

Transformations – a longer list (refurbished I.III.2010)

Haj Ross
 Department Linguistics and Technical Communication,
 University of North Texas
 haj@unt.edu
 2.VI.1999

The following list, which makes a half-hearted attempt to assemble the major processes which shape English sentences, was begun around eleven years ago, when I was visiting my friend Franz Guenther and his research group – CIS, das Centrum für Informations- und Sprachverarbeitung, at the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, München. I thank Franz and his fellow CISler for their hospitable open-mindedness, over the years. It was fun to work and think with all of you.

I say “half-hearted,” because I am pretty sure that an exhaustive search through all the books and articles that have discussed English syntax in the last 60 years would probably arrive at a list perhaps five times as long as this one (or even longer?). But, on the other hand, what army of researchers is liable to do all the reading and compiling that such a list will require? With what funding? Since these questions are both pretty rhetorical, I offer this list of the *iTOP ONE HUNDRED PLUS TRANSFORMATIONS OF 1999!* for your inspection of and additions to.

For what purpose(s)? For a broad-brush limning of the major players in English syntax. So students in their first syntax course can be shown this list with the admonition that they should try to stretch their minds to a big enough size that they understand that English is no smaller than this.

The list is, like your humble author, and his linguistic training, is obviously shaped by and framed in terms of the theories of his teachers, Zellig Harris, Noam Chomsky, Ed Klima, Paul Postal, and then those of his friends, at MIT and thereafter: Bruce, Chuck, Dave, George, Jake, Jim, Joan, John, Ken, Paul Kiparsky, Ray, Robby, who multiply on into the impossibly totally nameable hundreds I thank you each and all.

Above all this list is intended to be part of the ageless tradition, named so deftly by Chuck Fillmore: this list is for all of us OWG's – Ordinary Working Grammarians. It hopes to be making no theoretical claims at all – certainly none that will make it uncomfortable for theoreticians of one or another stripe to use. Like Lieutenant Friday, it aims at just the facts, Ma'am.

I think it may prove to be useful for advanced learners of English. After your first two years or so of English, you should be able to use all of these constructions / do all of these processes. If you are comfortable with all of them, they should serve you in good stead in academic and bureaucratic prose, and even in not-too-flowery literature. This is meat and potatoes English.

If you find this list useful, but are put off by some of the glaring omissions that I am sure are there, please let me know what they are, and I will try to remedy them in subsequent refurbishments.

Last, it is obvious how much this list owes to the brilliantly playful spirit of Jim McCawley, to whose memory it is affectionately dedicated.

Sections

I.	Emphasis	p. 3ff
	A. Pseudoclefts and Dislocations	pp. 3-4
	B. Clefts	p. 4
	C. Frontings	pp. 4-6
II.	Coordinate Structures	p. 6
III.	Deletions	p. 6ff
IV.	Noun Modifications	p.
V.	Insertions	p.
VI.	Pronominalizations	p.
VII.	Advancements	p.
	A. To subject	p.
	B. To object	p.
VIII.	Ascensions	p.
	A. To subject	p.
	B. To object	p.
IX.	Incorporations	p.
X.	Rules for Paths	p.
XI.	Reorderings	p.
XII.	Lexically-governed Deletions	p.
XIII.	Embeddings	p.

I. EMPHASIS

A. Pseudoclefts

1. PSEUDOCLEFT FORMATION: *What I ate was (~~I ate~~) an eel.*
What I ate was (%I ate) an eel. → What I ate was an eel. The centrality of this kind of sentences for all emphatic constructions has been *ein roter Faden* for me since I first started thinking about it after reading a pivotal short article on it by Bob Lees. I have gone into most detail about pseudos in two papers: Ross (2000, 2011)
2. COPULA SWITCH: [*What I ate was an eel.*] → *An eel is what I ate.*
3. BROGAN FAKE RELATIVIZATION: *Say the house that you saw.*
[Say which house you saw. → Say the house that you saw.
 This rule also works in pseudoclefts: *Who left was Al → The one who left was Al; What Tina claims is that we are nuts. → (?)That which Tina claims is that we are nuts]*
4. CONJUNCTIVE WH-CLAUSE NOMINALIZATION (G): *Bill's claim is that he is an alien.* [From: *What Bill claims is that he is an alien.*
 Works for conjunctive *wh*-clauses in other contexts as well:
We mentioned what Bill claimed → We mentioned Bill's claim.
 NB: G = a governed rule, i. e., a rule which does not work for all predicates, and for which one must therefore indicate for each predicate or class of them whether the rule applies or not. Thus, with respect to the present rule, it is impossible to apply it to *what Ed saw was that his van was gone* – see will not undergo this rule (cf. **Bill's sight was that his van was gone*).
5. LEFT AND RIGHT DEICTIC DISLOCATION:
[It won't cost \$2. → \$2, it won't cost that.] (via LEFT DEICTIC DISLOCATION) or: *[It won't cost \$2. → It won't cost [this / ?*that] – \$2.]* (via RIGHT DEICTIC DISLOCATION)
6. LEFT AND RIGHT DISLOCATION: [*My horse snores. → My horse, he snores.*] (via LEFT DISLOCATION) or: [*My horse snores. → He snores, my horse.* (via RIGHT DISLOCATION) In pseudoclefts, this rule will produce related sentences like the following: *Anne's brother is the one who left → Anne's brother, he is the one who left.* The rule can apply to its own output, producing sentences like *Anne's brother, HIM – HE is the one who left.*

NB: LEFT DISLOCATION may apply to the output of LEFT DEICTIC DISLOCATION, in this manner: *Anne's brother is the one who left.*
 → *Anne's brother – that is the one who left.* →
Anne's brother – HIM – THAT is the one who left.

7. SLUICING: (cf. Ross (1969)) *I know he is looking at something, but I don't know at what (he is looking)*. In pseudoclefts, this rule will convert (in some dialects) a sentence like *We need a fork is what we need*. into *We need a fork is what %(~~we need~~)*.

B. Clefts

- ia. WH-CLEFT SENTENCE FORMATION: *It was an onion which I ate.*
 ib. THAT-CLEFT SENTENCE FORMATION: *It was an onion that I ate.*

There have to be two distinct rules of clefting, because while the *wh*-clefts cannot cleft sequences of constituents which are not (do not seem to be) dominated by any single node, this is sometimes possible for *that*-clefts, as we see below:

*It was Jim swimming [that / *who] I saw.*
*It was in March for six weeks [that / *when] I worked there.*

At present, I do not know of any interesting story about where cleft sentences could derive from. On the one hand, they seem virtually indistinguishable, functionally, from pseudoclefts – both have the job of putting certain emphasized constituents in the limelight. And there are strong syntactic reasons too – like: neither likes the present perfect of the main verb *be* (?*What I eat has been beans* / ?*It has been beans that I eat*.) [FN: unless the verb in the *wh*-clause is also in the present progressive, e.g., *What I have been eating has been beans*.] However, there are grave differences in behavior which (seem to?) preclude deriving both from the same source. I shall thus temporize by extracting clefts from the brow of Hera.

The clefted constituent may later be topicalized (*An onion it was that I ate*.), and, topicalized or not, it may be deictic dislocated: *An onion – it was [THAT / THIS] that I ate*. *An onion – [THAT / THIS] it WAS [that / > ?which] I ate*.

2. PRESUPPOSITION DELETION: *They say that it was Barbara who ate all the leeks, but I know that it was Michele (~~who ate all the leeks~~)*. This rule seems highly similar to SLUICING – it may eventually turn out that the two rules are to be identified.

C. Frontings

1. TOPICALIZATION: [*I don't watch TV* → *TV I don't watch*.] [*I would never send anything to Harry*. → *To Harry I would never send anything*.] [*We have been stupid only about citizenship*. → *Stupid we have been only about citizenship*.] [*We should word this reply tersely*. → *Tersely we should word this reply*.] NB: Many Southern speakers aver that they can't do this kind of preposing. For some reason, NP's with deictic determiners prepose easier: [[*THAT / THIS*] / > ?*The* / ?**A*] *cat I*

fed.]

2. NEGATED CONSTITUENT TOPICALIZATION: [*She will invite no one from Montana.* → *No one from Montana will she invite.*] [*You should pat my tarantula under no circumstances.* → *Under no circumstances should you pat my tarantula.*] [*I have never lied* → *Never have I lied.*]
3. THOUGH-PREPOSING: [*Though Bill is rich, he eats a mean waffle.* → *Rich though Bill is, he eats a mean waffle.*] NB: this rule must be formulated in such a way as to delete indefinite articles when a predicate nominal is preposed: (**A pig though Milford is in bed, he sure can sing falsetto.*)
4. AS-PREPOSING: [*As Bill is rich, he will be perfect as a dishwasher.* → *Rich as Bill is, he will be perfect as a dishwasher.*]
5. VP PREPOSING: [*The feds fear that I will go to Lubbock, and I will go there* → *The feds fear that I will go to Lubbock, and go there I will.*]
6. ADVERB PREPOSING: [*I think he'll be in Texas tomorrow.* → *Tomorrow I think he'll be in Texas.*]
7. SLIFTING [= sentence-lifting] (G) : [*I feel that Terry is brilliant.* → *Terry is brilliant, I feel.*] Cf. Ross (1973). NB: this rule must follow a rule of NOT-COPYHOPPING: [*I think that Mel is not sober.* → (**I don't think that Mel is not sober.*)] Here, the doubled negative is audible (which produces an ungrammatical string, a necessary intermediate stage):

(*)Mel isn't sober, I don't think.

But if the complement of *think* is not then SLIFTed, then the original (embedded) *not* must be deleted, producing *I don't think that Mel is sober.*

8. SENTENTIAL AS-PREPOSING (G) : *Mel is drunk, as I feared.* [From (perhaps): *I feared that Mel was drunk, and he was.*] NB: when these sentential *as*-clauses follow a sentential negative in the (superficial) main clause, the *as* can refer to the positive clause which is inside the sentential negative, as we see below:

Mort is not, as we feared, completely besotted.

This can mean either that we feared that he was drunk, or that we feared that he was not.

NEW

9. ADVERB OF RANGE PREPOSING: [*Tom, of all the students, has the biggest house.* → *Of all the students, Tom has the biggest house.*] NB: the adverb of range (the PP starting with *of*) can be niched into all the places which other sentential adverbs can be. Cf. the discussion of NICHING in Section V below. Some examples in this sentence are: *Tom has, of all the students, the biggest house;* *Tom has the biggest house of all the students.*

10. EXCEPTIVE FRONTING: [*I bet everyone except for Claude had a blast.* → *Except for Claude, I bet everyone had a blast.*] [*I bet everyone except for Claude's house was ransacked.* → ??*Except for Claude, I bet everyone's house was ransacked.*]

AAA

II. COORDINATE STRUCTURES

- A. CONJUNCTION REDUCTION: [*Ed sings and Jane sings.* → *Ed and Jane sing*]; [*Ed eats and Ed runs.* → *Ed eats and runs.*]
- B. COORDINATE CONJUNCTION SPAWNING: copiable coordinate conjunctions (like *and*, *or*, *nor*) get Chomsky-adjoined to each conjunct. [[*and* (*or* / *nor*, etc.)] [C C C ...C]_C] → [[*and* C]_C [*and* C]_C [*and* C]_C...[*and* C]_C]
- NEW** C. WEIRD FIRST CONJUNCTION:
The first *and* → (*both*) before anything but a S. Before S, it deletes.
The first *or* → (*either*). The first *nor* turns to *neither*. Thus: *And Ed sings and Jane sings* → *Ed sings and Jane sings*; *And Ed and Jane sing* → *Both Ed and Jane sing*; *Or Ed sings or Jane sings* → (*Either*) *Ed sings or Jane sings*; *Nor Ed sings nor Jane sings* → *Neither Ed sings nor Jane sings*
- D. ALL BUT LAST CONJUNCTION ZAPPING: *red and white and blue* → *red, white, and blue*; *either red or white or blue* → *either red, white or blue*; *neither animal, nor vegetable, nor mineral* → *neither animal, vegetable, nor mineral*
- NEW** E. GAPPING: *Mike ordered Cheerios and Anne ordered Wheaties.* → *Mike ordered Cheerios and Anne Wheaties.* Cf. Ross (1971). If GAPPING has deleted the highest verbs in a coordinate structure, and the next highest verbs are also identical, then these latter verbs may also be gapped. *Mike wanted to order Cheerios and Anne wanted to order Wheaties.* → *Mike wanted to order Cheerios and Anne Ø to order Wheaties.* *Mike wanted to order Cheerios and Anne Ø Ø Wheaties.*
- F. RIGHT NODE RAISING: [*He **may** like poptarts, and Sheila definitely **does** like poptarts.* → *He **may**, and Sheila definitely **does**, like poptarts.*]
OR: *He **may** like, and Sheila definitely **does** like, poptarts.*

BBB

III. DELETIONS

- A. EQUI (A.K.A. CONTROL) The Granddaddy of all deletions. I will call it Equi for nostalgic reasons. Basically, this rule deletes the subject of a

non-finite subordinate clause under identity with some NP in the immediately superior clause. *I want [for me to win] → I want [for Ø to win].* I will not specify here the various cleanup rules that are necessary (like the rule which removes the complementizer *for* after the following subject has been zapped). This rule may be the same one which is necessary after Equi deletes the subject of subordinate clauses starting with *while, if, before, after, in*: *While I shaved myself, I thought of my pussycat. → While Ø shaving myself, I thought of my pussycat.* In English, the default kind of non-finite clausal residue is an *-ing*-phrase; I currently know of no subordinate clauses which allow an infinitive to follow a subordinate conjunction: **I will call you after Ø to shave myself.* In other languages, which, unlike English, have only one morphological choice for non-finite clauses, the infinitive follows this kind of post-subordinating conjunction deletion: *Je vous téléphonerai avant que je parte → Je vous téléphonerai avant de Ø partir* (I have no idea where the *de* comes from).

We should note that it is often possible, or necessary, to delete the form *being* after Equi has removed the subordinate clause subject: *While I was happy about the rebate, I was still ticked about the delay. → [via Equi] While Ø being happy about the rebate, I was still ticked about the delay. → [via other rules, perhaps collapsible with the rule(s) that delete the copula in certain non-finite complements, as in *I consider you to be a scoundrel, sirrah!* Cf. section D below.] While Ø Ø happy about the rebate, I was still ticked about the delay.*

- B. COMPARATIVE AND EQUATIVE DELETION: *Sandi has [more cars/ as many cars] [than / as] Ted (does / has) yachts; Bill wanted to try to build as big houses as Toni (wanted (to try (to build))) igloos.*
- C. COLON ZAPPING: *Terry said something dumb to them: he said a swear to them. → Terry said something dumb to them: ~~he said~~ a swear ~~to them~~*
- D. BE-DELETIONS
1. In adverbial clauses: *Though (being) polite, Ted was angry; [If/ When / Though / While] (being) [in London / drunk / a patient], I always rely on Schweppes.*
Cf. also: *[When(ever) / If / Where(ver) / As [soon/long] as / Insofar as] (*being) [possible/ expected], I keep my cool.* NB: in these latter sentences, the subject of the deleted copula was the expletive pronoun *it*, instead of a pronominal copy of the subject of the matrix sentence.
 2. After RAISING (G) : *Max seems (to be) happy. I found Max (to be) odd.*
 3. Absolutives: *(Bob) (being) scared of the ice, Jill drove slowly.*
- E. Adverbial Preposition Deletion(s):
*(*in) [last / this / next] week; (for) three weeks; (on) (last/next) Friday; (in) [this *last / *next] month, (in) [that/ the same] way*
- F. Deletion after *too* and *enough*:

*He sent me something [too slimy / slimy enough] to eat (?*it).*

G. PRE-(SENTENCY) COMPLEMENT PREPOSITION ZAP:

*I'm ashamed (*of) [that I have / to have] two Porsches.*

Compare: *I'm ashamed *(of) having two Porsches.*

H. QUANTIFIER OF-ZAP:

[All / Both] (of) the owls were asleep.

NB: if this deletion happens after *all* + Number, the head NP must undergo ascension, or the definite article must also be deleted:

**All three the owls were asleep. → The owls all three were asleep. OR:
→ All three owls were asleep.*

I. INFINITIVE DELETION: This rule is OPTIONAL after only one verb that I know of *help*: *I helped him (to) bathe his cheetah*. A few verbs delete the infinitival *to* when the verb is active (*I [made / saw / heard] him (*to) leave.*) but must keep it when the verb has been passivized (*He was [made / seen / heard] *(to) leave.*) And *let* has to delete its *to* when active, and refuses to passivize, except if the embedded verb is *go* (*We let him (*to) [go / play chess] vs. He was let [go /*play chess].*)

It may be that the rule which gets rid of the *to* after *need* in affective environments can be collapsed with the transitive cases above – this remains an open issue, as far as I know.

We need [(to) change this tire / not (to) change this tire.] Need we (*to) watch this bilge?*

NEW J. IT-DELETION (G): Some verbs can manifest an expletive *it* immediately before a sentential complement (only in object position). In general, these *it*'s are obligatorily deleted, but for some verbs, this deletion can be made optional or blocked. *I saw % (to it) that we had a good seat. I hate % (it) that it rains here so much.*

CCC

IV. NOUN MODIFICATIONS

- A. APPOSITIVE CLAUSE SWOOPING: *Ev has two fruit bats, and I really trust her → Ev, and I really trust her, has two fruit bats*. NB: we note that the shared NP (to use Harris's term) in the clause to be appositivized, need not have been topicalized, though it can be: *Ev has two fruit bats, and her I really trust → Ev, and her I really trust, has two fruit bats*.
- B. RELATIVE PRONOUN FORMATION: *Ev, and her I really trust, has two fruit bats. → Ev, who I really trust, has two fruit bats*. NB: special provisions must be made for parasitic gaps (Cf. Culicover and Postal (2001)): in the

following sentence, there is one gap after *threw away*, and another, the "parasitic" one, after *reading*: *The book, which I threw away \emptyset , before reading (it) was extremely interesting.*]

- C. WHIZ DELETION: *Somebody (~~who is~~) tall slept here; Mort, (who is) (a) consummate chess player, has warthogs in the basement.* [NB: there are interesting dependencies between WHIZ DELETION, the properness or commonality of the modified noun, and the possibility of various deletions *Sally, (who is) (the one) who called you last night, has moved* vs. *The painter (who is (*the one)) who called you last night, has moved / The painter (who is) who called you last night, has moved.*
- D. MODIFIER SHIFT (G): *the children sleeping quietly \rightarrow the children quietly sleeping \rightarrow the quietly sleeping children.* Modifiers can shift to prenominal position only if their head is phrase-final: **the sleeping quietly children.*
- E. INCORPORATION (G): *the detective smoking a pipe \rightarrow (*)the detective pipe-smoking \rightarrow the pipe-smoking detective; the detective traveling to London \rightarrow ??the to London traveling detective; the detective having a big heart \rightarrow (*)the big-heart-having detective, whence, obligatorily: the big-hearted detective.*
- F. PRENOMINAL ADVERB PREPOSING CUM PREPOSITION OBLITERATING: *the temperature in the city in Dallas on Thursday \rightarrow the (*on) Thursday (*in) Dallas in-city temperature*
- NEW** G. THAT-DELETION AFTER A HEAD NOUN: *The house [that \rightarrow \emptyset] I looked at was costly; We mentioned the fact [that \rightarrow \emptyset] it had rained too much.*
- H. ATTITUDE-PREPOSING (G): *his attitude of "No, you can leave it right there \rightarrow his no-you-can-leave-it-right-there attitude*
- I. POSSESSIVE FORMATION (G): *a book which Mel has \rightarrow a book of Mel's.*
NB: for some nouns there is a pluralization of the head noun, sometimes optional, sometimes obligatory, as a kind of agreement with the number of the possessivizing NP, and I don't know which when: *the height(*s) of Mel - the height*(s) of Mel and Al*
- J. OWNING: *himself's \rightarrow his own*
- K. POSSESSIVE FRONTING: *[A picture / the height] of Mel(s) \rightarrow Mel's [picture / height].* This rule probably has to be split into two; for the case of plain possessives (the ones meaning *have*), the article which conditions the fronting is *the*, which doesn't seem to have to be the case for at least some abstract nouns with which the function of the possessive is to express a subject relation (as with *height, arrival*, etc.) or an object relation (as with *Mel's picture, the city's destruction*, etc.)

DDD

V. INSERTIONS

- A. NICHING: *"Ed • might • not • have • been • talking • to Pete • about this*

• *yesterday*,” *said Tex*. [The parenthetical “*said Tex*” can be inserted anywhere where there is a black dot. The same applies to such sentence adverbs as *perhaps*, *reportedly*, *why am I telling you all this?*; *could you reach over and pass me the flyswatter?*, etc. - all can be inserted in (VERY) roughly the same niches.]

B. *THERE-INSERTION* (G): *A commotion arose* → *There arose a commotion*; *A giraffe is standing in the shower.* → *There is a giraffe standing in the shower.* (Cf. Levin p. 88)

NEW C. *PREDICATE LOWERING*: *The reasons [that /??for which] we should not go are three/numerous/several, etc.]* → *We should not go for [three/numerous/several] reasons.*

NEW D. *PLEASE-INSERTION*: The word *please* may be inserted to the left of any verb whose illocutionary force is that of a request. (Cf. Ross (1975))

EEE

VI. PRONOMINALIZATIONS

A. *EQUI(-NP DELETION)* (a.k.a. “control”) (G): Into complements : *I claim that I am able to eat olives.* → *I claim(*for me) to be able to eat olives.* Into infinitival relative clauses : *We took Betty a novel (for her) to read on the train.* Into adverbial clauses: *Before I got up, I shaved.* → *Before getting up, I shaved.*

B. *REFLEXIVIZATION*: *(*I want to talk to me about you* → *I want to talk to myself about you*; *(?)I want to talk to you about you.* → *I want to talk to you about yourself.*

C. *THAT₂THERE-ING*: *He moved to Illinois, and after moving to Illinois, he became a narc.* → *He moved to Illinois, and after that, he became a narc.* → *He moved to Illinois, and thereafter he became a narc.* → *He moved to Illinois, thereafter becoming a narc.* Other *there-able* prepositions: *there* + [*upon* / *by* / *in* / *from* / *with* / etc.]

D. *ANAPHORIC COMPLEMENT DELETION* (G): *He left, but they don't know (that he left).*

E. *VP-DELETION*: *If you will order a bagel, I will also (order a bagel).*

NEW F. *S DELETION* (G): *Greg always had fleas, but he never knew [that he had fleas]_i.* → *Greg always had fleas, but he never knew it_i.*

NB: under an abstract analysis of actions, where, for instance, *Max is walking* comes from *Max is doing [walk]*, *S DELETION* can be used to derive the sentential object of *do*, producing so-called “pro-VP’s,” like *do it*.

NEW G. *SO-PRONOMINALIZATION* (G): *Jeff used to yoyo secretly, but his mom never thought [that he used to yoyo secretly]_i.* → *Jeff used to yoyo secretly, but his mom never thought so_i.*

NB: under an abstract analysis of actions, where, for instance, *Max is walking* comes from *Max is doing [walk]*, SO-PRONOMINALIZATION can be used to derive so-called “pro-VP’s,” like *do so*.

FFF

VII. ADVANCEMENTS

To subject position:

- NEW** A. PASSIVE (G): *Terence was stalked by the paparazzi*. For certain idioms, there are two possible passives: *Advantage was taken of the favorable climactic conditions*; *The favorable climactic conditions were taken advantage of*. (Cf. Levin p. 85) NB: the set of types of post-verbal constituents that can be advanced by this rule superset that set s that can be advanced by the next two rules. Two brief examples: **Advantage was untaken of my absence*. **These students are adequately talked to about this by the time they graduate*.
- B. UNPASSIVE (G): *No one has painted the car*. → *The car is unpainted*. ; *Nobody is caring for my sheep*. → *My sheep are uncared for*. *I was uninformed* (**that there was going to be a party*).
- C. STATIVE PASSIVE (G): *Someone has paid for the shoes*. → *The shoes are paid for*. (Cf. Levin p. 86-87 - “adjective” passive) **These principles are too rarely spoken up for*.
- D. SOURCE → I (G): *Beer is oozing from the vat*. → *The vat is oozing beer*. *Heat radiates from the sun* → *The sun radiates heat* (Cf. Levin p. 32) [Cf. Blanco 1.1.3 Substance/Source Alternation]. Cf also Blanco 2.3.5 [Cf. Blanco 2.3.5 Clear Alternation (intransitive)] *Clouds cleared from the sky* → *The sky cleared of clouds*.
- E. LOCATIVE → I (G): *Bees are swarming in the garden*. → *The garden is swarming with bees*. (Cf. Levin p. 53) [Cf. Blanco 1.1.3 Substance/Source Alternation and 2.3.4 Swarm Alternation]
- F. HIDDEN (?) LOCATIVE → I (G) : (Perhaps from (***) *water filled into the pail*) *Water filled the pail*. → *The pail filled with water*. (Cf. Levin, p.81)
- G. CRYPTOLOCATIVE NATURAL FORCE SUBJECT DISPLACEMENT BY PATIENT (??) (G): *The sun dried the clothes*. → *The clothes dried in the sun*. (Cf. Levin, p.79)
- H. TEMPORAL → I (G: (*Columbus was in Sorrento in 1491*) → *1491 [saw / found] Columbus in Sorrento*. (Cf. Levin pp. 79-80)
- I. SOURCE → I (OUT OF → INTO) (G):. *An oak tree grew [out of/from] the acorn*. → *The acorn grew into an oak tree* (Cf. Levin, p. 57) [Cf. Blanco 2.4.2 MATERIAL PRODUCT ALTERNATION (intransitive)] NB: the assumed direction of the transformation is that the *out of/from*-phrase is deep, which means that the *into*-phrase should be a chômeur. One piece of evidence for this hypothesis is the weakness of the *into*-phrase if the

object NP is definite. *The acorn grew into [an/??the] oak tree.* Cf. Ross (1995b) for a discussion of chômeage and defective NP's.

NEW J. MIDDLE (a.k.a. PATIENT SUBJECT) (G): *Students can easily translate this book into Gothic* → *This book translates ??(easily) into Gothic (?for students); Authors can write well with this pen* → *This pen writes *(well) for authors; Journalists can take pictures of Einstein well (with this camera)* → *Einstein takes a *(good) picture (with this camera) (?for journalists).* Note the variable necessity of adverbs like *easily, readily, well* (which Harris called “catalysts”) [Blanco 1.1.3]

NEW K. INSTRUMENTALS TO SUBJECT POSITION [CF. BLANCO 1.2.6.2] {INSTRUMENTAL → 1] *Somebody cut *(the bread) with the knife* → *This knife cut (the bread) (This knife doesn't cut* – NB: after the formation of an instrumental-subject sentence, the rule of UNSPECIFIED (PREPOSITIONAL) OBJECT DELETION is enabled (Cf. §XII.F))

To object position:

- A. DATIVE (G): *I sent a jararaca to Mitchell.* → *I sent Mitchell a jararaca.* (Cf. Levin p. 45) [Blanco 2.1]
- B. BENEFACTIVE (G): *We baked a cake for Al.* → *We baked Al a cake.* (Cf. Levin p. 48) [Blanco 2.2]
- NEW** C. GOAL → 2 (G): *We loaded hay onto the wagon.* → *We loaded the wagon with hay.* (cf. Levin, p. 50) [Blanco 2.3.1 & 2.7 IMAGE IMPRESSION ALTERNATION] *The jeweler inscribed the name [into the ring/onto the shield]* *The jeweler inscribed [the ring/the shield with the name.* Also: *We fashioned the noodles into bayonets.* → *We fashioned bayonets out of the noodles.* (Cf. Levin, p.56) NB: this transformation works in French (*Luc charge des caisses dans le camion* → *Luc charge le camion de caisses* “*Luc loads the truck with boxes*”) and in German (*Lucas lädt die Kisten auf den Laster* → *Lucas lädt den Laster mit Kisten*) A suggestion that the transformed version ends with a PP that is a chômeur (cf. Perlmutter) is provided by the fact that in all three languages, the object of the preposition is less happy as a definite (cf. *?with the hay, ?des caisses, ?mit dem Kisten*), a fact consistent with the general tendency of chômeurs to diminish in saliency (and thus definiteness). Cf. Ross (1995b)
- D. LOCATIVE → 2 (G) : *Harrison searched for nuts in the forest.* → *Harrison searched the forest for nuts.* (Cf. Levin p. 70) [Cf. Blanco 2.11 SEARCH ALTERNATION] Blanco mentions that for the verb *hunt*
- E. TO → WITH (G) : *He presented a cake to me.* → *He presented me with a cake.* (Cf. Levin, p. 65) [Cf. Blanco 2.6 FULFILLING ALTERNATION]
- F. AGAINST → WITH (G): *We hit the stick against the fence.* → *We hit the fence with the stick.* (Cf. Levin, p. 67)

- G. *BLAMING* (G): *I blamed the damage on Oz. → I blamed Oz for the damage.* (Cf. Levin, p. 69) [Cf. Blanco 2.10 *BLAME ALTERNATION*]
- H. *PARTICLE MOVEMENT* (G): *You have ripped off too many taxpayers. → You have ripped too many taxpayers off.*
- NEW** I. *SOURCE* → 2 (G): *Ted cleared the snow from the sidewalk. → Ted cleared the sidewalk of snow.* Also: *We left from Dallas for Waco. → We left Dallas for Waco.* [Cf. Blanco 2.3.2 *CLEAR ALTERNATION*] Note that the deep object of verbs like *clear* must be a plural or a mass noun (a multiplex noun, in Len Talmy's felicitous terminology): *I cleared the table of [the dishes / *my cup]*. Cf. Ross (1995b) for a discussion of why the *of*-phrase in the transformed version is, like many chômeurized NP's, defective – for instance, unlike decent, upstanding NP's, it is less than happy to pronominalize: *?I cleared the table of them.* Some other verbs which undergo this alternation (some better than others): *empty, clean, sweep, wipe, etc. (?)*. The verb *rid* seems to be one which obligatorily must undergo the rule.
- NEW** J. *SOURCE* → 2 (G): *We wiped the fingerprints clean off of the wall → We wiped the wall clean of fingerprints* [Cf. Blanco 2.3.3 *WIPE ALTERNATION*] NB: this alternation is unique to English; there appear to be no other adjectives/adverbs (?) like *clean* which can appear where it does.
- NEW** K. *SOURCE (MATERIAL)* → 2 (G): [Cf. Blanco 2.4.1 *MATERIAL PRODUCT ALTERNATION* (transitive)] *Martha carved a toy out of the piece of wood → Martha carved the piece of wood into a toy.* NB: the *into*-phrase is uncomfortable as a definite: *Martha carved the piece of wood into [?the/*my] toy*, a fact which may suggest that this PP is a chômeur, despite the fact that it looks like a Goal-phrase. Cf. Ross (1995b) for discussion of chômeage and defectivity.
- NEW** L. *AGAINST/WITH ALTERNATION* (G): [Cf. Blanco 2.8] *I hit the stick against the fence → I hit the fence with the stick.* I have here suggested that the underlying form has the preposition *against*, as opposed to Blanco's suggestion, which is to consider the variant with *with* to be basic. The question either of these proposals leave us with is this: could one not say that the *with*-phrase here is an instrumental phrase, and that the *against*-phrase is simply a variant of the direct object – as in *% I was eating a bun ~ I was eating on a bun* [CF. BLANCO 1.3]. It seems to me that at the present, all analytic possibilities are open.
- NEW** M. *THROUGH/WITH ALTERNATION* (G): [Cf. Blanco 2.9, Gruber (1976)] *Alison pierced the needle through the cloth → Alison pierced through the cloth with the needle → Alison pierced the cloth through with the needle.* These sentences are all motional; clearly the Theme in all of them is *the needle*. The fullest path-structural version might be: *Alison pierced the needle [from the belt through the cloth to the zipper]_{Path}*. In such a sentence, it is clear that the function of the *through*-phrase is that of Trajectory, in the terminology of Ross (1995a). It is not clear to me how the preposition *through*, which heads a medial leg, can come to function as a particle. It

reminds one of alternations like *I let the cats into the house* → *I let the cats in (to the house)* → *I let in the cats* which were first discussed in Fraser (1965), but the prepositions which manifest particle-like behavior in such sentences (namely, *in, out, on, off*) are those which head Goal-phrases, not Trajectories, and the arguments which they show up on either side of are Themes, not Trajectories. This alternation, then, seems, for the moment, to be a lone wolf. None of what I have here suggested it written in anything more permanent than pencil.

GGG

VIII. ASCENSIONS

To subject:

- A. A-RAISING (G): *For Mark to win is likely.* → *Mark is likely to win.*
[Cf. Postal (1974)]
- B. TOUGH-MOVEMENT (G):
Short - *To get Mike to bite me will be tough for me.* → *Mike will be tough for me to get to bite me.*
Long - *To imagine making Betty say that she wore this hat will be tough for me.* → *This hat will be tough for me to imagine making Betty say that she wore.*
- C. POSSESSOR ASCENSION (G): *IBM's price went up.* → *IBM went up in price.*
(Cf. Levin, p. 77)
- D. QUANTIFIER FLOATING (chopping): *[All / Both] of the eagles had a snack.* → *The eagles [all / both] had a snack.*
- E. QUANTIFIER FLOATING (copying): *[All / Both / None / Neither] of the eagles had a snack.* → *The eagles [all / both / none / neither] of them had a snack.*
NB: a fuller treatment would have to specify the various nichabilities for each of the copying floated quantifiers. The problem can be seen in this first sentence: *all of them* can be inserted in all of the places marked with a '•' dot.

The eagles • may • have • been • being • photographed by Fred, •.
- F. PROPERTY FACTORING (chopping or copying) (G): *Bob's eyebrow texture and Hal's eyebrow texture are similar.* → *Bob and Hal are similar in (their) eyebrow texture(s).*
- NEW** G. BY-RAISING (chopping) (G): *Mel's winning the lottery surprised me.* → *Mel surprised me by (??his) winning the lottery.*
- H. WITH-RAISING (copying) (G): *Carol's surliness shocked us.* → *Carol shocked*

*us with *(her) surliness.* (Cf. Levin, p. 76-7)

NEW I. CONJUNCT MOVEMENT (G): [CF. BLANCO RECIPROCAL ALTERNATIONS 2.5; CF. ESPECIALLY 2.5.4] Predicates with NP* subjects (i.e., these subjects are deeply coordinate; they are not derived from coordinate sentences *via* CONJUNCTION REDUCTION (cf. Lakoff and Peters (1969)) can make one conjunct ascend to subject position, which thus chômeurizes the other conjunct, moving it become a sister of the main verb, marking it as a chômeur by Chomsky-adjoining a preposition to its left. *Pat and Lee danced* → *Pat danced with Lee*; *Gallia and Britannia fought* → *Gallia fought against Britannia*; *Caviar and hummus differ* → *Caviar differs from hummus*. *The oil and vinegar separated* → *The oil separated from the vinegar*.

J. CONJUNCT MOVEMENT WITH *TOGETHER* (G): [CF. BLANCO TOGETHER RECIPROCAL ALTERNATION (intransitive) 2.5; CF. ESPECIALLY 2.5.5] *The eggs and the cream mixed* → *The eggs and the cream mixed together* → *The eggs mixed (?together) with the cream*.

K. CONJUNCT MOVEMENT WITH *APART* (G): [CF. BLANCO APART RECIPROCAL ALTERNATION (intransitive) 2.5; CF. ESPECIALLY 2.5.6] (*) *The twig and the branch broke* *The twig and the branch broke apart* *The twig broke (*apart) off of the branch*.

To object:

A. B-RAISING (G): *I know that Solly chews gum.* → *I know Solly to chew gum.* [Cf. Postal (1974)]

B. POSSESSOR ASCENSION (G): *We kissed Queen Victoria's hand.* → *We kissed Queen Victoria on [the/ ?sber hand].* (Cf. Levin, p. 71)

C. *EACH-FLOATING*: *We will give each of the finalists a piece of gum.* → *We will give the finalists each a piece of gum.*

D. *EACH-HOPPING*: *We will give the finalists each a piece of gum.* → *We will give the finalists a piece of gum each.*

E. POSSESSOR ASCENSION WITH [FOR/THE] (G): *We admire Bev's determination.* → *We admire Bev for [her/the] determination.* (Cf. Levin, p. 73)

NEW F. CONJUNCT ASCENSION TO DIRECT OBJECT (G): *He compared the new oar and the old oar* → *He compared the new oar with the old oar*; *We separated the wheat and the chaff* → *We separated the wheat from the chaff*. [CF. BLANCO SIMPLE RECIPROCAL ALTERNATION (transitive) 2.5.1] *I mixed the sugar and the butter* → *I mixed the sugar into the butter*.

G. CONJUNCT ASCENSION TO DIRECT OBJECT WITH *TOGETHER* (G): *I mixed the flour and sugar* → *I mixed the flour and sugar together* → *I mixed the flour (??together) with the sugar.* . [CF. BLANCO *TOGETHER* RECIPROCAL ALTERNATION (transitive) 2.5.2]

H. CONJUNCT ASCENSION TO DIRECT OBJECT WITH *APART*: (G) *I split the twig and the branch* → *I split the twig and the branch apart* → *I split the twig off of the branch*. [CF. BLANCO *APART* RECIPROCAL ALTERNATION (transitive) 2.5.3]

NEW I. CAUSATIVIZATION (G): *Jim caused [the cup broke]* → *Jim caused the cup to break*; *Jim causes [the bell ring]* → *Jim caused the bell to ring*; *Jim caused [the horse jumped over the fence]* → *Jim caused the horse to jump over the fence*.

MAYBE THIS SHOULD BE IN XIII

HHH

IX. INCORPORATIONS

A. SUBJECT INCORPORATION (G): *Rain [fell]_V*. → (**It [rain-fell]_V*. → *It rained*. NB: the substitution of the verb *rain* for the incorporated verb compound *[rain-fell]_V* is obligatory if this lexeme is a surface verb. However, if it surfaces as a noun, the results of the operation of SUBJECT INCORPORATION can be clearly seen, in such compound nouns as *rainfall*, *snowfall*, *birdsong*, etc.

B. THEME INCORPORATION (G): *I removed the peel from the banana.* → (**I [peel-removed]_V the banana.* → *I peeled the banana*. And: *Tanya spread butter on the toast.* → *Tanya [butter-spread]_V the toast.* → *Tanya buttered the toast*. As with the previous process, while incorporated forms show up rarely as superficial verbs, this is sometimes possible in nounier environments: *The butter-spreading (?*of the King's toast) can take hours*.

NEW C. VERB-FROM-BY-PHRASE INCORPORATION: *Mary forced John into [John signing] by [Mary whipping John]* → *Mary whip-forced (> whipped) John into signing*.

III

X. RULES AFFECTING PATHS (cf. Ross (1995))

A. TOWARDS-INCORPORATION (G): *We swam towards the shore.* → *We swam shorewards*.

B. PREPOSITION ZAPPING IN END-LEGS: *They swam from (in) the river to (in) the lake*.

C. PREPOSITION ZAPPING BEFORE PATH-LINKED PROFORMS (G) *We can skate (to) there in a flash. I don't want to stay (at) here. We have been skating ([*at / ?to] everywhere for free*. NB: in some dialects, the *at* can surface if stranded: *%where's Joe Bob at?* vs. *who's (*at) where?*.

D. DEPREPOSITIONALIZED GOAL-FRONTING: (??)*Felicia flies from LA (??to) everywhere.* → *Felicia flies everywhere from LA*.

E. ANAPHORIC LOCATIVE PROFORM DELETION (G): *Let the cats in (to-~~here~~)* → *Let the cats in. Let the cats out (of-~~there~~)* → *Let the cats out. We had to push*

the needle through (there). → *We had to push the needle through*. [Cf. Fraser (1965/1976)]

JJJ

XI. REORDERINGS

NEW A. SUBJECT-VERB INVERSION(S?): Note that these inversions, though they overlap in many ways, often treat structures in which *have* has a nominal object differently. When *have* is a main verb, as in *They have friends*, in American, the only viable *yes-no*-question is the one involving the late great rule of *DO-SUPPORT*: *do they have friends?* Anything resembling *Have they friends?* sounds thumpingly like a British movie from the 30's. If an adverb like *often* is added to the mix, American grinds to a halt: *??Have they friends often?* >> ***Have they often friends?* And when causative *have* (as in *Bertie had Jeeves lay out his tails*), not even British can get away with ****Had Bertie Jeeves lay out his tails?* So with a clear spectrum of main-verbality lying at the genius of English – the variations of the order of Subject and the tense-bearing auxiliary verbs – it is of great importance to take most careful note of the ways in which the following inversion(s?) play out.

- i. After preposed *wh*-words (only in main clauses) – *(*When you were in Moscow?* → *When were you in Moscow?*
- ii. After preposed negative constituents – *(*At no time you will be alone with King Kong.* → *At no time will you be alone with King Kong; Never [did he have/*had he] friends.* For all speakers this rule applies in some embedded contexts (*Michael said ?(that) under no circumstances would he participate*), and for some, the rule applies in less flexible subordinate contexts: *%That under no circumstances are rattlers suitable pets for toddlers is sometimes necessary to remind new parents.*
- iii. In *than*-clauses and *as*-clauses – *Hasso is more vicious than Bodo was.* → *... than was Bodo. Lilo is as considerate as Lucretia was.* → *... as was Lucretia. Niccolo had as sumptuous a pad as [did/*had] Patrizia.*
- iv. After certain degree-modified preposed constituents:
Max was so big that ... → *So big was Max that ...*
Sonja was tall enough for me to ... → *Tall enough was Sonja for me to ...*
This is too zany a plan for me to ... → *Too zany a plan is this for me to ...*
So fast a car [does Max have/≥? has Max] that I fear for my life when I drive with him.
- v. In exclamations that do not start with *wh*-words – *Am I glad that it's raining! Does Pat need a new mouthwash!! ?*Could Jason have been being followed! Does Mr. Scranigan have a long beard! *Has Mr. Scranigan a long beard!*
- vi. In counterfactual *if*-clauses whose *if* has been zapped: *Jack knows that [if I were/ were I] an alien I would take him off this backward planet.* Note that this rule will not function to invert forms of *do* (no matter what the following main verb is [***Did I fear for my life I would flee*]), though unlike many of these inversion rules, it will invert the main verb *have*: *Had I world enough and time, ...; ?Had he family here, they would help him out. ?Could I be a fullback, ...; *Did I need money, I would rob a bank.*

- B. PP-SCRAMBLING: Post-verbal PP's are in general pretty freely ordered. *Talk to Homer about this for a few days.* - *Talk for a few days to Homer about this.* - *Talk about this for a few days to Homer.* - etc.

NB: This rule is also applicable in sentence-initial position, if more than one PP has been preposed. In general, it is only possible to prepose more than one PP if the PP's are loosely attached ("adjuncts," in GB terms); preposing two PP-objects is (always(?)) prohibited: cf. *(To Ed) (*about deforestation) I will be talking tomorrow.* vs. */For this reason / on the fourteenth of July / in front of the old oak tree, we drank seven sixpacks.*
In this sentence, the preposed PP's between '/' marks can be scrambled in any order.

- C. HEAVY NP SHIFT: *I painted the little birdhouse sky blue.* → *I painted sky blue the little birdhouse.*

- D. RIGHT NODE RAISING: *I may have psoriasis, and Ray definitely does have psoriasis.* → *I may have, and Ray definitely does have, psoriasis.*
THIS ONE IS IN COORDINATE STRUCTURES TOO

- NEW** E. EXTRAPOSITION (G): *That you like ouzo is pretty obvious.* → *It is pretty obvious that you like ouzo.* And, in object position: *(?) We took that you would be back for granted.* → *We took it for granted that you would be back.*
This rule can only be governed when the complement is in the object. Problem: why is this rule OBL with *seem* and *appear*, but OPT with the *surprise-class*? Both of these have (superficially post-verbal) human experiencers.

- F. EXTRAPOSITION FROM NP: (a) For relative clauses (only restrictives can participate): *A sergeant (that) I had never met lurched in.* → *A sergeant lurched in (that) I had never met.* For noun complements: *The claim that our salaries should be tripled was discussed.* → *The claim was discussed that our salaries should be tripled.*

- G. EXTRAPOSITION OF PP: *A review of Nodoffski's newest tome is coming out this month.* → *A review is coming out this month of Nodoffski's newest tome.*

- H. RAISING TO OBJECT OF HAVE (etc.(?)) (G): *I have to remember grading these papers.* → *I have grading these papers to remember.* Cf. also *There is grading these papers to remember.* (No agreed-on source yet proposed)

- I. INVERSION IN ROOT CLAUSES: *The cops dashed into the lab.* → *Into the lab dashed the cops.* Cf. also: *((?)The weasel goes pop)* → *Pop goes the weasel.* *Willa shrieked, "Yikes!"* → *"Yikes!" shrieked Willa.*

- J. INTENSIFIER CLIMBING: Intensifiers like *even*, *also*, *only*, and laid-back *like* can be raised to Chomsky-adjoin to the left or right of any higher constituent that contains them in their original position adjacent to their focus. In the example that follows, the left margins are marked with dots: *He might • have • been • talking to Ellen [even / also / only / like] about the cosmos.*
Cf. Ross and Cooper (1979)

- K. NOT-HOPPING (G): *We believe that Tim is not exactly a liberal.* → *We do not believe that Tim is exactly a liberal.* NB: this rule should best be seen as a two-part rule: first the negative is copied into the higher clause, and then, after SLIFTING has had a chance to apply, if the lower clause is still adjacent to the one into which the negative has been hopped, the lower negative is zapped. This split into copying and deletion is necessary to account for the fact that parentheticals can show up negated in just those verbs for which NOT-HOPPING works; cf. *Max is not, I don't think /*say, a terrorist.* Cf. #7 above.
- L. NEVER-HOPPING (G): *I want to never go there again* → *I never want to go there again.*
- M. EVER-HOPPING (G): *I don't remember ever having gone there.* → *I never remember having gone there.* NB: the rule, which only works for *remember*, seems really to be necessarily seen as a copying rule – cf. *I never remember ever having gone there.*
- N. NEGATIVE INCORPORATION: *I will not force her to marry anyone* → *I will force her to marry no one.* (cf. Klima (1964))
- O. EXTREMING: *I never eat walnuts.* → *I never ever (ever) ... (ever) eat walnuts.* NB: I do not know if there is only one or if there are many rules which produce things like: *I do not ever eat walnuts – never – not ever – never at any time – NEVER!*
- P. N'T-ING (G): *I do not believe this.* → *I don't believe this.*
- Q. EXTRAPOSITION OF PP FROM AP (G): *How sure of this are you?* → *How sure are you of this?*
- R. QUANTIFIER CIRCUMPRONOMINAL POSTPOSING: *I photographed [all / both] of them.* → *I photographed them [all / both].*
- S. ADJECTIVE→ADVERB (G): *The FBI kept track of Harold carefully.* → *The FBI kept careful track of Harold.* *I drank a cup of coffee quickly.* → *I drank a quick cup of coffee.*
- T. NOMINALIZATION (G): *That Janice dislikes baths is alarming.* → *Janice's dislike for baths is alarming.*

KKK

XII. LEXICALLY GOVERNED RULES OF DELETION

- A. POSSESSED BODY PART DELETION (G): *Maxine flosses (her teeth).* *Tony shaved (his face).* *Max waved (his hand) at me* (Cf. Levin, p. 34) [Cf. Blanco 1.2.2]
- B. REFLEXIVE DELETION (G): *Miss Johnson is dressing (herself).* *Ted will not behave (himself)* (Cf. Levin, p. 35) [Cf. Blanco 1.2.3]

- C. DIRECT OBJECT RECIPROCAL DELETION (G): *Bill and Christine kissed (each other). France and Italy touch (each other)* (Cf. Levin, p.62) [Cf. Blanco 1.2.4]
- NEW** D. THAT-DELETION (G): *Twombly knew that he had lost everything. → Twombly knew he had lost everything. Moritz ascertained (that) he had been swindled.* This rule works best when the *that* directly follows the verb which the *that*-clause is the complement of: *It was reported (?by the magazine) he was drunk.* The rule is blocked if the *that*-clause is in subject position (**He was drunk was reported.*) or has been fronted (**He was drunk the magazine reported.*). If the verb has been gapped, the rule is weakened: *One magazine reported he was sick, and another (?that) he was drunk.*
- NEW** E. MODAL DELETION (G): *Sue demanded that she (must) not be weighed.* The argument that tenseless *that*-clauses derive from a source which contains a modal verb (perhaps *must* or *will*) comes from the observation, due to Joe Emonds, I believe, that the normal position for *not* in a tensed copular clause is after the copula: *that they are not hell-raisers.* However, in tenseless clauses, the *not* must precede the copula: *that they [not be /*be not] hell-raisers,* a fact which the postulation of a deleted modal would account for.
- NEW** F. UNSPECIFIED (PREPOSITIONAL) OBJECT DELETION (G): *Zelda is [eating/drinking, etc.] (something). My chauffeur will drive (the car). Henry was riding (a horse). Maverick was under the gun, but he opened (the pot) anyway. That young girl has started kissing (people). We sold (stuff) (to people) like crazy. The sign warned (people) against skating on the pond. Merwin's report will surprise (people). My dog bites (people).* Note that for some predicates (*eat, drink*), the deleted argument is interpreted as an indefinite singular, while for others (*drive, ride, open*) the hearer can narrow down the identity of the deleted object with much more accuracy. And with still others (*kiss, sell, warn, surprise, bite*), the deleted noun phrase seems to have to be interpreted as generic and/or plural. (Cf. Levin, p. 33). It is worth mentioning here that any deletion that is not triggered by identity to a coreferential antecedent, as in the cases under discussion, the deletion of the noun entails the simultaneous disappearance of any preceding preposition(s). No deletion rule ever strands a preposition. [Cf. Blanco 1.2.1, 1.2.5, & 1.2.6]
- G. UNSPECIFIED AGENT DELETION (G): *Gates will be investigated (by someone).* Cf. *The fire was caused *(by somebody).*
- H. EQUI-OBJECT DELETION (G): *The buns are ready for us to eat (them).*
- I. RECIPROCAL PP DELETION (G): *Mike and Todd differ (from each other). I compared the banana and the kangaroo (with each other).* (Cf. Levin, p. 59, 61)
- J. TO BE → AS (G): *We appointed Trey to be the Commissioner of Yoyo Size. → We appointed Trey as the Commissioner of Yoyo Size.* (Cf. Levin, p. 78)
- NEW** K. COREFERENTIAL POST-VERBAL ARGUMENT DELETION (G): *We will settle*

*(the case/it) out of court. I don't know where Tom is – I'll look (for him). Here are the petition letters – do you want to distribute (them) or [pick/*tear] (them) up. Our cat woke me up at 5, and did I get mad (at her)! I believe that while these deletions are governed by the predicate whose argument is being deleted, there is another **ungoverned** rule that deletes coreferential adverbs of many kinds. Cf. the rule in L.*

- NEW** L. COREFERENTIAL POST-VERBAL ADVERBIAL DELETION: *Mike was playing the guitar on the porch, and his sister was reading (there). I can meet Ellen in Paris on October 6 if you **can't** meet her (there) (then). I can meet Ellen in Paris on October 6, and Bill may meet her ??(there) (then). As these examples show, under complicated conditions of parallelism, more deletion of coreferential adverbials is possible. While adverbials of space, time, manner, frequency, purpose and reason can be deleted by this rule, it appears that certain tenuously attached adverbs cannot undergo this rule: Millie mowed the lawn despite the rain after Jack piled the wood *(despite it). I contributed \$10 to Senator Fustibule's reelection campaign as [an indication of my support, but I did not contribute any money to Congressman Grasswasser's campaign *(as [one/it]).*
- NEW** M. TAG QUESTION DELETION. While no agreed-on source for tag questions exists, it appears clear that they are remnants of full clauses, which can undergo progressively invasive ellipses. *Harry might have been being followed by spooks, might he not (have (been (*being (**followed))))*. Note that tags are not restricted to appearing only after main clauses; they can also be found after non-restrictive relative clauses (*These grapes, which Mike has certainly had more than enough of, hasn't he (had), were delicious, weren't they?*), and after certain other appositional inserts: *These grapes – although Janet would probably never admit it, would she? – were constructed out of carbon nanotubes.*
- NEW** N. DELETION OF PREPOSITION MARKING CHÔMEURIZED CONJUNCT (G): *Mark and Nora met → Mark met with Nora → Mark met (with) Nora; Italy and France touch → (*)Italy touches {with/to} France → Italy touches France. Monaco and Canada fought → Monaco fought against Canada → Monaco fought Canada. [Cf. Blanco, WITH-DROP PREPOSITION DROP ALTERNATION (1.4.2)]*
- NEW** O. WAY OBJECT ALTERNATION (G): *He pushed (his way) through the crowd. [CF. BLANCO 1.2.7]*
- NEW** P. INSTRUCTIONAL IMPERATIVE ALTERNATION (G?): *Bake (the cake) for 30 minutes [CF. BLANCO 1.2.8]*
- NEW** Q. CONATIVE ALTERNATION (G): *Paula hit the zebra → Paula hit at the zebra. Brenda sprayed the lilies → Brenda sprayed at the lilies. [CF. BLANCO 1.3]*
- NEW** R. DIRECTIONAL PREPOSITION DROP ALTERNATION (G): *Jason climbed (up) the ladder. Marge descended %(down) the stairway. [CF. BLANCO 1.4.1]*
- S. FOR PREPOSITION DROP ALTERNATION (G): . [CF. BLANCO 2.II SEARCH ALTERNATION] *Ida hunted for deer → Ida hunted deer. This alternation may be limited to the lone verb hunt: cf. Ida [fished *(for) trout/ trolled *(for)*

pike/searched(for) game*]. I have here suggested that the alternant with *for* may be the more basic form on the slenderest of leads: usually, transformed clauses are more limited in their choices than are their derivational sources. An example: *A student (that) I had never before was crying his eyes out* → *A student was crying his eyes out ?(that) I had never before*. Here, under the assumption that relative clauses that immediately follow their head nouns are more basic than are those that have been extraposed, we can use this (weak reed of a) guideline to suggest that the possibility of applying the rule of *THAT-DELETION AFTER A HEAD NOUN* (Cf. §IV.G above) has been slightly limited when the clause it heads has been extraposed.

Returning to *hunt*, I suspect that when its object does not begin with *for*, it may also be slightly less free than when *for-ful*. One obvious difference is that without *for*, the best objects are living creatures: *We hunted lion(s)/antelope(s)/[geese/*goose]/**cookies*. Probably the best paraphrase for this use of *hunt* is “try to kill.” However, after *hunt for*, the possible objects are far more numerous; a good paraphrase of this verb would be “try to find.” I note also that certain quantifiers seem to be disfavored after a *for-less hunt*: ??*they hunted nothing*. Blanco mentions that *hunt* exhibits another alternation: *we hunted deer in the forest* → *we hunted the forest for deer*. It seems to me that the latter sentence here is less happy if *deer* is definite: *we hunted the forest for [the/that] deer* is no longer paraphrased by the “try to kill” meaning – it means to me, I believe, simply “try to find.” I admit that this feeling is very subtle, and I may be fooling myself. The main point, though, remains: the lone verb *hunt* can have either a direct object or a *for*-phrase. I suspect that as we look more deeply into the fine structure of the lexicon, we will find more and more cases of phenomena which make each verb unique. I believe that this was in fact the experience of those French linguists who worked with Maurice Gross on a large-scale study of verbs: each verb was a Unikum.

LLL

XIII. BINARY TRANSFORMATIONS

NEW A. CAUSATIVE FORMATION (G). [CF. BLANCO I.I.2.1]
Janet CAUSED [that cup broke] → Janet Broke that cup

1. Subtypes (?)

NEW **Induced Action** [BLANCO I.I.2.2]
Janet CAUSED [the horse jump over the fence] → Janet jumped the horse over the fence

2. **Other Instances of Causative Alternations**
[BLANCO I.I.2.3] *The visitor CAUSED [the bell ring] → The visitor rang the bell.*

3. TOTAL TRANSFORMATION ALTERNATION [BLANCO 2.4.3]
Janet CAUSED [the frog turn into the prince]

MMM negative splurge

References

- Culicover, Peter, and Paul Postal. 2001. *Parasitic Gaps*. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology
- Fraser, James Bruce. 1965. *The Verb-Particle Construction in English*, doctoral dissertation. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology. [Published by Taishukan, Tokyo (1976)].
- Gruber, Jeffrey. 1976. *Lexical Structures in Syntax and Semantics*. New York: North Holland
- Klima, Edward S. 1964. Negation in English. In Jerrold Katz and Jerry Fodor, Katz, (eds.), *The Structure of Language*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall. pp. 246-323.
- Lakoff, George, and Stanley Peters. 1969. Symmetric predicates and phrasal conjunction. In David A. Reibel and Sanford A. Schane (eds.), *Modern Studies in English*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey. pp. 113-142.
- Levin, Beth. 1993. *English Verb Classes and Alternations: A Preliminary Investigation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- McCawley, James D. 1988. *The Syntactic Phenomena of English*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Perlmutter, David, M. 1983. (ed.) *Studies in Relational Grammar 1*, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press.
- Postal, Paul M. 1974. *On Raising*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, The MIT Press.
- Ross, Haj. 1995a. A first crosslinguistic look at paths – the difference between end-legs and medial ones. In Lynn Eubank, Larry Selinker and Michael Sharwood Smith (eds.) *The Current State of Interlanguage Studies in Honor of William E. Rutherford*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, the Netherlands, pp. 273-285.
- _____. Defective noun phrases. 1995b. In Audra Dainora, Rachel Hemphill, Barbara Lukas, Barbara Need and Sheri Pargman (eds.), *Proceedings of the Thirty-First Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, Chicago Linguistic Society, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, pp. 398-440.
- _____. 2000. The frozenness of pseudoclefts – towards an inequality-based syntax. In Arika Okrent and John P. Boyle (eds.), *Proceedings of the Thirty-Sixth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, Chicago Linguistic Society, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, pp. 385-426.
- _____. An automodular perspective on the frozenness of pseudoclefts, and *vice versa*. 2011. In Tista Bagchi, Katharine P. Beals and Etsuyo Yuasa (eds.),

- Pragmatics and Autolexical Grammar: In Honor of Jerry Sadock*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. pp. 243-260.
- Ross, John Robert. 1971. Gapping and the order of constituents. In Manfred Bierwisch and Karl-Erich Heidolph (eds.), *Progress in Linguistics*, Mouton and Company, 's Gravenhage, Holland, pp. 249-259.
- _____. 1969. Guess who? In Robert I. Binnick, Alice Davison, Georgia M. Green, Jerry L. Morgan et. al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the Fifth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, Chicago Linguistic Society, University of Chicago: Chicago. pp. 252-286.
- _____. 1973. Slifting. In Maurice Gross and Marcel Schützenberger (eds.), *The Formal Analysis of Natural Languages*, 's Gravenhage: Mouton and Company, pp. 133-172.
- _____. 1975. Where to do things with words. In Peter Cole and Jerry L. Morgan (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics III: Speech Acts*. Academic Press, New York, New York. pp. 233-256.
- Ross, John Robert, and William E. Cooper. 1979. Like syntax. In William E. Cooper and Edward C. T. Walker (eds.), *Sentence Processing: Psycholinguistic Studies Presented to Merrill Garrett*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates: Hillsdale. pp. 343-418.
- Talmy, Leonard. 2003. *Toward a Cognitive Semantics: Volume 1: Concept Structuring Systems and Volume 2: Typology and Process in Concept Structuring (Language, Speech, and Communication)*. Cambridge: MIT Press.