

A COUNTER TO COUNTER EQUI

Kenneth L. Hale and Chisato Kitagawa
M.I.T. *University of Arizona*

1. INTRODUCTION

Our objective in this short essay is to present a critique of the 'Counter Equi NP Deletion' analysis of sentences with a tokoro complement proposed by Harada 1973. Our claim, briefly, is that there needs to be nothing more than the ordinary provisions for pronominalization, plus the 'Double-Q Constraint' (to be discussed below), applying in the derivation of these sentences.

2. HARADA'S PROPOSAL.

A rule roughly of the following form was proposed by Kuroda (cf. 1965a:37) and Inoue (1969:49), and recently defended by Shibatani (1973:343-344).

$$(1) \dots - NP_1 + \underline{o} - NP_2 + \underline{o} \dots \longrightarrow \dots - NP_1 + \underline{ni} - NP_2 + \underline{o} \dots$$

This rule, to which we will refer by Kuroda's term 'o-Adjustment', is designed to account for a sentence like 2c below, which may be assumed to be derived from 2a; without a rule like o-Adjustment, the application of usual case marking rules, such as specified in Kuroda 1965b:192,¹ in conjunction with normal Equi NP Deletion, will derive the ill-formed 2b.