitival di cui binds a slot inside a preverbal subject NP the relative clause is marginal, if not worse (cf. Cinque 1979). (This fact, on the other hand, is explained by our hypothesis as stemming from the parallel inadmissibility of Clitic Movement applied to a preverbal NP. See page 16-17) Thus one would expect that a double di cui sentence parallel to (29) will be harder to judge than its French equivalent.

However I can report, for what it's worth, that my two Italian informants have agreed that there is a definite contrast between the equivalent of (29) and that of (34) *(Un étudiant dont le professeur dit que la thèse est bonne* the same contrast as in French. This of course tends to support my position though it's unclear how a precise argument can be made on the basis of such data.
Finally the paradigm of (38) and (39) is exactly the same as for Italian, according to Adriana Belletti.

All this suggests that the solution outlined above to the problem of applying Wh-M inside NP's does extend to Italian though the conclusion is less firm as long as the difficulties mentioned haven't been explained.

4.3. The problem left unsolved

The main conclusions of this paper are:

(a) wh-traces are never subject to opacity;

(b) NP's are not accessible to Wh-M in at least two languages, Italian and French, in which $\bar{S}$ is a bounding node but not $S$.

The immediate consequence of (b) is that, if the subjacency mechanism presented in Chomsky 1977 is essentially right, then there should be an additional parameter determining whether NP's are accessible to Wh-M or not. Alternatively, the basic idea behind subjacency (namely that the island quality of a certain structure follows from the number of bounding nodes encountered on the path between the extraction site and the nearest COMP) is wrong. The data we have discussed here is neutral with respect to these possibilities.

However the Igbo question formation pattern, briefly described in 1.2., is not. One cannot account for the Igbo data by keeping subjacency unchanged and adding and Igbo-particular provision about gaps inside NP's and PP's.

Neither is, I believe, the pattern of extraction from NP in English: by the wh-island test English is a language where $\bar{S}$ is a bounding node and this should be sufficient to rule out any kind of Wh-M out of NP. The apparent cases of Wh-M out of NP could, at first sight, be dealt with by the reanalysis rule proposed in Weinberg and Hornstein 1978. In an attempt to show that the more general Germanic phenomenon of preposition stranding is compatible with subjacency even if PP is a bounding node in a preposition stranding language, apparent $\bar{V}$ and $H$ propose to explain all cases of extraction from PP by a rule of reanalysis which turns any string of elements contiguous to $\bar{V}$ and c-commanded by it into
a complex V. This is not the place for a detailed critique of that paper but one immediately relevant comment can be made: the system developed by W and H can account for the acceptability of sentences like Ross's:

\[(57) \text{Reports which the government prescribes the height of the lettering on a complex V so that the target of Wh-M is in (57) a position immediately dominated by VP. (As W and H don't discuss this in their paper I am deducing this position from the possibilities offered by the reanalysis rule. They shouldn't be held responsible for my deductions.)} \]

But the same system cannot account for the contrast between (57) and (58):

\[(58) \text{*Reports on which the government prescribes the height of the lettering on a complex V} \]

The solution I know of proposed for the series of contrasts illustrated by (57) and *(58), Bresnan's Relativized A over A Condition, is not compatible with the reanalysis solution of W and H. This is so because Reanalysis "crucially applies in the base, preceding all transformations" (W and H page 51) in order to block it from applying to strings like the one underlined in (59):

\[(59) \text{* Who do you think [to t] I sent [pictures e] ?} \]

If by the time Wh-M applies the VP has been already reanalyzed into a complex V followed by an NP or a PP, the Relativized A over A Condition will not be able to distinguish between the operation of Wh-M in (57) and (58).

A contrast similar to the one between (57) and (58) is found in other positions too:

\[(60) \text{a. ? The man who John was killed [by a cousin of -] } \]

b. ** The man of whom John was killed [by a cousin -] \]

(61) a. ?? The man who [a book [by ] refuted all allegations against subjacency...]

b. ** The man by whom [a book refuted all allegations against subjacency...].
Interestingly enough at least one of my English informants, Bill Poser, otherwise prefers PP pied-piping to P stranding. Still he too checks the data in (60) and (61).

Why is this at all relevant to the problem of explaining why Romance NP's are not accessible to Wh-M? First because it suggests that, pace George Horn and Weinberg and Hornstein, Wh-M does sometimes take off directly from NP's in an S-language like English. Not all is clear about the circumstances under which Wh-M out of NP is possible in English but the contrasts of (57) and (58), (60) and (61) tend to show that it is sometimes possible.

Second, the fact that the extraction out of NP must in English leave a stranded preposition suggests a way to look at the Romance and Igbo data: neither Romance languages nor Igbo allow preposition stranding. And, as we have shown, neither of them allows Wh-M to leave a gap inside an NP. On the other hand, an idealization of the English state of affairs is that English does allow extraction from NP's but only with preposition stranding. Obviously if this is the right idealization the differences between a language like English and one like French or Igbo can be reduced to one: the presence (in English) vs. the absence (in Igbo) of a process of preposition stranding. The accessibility of NP's to Wh-M (more precisely the ability of Wh-M to leave a gap inside an NP) would then be a correlate of this process of preposition stranding. If all this is right then what this paper leaves as the usual 'task for further research' is finding a constraint on syntactic binding to replace subjacency and deducing Wh-M out of NP from preposition stranding.
* Thanks go to Adriana Belletti, Guglielmo Cinque, Alec Marantz, Luigi Rizzi and especially to Dominique Sportiche without whose help the French syntax part would have been much more simple minded. The French judgments are those of Dominique Sportiche, Nathalie van Bockstaele, Claire Dufour and François Cossec.

1. I should clear up a terminological point here: subjacency, if this term refers narrowly to the theory exposed by Chomsky, chiefly in his 1977 paper, could not help making some predictions about extraction from NP's. The nature of the mechanism proposed by Chomsky is such as to predict inevitably that binding into a configuration will be impossible in a language that observes CNPC and the wh-island constraint; also that binding into a configuration will be impossible in any language that observes the CNPC.

In this paper I use 'subjacency' as a name for the constraint on syntactic binding whose most constant cross-linguistic effect is CNPC. So rather than naming a particular theory 'subjacency' stands here for the phenomenon that one is making theories about. Therefore one can argue about whether the right theory about this phenomenon that I call subjacency should say anything about extraction from NP's.

2. The fact that (11)b, unlike (10), is grammatical is due to the disappearance of the pe-marker on the direct object that has undergone PD in (11)b. But this disappearance is itself a mystery: the pe-marking rule is not optional and, if Pd had not applied in (11)b, the absence of pe would have made the sentence ungrammatical:

   (i) *Am cunoscut nevasta ta
       I-have met wife yours

On the other hand there are other cases in which the pe-marker may be lacking despite the fact that the direct object is specific and human, two conditions
sufficient for pe-marking:

(ii) M-am așezat pe o bancă de unde puteam vedea copiii.

I sat on a bench from where I could see the children.

(iii) Luți nevestele cu voi.

Take the wives with you pl.

The suggestion associated with the lack of the pe-marker in (ii),(iii) is that the referents of the direct objects are either acted upon without being aware of it or without being able to react or to participate in the action.

Suppose the that there is a marginal process of pe-deletion whose effect on the reading of the sentence is that outlined above. We can now make a suggestion about the three way contrast that interests us:

(iv) (= (11)b) Ti-am cunoscut nevasta.

you dat-I have met the wife.

(v) (= (10)d) *Ti-am cunoscut-o pe nevasta.

(vi) (= (i)) *Am cunoscut nevasta ta.

The pe-deletion process has applied in both (iv) and (vi) and in both cases the resulting reading should be anomalous: somebody cannot meet somebody else without being aware of it or without participating in the event. This would predict that both (iv) and (vi) should be unacceptable: however, of (iv) and (vi) only the latter has a grammatical alternative:

(vii) Am cunoscut-o pe nevasta ta.

There is no grammatical alternative to (iv): (v) is ungrammatical because PD has applied there to an overtly case marked NP. This may be a hint as to why (iv) which by rights should only have an anomalous reading, is acceptable and used under the normal reading. Even so, I leave it unexplained why, granted that of (iv) and (v) one should be used, the choice is (iv) rather than (v).
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