

CONDITION DUPLICATION, PARADIGM HOMONYMY,
AND TRANSCONSTRUCTIONAL CONSTRAINTS*

Geoffrey K. Pullum
University of California, Santa Cruz

Arnold M. Zwicky
Ohio State University and Stanford University

Recent proposals eliminate familiar notions like “rule” and “construction” from syntactic theory; the oxymoronic-sounding phrase “rule-free grammar” has become a slogan for some syntacticians. Consider this quotation from Chomsky (1989: 43), for example:

...within syntax... there are no rules for particular languages and no construction-specific principles. A language... is not, then, a system of rules, but a set of specifications for parameters in an invariant system of principles of universal grammar (UG); and traditional grammatical constructions are perhaps best regarded as taxonomic epiphenomena, collections of structures with properties resulting from the interaction of fixed principles with parameters set one way or another.

The idea is to reduce grammar entirely to (a) universal constraints and (b) non-universal (henceforth, *parochial*) settings for certain parameters. Parochial construction definitions — syntactic rules in the traditional sense — are eliminated completely. The very notion of a construction is dismissed as an artifact of outmoded assumptions.

However, filters that apply across constructions are assumed to exist, and one kind of parameter that may participate in defining a given language is an indication that a certain filter defined in universal grammar applies or does not apply. The Null Subject Parameter (determining whether constraint (9) of Perlmutter (1971: 100) holds) is one example. Another (very relevant here), is the parameter proposed by Longobardi (1980: 139), determining whether adjacent verbs are permitted to have identical inflections. In this paper we will use the term *transconstructional* to describe statements of this sort that apply to syntactic configurations without regard to what construction they represent.

This paper, like Fillmore (1988), adopts diametrically different assumptions. We take a grammar to be simply a set of construction-particular rules (partly universal and partly parochial in their formulations). We regard the notion of a construction as the crucial basis of syntax, and we think parochial transconstructional constraints probably do not exist at all. We develop this counterpoint to current trends by re-examining a classic transconstructional filter in English, Ross’s “*Doubl-ing*” constraint, and showing, contrary to all previous

accounts, that it is a condition on a single construction-defining rule.¹

Ross gave specific arguments for the transconstructional character of *Doubl-ing*. We will first review and amplify these, and then subvert and nullify them. If we are successful in the case of the *Doubl-ing* constraint, it becomes more plausible to think that all parochial transconstructional constraints might similarly dissolve.

1. The *Doubl-ing* constraint. Ross's *Doubl-ing* constraint is motivated by the ungrammaticality of strings like (1).

(1) *Keeping doing silly things like that would be a bad idea.

Ross's formulation referred to a surface configuration in which a verb ending in *-ing* was sister to a clause whose main verb also ended in *-ing*. He argued that global and perhaps transderivational codicils are called for. First, to predict grammaticality for cases like (2), where the clause following the first verb is not its complement (under classical TG assumptions it is a raising-derived object, and in current analyses it would be a subordinate clause sentential subject), he proposed a global condition requiring that the second verb be subject to the first in deep structure.

(2) Your expecting breathing deeply to benefit us is naive.

And second, to exempt certain matrix verbs from the constraint (as in *Lee's resenting getting photographed drunk*, which is grammatical), Ross noted, but did not formally incorporate into his final statement of the constraint, a transderivational generalization (suggested by George Lakoff) attributing the grammaticality of (3a) to the existence of (3b).

(3) a. *Lee's resenting getting photographed* is silly.

b. *Lee's resenting Chris's getting photographed* is silly.

Milsark (1972) made a valuable contribution to the discussion of the *Doubl-ing* constraint by applying some observations of Emonds (1970), who argued that the complement of a verb like *enjoy* had NP properties but the complement of a verb like *start* did not. Milsark noted that where Emonds' tests confirmed NP status for the complement, the *Doubl-ing* constraint did not apply:

(4) a. Robin was enjoying going to concerts frequently.

b. *Robin was starting going to concerts frequently.

This eliminates the need for a global condition to allow for (2), since *breathing deeply* is a nominal gerund phrase in that example, and it obviates the transderivational reference permitting (3a), since there *getting photographed drunk* is a nominal gerund phrase.

Subsequent refinements of Milsark's statement by Emonds (1973) and Pullum (1974) arrived at a statement of the *Doubl-ing* constraint along the lines of (5):

- (5) Filter out surface structures, from whatever source, in which an *-ing*-suffixed verb has an immediately following non-NP complement with an *-ing*-suffixed verb.

We are concerned with explicating the words “from whatever source” in (5); if there are two or more “sources” for either or both of the *-ing*-suffixed verbs referred to in (5), then we apparently have evidence that the constraint must be transconstructional.

An additional point about (5) is that it refers to the morphological composition of syntactic words (by saying “suffixed”), and to the phonological makeup of morphemes within those words (by saying “*-ing*”), so (5) violates the Principle of Morphology-Free Syntax (or Strong Lexicalist Hypothesis) and the Principle of Phonology-Free Syntax (Zwicky 1969; Pullum and Zwicky 1988). (It was the unwelcome possibility that the Doubl-*ing* constraint violated these two important principles that led us to reexamine it.)

1.1. Syntactic determinants of the form of the first verb. The ending on the first verb in a Doubl-*ing*-offending sequence may be due to the demands of any of at least four different constructions. We illustrate the point with examples in which the first verb is the aspectual *start*, which takes a verb-*ing* complement (like *keep*, *stop*, *continue*, etc.).

- (6) a. The progressive (*I was eating at 10.*; **I was starting eating at 10.*)
 b. The nominal gerund (*My eating shocked them.*; **My starting eating shocked them.*)
 c. The *-ing* exclamation (*Me eating meat!*; **Me starting eating meat!*)
 d. The *-ing* postmodifier (*Anyone eating is crazy.*; **Anyone starting eating is crazy.*)

A generalization would be missed if the constraint were located in the rules that give rise to these constructions. This is what Ross calls a **condition duplication** argument.

1.2. Syntactic determinants of the form of the second verb. A similar case can be made with respect to the second verb in a Doubl-*ing* sequence. There are at least three different *-ing* complement types:

- (7) a. Those governed by aspectual verbs (*Organisms began containing DNA long ago.*)
 b. Those in the progressive construction, which have a different semantics and a very strong anti-stativity restriction (**Organisms are containing DNA today.*)
 c. Those with passive semantics (*This needs washing.*)

The Doubl-*ing* constraint must apply to all of them. We illustrate this with examples in which the first verb is a nominal gerund:

- (8) a. I began singing all day.
 *My beginning singing all day upset them.
 b. I was working on the book all day.
 *My being working on the book all day upset them.
 c. I needed examining by a psychiatrist.
 *My needing examining by a psychiatrist is upsetting.

Here we have a distinct condition duplication argument that is not made explicit by Ross but follows in the same spirit as the arguments he gave.

1.3. The morphological forms of the verbs. Two syntactically (and semantically) distinct, but phonologically identical, forms of the traditionally recognized verb paradigm are implicated in Doubl-*ing* violations. We will call them the **Progressive** and the **Gerund**, after the constructions with those names; see (6a) and (6b), respectively. Once more it seems that it is the surface sequence of *-ing*-marked verbs that must be filtered out regardless of syntactic or morphological provenance.

2. Reanalysis of the morphology. We deal first with the morphological point. We will claim that the traditional morphological analysis is simply wrong to postulate homonymy between the Progressive and the Gerund in English verbal paradigms. There is only one form here; we will refer to it henceforth as the **Present Participle**.²

2.1. Not multiplying categories: I. The mere fact that Present Participles occur in different syntactic contexts with different semantic interpretations does not show that different grammatical categories are involved. Icelandic, for example, is not assumed to have distinct categories for dative indirect objects, dative direct objects, dative subjects, dative prepositional objects, etc. These case forms have quite different syntax (and semantics), but no analyst of Icelandic would entertain the idea that each of them represented a distinct case; they are standardly treated as different "uses" of the same case (as in Andrews 1982).

The point here is that category distinctions should not be multiplied in the absence of phonological realization differences. The Icelandic dative case has a complex set of distinct realization for different classes of words, so that generalizations are clearly lost by treating the different syntactic uses as different morphological cases; but even where there are no realization differences, as with the English forms found in the gerund and progressive constructions, it is preferable to apply Occam's Razor.

2.2. Not multiplying categories: II. One thing about the Icelandic dative is also true of English *V-ing*: Many more than two category distinctions must be made. The logic that leads to distinguishing the Gerund from the Progressive in English morphology would lead to postulating not just two but as many as eight different *V-ing* verb forms in English with different syntactic distributions and semantics:³

- (9) a. Progressive *-ing*:
I am singing a madrigal. (cf. *They are having died.)
- b. Gerund *-ing*:
my singing a madrigal; their having died
- c. Exclamatory *-ing*:
Just think: me singing a madrigal!
Them having died!
- d. Postmodifier *-ing*:
Anyone singing a madrigal must be mad.
Anyone having died will be erased from the database.
- e. Adverbial *-ing* (Silva 1972):
I'm going carol-singing.
*They are going having died.
- f. Absolute *-ing*:
With me singing madrigals, everyone will be amused.
Having died, they were no further use to us.
- g. Premodifier *-ing*:
the questing vole; the containing wall
- h. Action-nominal *-ing*, limited to verbs denoting actions:
My singing of the madrigal took four minutes.
*their having of the appearance of death

Surely postulating eight homophonous suffixes is somewhat profligate.

2.3. The unity of *-ing*: I. We have argued that the reasoning that leads to a distinction between Progressive and Gerund forms in English is not sound. But there are at least two positive factual arguments against the distinction, based on rules of English that apply to all and only the verbal *-ing* forms.

First, a phonological argument: all the occurrences are subject to the same alternation in shape between a velar and an alveolar nasal, *-ing* versus *-in'*. This affects the verbal suffix *-ing*, not just anything that rhymes with it, as we can see from the fact that many speakers have a style of moderate informality in which verb forms like *singin'* occur but the noun *building* would not be pronounced **builidin'*. These speakers would say *puttin' up some siding*, *naillin' down some planking*, or *singin' outside a building*, but not **puttin' up some sidin'*, **naillin' down some plankin'*, or **singin' outside a builidin'*. This generalization about English phonology treats all the types of *V-ing* as a class and distinguishes them from other words ending in an unstressed suffix *-ing*.

2.4. The unity of *-ing*: II. Second, a morphological argument, noted by Kiparsky (1974): all and only the *-ing* forms in the paradigm participate in the compounding process that incorporates non-subject nouns into their verbs, as in *wine-making*, *spear-fishing*, and *bicycle-riding*. There are incorporations involving all eight types of *-ing*, as shown in (10), but no form other than the Present Participle is available: not the unmarked Present in (11a), nor the marked Present in (11b), nor the Past in (11c), nor the Past Participle in (11d), nor the unmarked Infinitive in (11e, f), nor the Base form in (11g).

(10) a. Progressive:

They are bicycle-touring across France.

b. Gerund:

Bicycle-touring across France is great.

c. Exclamatory:

Them bicycle-touring across France!

d. Postmodifier:

Anyone bicycle-touring across France must be crazy.

e. Adverbial:

Let's go bicycle-touring across France!

f. Absolute:

With Dana bicycle-touring across France, we were sad.

Bicycle-touring across France, Dana found peace.

g. Premodifier:

Bicycle-touring maniacs invaded the square.

h. Action-nominal:

Their bicycle-touring across France took a week.

(11) a. *They bicycle-tour across France every summer.

b. *She bicycle-tours across France every summer.

c. *They bicycle-toured across France last summer.

d. *They have bicycle-toured across France every summer for years.

e. *We made them bicycle-tour across France.

f. *Please bicycle-tour across France this summer!

g. *I expect you to bicycle-tour across France this summer.

Again the generalization treats all the types of *V-ing* as a class, opposed to all other forms.

Summarizing: first, it is unnecessary to distinguish two or more *V-ing* forms (the differences can be associated instead with different rules referring to Present Participle form); second, it is cumbersome to do so (it forces a multiplication of categories); and third, it is actually wrong to do so (it misses generalizations). We conclude that the right formulation of the *Double-ing* constraint mentions a grammatical category Present Participle, not a morphological notion like "the *-ing* suffix" or a phonological one like "the shape *-ing*."

3. **Undercutting the condition duplication arguments.** We now turn to the condition duplication arguments of sections 1.1 and 1.2 and show that these collapse, given (a) direct phrase structure description of VP complementation and (b) the distinction between constituency rules and valency rules.⁴

3.1. **Direct description of VP complementation.** We begin by observing that it is necessary on a number of grounds to distinguish between (at least) two types of argument constituents for verbs, which we shall call **direct objects** and **complements**. This is a conceptual and terminological refinement of our earlier discussion, which used “complement” and “complementation” loosely, to refer to any sort of argument for a verb.

In English, direct objects (but not complements) are passivizable and *tough*-movable, while complements (but not direct objects) can have modifiers of the head verb intervene between them and this verb. In (12) we illustrate these points with the object-taking verb *try*, as in *I've never tried sushi*, and the complement-taking verb *try*, as in *I've never tried to eat sushi*.

(12) a. Passive:

Several kinds of sushi have been tried by everyone I know.

*To eat several kinds of sushi has been tried by everyone I know.

b. *Tough* movement:

Sushi is difficult for most people to try.

*To eat sushi is difficult for most people to try.

c. Intervening VP modifiers:

*I have tried often sushi.

I have tried often to eat sushi.

From such examples alone, one might conclude that the difference was merely a matter of whether the internal argument of the verb was an NP or not. But as is well known, NPhood is neither sufficient for passivization (many verbs occur with NPs that cannot be passive subjects), nor necessary (non-NP constituents with the same internal syntax may act like objects or like complements depending upon what head verb they combine with). In particular, there are present participial VPs of both types, with verbs like *enjoy* and *relish* occurring with arguments that act like objects and with most aspectual verbs (like *start*) and some others (for some speakers, *(dis)like*) occurring with arguments that act like complements:

(13) a. Object behavior with *enjoy*:

Dining out is enjoyed by millions every day.

Dining out is not hard to enjoy.

*I enjoy enormously dining out.

- b. Complement behavior with *start*:
 *Dining out has been started by millions.
 *Dining out is not hard to start.
 We started long ago dining out.

3.1.1. Reference to grammatical relations. We will assume here, uncontroversially, that rules can refer in some way to the relations “object” and “complement”. It does not matter whether they do this à la relational grammar by direct reference to the grammatical relations *Object-of* and *Complement-of*, or via an NP versus non-NP categorial distinction à la Emonds (1970). Some realization of the distinction, however, is crucial to our statement of the *Doubl-ing* constraint.

It is well known that not all combinations of present participial head verb with a present participial non-subject argument violate the constraint, or at least that some of these combinations exhibit lesser degrees of unacceptability than examples like **It is stopping raining*, and it is known that there is some variation from verb to verb and from person to person in these judgments. For us, the verbs that are fully grammatical in the *doubl-ing* configuration include those in (14a), as in (15a), while the verbs in (14b) are less acceptable, as in (15b); other speakers report other patterns of grammaticality.

- (14) a. avoid, dread, enjoy, forget, recall, recommend, relish, remember
 b. like, dislike, hate, try
- (15) a. I'm really dreading eating raw octopus.
 b. ?These days I'm liking eating raw octopus less and less.

We explain this distinction by claiming that direct object VPs, as in (15a), are not subject to the *Doubl-ing* constraint, and complement VPs, as in (15b), are subject to it. The word “complement” in (5) above is correct, but must be taken in its narrower sense.

3.1.2. Constructions and rules. Our next point arises from the observation that there is no one-to-one correspondence between (i) verb subcategories, (ii) formal properties of complements, and (iii) semantic concomitants of verb-complement combinations. Rather, we have a set of **constructions**, each with its own formal requirements on the participant constituents, its own subcategory for the head,⁵ and its own semantics (Zwicky 1987).

The standard analytic strategy of generative syntax distinguishes constructions via representation differences. Syntactic rules are conditions on the well-formedness of representations, and do not necessarily correspond at all closely to constructions. In a framework with no parochial rules but only parameter settings, there is nothing that corresponds to an individual construction. In either case, we expect transconstructional constraints.

In a construction-based framework for syntax, in contrast, the natural arrangement is for each rule to be a description of one construction and for each construction to be described by one rule. Anything other than this direct alignment of rules and constructions — in particular, any sort of transconstructional constraint — constitutes something of an anomaly.

Our previous discussion has eliminated much of the transconstructional character of the Doubl-*ing* constraint. Suppose for the moment that the only English construction combining a V head with a present participial VP complement was the one that was the focus of all the original discussion of the constraint, namely the aspectual construction with *stop*, *start*, etc. Then it would suffice to constrain this one rule not to apply if the head V has the present participle form. This formulation would generalize across all the sources for the present participle form on the first verb.

The only transconstructional characteristic of the constraint that remains is the generalization across (at least) three different sources for the present participle form on the second verb. We now turn to the analytic step that removes this too.

3.2. The distinction between constituency and valency rules. The second analytic step we make is to distinguish between constituency rules, which express generalizations about constituent inclusion and linear ordering, and valency rules, which express generalizations about the compatibility of heads with dependents bearing particular grammatical relations. Constituency rules make no reference to what specific types of dependents different subcategories of head may demand. Valency rules make no reference to how the participants in grammatical relations are organized into constituents or ordered with respect to one another. Both sorts of rules, of course, refer to syntactic categories,⁶ and one rule can depend upon or invoke the conditions in another (Zwicky 1989). We will illustrate with some rules from English, listed in (16) – (20) below.

The content of rule A is universal, though a given language may either have two-argument adjectives or happen to lack them. Other rules of English require oblique objects to be marked with prepositions, the default preposition being *of*, and thus rule A licenses combinations like *sure of NP*, *aware of NP*, etc.

(16) Rule A (valency):

An adjective head word is compatible with a subject constituent and an oblique object constituent.

Such an adjective and its object can then be “assembled” by rule B, with X instantiated as A, into an AP (adjective phrase) constituent like *sure of your answer*.

Rule B has a universal portion (essentially rule 2 of Pollard and Sag 1987:151), plus several codicils specific to English, including the two given below that impose ordering conditions on the daughter constituents of phrases:

(17) Rule B (constituency):

- (universal) An X-phrase can be composed of an X head and all the non-subject arguments licensed for it by some valency rule.
- (parochial) 1. The X head is leftmost.
- (parochial) 2. A direct object, if there is one, immediately follows the X head.

The content of valency rules C and D is universal. Rule C licenses an adjective phrase like *sure of your answer* in the predicative grammatical relation. Rule C is used by rule D, which licenses copular verbs like *be* as heads with subjects and predicatives. Rule D includes a clause by which such a copular verb “inherits” its subject from a subsidiary construction.

(18) Rule C (valency):

An adjective phrase can serve in the predicative relation.

(19) Rule D (valency):

A verb head is compatible with a subject constituent and a predicative constituent, the latter comprising a subsidiary head and any number of dependent constituents, where some valency rule licenses the compatibility of this subsidiary head with this subject and these other dependents.

Rule D in turn is invoked by constituency rules B and E; with $X = V$, B combines verbs and their non-subject arguments to make verb phrase constituents like *be sure of your answer*, *become an opponent of the government*, and *send flowers to the judge*. Finally, E combines verbs indirectly (via the mediation of a VP constituent) with all their arguments, to make clause constituents like *you be sure of your answer* (as in *I insist that you be sure of your answer*). Like B, rule E (roughly rule 1 of Pollard and Sag 1987: 149) has a universal portion, building a clause from a subject and a compatible X-phrase predicate, and portions specific to English, requiring that the predicate be a verb phrase and ordering the subject before the predicate.

(20) Rule E (constituency):

- (universal) A clause can be composed of an X-phrase constituent licensed by rule B and a subject constituent, where some valency rule licenses the subsidiary head X with this subject and its other arguments in the X-phrase.
- (parochial) 1. X is V.
- (parochial) 2. The subject precedes the X-phrase.

3.3. Formulation of the Doubl-*ing* constraint. We are now close to eliminating the last remnants of transconstructionality from the statement of the Doubl-*ing* constraint. The remaining apparent problem is that, as noted above, there are at least three rules combining a verb head with a Present Participle VP complement: one rule for an aspectual construction, one for a progressive construction with head verb *be*, and one for a "passive" construction with head verb *need* or *want*, as in (7). Each is a valency rule, with a condition by which the construction in question "inherits" its subject from a subsidiary construction.

Other valency rules of English license head verbs with VP complements of other types, with predicatives, with objects of various types, or as occurring intransitively, without an object. All of these valency rules can be called upon by the constituency rule B above with $X = V$, which "assembles" a verb head and all its non-subject arguments into a VP. Our claim is that it is this one constituency rule that is subject to the Doubl-*ing* constraint, and not any of the valency rules invoked by rule B. This is a third parochial condition on rule B:

- (21) The Doubl-*ing* constraint: Rule B is inapplicable if its head V and an immediately following head of a complement VP are both in Present Participle form.

In (21) we have a constraint on one construction-defining rule of English, the one for the standard verb-initial VP. This rule does not need to mention that any one of four or more rules might be the source of the requirement of Present Participle form on the head verb; nor does it need to mention that any one of three or more rules might be the source of the requirement of Present Participle form on the complement VP.

3.4. Inconstancy. A condition on a valency rule applies constantly throughout all invocations by different constituency rules. However, a condition on a constituency rule, like (21), will not apply to other constituency rules, even when the same valency rules are invoked; such a condition will appear to be "inconstant" or subject to what Ross has called an "amnesty". Inconstancy served as one of Ross's types of argument for the transconstructional character of the the Doubl-*ing* constraint: the argument from **necessary intermediate stages**.

Consider a condition that is constant: the membership of verbs in the subcategory of head words for valency rule D. The verb *be* occurs with predicatives, but *exist* does not, as in (22a) below. This condition continues to hold even if the head verb and the predicative are not together in a single VP, as in (22b, c).

- (22) a. They were sure of their answers.
 a'. *They existed sure of their answers.
 b. How sure of their answers were they?
 b'. *How sure of their answers did they exist?
 c. They remain \emptyset today, and were \emptyset a month ago,
 c'. *They remain \emptyset today, and existed \emptyset a month ago, completely sure of their answers.

Contrast this with doubl-*ing* violations, which disappear (as Ross noticed) when the two Present Participle forms are not together in the same phrase:

- (23) a. I was hoping they would stop singing, and now Kim is indeed stopping \emptyset .
 b. Kim neither was stopping \emptyset , nor ever intended to stop \emptyset , singing.

Ross assumed that strings like **Kim was stopping singing* had to appear as intermediate stages in the derivations of examples like those in (23).

We deny that an intermediate representation has to be posited here. The valency rule for aspectual verbs says that the verb *stop* is compatible with the subject *Kim* and the Present Participle complement VP *singing*, and since this rule places no conditions on the form of the head verb, the Present Participle *stopping* is compatible with these arguments as well. A problem arises only when we put *stopping* and *singing* together in a VP by constituency rule B, which is subject to constraint (21). When VPs are licensed by rules that do not call for a VP complement, as in the examples in (23), there is no problem in having the head verb form *stopping*, since these other rules are free of constraints like (21).

Thus our analysis, which locates the Doubl-*ing* constraint on the constituency rule for X-phrases, makes correct predictions about where the constraint fails to apply.

3.5. Immediate adjacency. If the Doubl-*ing* constraint was a condition on one or more valency rules, then we would expect no reference to linear order in it; conditions on linear order are imposed not in valency rules but in constituency rules. Earlier formulations of the constraint, however, implicitly or explicitly call it up only for adjacent Present Participle forms, and we have carried this restriction through to our formulation in (21). Insofar as the restriction applies only to immediately adjacent forms, we have a further correct prediction from treating it as a condition on a constituency rule.

English verbs that are compatible with both a direct object and a Present Participle complement VP provide clear evidence for the adjacency restriction. When the complement VP is separated from the head V by the direct object, the Doubl-*ing* constraint is not infringed, so (24a) is fine. But when the second parochial condition on rule B is lifted, in "heavy NP shift" examples like (24b),

so that the complement VP can immediately follow the head, a violation of the *Doubl-ing* constraint results, as in (24c).

- (24) a. We were getting everyone singing in tune.
 b. We got singing in tune everyone who came to the festival.
 c. *We were getting singing in tune everyone who came to the festival.

Conversely, whenever other rules license material that can intervene between the head V and its complement VP — whether this intervening material forms a constituent with the head (as in (25a)), forms a constituent with the complement (as in (25b)), or is a sister constituent to them both (as in (25c)) — the resulting examples seem fine, or at least dramatically improved.⁷

- (25) a. I'll be keeping right on singing even after you stop.
 b. I'll soon be starting regularly going to church.
 c. I'll soon be starting, as you probably already realize, eating only salads for lunch.

4. Conclusion. The *Doubl-ing* constraint as restated in (21) lends no support to the idea of filters or other transconstructional constraints, or to any of the weakenings of linguistic theory that have been associated with previous formulations. Our statement is nonglobal, nontransderivational, and free of syntactic reference to morphology or phonology. One implication is that early criticisms of global and transderivational constraints are borne out: such devices are not needed to capture the *Doubl-ing* generalization. Another is that the mutual autonomy of syntax, morphology, and phonology is supported. And a third is that since the transconstructionality of the *Doubl-ing* constraint had been argued by Ross with unusual care, our result locating it on a construction-defining rule undermines the “rule-free grammar” program.

We are prepared to argue (though not here) that all the parochial transconstructional syntactic constraints that have been proposed in the literature, beginning with Ross (1967) and Perlmutter (1971) and continuing through Longobardi (1980), are either (i) not parochial, but universal; or (ii) not syntactic, but rather morphological (like many clitic ordering constraints) or prosodic (like conditions on the stranding of words with particular accentual properties); or (iii) not grammatical generalizations at all, but rather statistical tendencies or stylistic preferences (e.g. constraints referring to length and complexity); or (iv) not transconstructional, but rule-particular, like *Doubl-ing*.

NOTES

* This paper was written at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences (CASBS). Pullum is grateful for financial support from a fellowship provided under National Science Foundation grant BNS 8700864 to CASBS and from a sabbatical leave granted by the University of California, Santa Cruz. Zwicky is grateful for sabbatical

support from the Ohio State University.

¹ Bolinger (1979) has suggested that there is no grammatical constraint here at all, merely a dispreference for successions of "jingling" words in sentences. He points out that we would similarly avoid locutions like *Was his the token taken?* Undoubtedly there are dispreferences for some of the jingles in Doubl-*ing* examples, even those we have judged to be fully grammatical, but for many speakers of English the constraint is quite specific, even limited to specific verbs, and not at all fuzzy. There might well be many other speakers who lack the constraint, and merely find examples like those in (6) awkward, but this possibility should not divert us from considering the grammar for those speakers whose judgments are clear-cut.

² Quirk et al. (1985) refer to it as "participle -ing".

³ The generative literature either avoids the question of what the verb forms in (9c-h) are or assumes that a form that doesn't have the action semantics of the progressive is a gerund. Ross (1972), for instance, takes the first tack, while Gazdar et al. (1982: 597) take the second, at least with respect to absolutes like those in (9f). But there are gross distributional and semantic differences between gerunds and absolutes.

⁴ The full taxonomy of rule types includes two others, concerned with sentence types and with anaphoric elements, and is thus that of Bloomfield (1933) on construction types, but with his constituent structure constructions split into two types.

⁵ Strictly speaking, it is the functor word that is relevant for subcategorization in the "lexical" generalizations: the head word in a combination of head with arguments, the modifier word in a combination of modifier with head.

⁶ A description of this sort is reminiscent of descriptions in Lexical Functional Grammar (Bresnan and Kaplan 1982) or Head-driven Phrase Structure Grammar (Pollard and Sag 1987), but in constructing a theory of grammar we would not necessarily adopt all the specific assumptions made by LFG and/or HPSG.

⁷ Some speakers judge some of these examples to be less than fully acceptable, presumably because of a residual "jingle" effect in the sense of Bolinger (1979).

REFERENCES

- Andrews, Avery. 1982. The representation of case in Modern Icelandic. Joan W. Bresnan (ed.), *The Mental Representation of Grammatical Relations*, 427-503. MIT Press, Cambridge MA.
- Bolinger, Dwight. 1979. The jingle theory of double -ing. David J. Allerton, Edward Carney, and David Holdcroft (eds.), *Function and Context in Linguistic Analysis: A Festschrift for William Haas*, 41-56. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Bresnan, Joan W., and Ronald M. Kaplan. 1982. Lexical-Functional Grammar: A formal system for grammatical representation. Joan W. Bresnan (ed.), *The Mental Representation of Grammatical Relations*, 173-281. MIT Press,

Cambridge MA.

- Chomsky, Noam. 1989. Some notes on economy of derivation and representation. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 10.43–74.
- Emonds, Joseph E. 1970. *Root and Structure-preserving Transformations*. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT. Distributed by Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- Emonds, Joseph E. 1973. Alternatives to global constraints. *Glossa* 7.39–62.
- Fillmore, Charles J. 1988. The mechanisms of "Construction Grammar". *BLS* 14.35–55.
- Gazdar, Gerald; Geoffrey K. Pullum; and Ivan A. Sag. 1982. Auxiliaries and related phenomena in a restrictive theory of grammar. *Language* 58.591–638.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 1974. Remarks on analogical change. Anderson, John M., and Charles Jones (eds.), *Historical Linguistics, Volume 1*, 257–75. North-Holland, Amsterdam.
- Longobardi, Giuseppe. 1980. Remarks on infinitives: A case for a filter. *Journal of Italian Linguistics* 1/2.101–55.
- Milsark, Gary. 1972. Re: Doubl-ing. *Linguistic Inquiry* 3.542–9.
- Pollard, Carl J., and Ivan A. Sag. 1987. *Information-based Syntax and Semantics. Volume 1: Fundamentals*. Center for the Study of Language and Information, Stanford CA.
- Perlmutter, David M. 1971. *Deep and Surface Structure Constraints in Syntax*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.
- Pullum, Geoffrey K. 1974. Re-stating doubl-ing. *Glossa* 8.109–20.
- Pullum, Geoffrey K., and Arnold M. Zwicky. 1988. The syntax-phonology interface. Frederick J. Newmeyer (ed.), *Linguistics: The Cambridge Survey*, Volume 1, 255–80. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Quirk, Randolph; Sidney 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*. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT. Distributed (1968) by Indiana University Linguistics Club, Bloomington.
- Ross, John Robert. 1972. Doubl-ing. *Linguistic Inquiry* 3.61–86.
- Silva, Clare. 1975. Adverbial -ing. *Linguistic Inquiry* 6.346–50.
- Zwicky, Arnold M. 1969. Phonological constraints in syntactic descriptions. *Papers in Linguistics* 1.411–63.
- Zwicky, Arnold M. 1987. Constructions in monostratal syntax. *CLS* 23.1.389–401.
- Zwicky, Arnold M. 1989. What's become of derivations? Defaults and invocations. *BLS* 15.303–20. Earlier version in *Working Papers in Linguistics* (The Ohio State University) 37.100–14 (1989).