

# A Note on Extraposition from NP in English and in Japanese\*

Kayono Shiobara

The University of Tokyo

fwik8800@mb.infoweb.ne.jp

## 1. Introduction

While a speaker of a natural language could make use of a variety of syntactic forms for communicating a single semantic proposition to a hearer, the speaker selects one of them which may serve an "information-packaging function" (Birner(1994: 233)). That is, a speaker uses a syntactic construction with a particular function in order to convey what s/he wants to say in the most relevant way.

One such syntactic option available to speakers of English is Extraposition from NP (EXNP):

- (1) a. A man with green eyes appeared.  
b. A man appeared with green eyes.
- (2) a. John read a book by Chomsky over the summer.  
b. John read a book over the summer by Chomsky.
- (3) a. The order to evacuate the building was given.  
b. The order was given to evacuate the building. (Guéron (1980: 637))

Within the framework of generative-transformational grammar, the (b) sentences in (1)-(3) are considered to be derived from the (a) sentences respectively via the operation of EXNP. In (1) the PP *with green eyes* is extraposed from the subject NP and in (2) the PP *by Chomsky* is extraposed from the object NP. EXNP of a CP is also possible as is shown in (3). Hence, EXNP is an operation which induces a displacement of a modifier

---

\* I am indebted to Noriko Imanishi, Christopher Tancredi, and Akiko Terunuma for valuable comments on earlier drafts.

and a modifiee. It can be regarded as rightward movement or leftward construal depending on whether it involves movement or not.<sup>1</sup>

From the viewpoint of functionalism, the extraposed phrase bears a focus. (cf. Takami(1990, 1994, 1995a, 1995b), Takami and Kuno (1992)). On this view, a necessary condition for EXNP is that the extraposed element be interpreted as being more important than the rest of the sentence.<sup>2</sup> For example, the sentence in (4b) is ruled out by the functional constraint even though it seems to have the same syntactic structure as that in (1b).<sup>3</sup>

- (4) a. A man from India died.  
 b. \*A man died from India. (Guéron(1980:651))

According to the functional approach to EXNP, the sentence in (4b) is ruled out because in that sentence what is focused on is the fact that a man *died*, not that the man was from India.

A similar construction is found in Japanese:<sup>4</sup>

- (5) Totsuzen oo-otoko-ga arawaremashita, ni meetoru gurai no  
 suddenly big-man-Nom appeared two meters about of  
 'Suddenly a big man who is about two meters tall appeared.'
- (6) Kinou watashi-wa oo-otoko-o mimashita, ni meetorugurai no  
 yesterday I-Top big-man-Acc saw two meters about of  
 'Yesterday I saw a big man who is about two meters tall.'
- (7) \*Wain-wa nome-nai, doitsu no  
 wine-Top drink-cannot German of

In (5) the extraposed element is a modifier of the subject NP and in (6) it is a modifier of the object NP.<sup>5</sup> Takami (1994, 1995b) argues that the function of EXNP in Japanese is

<sup>1</sup> See Culicover and Rochemont (1990) for a non-transformational approach to EXNP and Takami(1990) for its problems.

<sup>2</sup> Takami (1990, 1995a, 1995b) refers to the notion of more/less important information, which is a relative notion and differs from that of old/new information and focus/presupposition. See Takami (1995a) for the argument. Note that this kind of functional approach (to EXNP) is faced with a problem of how to define "important information" in an explicit way.

<sup>3</sup> This assumption has been challenged: *appear* is an unaccusative verb, and *die* is an unergative verb. A standard assumption these days is that subjects of the former are underlying objects while subjects of the latter are underlying subjects.

<sup>4</sup> The examples in (5)-(7) are based on Takami (1995b:150-151).

entirely different from that in English in that EXNP is allowed in Japanese only when the extraposed element itself signifies something other than the focus of the sentence. In (5) and (6) the extraposed elements provide the hearer with the additional information modifying the NP *oo-otoko* and cannot be interpreted as the focus of the sentence while in (7) the particle *-wa* marks the NP *doitsu no wain* as a contrastive focus and extraposing *doitsu no* in it, which is focused on most, is not allowed.

Thus when an extraposed element appears in the sentence-final position, the function of an EXNP sentence is totally different in English and in Japanese. In Japanese, however, the sentence-final position is not the only position where an extraposed element can appear. In this paper, I present another type of EXNP in Japanese and show that the functional difference between English and Japanese comes from the focus position of a sentence.

## 2. Extraposition from NP as a Rightward Movement

In this section, I will describe in more detail the properties of EXNP as a syntactic movement.

### 2.1. English

First let us investigate some English sentences which involve EXNP.<sup>6</sup>

- (8) a. That a review of this book came out yesterday is catastrophic.
- b. That a review came out yesterday of this book is catastrophic.
- c. \*That a review came out yesterday is catastrophic of this book.
- (9) a. A review of a new book about French cooking appeared yesterday.
- b. A review appeared yesterday of a new book about French cooking.
- c. \*A review of a new book appeared yesterday about French cooking.

---

<sup>5</sup> I use the term extraposed "element" instead of extraposed PP or CP. This is because Japanese has a nominal *-no* as well as a preposition *-no*, as the following example shows:

- (i) A: Dochira-no shatsu-o kaimasu ka?  
       Which shirt-Acc buy Q  
       'Which shirt do you buy?'  
       B: Akai-no-o kaimasu.  
       red-Nominal-Acc buy  
       'I buy the read one.'

In (5) it is not clear whether *-no* is a preposition or it is a nominal which signifies *oo-otoko*. (cf. Appendix)

<sup>6</sup> The examples in (8) and (9) are based on Akmajian(1979:117-118).

Syntactically viewed, EXNP is a rightward movement and it is more constrained in one respect and less constrained in another respect than leftward movement (i.e., wh-movement). As is seen in (8c) and (9c) it is impossible to apply EXNP in a successive cyclic manner. The sentences violate the pre-Barriers style subjacency condition, which says that movement cannot cross more than one bounding node (NP and S in English).<sup>7</sup> In this sense EXNP is more constrained than wh-movement which permits an element to move successive cyclically (via the Spec position or the VP-adjoined position in Chomsky(1986)'s *Barriers* system). EXNP is less constrained than leftward movement in that it does not obey the subject condition (cf. Chomsky (1973: 249)) as the (b) sentences in (8) and (9) show.<sup>8</sup>

My claim is that the difference in the syntactic behavior between EXNP and wh-movement derives from the difference in their motivations. EXNP is a strategy for making the processing of a sentence easy (cf. Quirk et al.(1985:1398-1399)). For example, the (a) sentences in (8) and (9) to which EXNP has not yet applied are grammatical, though they are hard to process because of the heaviness of the subject. If syntactic movement is always syntactically motivated (e.g. by feature checking as in the Minimalist Program proposed by Chomsky(1995)), EXNP must not be a syntactic operation. Then, it is not adequate to account for the acceptability of EXNP sentences in terms of a syntactic constraint such as the subjacency condition. We will come back to this matter in 3.1 and 3.3.

## 2.2. Japanese

As we saw in section 1, Japanese also has sentences which involve a displacement of a modifier and a modifiee,<sup>9</sup> repeated here for ease of reference:

- (10) Totsuzen oo-otoko-ga arawaremashita, ni meetoru gurai no.  
 (11) Kinou watashi-wa oo-otoko-o mimashita, ni meetoru gurai no.

<sup>7</sup> The subjacency condition subsumes Ross (1967)'s Right Roof Constraint as a special case.

<sup>8</sup> Here I do not take into consideration such leftward movements as VP-preposing and left dislocation which are not constrained by subjacency.

<sup>9</sup> As for the precise landing site of an extraposed phrase in English, syntactic tests such as VP-deletion, VP-preposing and though-movement reveal that an element extraposed from an object is adjoined to VP while an element extraposed from a subject may be adjoined to VP or IP. (cf. Terazu (1979), Guéron (1980), Culicover and Rochemont (1990) among others) In Japanese it is hard to determine the landing site of an extraposed element because identical syntactic tests are not available.

Note that the comma break (i.e. pause) between the main clause and the extraposed element is bigger than that in English EXNP sentences and it is not clear whether these examples consist of one sentence or of two sentences (cf. Fukuchi (1985:97), Miyaji (1984)).<sup>10</sup>

Rightward movement in Japanese is an optional operation like EXNP in English and the processing of the sentence is made easy by excluding an element which provides additional information from the main clause. (See 3.1.)

Let us look at another example:

- (12) a. Furansu ryori-no atarashii hon-no shohyo-ga kinou demashita.  
 French cooking-of new book-of review-Nom yesterday appeared  
 'A review of a new book about French cooking appeared yesterday.'  
 b. ?Shohyo -ga kinou demashita, furansu ryori-no atarashii hon no.  
 c. ?Atarashii hon-no shohyo-ga kinou demashita, furansu ryori no.

The sentences in (12) correspond to the English sentences in (9). The sentence in (12c) is a little awkward but acceptable with focus on *shohyo*.<sup>11</sup>

In sum, assuming that EXNP is a rightward movement the functional (and probably syntactic) properties of the derived sentences in Japanese are different from those in English. In the next section, we will examine what causes this difference and show another type of EXNP sentences in Japanese which have the same function as EXNP in English.

### 3. Extraposition from NP as an Information-Packaging Operation

#### 3.1. Informational Structure

It is generally considered that in English there is a flow of information behind each sentence (cf. Fukuchi (1985), Quirk et al. (1985)). In particular, English sentences have the informational structure in which information flows from that of less importance to that

---

<sup>10</sup> According to Fukui(1993), in Japanese, rightward movements must be forced by some grammatical factor. If this is right, the examples in (10) and (11) either do not involve movements or consist of two sentences.

<sup>11</sup> The slight awkwardness of the sentence in (12c) might be due to processing factors. One tends to associate the extraposed modifier *furansuryori-no* with the noun which is nearer to it in linear order or with the configurationally higher noun. In either case, the extraposed element is wrongly associated with the noun *shohyo*, not with the noun *hon*.

of more importance. EXNP sentences are no exception to this fact and the rightmost extraposed phrase bears a focus.<sup>12</sup>

In contrast, in Japanese the focused element appears in the position just before the verb as the answer to a wh-question shows:

- (13) A: Taro-wa Hanako-to Doko-e it-ta no?  
 Taro-Top Hanako-with where-to go-Past Q  
 'Where did Taro go with Hanako?'  
 B1: Kare-wa Hanako-to *Kyoto-e* it-ta.  
 He-Top Hanako-with Kyoto-to go-Past  
 'He went *to Kyoto* with Hanako.'  
 B2: \*Kare-wa Hanako-to it-ta, Kyoto-e.  
 he-Top Hanako-with go-Past Kyoto-to (Takami (1995b: 160))

Then the function of Japanese EXNP we have seen so far is to remove an element from the pre-verbal position and the extraposed element indicates an afterthought or additional (and less important) information.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Fukuchi(1978), in his analysis of extraposed clauses, argues that it is not the case that the "asserted" clause is allowed to be extraposed but rather that the extraposed clause is asserted. Asserted clauses roughly correspond to clauses that carry important information. I agree with him in the point that the degree of importance of the element is not a sufficient condition (or motivation) for EXNP because English has a tool of stress which can mark an element as important information without changing the word order.

<sup>13</sup> Takami(1994,1995b) argues that this contrast in informational structure between English and Japanese comes from the difference of word order between these languages. His argument is briefly as follows: English has an S-V-O word order and the object is focused under the neutral intonation (i.e. without any stress on another element) while the word order in Japanese is S-O-V and the object, the pre-verbal element normally bears focus. Object focus in English and object focus in Japanese are mirror images of each other from the viewpoint of the verb.

This idea leads us to a deeper question: *why* do natural languages have different word orders? To find an answer to this question might be beyond the reach of linguists but it seems to me worth considering. I note here one thing in terms of language acquisition: a child raised in a Japanese environment who is at the two-word stage often utters verb-object sequences. (cf. Shibata (1990)). This fact suggests that S-V-O is the default word order. This observation is in accord with Kayne (1994)'s claim that the Spec-Head-Complement order is the basic order. However, there are many other logically possible word orders and in fact there are word orders besides S-V-O and S-O-V. I leave this matter wide open. (See Hawkins (1994) for an argument which reduces the word order possibility to syntactic processing principles.)

3.2. *Another Type of Extraposition from NP Sentences in Japanese*

In Japanese, the sentence-final position is not the only position where an extraposed element appears. It is also possible for an element to appear in the pre-verbal position which is the focus position in Japanese as we saw in 3.1.

- (14) a. Doitsu-no wain-wa nome-nai.  
 Germany-of wine-Top drink-cannot  
 'I cannot drink wine made in Germany.'  
 b. \*Wain-wa nome-nai, doitsu no  
 wine-Top drink-cannot Germany of  
 c. Wain-wa doitsu no-wa nome-nai.  
 Wine-Top Germany of-Top drink-cannot  
 'I cannot drink wine, made in Germany.'

The sentence in (14a) is the sentence without any displacement: *doitsu no* modifies the following noun *wain* and *doitsu no wain* bears contrastive focus by virtue of the particle *-wa*. In (14b) (= (7)), *doitsu no* is moved into the sentence-final position where focus cannot appear and the derived sentence violates the informational structure in Japanese (see 3.1). Note that the sentence in (14b) is acceptable in the following conversation:<sup>14</sup>

- (15) A: Doitsu-no nomimono-o nome-ru?  
 Germany-of beverage-Acc drink-can  
 'Can you drink beverages made in Germany?'  
 B: Wain-wa nome-nai, doitsu no.

In (15B) what is focused is *wain* and *doitsu no* provides additional information.

The sentence in (14c) is another type of EXNP sentence in Japanese. The modifier of the noun *doitsu no* appears immediately before the verb and it is interpreted as a focus of the sentence. Note that Japanese is a head-final language. A modifier of a noun usually appears before the noun (as is seen in (14a)) and displacement of the modifier is not permitted as freely as that in English.<sup>15</sup> This is one of the reasons why in (14c) it is necessary to mark *doitsu no* with the particle *-wa* again. This gives rise to the possibility

<sup>14</sup> I am thankful to Chris Tancredi for indicating this example to me.

<sup>15</sup> Note that in English, prenominal adjectives cannot be extraposed while postnominal adjectives can:

- (i) \*It appears I have given the assignment to a fool after all, complete and utter.  
 (ii) I want to see someone at every window armed and alert.

(Stucky(1987:389))

that the extraposed phrase is interpreted as important by virtue of *-wa*, not by its position. However, the sentence is still acceptable with another particle attached to *doitsu no*:

- (16) a. (?)Wain-wa doitsu no-o nome-nai.  
           Wine-Top Germany of-Acc drink-cannot  
 b. Wain-wa doitsu no-ga nome-nai.  
           Wine-Top Germany of-Nom drink-cannot  
 c. Wain-wa doitsu no-mo nome-nai.  
           Wine-Top Germany of-also drink-cannot  
 d. Wain-wa doitsu no-shika nome-nai.  
           Wine-Top Germany of-but drink-cannot  
           'I can only drink German wine.'

In (16a) the simple accusative marker *-o* appends to *doitsu no* and the sentence is acceptable even if it may be marginal. In (16b) the nominative marker *-ga* is attached to *doitsu no*. The particle *-ga* is morphologically the marker of nominative but it thematically marks the object and the interpretation of the sentence in (16b) is roughly the same as that in (16a). These two sentences are adequately interpreted in the context that, for example, the speaker is keen on wine generally but s/he cannot drink German wine for some reason. In (16c) and (16d), *doitsu no* is marked with *-mo* and *-shika* respectively and these markers help *doitsu no* to be interpreted as important information (cf. Takami (1995b: 162)). The plausible context of (16c) might be that the speaker cannot drink wine in general and s/he cannot drink *even* the German wine which many people find tasty. On the other hand, in (16d) the speaker cannot drink wine in general but *only* the German wine is to his/her taste. In the sentences in (16), the particle *-wa* in *wain-wa* simply indicates that *wain* is the topic of the sentence, not the contrastive focus.<sup>16</sup>

Thus we have at least two types of EXNP in Japanese. In one EXNP, an extraposed element appears in a sentence-final position and conveys an afterthought. In the other, an extraposed element appears in a pre-verbal position and bears a focus.

<sup>16</sup> Again it may be the case that *-no* in (15c) and (16) is a nominal, not a preposition (See note 5). If so, EXNP is not a movement but a deletion of an element which carries redundant information:

(i) Wain-wa doitsu-no wain-wa nomenai.

↓  
 ∅



### 3.3. *The Theoretical Problem with Extraposition from NP*

When we regard EXNP as an operation which induces some kind of displacement, a question arises concerning the level where EXNP is applied. In the Minimalist Program proposed by Chomsky (1995), the crucial property of human language, "displacement" is divided into two subtypes: Last Resort movement driven by feature checking within the core ( $N \rightarrow \lambda$ ) computation and stylistic rules which apply within the phonological component. Optional operations such as EXNP are classified into the latter group. However, EXNP has influences on the interpretation of scopes, the licensing possibility of negative polarity items and the binding possibility of nouns which are considered to be determined by LF representations. (cf. Guéron (1980) and Kamada (1995)). Hence the view of EXNP as a stylistic rule should be abandoned.

There seems to be two possible ways to eschew this problem. The first is to hypothesize that EXNP sentences have some feature like [+EX] in their Numeration. Then EXNP can be a syntactic movement for feature-checking and the difference between English and Japanese may be in the position where the feature [+EX] is checked. Clearly this is a stipulation and how the feature is checked must be clarified. The second possibility is to hypothesize that EXNP does not involve movement. Even if we assume that EXNP is not a movement, there must be some kind of functional feature in the Numeration which serves to connect an extraposed phrase to the rest of the sentence. In either case, the properties of EXNP remain obscure under the assumptions in the Minimalist Program.

## 4. **Concluding Remarks**

In this paper I looked at English and Japanese EXNP sentences in terms of its information-packaging function and presented another type of EXNP sentence in Japanese. This idea is based on the fact that the motivation of EXNP is not a syntactic one and its acceptability does not depend exclusively on syntactic constraints (e.g. the subjacency condition). To put it another way, in Japanese, the displacement of a modifier and a modifiee is induced by at least two different motivations. One is to remove a less important element to the sentence-final position and the other is to move an element into the pre-verbal position in order to mark it as a focus. On this view, the different behavior between English and Japanese EXNP sentences derives from the difference of the focus position between these languages.



**References**

- Akmajian, Adrian (1975) "More Evidence for an NP Cycle," *Linguistic Inquiry* 6, 115-129.
- Birner, Betty (1994) "Information Status and Word Order: An Analysis of English Inversion," *Language* 70, 233-259.
- Chomsky, Noam (1973) "Conditions on Transformations," *Festschrift for Morris Halle*, ed. By Steven Anderson and Paul Kiparsky, 232-286, Holt, Reinhart & Winston, New York.
- Chomsky, Noam (1986) *Barriers*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Chomsky, Noam (1995) *The Minimalist Program*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Culicover, Peter and Michael Rochemont (1990) "Extrapolation and the Complement Principle," *Linguistic Inquiry* 21, 23-47.
- Fukuchi, Hajime (1978) "The Applicability of Complement Extrapolation and Functional Implications," *Studies in English Linguistics* 6, 32-50.
- Fukuchi, Hajime (1985) *Danwa no Kozo*, Taishukan, Tokyo.
- Fukui, Naoki (1993) "Parameters and Optionality," *Linguistic Inquiry* 24, 399-420.
- Guéron, Jacqueline (1980) "On the Syntax and Semantics of PP Extrapolation," *Linguistic Inquiry* 11, 637-678.
- Hawkins, John A. (1994) *A Performance Theory of Order and Constituency*, Cambridge University Press.
- Kamada, Kohji (1995) "Uhoido wa Buntaikisoku ka? (Is Rightward Movement a Stylistic Rule?)," *Sophia Linguistica* 38, 153-169.
- Kayne, Richard (1994) *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Miyaji, Yutaka (1984) "Touchikou" *Nihongogaku* 3, 75-86.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sydney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvik (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*, Longman, London.
- Ross, John Robert (1967) *Constraints on Variables in Syntax*, Doctoral dissertation MIT.
- Shibata, Jiro (1990) *Akachan no Kotoba: Oboeru, Hanasu, Kangaeru*, Tomizu, Tokyo.
- Stucky, Susan (1987) "Configurational Variation in English: A Study of Extrapolation and Related Matters," *Syntax and Semantics* 20, 377-404.
- Takami, Ken-ichi (1990) "Remarks on Extrapolation from NP," *Linguistic Analysis* 20, 192-219.

---

English. (cf. 3.1.) See Ward and Birner (1995) for the functional property of right-dislocation in English.

- Takami, Ken-ichi (1994) "Nichieigo no Kouchibun to Johokoza," *Eigo Seinen* 8, 230-232.
- Takami, Ken-ichi (1995a) *Kinoutekikobun niyoru Nichieigo Hikaku*, Kurosio, Tokyo.
- Takami, Ken-ichi (1995b) "Nichieigo no Kouchibun to Johokoza," *Nichieigo no Uheidokobun: Sono Kozo to Kino (Rightward Movement Constructions in English and Japanese)*, 159-165, Hitsuzi, Tokyo.
- Takami, Ken-ichi and Kuno Susumu (1992) "Extrapolation from NP and VP-Internal Subjects," *Harvard Working Papers in Linguistics* 1, 155-173.
- Terazu, Noriko (1979) "A Note on the Derived Structure of Extrapolation Rules," *Studies in English Linguistics* 7, 86-99.
- Ward, Gregory and Betty Birner (1996) "On the Discourse Function of Rightward Movement in English," *Conceptual Structure, Discourse, and Language*, ed. by Goldberg, A.E., 463-479.