

Cool03.doc

**He can't just hire no one (must be NEG NEG NECESSARY he hire NEG NEG some one**

**He can't just hire no one (\*not even Bob).**

**He can't just not hire anyone (\*not even Bob)**

**He did not just hire no one (must be NEG NEG true he hire NEG NEG some one**

**okSchmoyk starred in a movie about the only thing he cared about, which was himself.**

**okIrving claimed something about the only person he was concerned with, which was ?him/himself.**

**\*That book claimed something about the only book it was concerned with, which was \*it/itself.**

**He visited the capitol of that country**

**\*\*\*That country was visited the capitol of.**

**the only thing that Schmoyk cares about is himself  
the only thing that you care about is yourself.**

**Hi...end of year/century/etc. greetings.; I hope things are fine.**

**I think your ideas on lateral feature passing merit, and may actually get, more consideration, for the following reason.; There is a good possibility that they do an important piece of hitherto unnoted work in English.; I am doubtful that this is of great interest to you but you are the only person I can think of who even <u>might</u> be interested, so here goes.**

**My comments are based on the fact that in a very good MIT thesis a person (not sure of sex) named Idan Landau has developed a theory of a type of control which has gotten very little attention.; (S)he calls it**

partial control (PC), as opposed to the exhaustive control (EC) of standard cases.; It is illustrated in:

(1); The chairman wants to get together at 10.

The point is obviously that the complement understood subject is a plural.; Only certain main verbs permit this and only certain complements reveal it.

For Landau this is a phenomenon involving a PRO whose indices partly overlap with those of the controller rather than being identical.; This is an ugly idea obviously.; My suggestion is that your ideas permit its elimination and the reduction of PC to EC.

Needed evidently is to allow subject of the complement at one stage to be a binary conjunction of one pronoun, P1, linked to the controller and another, P2.; Then something like conjunct union could make P1 the final subject and, if P2 were made to disappear somehow, real strides toward eliminating PC as a thing in itself would have been made.

Of course, there are many problems...the kind of conjunct union at issue is only going to be possible in English if one of the raisees is controlled.; Second, making the second conjunct invisible is an issue.; Third, there are many questions of what kind of clauses even then will permit it...Landau notes contrasts like:

- (2)a. Joan wants to kiss in the library (e.g. wants herself and another to )
- b. \*Joan wants to kiss each other in the library.

Landau has a complicated theory based on minimalist ideas plus a notion that these cases involve the principle that the controller determines the syntactic features of the PRO but not its semantic number. The idea would be a guess that the antecedent of e.g. 'each other' has to be syntactically plural.; He is assuming that the complement verbs which highlight the phenomena are those which require their subject to be a semantic plural even if it is a syntactic singular:

- (3) a. The chairman wants to meet at 10.
- b.; They/the committee will meet at 10.

However, interestingly, that assumption is false:

(4) We/The committee gathered/got together at 10.

(5) There gathered/got together in my living room at 10 the committee on feature passing.

Clearly, (5)'s subject; is not a semantic plural.

This supports my view that everything involved is syntactic and that like there, the final subject of PC cases is a pronoun which is syntactically plural only in a very weak sense.

In fact, there are striking parallels:

- (6)a. Joe wants to get together at 10.  
b. \*Joe wants to get together with each other at 10.

- (7)a. There got together in my room; seven .....  
b. \*There got together with each other/argued with each other; seven...

In short, the evidence is that the singular form which is controlled in PC has the kind of syntactic plurality that there does.

Mike turned to the second problem.  
\*The second problem was then turned to.

Disaster struck America. => ??America was struck by disaster.

a guy whoX <the police followed everyone that contacted himX> and <the FBI is now about to arrest tX>

up to is AC

- What are you up to?  
\*He is up to it.  
\*Such crimes are easy to be up to.  
\*That, I am no longer up to.  
\*He discussed something, which Ted was up to.

those women, to none of whose husbands have they sent any incriminating photos,

those women, carvings of none of whom have I borrowed,

pied piped phrases trigger inversion:

?those women, Your carvings of none of whom have I borrowed,  
those women, your carvings of none of whom I have borrowed,

**get at (abstract sense) may require nonchromatic object**

**She is getting at something/\*some point/\*some principle/\*some issue**

**Up to may require nonchromatic object**

**She is up to something/\*some evil/\*some plot/no good (why??)**