

**(1) I reviewed without reading <the new book.....>**

**(2) I described to JOe \without praising\ < the new >**

**(2) is bad if \ is fronted or moved to end**

**(3) a paper which we need to find someone who (\*we agree) understands**

**Principle controller of type B/C is non-predecessor**

**(4) everyone else, Jon thought I had convinced that they would be rehired**

**(5) everyone else, jon asked me whether I had convinced that they would be rehired**

**(6)a. something happened/\*became of Frank.**

**b. What the hell/\*else became of Frank**

**c. What do you think/is thought to have become of Frank**

**d. Who learned what happened to/\*became o who**

**e. It is Frank that I couldn't learn what ?happened to/\*became of**

**(7) Who did friends of introduce to Jon in order to help her sister**

**(8) \*\*Friends of introduced to John in order to.. the woman who**

**(9)a. Joan, I asked Bill whether he assaulted.**

**b. \*Joan is hard to ask Bill whether he assaulted.**

**Principle resumptive arc controlled by OV arc can be antecedent arc, resumptive arc controlled by Central arc cannot be.**

**(10) Nobody but himself likes Ted.**

**(11) Nobody likes Larry except himself.**

**(12)a. Joe, I asked her when they mailed the book to**

**b. \*Joe is hard to ask her when they mail books to**

**(13)a. Joe, I don't know anyone who likes**

- b. Chicken, I don't know anyone who likes**
- c. the guy who I don't know anyone who likes**
- d. \*Sally interviewed more guys than I know someone who likes**
- e. \*No matter who you call someone who likes**

**(14)a. Joe, they never asked me whether I had met**

- b. \*Joe was hard for them to ask me whether I had met**
- c. Joe was hard for them to prove to me that I had met**

**(15)a. \*Himself they never asked me whether Joe had criticized.**

- b. \*Joe considers himself difficult to ask (Jane) whether he criticized/understands.**

**(16) a woman that most people who meet anyone who can tolerate tend to tolerate**

**(17)a. \*It was some other manX that hisX mother voted against.**

- b. \*No other manX did hisX mother vote against.**

**(18)a. Joe, they never would have asked me whether I loved**

- b. \*Everyone else they never would have asked me whether I loved.**
- c. ?Someone else, they might not have asked me whether I loved**

**(19) Any other book, he would have gone home and read..**

**(20)a. I found out where/who**

- b. \*I found where/who out.**

**(21)a. \*June, he was born in.**

- b. \*That month, he was born in.**
- c. What month were you born (in).**
- d. Who sang what when/for how long?**

(22)a. I told Fred to relax and he (\*went home and) did.

b. I told Fred to relax and he (went home and did so.

c. but they arrested the guy who (\*went home and ) did (ok did so)

(23) \*With which people can you play poker, still remain sane, and not argue??

(24) ??Where can you buy a house, still stay sane and live cheaply?

(25)a. lord it over

b. stay at it \*I found him at it.

(26)a. What speed was he driving at?

b. \*That speed, I never drive (at).

(27) Otto kissed more nurses than were arrested/\*difficult to please/too ugly to date.

(28)a. that was never figured/\*found out

b. \*It was found out that S

(29) Any other book, he would review (\*Syn Struc) without reading

(30)a. Anyone else, she would have run home and shot

b. \*Anyone else, I would regret it if she shot.

c. Bob, I would regret it if she shot

(31)a. \*Who did they tell why you called?

b. ??Who did they tell her why you called?

c. John, they never told her why you called

d. \*They indicted more people than he told her why you called.

(32) who said that <> Frank gave the diamonds to whom?

\* if the diamonds moves to <>

-----

added 12/5/93

Who do you regret/deplere that Frank gave the diamonds to  
\*Who do you regret that the diamonds Frank gave to

-----

(33) \*Who said that (under the tree) there was sitting what (under the tree)?

(34) \*To Frank it is time to be shown certain books

(35)a. ?To Frank, I would prefer it if you said certain books had been shown

b. \*To Frank, I would prefer it if you said had been shown certain books

(36)a. I know under which bed which mice are hiding?

b. \*I know under which bed are hiding which mice.

(37)a. \*Those mice, I know under which bed he believes are hiding

(38)a. Joan, I went to sleep after kissing.

b. \*Joan is hard to sleep after kissing

(39)a. There is somebody's cat in my car.

b. \*Bob, whose cat there is in my car,

c. \*anyone whose cat there was in my car

(40)a. the kind of people who there were at the party

b. \*the kind of people whose mothers there were at the party

c. \*the guy whose nickname they referred to me as

(41)a. \*tall though they care whether he is

b. \*How tall did they ask whether he was?

c. What height does a male giraffe reach?

d. \*What height did they ask whether a male giraffe reaches?

(42)a. take it out on

b. leave NP no passive

c mind NP

**(43) the woman crossed herself and the man himself**

**(44) we suggest to our employees without accepting the advice of those who would have us require of them-- <<>>**

**(45)a. There was a gorilla (sitting) on the sofa.**

**b. He prevented there from being a gorilla (\*sitting) on the sofa.**

**c. On the sofa he prevented there from being a gorilla (\*sitting)**

**(46) the woman he wanted to seduce rather than talk/\*matter to**

**(47) Who did he promise/swear to that he would marry**

**(48) Who did everyone who couldn't \*stand/?tolerate sneer at**

**(49)a. I told sally that heroin I had never used.**

**b. ??It was sally who I told that heroin I had never used.**

**c. Tell her that the apples, I'll bring later.**

**d. \*Everyone who he told that p-gaps he understood laughed**

**(50) Who did she convince that carvings of she had not defaced?**

**(51)a. I convinced Joan that Ted she should not date**

**b. ??the girl who I convinced that Ted she should not date**

**(52) \*Green they never asked me whether I painted my house**

**(53)a. nobody did they say it was time to call**

**b. \*the man whose mother they said it was time to call**

**(54) Supporting herself, Joan would have preferred it if Barbara had been capable of**

**(55) Which professor did you (\*meet a student who had) study(ied) under other than Frank?**

**(56) \*Joe will be hard to arrest everyone who voted for.**

**(57)a. Never will he accept that I can read mongolian.**

**b. He will never accept that mongolian I can now read.**

**c. \*Never will he accept that mongolian I can now read.**

**(58)a. No one believed ?strongly/null that anyone came**

**b. No one believes (\*strongly) that sushi I ate.**

**(59)a. \*Nobody cares if/whether sushi you eat.**

**(60)a. \*Who did you convince t t should marry you**

**b. \*Barbara, I convinced t t should marry me.**

**c. Who did you convince t you would marry t?**

**(61)a. If you only read one paper, this\*mine should be it.**

**b. Which one are you/is you?**

**c. ?Which one did he ask them whether they believed was you?**

**d. \*Which one did he ask them whether they believed were you?**

**e. \*Which one does he believe are you?**

**(62) \*Who said that in what drawer were found what condoms?**

**(63) Who did Frank (\*dash in and/\*stand up and) say that it was that screamed?**

**(64) To Mary/\*Himself, Jay is not sure whether to talk.**

**(65)\*It is that sort of religion that there may have arisen in France and there certainly arose in England ...argues no cleft on RNR pivot.**

**(66) \*Which/What criminals do there exist (pictures of) in that country?**

**(67) I believe that/\*null joan he will call.**

**(68) take A into account/account of A**

**(69)a. Nixon't biggest mistake was <not giving up the tapes?**

- (70) enter the army, \*the army was entered/\*the army was hard to enter.
- (71) ??Which service did he criticize before entering?
- (72) \*The army is too evil for me to enter.
- (73) the book which Arthur showed to Sally and (\*which) Milton to Louise
- (74) ?\*Which starlet did gossip about cause a scandal.
- (75) \*Which starlet did gossip about annoy herX/that starletX a lot.
- (76)a. gremlins are burrowing under(neath) my house.
- b. My house is being burrowed under(\*neath) by G
- c. Whose house is being burrowed under(\*neath) by G
- (77) This horse mounts/\*jumps on easily.
- (78) No thought was given that/\*it.
- (79) \*Who did Joan tell that he would chatter with Mary before interviewing
- (80) I offered to Bill before meeting the women who offered to Fred -- < >
- (81) \* He felt and my opinion was also that S
- (82) He felt and it was my view also that S
- (83)a. He believes and it appeared to us that S
- b. \*He believed and it bothered me that S
- c. \*It appeared to me and it bothered me that S
- (84)a. I told Jim how to make people like him.
- b. Who did you tell how to make people like him/\*null
- c. ?It was Jim who I told Frank how to make people like
- (85)a. \*Nude pictures of who shocked who?
- b. Who was shocked by nude pictures of who

**(86) Joan and Sally he respectively kissed - and hugged while interviewing (them).**

**(87) Who described whoseX mother to himX?**

**(88) Under what conditions would what man'sX mother hate himX?**

**(89)a. Mary wanted Bill to be given books and Frank magazines.**

**b. \*Mary wanted books to be given Bill and magazines Frank**

**(90)a. \*Who did Joe say was guilty after hanging?**

**b. Who did Joe imply was evil (while ostensibly praising)?**

**(91) \*Who did Joe say was guilty after hanging**

**(92)a. \*Who do you think the book was given?**

**b. What do you think he was given**

**c. Who do you think the slave was given?**

**(93) I showed Marie the magazine but not Helen.**

**(94) take a peek/look at/take care of/make sense of complex passives,  
Den Besten 1981: 66**

**(95) \*In Iran <abortion is hard to argue for> and In china against**

**(96) \*On sunday the bridge was flown over and on monday under**

**(97)\*On monday the bridge was impossible to fly over and on sunday under**

**(98)a. to hell with Nixon and Agnew**

**b. \*to hell with N or A**

**c. \*Not to hell with you**

**d. To hell with everyoneone/\*no one \*anytone**

**e. To hell with \*none/\*some/all of them**

**(99) \*your kissing pg1 made t1 the woman who....**



**(100) whoX did your kissing himX make sick?**

**(101) \*Himself Joe criticized after buying pictures of**

**(102) WhoseX brotherY did you criticize after buying pictures of from him**

**(103) Which bridge would you prefer it if he fell off of/\*null?**

**(104) Ted thinks that pictures of him(self) will amuse Sally**

**(105) Ted thinks that Sally, pictures of himself will amuse**

**(106) Ted arranged for it to be himself that Sally called/\*called Sally**

**(107)a. Who did you talk about Bob to?**

**b. \*Who was that explained by Bob to?**

**c. \*Joe was talked to by Betty about herself.**

**What is it/the matter/wrong with you guys?**

**(108) Which bridge did they ask whether he fell off \*(of)?**

**(109) I consider \*me/myself easy for me to understand**

**(110)a. I consider \*her/\*herself easy for Joan to understand**

**b. \*I consider herself easy for her to understand.**

**c. I am easy to describe to myself.**

**d. I am easy to talk to about myself.**

**e. I am very hard to talk to about myself.**

**f. I am very hard to argue with about myself.**

**g. \*Joan considers herself hard to talk to her about.**

**h. I consider myself hard to talk to me about**

**(111) Harry I didn't tell herX you loved but herX I did.**

**(112) It was her that I told her I loved.**

**(113) Her I informed her that I loved**

**(114) Her I informed that i loved her**

**(115) JoanX, I informed herX that I loved.**

**(116) befall**

**(117)a. For Bob, what did you buy?**

**b. \*For Bob, the mercedes I bought yesterday.**

**(118) Ted saw/\*is the only person who voted for him.**

**(119) I regard Ted as the only person who voted for him.**

**(120) Mary had the chicken tasted by Bob without knowing why**

**(121) give it a thought/consideration/ make it a point of honor/get hold of, take notice of, bring word of, get word of**

**(122) Melvin, I expected to confess after you interrogated and confess after you interrogated he did.**

**(123)a. ?the things which I don't know who gave to whom**

**b. \*the people who I don't know what gave to whom**

**c. \*the people who I don't know what who gave to**

**d. ?the people who I don't know who gave what to**

**e. \*the people to whom I don't know who gave what**

**(124)a. the woman who I don't know where you thought Bob met**

**b. \*the woman who I don't know where you thought met Bob**

**c. \*I don't know where he thinks who ate the meat**

**d. \*the woman who I don't know where he thinks ate what**

**(125)a. \*Which man'sX nose did Joysce describe to himX?**

**b. \*Which woman described which man'sX nose to himX?**

**(126)a. I talked to some man's sister about him.**

**b. \*Which man's sister did you talk to about him?**

**c. \*Which man's sister did you talk about to him?**

**d. \*Which man's sister did you talk about to him?**

**e. \*Which man's sister did you describe to him**

**f. that man, whose sister I talked to about him,**

**(127)a. \*I bought pictures of no nudes from anyone.**

**b. No nudes did I buy pictures of from anyone.**

**c. ?I bought pictures of no nudist from that nudist.**

**d. \*No nudist did I buy pictures of from that nudist.**

**(128)a. 5 dollars were/was paid for that sheep. (Haj)**

**b. 5 dollars was/\*were foolish to pay for that sheep.**

**c. 500 kilometres were/was travelled by the team.**

**d. 500 kilometres \*were/was hard for that team to travel.**

**(129)a. Betty is dead, as I was sure \*null/\* of**

**b. Betty is dead, which I was sure \*null/ok of**

**c. Betty is dead, as \*it/\*null seemed**

**d. Betty is dead, as was obvious**

**e. Betty is dead, which was obvious,**

**(130)a. He is, as I informed you ?null/\*of, a doctor**

**b. He is, as I told you, ..**

**c. He is, as I mentioned oknull/\*it to you,**

**d. He is, as I always believed,**

e. He is, as (??it) ok null was made clear,

f. Joe is, as seemed \*null/ok obvious, going to die

(131) as it was agreed (\*on)/ as it was decided (\*on) as we agreed (\*on)

(132) so he claims/soi it appears/so it was claimed/as I persuaded him (\*of)

(133) Ted should, I persuaded him (\*of), leave...

(134)a. ?It was believed to have turned out that

b. It was believed to have been inevitable

c. as it/\*null was believed to have turned out

d. as \*it/null was believed to have been inevitable

e. as it/\*null is certain to turn out

f. as \*it/null is expected to be inevitable

(135) That/\*who kissed Sally, Ted never asked (whether you were wondering).

(136) Ted isn't really sick, as it/null is easy to prove.

(137) \*who did tom prove t was aware that I believed pg was incompetent.

(138) \*who did the police warn pg t was likely to be arrested.

(139) Martha prayed to be allowed to go but Jack didn't (\*pray to)

(140) Martha wanted to be allowed to go but Jack didn't (want to).

(141) count/decide/insist/concentrate/dawn/focus/rely/bet/depend/rest

(142) It may be \*time/nice to buy a canary but I'm sure that to buy a dog isn't

\*To kiss a starlet may be nice but I am sure that to kiss a gorilla isn't.

(143)a. \*I forgive that he did that.

b. That he did that is hard to forgive.

c. That he did that has not been forgiven.

**d. That he did that, I will never forgive.**

**(144) refer/admit/swear/see/testify/agree/confess/object/to**

**(145) Ted helped/treated/staked/helped himself/Mary to an icecream cone**

**(146)a. Expensive slaves are difficult to mail things to**

**b. Expensive slaves are difficult to treat Bob to**

**(147)a. I insist \*null/on that**

**b. I insist null/\*on that he die.**

**c. That he die, no one insisted \*null/?on**

**d. That was insisted \*null/on**

**e. That he died was insisted \*null/?on by everyone**

**f. It was insisted null/\*on that S**

**g. I insist on it, that he died/ figure/point/find oyt**

**(148)a. You will answer to God for that.**

**b. \*God will be answered to for that.**

**c. \*God is hard to answer to for such crimes.**

**(149)a. There is getting into college to consider.**

**b. There is that he might die to consider.**

**c. \*There is it to consider that he might die.**

**d. We have getting into C to consider.**

**e. \*We have it to consider that S.**

**f. We choose that S to prove.**

**g. \*We chose it to prove that S**

**h. \*Meatballs are hard to choose to discuss.**

**(150) \*I consider likely to emerge shortly of this book a review**

**(151)a. Reagan helped us, I am glad to say, to (all) understand that Panama must be destroyed.**

**b. Reagan gave us to (\*all) understand that S.**

**c. \*Two coats of paint were received by each fender**

**d. \*No explanation was received by those facts.**

**(152) Now will be hard to prove to be a good time to invest in windmills.**

**(153)a. John's oil ran out.**

**b. John ran out of oil**

**c. \*John's oil is out.**

**d. John is out of oil.**

**e. John's battery ran down.**

**g. \*John ran down of battery.**

**h. John's battery is down.**

**i. John is down of battery.**

**(154)a. out/down are intrans . adjectives**

**b. ran is intrans inchoative verb, requiring A-raising.**

**c. out triggers out ascension, but down does not.**

**(155)a. I don't know which one is you/you are**

**b. Which one did they ask her whether she believed was you/\*you were**

**(156)a. Which one did they ask her whether she believed to be you**

**b.\*Which one did they ask her whether she could prove you to be**

**(157) Which car did he steal t after a. longing for b. coveting for a long time**

**c. \*wanting "**

d. \*needing "

e. \*desiring "

(158)a. Who did he interview from Harvard before hiring Sally?

b. \*Who did he interview from Harvard before hiring?

(159)a. How many people did he interview who had no PH.Ds. before hiring Sally?

b. \*How many people did he interview who had no PH>Ds. before hiring?

(160)a. Someone else, I might have interviewed (\*who had no PH>D>)

(161) the person that everyone who told me to call wanted me to meet

(162) the person that she wanted me to meet who had red hair

(163) the person that everyone who told me to call Sally wanted me to meet who had red hair

(164) the person that everyone who told me to call wanted me to meet who had red hair

(165) Who elsedid his contacting Sally lead you to meet who was luscious?

(166) Who else did his contacting pg lead you to meet t who was luscious?

(167) Who else did his contacting Sally lead you to meet from Ireland?

(168) Who else did his contacting pg lead you to meet t from Ireland?

(169) Who else did John say (after talking to Sally/\*pg) that he had met from Ireland?

(170) Who else did John say after talking to Sally/\*pg was hired who had a PHD

(171) Who else did Joe say immediately after talking to pg was hired who had a PHD.?

(172) Who else did Joe inform t that I wanted to meet who had a PHD.

(173) No one else did Joe meet who had a phd.

(174) No one else have I before even interviewing pg affirmed was going to be hired (\*who had a PHD).

(175) I choose someone yesterday who had a phd for you to interview

- (176) I choose someone yesterday for you to interview who had a phd.
- (177) Who did you choose yesterday for me to interview who had a phd?
- (178) Who did Jack interview and Sally hire who had a phd.
- (179) \*Who did Jack interview who had a phd and Sally hire
- (180)a. Who from Bananstan did he meet yesterday?  
 b. Who did he meet yesterday from Bananastan?
- (181)a. Who else that had a forked tongue did he meet yesterday?  
 b. Who else did he meet yesterday that had a forked tongue?
- (183)a. Who else did he date on Monday after meeting at the conference?  
 b. \*Who else did he date on Monday from Bananastan after meeting at the conference?  
 c. \*Who else did he date on Monday after meeting at the conference from Bananastan?
- (184)a. Who else did your stories about Sally annoy other than Ralph.  
 b. OKWho else did your stories about annoy other than Ralph.
- (185) Who else did you date other than Louise after ditching Sally.
- (186) \*Who else would you prefer it if I dated other than Louise after ditching Sally?
- (186) who else is it time to date other than Louise after ditiching sally
- (187) Frank called more people than I met from Persia.
- (1) Let  $J$  be an island arc and  $K$  a 31 arc neighbor of  $J$  and successor of a branch of  $J$ . Then  $J$ 's Starter is replaced by a copy arc.
- (2) Starter  $(A,B)$  iff  $R$ -predecessor  $(A,B)$  and  $R$ -Successor $(C,A)$  and  $R$ -Successor $(B,C)$   $\dashv\vdash$   $\{31\}(C)$
- (3) CTRL arcs are (i) controlled (ii) local successors of 31-arcs.
- (4) If Control  $(A,B)$ , then either neighbor  $A B$  or subjacent  $B,A$ .
- (5) If Resumptive $(A,B)$  then  $B$  is not ascension host



**I love it, kissing sally**

**Joan is easy to approve of (\*it,) her living with**

**'subject' control goes into R-Dis, Top islands**

**Joan is/\*I am intrigued by the idea of CTRL shooting herself.**

**the idea of shooting herself/\*myself intrigues Joan**

**the fact that shooting herself is not legal is of no interest to Joan.**

**\*the fact that being you was important amused the killer.**

**the fact that shooting himself was illegal worried the secret agent.**

**(1) Mary thought that proM/proH giving birth to a mutant would upset her husband.**

**(2) Mary thought that under those conditions proM/proH giving birth to a mutant would upset her husband.**

**(3) Marth thought that under no conditions would proM/proH giving birth to a mutant upset her husband.**

**(4) Their all giving birth to mutants surprised them.**

**(5) \*\*\*All giving birth to mutants surprised them.**

**(6) Their having all given birth to m.... them**

**(7) \*\*having all given birth to mutants surprised them.**

**(8) ?We expect to have all left.**

**Irene thought that sitting by herself would upset Ted.**

**Irene thought that under those conditions sitting by herself would upset Ted.**

**Irene thought that under no conditions would sitting by herself upset Ted.**

**Irene thought that no one would her/\*null sitting by herself please.**

**Irene though that nothing would her/null sitting by herself accomplish.**

**Irene thought that no such attitudes would sitting by herself be revealing of.**

**Irene thought that sitting by herself would make Ted angry.**

**Irene thought that under no conditions would sitting by herself make Ted angry.**

**Irene thought that under no conditions would sitting by herself anger Ted.**

**Irene didn't think that under any conditions could sitting by herself upset Ted.**

**Irene didn't think that under any conditions could it upset Ted to sit by herself.**

**\*Joe came home and I said that shaving himself had upset Louise.**

**Joe got drunk and said that shaving himself had upset Louise.**

**\*Joe said he was sick and I said that drinking 10 beers had upset Sally.**

**\*Joe is sick and drinking beer is prohibited.**

**Joe woke up and said cutting himself had upset his wife.**

**Joe is clever and says cutting himself won't upset his wife.**

**I spoke to Joe about the possibility of my dating Louise or null = my/\*\*null = Joe marrying Joan**

**Joe insulted Louise but I didn't and Frank didn't**

**Joe insulted Louise but I didn't see her and Frank did \*\* = insulted Louise.**

**Mary got upset and null/\*Joe said it was necessary to be by herself.**

**Mary got upset and was reported by Joe to have said it was necessary to be by herself.**

**I mentioned to Joe the possibility of calling Sally and of shooting myself/\*himself.**

**I talked to Joe about shooting himself/myself**

**\*I talked to Joe about shooting himself and shooting myself.**

**I talked to Joe about shooting himself and stabbing himself.**

**I mentioned to Joe the possibility of shooting himself and to Louise the possibility of shooting myself**

**I mentioned to Joe the possibility of shooting himself and the possibility of shooting myself**

**I mentioned to Joe the possibility of shooting Al and to Louise the possibility of shooting herself/\*\*himself**

**I believe that that you are sick, Joe claims they admitted**

**\*I believe that that you are sick, Joe claims was never admitted.**

**That you are sick, Joe claims was never admitted**

**That bananas were psychic was explained/reported to congress**

**To congress was reported that bananas were psychic.**

**connection between**

**2 and 2 is 6 as I suspected even before proving**

**and claim that as represents so and not an NP:**

**I suspected x even before proving it was so**

**I suspected 2 and 2 was 6 even before proving it was so**

**Date: 11 Feb 1993 12:30:21-EST (Thursday)**

**From: POSTAL@YKTVMV**

**To: ellrossj@nusvm**

**Subject: old locative fact in new bottle**

**Hey it has long been known to linguistic scientists and other unproductive citizens that locatives don't like to be pronouns:**

**(1) Frank discussed that brothel in that brothel/\*it.**

**(2) Which brothel did Frank discuss in that brothel/\*it?**

**(3) Which brothel did Frank discuss that in?**

**Now note parasitic gap facts:**

**(4) \*Which brothel did Frank discuss t in pg?**

**(5) \*Which brothel did Frank discuss a picture of pg/t in pg/t?**

**Thus, more evidence for pronominal character of P-gaps.**

**( ) As for Jerome, he is the winner.**

**( ) \*As for Jerome, the winner is him.**

**( ) He is the winner, Jerome.**

**( ) \*The winner is him, Jerome**

**(1) Sentence from Robert Levine, January 1994 LSA Meeting Boston**

**Out came the rain and washed the spider out**

**That's nonsense snapped robin and stalked out of the room**

**Date: 18 Jun 1993 09:24:37-EDT (Friday)**

**To: pullum@cats.ucsc.edu**

**Subject: fact**

**At one time if memory serves you were involved in a dispute, perhaps with the beloved Higgintop, as to the question of whether the clause of a SUCH THAT construction must involve an NP bound to the head. I believe you argued NEIN.**

**But for the parallel question for English restrictive relatives, everyone would surely answer uncontroversially yes.**

**Consider though the following verbatim from a not too long ago Nissan Infiniti ad in the NY TIMES magazine:**

**(1) It is definitely not a car that years from now you'll say, "What was I thinking?"**

**(1) is remarkably good. It perhaps decays a bit if one substitutes WHICH for THAT. Notably, attempts to analyze (1) such that it contains a hidden reprise of the head are immediately not close-fetched.**

**(2) ..a car that years from you'll say about (it) "What...thinking?".□**

**Anyway, note that the hypothetical reprise position in (2) is an island:**

**(3) \*\*\*the car that he said about "What was I thinking?"**

(4) \*\*\*the car that he said about that it sucked.

Clearly a problem which evidence has been presented that help is needed to solve.

PMP

Paul--

I have some questions regarding the sentences we discussed like:

1. Who was it explained by that the world is flat?

You mentioned trying other extraction constructions and, if I recall, mentioned a correlation with "that" deletability. Can you tell me who has discussed this issue?

Now some judgements; mine are weak/fluctuate in some cases.

Consider:

	DEJ	WJP	PMP	
2. Who is it obvious to that the world is flat?		<u>OK</u>	<u>OK</u>	ok
3. Who did it occur to that the world is flat?		OK	OK	ok
4. Who was it explained to that the world was flat?		?	?	?
5. Who was it explained by that the world is flat?		?*	*	*
6. Who did it seem to that the world was flat?		?*	?	*
(cf. ** Who did John seem to to be fat? i.e., Raising and extraction worse for some reason)				
7. Who did Jack mention to that the world was flat?		*	*	*
8. Who did Jack mention it to that the world was flat?		?,OK	?,OK	?

But it also seemed to me that the "that" deletability almost but not quite parallels these judgements:

In the sentences below, I take 2' (obvious)

and 3' (occured) to be extraposed from 1;

4'(be explained) to be extraposed or maybe even extracted from 2;

6' (seem) to be neither extraposed nor extracted; 7' (mention) might be null extraposed or extracted (ie., seem and mention are not equivalent).

	DEJ	WJP	PMP	
2'. It is obvious the world is flat		<u>OK</u>	<u>OK</u>	ok
2''. It is obvious to Jane the world is flat		?	?	ok
3'. It occured to Jane the world is flat		??	??	ok

- |                                                 |    |    |    |
|-------------------------------------------------|----|----|----|
| 4'. It was explained the world is flat          | *  | *  | *  |
| 4'. It was explained to Jane the world is flat  | *  | *  | *  |
| 4''. It was explained by Jane the world is flat | *  | *  | *  |
| 6'. It seems the world is flat                  | OK | OK | *  |
| 7'. Jack mentioned the world is flat            | ?  | ?? | ?* |
| 8'. Jack believes the world is flat             | OK | OK | ok |

With Wh-extraction no "that" can be deleted:

- |                                                     |   |    |    |
|-----------------------------------------------------|---|----|----|
| 2'''. Who is it obvious to the world is flat?       | * | *  | *  |
| 3'''. Who did it occur to the world is flat?        | * | *  | *  |
| 4'''. Who was it explained to the world is flat?    | * | *  | *  |
| 5'''. Who was it explained by the world is flat?    | * | *  | *  |
| 6'''. Who did it seem to the world is flat?         | * | *  | ?  |
| 7'''. Who did Jack mention to the world is flat?    | * | ** | *  |
| 8'''. Who did Jack mention it to the world is flat? | * | *  | *□ |

Finally some judgements on extractions from the "that" clauses

DEJ WJP PMP

- |                                                     |    |    |
|-----------------------------------------------------|----|----|
| 2a. Who is it obvious that Mary hates?              | OK | ok |
| 3a. Who did it occur to Jane that Mary hates        | ?  | ok |
| 4a. Who was it explained to Jane that Mary hates?   | ** | *  |
| 5a. Who was it explained by Jane that Mary hates?   | ** | *  |
| 6a. Who did it seem to Jane that Mary hates?        | ?  | ?  |
| 6b. Who did it seem that Mary hates?                | OK | ok |
| 7a. Who was it mentioned that Mary hates?           | ** | *  |
| 7b. Who did Jack mention to Jane that Mary hates?   | ** | *  |
| 7c. Who was it mentioned by Jane that Mary hates?   | ** | *  |
| 8. Who did Jack mention it to Jane that Mary hates? | ** | *  |

I don't have all of this worked out, obviously. But I still think I'm on the right track.

It seems to me that all the OK cases can be related to predicates allowing (forgetting unaccusative) "basic" (i.e., no passive) sentential subjects.

I.e., we have:

9. That S (be) obvious to NP

10. That S occurred to NP

11.\*That S seems to NP

12. That S was explained by/to NP (BUT THIS IS PASSIVE so the "that S" in "It was explained that S" could be argued to be extraposed from 2 (like "seems".)

That's part of what I think is going on: clauses in some sense to be specified associated with 2s disallow the leftward extraction.

Next: in something like

13. "Who was it explained by that Max is a fool"

I claim the "by \_\_\_" intervenes between the verb and the "that S" by virtue of the "that S" be extracted to the right, leaving informally an "extraction 2 gap" that cannot be crossed by leftward extraction (my basic claimed generalization).

Do you know whether anyone has ever tabulated and/or discussed such data before? Where do you suggest I look (other than Fodor and Pesetsky). If it's new territory, I'd like to expand on this and try to write a syntax squib/paper.

Best,  
David

25-JUN-1993 11:10:54.13

Paul - Here are a few facts culled from a recent letter to George - hope you are thriving unixly, and that you will like these. No word from Canada yet, but said to be supposed to be perhaps soon - good for the soul, this waiting - Love to you all up there in Twinky-land - Peace - Haj

Date: Fri, 25 Jun 93 11:27:24 BSC

From: Haj Ross <PERSIANO@BRUFMG>

But I do have a nice birthday squib for you. Remember our joint squib about "the availability or not of funds"? Brame wrote a reply saying that of course no one could say it, it therefore proved how full of shit we were, etc. Well we may not be among many people who say it in English, but in Brazilian, it is robust, though these "ou nao"s (= or not) only go after some presently mysterious subclass of (mostly deadjectival) nominalizations: seriousness, availability, possibility, comparability, - many. Not after things like refusal, height, etc. Interesting problem in itself, but forget that...Look here:

The fact that funds are available is a surprise/\*mystery

Whether or not funds are available is a \*surprise/OK mystery.

The availability (or not) of funds is a mystery

The availability (\*or not) of funds is a surprise.

Same facts in Brazilian, of course. So raise high the banner of nominalization of questions, which will be a nice entering wedge.

Hey - here's something transderivational to make the day brighter:

Infinitival questions (like what to wear, where to live, etc.) are good after what predicates? Why, I'm glad you asked. They work after:

mystery, enquire, wonder, etc - the predicates which take only disjunctive Q's

or after:

know, find out, learn, discover, etc - the words which take either disjunctive \*or\* conjunctive Q's

And what don't they go after? **\*\*Very\*\*** glad that you asked:

just after surprise, horrify, odd, wild, fantastic, etc - the class that \*only\* takes conjunctive Q's.

So the rule that forms these infinitival Q's, which I am currently amassing evidence to the effect that it is a totally regular rule which deletes the subject and "should" (another rule sure to be popular in certain unnumbered buildings on the East Coast) is transderivational: you can only do it if the predicate you are the question complement of **COULD TAKE A DISJUNCTIVE QUESTION** - NB -not "is now taking" - because to get "we finally discovered what to wear" - that is a conjunctive Q, not a disjunctive one.

From: IN% "PERSIANO@BRUFMG.BITNET" 17-AUG-1993 09:25:41.22

Paths, points, and proforms

Haj Ross     Circle Noetic Services

One of the first questions that a linguist who works on spatial expressions must face is: what is the distribution of words whose primary sense is a spatial one? Such words can be prepositions (such as "from," "to," "in," "out (of)," "on," "off (of)," "across," "over," "under," etc.), or verbs (such as "go," "come," "rise," "fall," "enter," etc.), or adverbs (such as "far," "deeply," etc.), and so on. The linguist wants to know under what conditions these words can be used non-spatially, in extended, or metaphorical, senses, as in "I prevented him \*from\* leaving," "We were



acting \*out of\* desperation," "Ben \*went\* crazy," "Sue \*came\* \*to\* her senses" "You are \*far\* smarter than I am," "I \*deeply\* resent you for your condescension," etc. The question of the distribution of such basically location or motion-related words has attracted enormous amounts of attention, not only in the recent literature (especially that dealing with metaphor), but also in work which goes back centuries.

All of the above words presuppose the existence of various kinds of spaces; they deal with the location of certain sorts of entities in these spaces, or, in the case of movements, with changes in location. A typical phrase describing a movement would be "from LA along Route 1 through Santa Barbara to San Francisco." My work is in part concerned with the characterization of the maximally general form of such expressions for movements, which I refer to as "paths." Briefly, I argue that all paths can be decomposed into a sequence of "legs," starting with a single (optional) "initial leg" (such as "from LA"), which can be followed by any number of "medial legs" (such as "along Route 1," "through Santa Barbara," etc.), ending with a single (optional) "final leg" (such as "to San Francisco). One of the innovations in my work is the investigation of the extent to which these three types of legs are similar, and to what extent different. A related, and immense, problem is the specification of which members of the extremely large set of possible path types go with which types of predicates, and under what conditions. Why, for instance, is it that the rule of \*To\* Deletion cannot apply when the final leg of a path contains only a noun phrase, as in (1)? That is, we cannot elide the preposition "to" in (1a), for (1b) is ill-formed (in these and later examples, a '\*' prefixed to a sentence indicates that the sentence is ungrammatical).

- (1) a. We ran from this bridge to that bridge.  
b. \*We ran from this bridge 0 that bridge.

while such a shortening is possible if the final leg has a prepositional phrase following the "to":

- (2) a. We ran from the house to under that bridge.  
b. We ran from the house 0 under that bridge.

Or why is it that when we say "They left from Tokyo on May 7," we do not imply that they did not return, while when we say "They left Tokyo on May 7," there is such a suggestion? There is also a rich tradition of research into questions like these, concerning the conditions under which certain variants of basic path structure are required or prohibited. Much has been learned about these conditions, but much more remains mysterious. □

It is when we come to the next set of basic questions which my research addresses that we find ourselves on terra more or less incognita - at least, I have been able to find little work that bears on these issues. At issue is what kinds of "proforms" (i.e., "pronouns" (like "she," "he," "they," "it"), "pro-adverbs" (like "there," "then," etc.)) can be used to refer to paths and subparts of paths, and how various adverbial modifiers of paths (like "right," "far," "way," etc.) fit into the syntax and semantics of movement. Behind the details of the research lies a fundamental problem: how are the notions of "context," or "generalized location" (such as points, regions, scatterings, etc.) in a space to be characterized, conceptually and syntactically?

One way into the problem is to reflect on the contrast between "it" and "there" in a sentence like (3):

- (3) a. The tower is so high that I'm not sure that I want to jump from it.  
b. The tower is so high that I'm not sure that I want to jump from there.

It seems intuitively correct to say that the so-called "personal pronouns," such as "she," "he," "it," etc.) are used to link sets of coreferential "participants," while pro-adverbs, like "there," "then," and "thus," are used to link coreferential "contexts," of various types. (My distinction between participants and contexts is, I believe, the same as the one that Langacker draws between participants and settings.) It is only participants that can undergo processes like "Passivization," which takes a noun phrase form after the verb and moves it forward in its clause to convert it into a subject. Thus we find that "jump from it" in (3a) can be passivized (cf. (4a)), while "jump from there" in (3b) cannot be (cf. \*(4b))

- (4) a. It was never jumped from.      b. \*There was never jumped from.

A probable cause for this gap in passivizability is the function of this rule, which is to up the clausal prominence of the passive subject, to make it a more salient participant. But the function of "there" is just the opposite - it is to assign to the noun phrase to which it refers a role which is out of the limelight. Thus there is a functional tug of war, and the sentence is trashed.

What are the general conditions under which a noun phrase in a sentence can be replaced by "there"? The first answer that suggests itself is that "there" is always possible when one is referring to some noun phrase in a path. It turns out, however, that things are more complex, as we see when we contrast a sentence like (5), in which "there" can replace the object of "from,"

- (5) a. We cleared the snow from the sidewalk.

- b. We cleared the snow from there.

with another variant of the same sentence - (6):

- (6) a. We cleared the sidewalk of snow.
- b. \*We cleared there of snow.

in which "there" cannot appear. It is clear that in both versions, the phrase about the sidewalk \*is\* part of a path - it is designating the initial leg of the snow's journey. Then why should "there" only be possible in the first variant? I believe that the answer here also has to do with discourse prominence, but I will not go into the details of this answer here.

For a final puzzling fact about "there," let us ask: when can this proform be modified by the adverb "right"? In (7b), we see that "right there" can follow "from," but in (7d), we see that this same sequence is impossible after the preposition "behind" (most other prepositions behave like "behind" in this respect).

- (7) a. We jumped from there.
- b. We jumped from right there.
- c. We jumped behind there.
- d. \*We jumped behind right there.

This is just the first manifestation of a fundamental difference between the structure of prepositional phrases headed by the two "end-prepositions" - "from" and "to" - and that of all other prepositions that are not linked to end-legs.

One other reflex of the participant/context distinction can be found in a restriction on the use of "what". Consider the contrast in (8), which I owe to Paul Postal.

- (8) a. What I lived in was that house.
- b. \*What I lived in was that country.
- c. \*What I lived in was Kansas.

It is not that "country" and "Kansas" can never be linked to "what" - cf. (9):

- (9) a. What I described was that house.
- b. What I described was that country.
- c. What I described was Kansas.

Rather, there seems to be a class of locative nouns, like "country," "Kansas," "Berlin," etc., which, when they occur in locative contexts (such as after a spatial preposition, like "in"), can only function as contexts, not as participants. This also explains the contrast in (10):

- (10) a. She lived in that house and he lived there too.  
b. She lived in that house and he lived in it too.  
c. She lived in that country and he lived there too.  
d. \*She lived in that country and he lived in it too.

Possibly the most important finding for syntactic theory of my investigation of where adverbial proforms are possible comes from the observation that there is a difference in "thereability" in the object of "of" between the sentences in (11):

- (11) a. The robot affixed a searchlight on top of the tower.  
b. The robot affixed a searchlight on the top of the tower.

In (12), we see that "the tower" can be replaced by "there" in (11a), but not in (11b):

- (12) a. The robot affixed a searchlight on top of there.  
b. \*The robot affixed a searchlight on the top of there.

By itself, this fact would be of only minor interest. But when we realize that the difference between having and not having the definite article preceding "top" also affects the distribution of the reciprocal pronoun "each other," as we see in (13),

- (13) a. The robots affixed searchlights on top of each other.  
b. \*The robots affixed searchlights on the tops of each other.

then we conclude that just as reciprocalization is a process, whose scope must be constrained by one of the various theories of rule constraints now under elaboration, so must "thereing" be a process of the same type. Thus ultimately, the question as to whether "there" can function as a spatial modifier of some predicate will have to be included in theories of rule scope and islands.

I think that enough has been said to allow us to conclude that the "thereability" of a noun phrase - i.e., whether it is functioning as a participant or as a context - depends on a myriad of complex factors. I have discussed some of these only to show the depth of the waters here.

I believe that I am on a promising track towards some revealing answers for questions in this last basic set, answers which necessitate drawing a fundamental distinction between the syntax of medial legs and that of end-legs. Briefly, I believe that while the deep object of end-prepositions like "from" and "to" is the noun "point," this is not the case for medial prepositions like "along," "through," "across," and so on, whose objects can be any of various noun phrases which can be used to describe locations. The matter is an extremely complex one, however, since there are various contexts in which prepositions such as "at" and

"to" can be deleted (recall (2): "We ran from the house (to) under the bridge"), and others in which prepositional phrases can be elided, if they refer to a previously mentioned location. For instance, (14a) can be abbreviated as (14b):

- (14) a. I dropped the box, and the kitten jumped in (to it).  
b. I dropped the box, and the kitten jumped in.

These facts make extremely difficult the ascertaining of the path structure of sentences with sequences of prepositions, such as "He jumped up in under the bench."

The syntax and semantics of the participant/context distinction has intimate connections with that of paths, and therefore with the central notion of what spaces are, and of what possible motions within them are. I believe that there will be interesting spinoffs, both for geographers and for those who work with spatial cognition, from my investigations into the detailed structure of paths and of their proforms.

From: IN%"PERSIANO@BRUFMG.BITNET" "Haj" 2-SEP-1993 07:09:01.18  
To: IN%"POSTAL@ACFcluster.NYU.EDU" "Paul Postal"  
Date: Tue, 31 Aug 93 08:28:35 BSC  
From: Haj <PERSIANO@BRUFMG>  
Subject: Eternal Golden Shining TruthAbout Movement  
To: Paul <postal@yktvmz>

Paul -

Thanks a lot for the comments, especially about laundering the autobiographical stuff, which I will do. I am not sufficiently allergic to that yet.

I think that the idea about avoiding problems with unwanted gaps in the presence of "there" by refusing to call it an NP will not work very well. First of all, often it does function as a NP - like it can cleft and pseudocleft. Secondly, note that you have to make sentences like (1) and (2) anyway

- (1) I cleared the sidewalk of snow.  
(2) The garden was swarming with bees.

Now, since you want "there" to sometimes show up right after verbs (I reached there, left there. etc), how do you stop "there" from replacing "sidewalk" in (1)? Or "garden" in (2)? It is not so easy to specify where "there" is possible - if the answer is not: it replaces any constituent of a (deep) path, then what is the characterization? That one has the advantage of maybe

being right - and it is hard enough to get airborne anyway - like what is the path which is enabling the "there" in (3)?

- (3) I slept, went home, ate, etc. there. (I.e., garden variety locatives  
But locating \*what\*? In what  
path? I'm sure you can imagine  
the popularity of any such claim  
in circles where syntax is done)

I have recently come to understand why this contrast:

- (4) We jumped from out of the boat.  
\*into

It has taken me a long time to realize that what follows "from" and "to" are locations (i.e., are points, modified by relative clauses). They are not directionals - obvious, you may think, but there have been so many prepositions of so many flavors whizzing around in my head for so long that I didn't know how to prove that. Now I have a simple argument:

it depends on "straight," which only goes with directionals - so notice that (5) is ambiguous without "straight," but only a directional with it.

- (5) a. Sheila jumped in front of the school  
b. Sheila jumped straight in front of the school.

Now observe that "straight" won't go in "from"-phrases"

- (6) Sheila left from (\*straight) in front of the school.

So why then the contrast in (1)? It is because "out of" has a locative sense:

- (7) The points are out of / \*into the boat.

I probably have lots more to tell you (ah yes - I do: I think I know why

- (8) I let the cat (right) in.

- (9) I let (\*right) in the cat.

contrast. It probably has to do with reanalysis being blocked by inserted adverbs: He was depended (\*continually) on. But in order to get that to work, there are interesting things to say about the rule which moves things to the front of paths:

(10) He ran from the barn (right) in (to the house)

0

(11) He ran (right) in from the barn

The rule doesn't take the "in" out of the path, as opposed to the rule which fronts the whole path and presumably adjoins it to the verb in "let in". The latter rule blocks whenever the "in" is modified by anything - right, down, way, straight - etc. The rule which pops things to the front of paths don't care a hoot. I think that this non-hoot-caring rule may be also responsible for

(12) towards the west (13) west-wards

Maybe even for this interesting pair:

(14) from NY to the south (15) south of NY

All these and yet other wonders will become crystallinely clear in my next encyclical. Meanwhile, running mode.

I'm sorry to hear about the no break in the heat. It must be unthinkably bad there. At least in Singapore, everybody knew it was going to be hot, the taxis are airconditioned, some buses are, almost all stores etc. Not in NY, though.

Peace - Haj

Paul - I remembered two more arguments for differentiating long and short TM. The first has to do with an idea that I have never had time to write up or down. It is that an element which has been moved can't have stuff ripped out of it. I call it "quarantining," and an example of it is in (1)

(1) \*It is this symphony which I think that the end of \_\_ he can't play.

Now: I think that quarantining is variable - that is, the stronger the variables in the rule which does the initial ripping, the stronger the quarantining. So (1) should be worse than (2), in which the thing that has had stuff ripped out of it was moved, but by Adverb Preposing, a far weaker rule than the one which made (1), whose quarantine was made by Topicalization.

(2) ?It is this symphony which I think that at the end of \_\_, he may faint.

I made up these sentences in 1971 or thereabouts, for that conference in the University of Western Ontario, and incredibly, the judgements stay with me. I think I would be willing to call them "facts".

Now, however, let us pass on to the tougher nuts. There should be quarantining differences between (3) (with short TM) and (4) (with long):

- (3) ?It is this symphony which I think that the end of \_\_ may be hard to play.
- (4) \*It is this symphony which I think that the end of \_\_ may be hard for you to imagine him saying that he played.

I still feel about those two the same way, but do you?

The other argument I don't have time now to recook up - it is the converse of the quarantining one, which says that when a rippee has "moved over" some clauses, you can't take anything out of them, the more so, the stronger the ripping rule which you used.

Just one example:

- (5) \*It is my violin which I think that the end of the symphony he can't play on \_\_.

I'm sure you can construct the relevant exaMPLE FOR Adverb Preposing, and then try out two matched examples for short and long TM.

Haj

"Haj" 3-SEP-1993 08:22:52.05

Paul -

How \*\*\*could\*\*\* I ever challenge your stars? Anyway, that is, as Oscar Wilde said of patriotism, the last refuge of a scoundrel.

In this case, it just doesn't work, what you say, because there are MANY prepositions which can be followed by "there" which can't be followed by PP's: through, in, along, underneath, above, etc. On and on. The ONLY ones which can be followed in SS by PP's are end-prepositions, like "from" and "to". Which is what has been driving me crazy for a long time.

Also, what stops the of course there won't replace anything but PP's are sentences with "reach" and "leave," like "Reach Boston," "Leave Texas," which can be followed by "there," but not by PP's. So why can't "clear"?

And don't forget the un"then"ability of

- (1) 1944 / \*Then saw Frank Sinatra hit Hoboken.

That baby is out for the same reason: advances can't be locatively pronominalized. I really think that that law will turn out to be quite useful, but may-be not.

At any rate, let me flash back to your long and short TM query.

If you agree with me about the difference in quarantining strength between (2) and (3) (do you?)



(2) (?) It was this symphony which the end of \_\_\_ was hard to play.

(3) \*It was this symphony which the end of \_\_\_ was hard to imagine Frank saying that he could play.

then notice how beautiful, how beautiful. Because note that when you look at the "---"'s in the two sentences, there is nothing to tell you thaty one has come from "further away" (i.e., has been moved to the front by a longer version of TM) than the other, especially if you believe that TM is Object Deletion. If you are using chains, boundaries, whips, and other essentials of modern grammar, note that you are going to have to have a virulently global theory of (non-so-called) islands - you are going to have to look further back down the tree to see what the relationship was between the "---" in question and the verb "play". This will not be very palatable in certain numbered buildings.

For me, tudo bem (=everything well =OK) - I have thought that we need to have a global theory of islands ever since the Guess Who? stuff. But (2) and (3), if the "facts" seem even close to being such for you, they seems to put the ball pretty solidly in the other court. Wuyya think?

Hey - have we or have we not biutnet about such things as:

(4) I talked to Zelda about Jim near ?her (\*\*self) him (\*\*self)

behind ?her?\*himyou/Alan/Mr. Swithers/etc.

There seems to be a sometimes relaxable unguessably how to statable constraint which says that if you are in the sort of subject/object/IObj part of the sentence, you better not appear coreferentially in the locative/temporal part too:

(5) I talked to Zelda about Jim after ?her.\*him

Peace - Haj

Hey Paul -

Look at this: go (just (right (straight (to bed))))).

The order of those three adverbs is fixed; more interesting is their meaning/distribution. The closest one to the PP is straight - it only goes with clear directionals, has one meaning only. Next out is right: it has a lot of meanings, goes with temporal adverbs: right after that. So it can mean no separation in space, or in time, and it has some hard to classify meanings - like in "it might fall right over".

And then the furthest out, just, is also loose syntactically \_ IT CAN PRECEDE THE VERB. Aside from the fact that it used to mean justice, and now can mean only, but lotsa other things too -

Don't we find the same thing in

the poor (derived meaning) rich (no derived meaning) students

or in: must have been being written

The innermost verb, passive, has only one (or maybe two) meaning(s)  
thgen be + ing, which mostly means continuative aspect, but hasa other possibilities  
(Pickles are containing more and more strontium these days)  
then "have," which means straight past, perfective, lots of alloemes (there's a great word, how did we let it slip into disuse?)

So I am wondering: is there some prionciple (or possibly even a principle) which says that whenever you have ABC syntactically, C being the head, that A, being syntactically looser, also is semantically looser, freer to wander and acquire new alloemes? Wuyya think?

Another query: lookee here:

(1) Alain put le plastique (\*way/\*right) under few bridges.

(2) What did Alain put le plastique (\*way/\*right) under

Doesn't it seem that Negative Attraction (or whatever it is to be called) and ripping are wanting to obey the same rules?

I think that the restriction is like this: paths are sort of in a different part of the syntax of a sentence from the 1, 2, 3 part of RG. Paths mostly are about prepositional phrases, and contexts of actions, states, etc. When they are stripped down (i.e., don't have any fancy shit on them like "way" "right", then they can be conscripted into duty as part of the relational part of the sentence.

This is why the well-known contrast: This bed/\*country was slept in. Basically, a context can't passivize - but when we know that the context can get rumped, etc., by virtue of an action, then we grudgingly allow it to behave a bit like a patient.

I know this is all pretty crazy right now, but lookit this:

(3) I have gone from few cities along the coast to SF.

(4) ?I have gone from LA along few roads to SF.

(5) ?I have gone from LA along the coast to few cities.

Negation Attraction doesn't like to stick the n- into paths except into things at the left end of them, which is the "boundary" between the two kinds of syntaxes (which is sort of parallel, maybe to the distinction that you and Dave made about kinds of terms - the RG rules mess with NP's, not much with PP's, unless they can lose their P's, right.

Peace - Haj

Date: Mon, 15 Nov 1993 17:11:57 -0800 (PST)

From: Haj Ross

Paul -

Just a flash of gratitude for proposing Paul's Law - namely that (\*at) there is always bad.

Look how that must be generalized:

there \*at) here  
where

now  
(\*at) then  
when

There is also a generalization to (\*to) here/there/where //now/then/when, etc., but it is trickier. It has to throw out

I came (\*to) here yesterday.

But the cool thing is that the generalization must say:

\* at +X+ pro [+path]

(I think that it is non-trivial to specify what the "X" is)

I think. I wonder if it should also throw out

Who did it (\*by) how?  
He left (\*for) why?

It also must throw out the corresponding things with wherever and whenever - begins to look a bit tricky. Fundamental, though, is the fact that -ere/-en is one morpheme, which doesn't like being preceded by at (or to - which also form for \$64 WHAT (the fuck) natural class?)

Happy Ides of November -

Peace - Haj Ross,

7 Jan 94 17:19 PST

Date: Fri, 07 Jan 1994 17:02:18 -0800 (PST) From: Haj Ross Subject: right-ability =where-ability

Hey Paul -

Check this out: wherever one can have where, one can have right.

Like: in DO position, both are crummy:

1) I departed \*(from) right there at 12. (2) Where did you depart \*(from)?

And after medial P, both also are:

(3) Max jumped through (\*right) there. (4) \*Where did Max jump through?

Sounds like a minor thing, but in fact, for my understanding of my understanding, it feels like a biggie. Should have something for you to look at soon.

By the way, German makes a very sharp distinction between end-p and medial ones:

Only end-P can have "dort" [=there] after them:

- (5) Hans fuhr bis dort / bis da / \*dabis. H drove to there
- (6) Hans fuhr ( \*durch dort / \*durch da / dadurch )  
Hans drove through there
- (7) Hans fuhr von dort / von da / \*davon .... from there ...

This last fact, which I have just noticed, is really wild, because, while \*dabis is hopeless on any interpretation - it's just an ill-formed word, "davon" is fine in other contexts - "Ich trauechte davon" means "I dreamed of it"

So it looks like the German scene makes a razor-sharp distinction between the ends of paths and the middles, and I could show you something equally stunning for the Brazilian one, but do I detect e-eye-gl;azing effects? You can see it in all its glory in the paper.

I'm outta here -

Date: Wed, 26 Jan 1994 22:37:11 -0800 (PST) From: Haj Ross <haj@unbc.edu>  
Hey Paul -

Look at this: when you deprepositionalize (a catchy little neologism, which will doubtless go over like the fart in you know who's helmet) "leave from NY," getting "leave NY," you get an NP that can't passivize (\*NY was left by noon), pronominalize (\*I hated to leave it) or be whered - compare: Where did you leave \*(from)?

Now look: you also can't get things like these:

Travelers were leaving \*(from) everywhere/place somewhere/place

So the generalization is: medial legs (things headed by "through," "by," "along," etc.) and DePed (short for deprepositionalized PP's can't have adverbial nonspecific indefinite quantifiers. That is, the restriction on "where" that I originally noted is much more general - it blocks any kind of adverbial quantification (NB - not NP quantification: Travelers were leaving (from) every city, Maniacs were jumping (from) everything / \*(from) everywhere).

What I like about it is that it now makes a weird kind of sense: don't do this restricted kind of quantification into environments that are too inaccessible.

So you retort: why should DePing inaccessibilize (to coin another lovely) an environment? There you spit me, I twist slowly in the wind. I have no story to tell about that - do you have anything metagraphic?

Too late to go on much more here. One Q: have you ever looked at "back"? Like: I hit him back / he came back / back on the road again / she fought back / I kicked (\*back) Judy - kicked Judy back vs I kicked (back) at Judy - kicked at Judy (\*back)? There are at a conservative estimate seven consecutive life sentences in there, looking at that sucker - has anyone started?

1 Feb 94 14:32 PST

Date: Tue, 01 Feb 1994 14:28:38 -0800 (PST) From: Haj Ross <haj@unbc.edu>

Hey Paul -

From: Haj Ross <haj@unbc.edu> Subj: Rippabilities out of clefts

Your e-note made me think about the problem a bit, which I have been for a number of years, to no avail. The list (always a great breakthrough. lists) of rules which can yank out the rippee of a cleft is:

Question Formation (whether conjunctive or disjunctive), also wh-ever rules, whether they are the kind which fill a slot in the matrix (as in "I'll eat whatever you fry up"), or whether they are the absolute, no matter wh- kind: (as in "Whatever you fry up, I'm going to the races")

**Topicalization: Beans it was that he fried up. NO THIS IS IRISH OR**

**NB: won't work with negative clefts, which are pretty sick even untopicalized:**

**??I think it was never that he filled out a check right.**

**\*Never do I think that he filled out a check right.**

**I think it is few students who can follow the intricacies of Sid's thought.**

**Peacer -Haj**

**Date: Thu, 17 Mar 1994 22:04:28 -0800 (PST)**

**From: Haj Ross <haj@unbc.edu>**

**Subject: where o where o where?**

**Hey Paul -**

**Just to prove to myself that I'm still lost in syntax, here are some impenetrabilities:**

**(1) Paris is similar to everywhere I have always lived.  
                                          where we used to live in Newark.  
                                          ?here.**

**(2) \*\*Where is Paris similar to?**

**(3) ?Your house is similar to everywhere I have always lived.  
                                          \*face**

**The contrast between (1) and (3) is doubtless mumbly about in terms of "place nouns," etc., noting such contrasts as you have pointed out between sorta "obligatory" place nouns, like city and country names, cf.**

**(4) ?That city was never escaped from.  
                                          country  
                                          \*Duluth  
                                          \*Ecuador**

**But what is going on with (1) allowing -where-words at all? They are supposed (by me) to only be good inside paths - since when is the "to"-phrase after similar (lotsa NP\* predicates have similar sicknesses - different from, differ from, like - while we are scratching our heads, however, let's not forget to do so for**

**(5) \*Paris and where I have always lived are similar.**

**Bloody but unbowed, I can still imagine finding something to say about those, maybe, but \*\*WHY\*\* should there be a difference between QF with "where" and all other -where-**

words after "similar"? I hereby gape at these facts, and await their instant elucidation by your esteemed Eminence.

**Out of a northerly it - Haj**

**Date: Sat, 19 Mar 1994 11:30:12 -0500 (EST)  
From: djohns@watson.ibm.com Subject: EC's revisited To: POSTAL  
Paul --**

**I was thinking about the discussion with Ivan on the above. It occurred to me that the MGG and HPSG positions are in some ways quite similar -- that is neither postulate ECs. Of course the question is what counts as an EC. The answer for HPSG (and LFG) seems to be that an EC is a kind of phonologically null "surface structure" category. In HPSG, Ivan has explicates so-called ECs as values of a feature (arc label) "SLASH". This is not part of the "constituent structure" i.e., "surface structure", and hence there are no ECs. Similar story for LFG, which has two separate "data structures" for syntactic structure: c-structure (= surface constituent structure") and f-structure. There are analogs to ECs in f-structure, just as there are analogs to ECs in HPSG's SLASH features.**

**The MGG analog to HPSG/LFG constituent structure would seem to be for a given M-graph, the collection of NONerased arcs. Now the precise EC analog in MGG depends on the analysis -- that is, whether one simply has erasure of an overlapping arc, as in older versions, or whether one always introduces a separate arc whose head corresponds to an EC. But in neither case can one find a phonologically null node corresponding to an EC in the collection of NONerased arcs ... on the assumption (I'm not sure what your current position is) that all such arcs are erased. (Alternatively one could define constituent structure as all nonerased arcs with certain R-signs.) That is, under this reasonable correspondence between frameworks, MGG has no ECs either.**

**SFG has an analog that corresponds well to HPSG too. Instead of the Erase relation, a collection of null R-signs are postulated. An "EC" is simply the head/target of an arc whose label ends with one of these null R-signs. The SFG constituent structure (surface tree) is the collection of all arcs whose labels do not end with a null R-sign (= MGG nonerased). There are no "null constituents" in the surface tree either.**

The only difference is that in HPSG the "null R-sign" has been "broken out" into a separate SLASH feature. To SUM UP:

**\*VERY ROUGHLY\***: I will use "node" to mean the relevant structure rooted by "node" -- typically a (sub)graph or (sub)feature structure.

Pretheoretic Notion: "(surface) EC"

**GB:** kind of phonologically null node in S-structure

**HPSG:** kind of node occurring as value of SLASH feature (arc labeled SLASH) but not occurring in corresponding position of feature structure defining constituent structure.

**LFG:** kind of node in f-structure but not in corresponding position in corresponding c-structure

**MGG:** a kind of node that is the head(target) of an erased arc.

**SFG:** a kind of node that heads an arc whose label ends with a null R-sign.

What do you think? I was gonna send this to Ivan but wanted your feedback first.  
David

From:djohns@watson.ibm.com" 20-MAR-1994 12:09:12.78  
To: POSTAL"Subj: "That del" data judgement query memo

Date: Sun, 20 Mar 1994 12:00:26 -0500 (EST)  
From: djohns@watson.ibm.com  
Subject: "That del" data judgement query memo

Paul --  
Could I trouble you for some more judgements?  
It's obvious Mary lied.  
It's apparent Mary lied.  
It's evident Mary lied.  
It's likely Mary lied.  
It's seems Mary lied.  
It's clear Mary lied.  
It's obvious to Jack Mary lied.



**It's seems to Jack Mary lied.  
It's apparent to Jack Mary lied.  
It's evident to Jack Mary lied.  
It's clear to Jack Mary lied.  
It occurred to Jack Mary lied.  
It's obvious even to Jack Mary lied.  
It's apparent even to Jack Mary lied.  
It's evident even to Jack Mary lied.  
It's clear even to Jack Mary lied.  
It occurred even to Jack Mary lied.  
It's seems even to Jack Mary lied.  
Mon, 21 Mar 94 09:45:46 EST  
Date: Mon, 21 Mar 1994 09:38:10 -0500 (EST)  
From: djohns@watson.ibm.com  
Subject: that again**

**Paul --**

**Thanks for note: yes, the bit about "even" etc. requiring "that" was one of the things I noticed. The other is that "that"-or-not seems generally less straightforward than GB literature would let on. I'm wondering if there isn't a squib or something there ...**

**In an earlier judgement query, you reported something I take to be a mistake, viz.:**

**(1) \* It seems the world is flat.**

**You didn't really mean this did you?**

**I think I am going to spruce up my EC comments and send them along to Ivan...**

**Actually, I have read a good hunk of Move Alpha: it's the Duke of York phenonemon running amok that most struck my eye!!**

**See you soon,**

**David**

**Date: Mon, 21 Mar 1994 16:52:00 -0500  
From: djohns@watson.ibm.com  
Subject: EC's in HPSG, MGG and other frameworks  
To: SAG@CSLI.STANFORD.EDU**

**Ivan,**

**It was good seeing you at the CUNY conference. After the discussion on the above topic, I had the following thoughts. Here I will use the modern term for the framework Paul and I developed -- Metagraph Grammar (MGG), but all my remarks hold for the earlier**

**APG version.**

**(1) MGG has no notion of EC, if one takes this to mean a phonologically null (terminal) element in surface/constituent structure. The reason is simple: Analogs to ECs in MGG all head arcs that are ERASED and hence do not, by general definition, appear in the SURFACE GRAPH, defined for a fixed METAGRAPH as the collection of all NONERASED arcs. See, e.g., Arc Pair Grammar, p. 78, pp. 88-89. The MGG concept Surface Graph corresponds to others' surface/constituent structure -- they are trees, their terminal nodes correspond to phonological entities and they are the locus of linear precedence constraints.**

**(Recall that in MGG the primitive relations on arcs, Erase and Sponsor, permit the definitions of two subgraphs of the entire Relational-Graph "embedded" in a metagraph (= all the arcs plus the two relations Sponsor and Erase). The collection of Nonsponsored arcs (= Self-Sponsored arcs in APG book) constitutes the so-called Logical Graph (MGG's predicate-argument structure). Essentially, then, Sponsor and Erase mediate between two distinguished subgraphs of an entire Metagraph.)**

**As Paul has amply shown over the years, judicious use of Sponsor and Erase allows MGG to formally characterize a large body of facts requiring ECs in, e.g., GB, without appeal to this notion. Paul's notion of a Type II Successor (where a sponsoring arc erases the arc it sponsors) permits the equivalent of metaphorically percolating information up linguistic structure using features such as SLASH. That is, elements in embedded phrases can affect the properties of elements in higher up phrases without the former showing up in the higher "constituent structure".**

**(2) It occurred to me that the MGG and HPSG positions are in some ways quite similar -- that is neither postulate ECs in the intended sense. In HPSG, you explicate so-called ECs as values of a feature (arc label) "SLASH". This feature (equivalently, arc labeled with this feature) is not part of the "constituent structure" -- hence there are no ECs.**

**Similar story for LFG, which has two separate "data structures" for syntactic structure: c-structure and f-structure. There are analogs to ECs in f-structure, just as there are analogs to ECs in HPSG's SLASH features, and analogs in MGG's relational graph (all the arcs in a metagraph). But no ECs in c-structure.**

**The RG/MGG variant developed by Larry Moss and me -- stratified feature grammar (SFG) -- has analogous mechanisms and no ECs. Instead of the Erase relation, a collection of null R-signs are**

postulated, e.g., 0 -- for bounded cases; /L for left extractions; /R for right extractions. This represents a conscious blend of MGG and GPSG ideas. Analogous to MGG's notion of S-graph, SFG defines the collection of arcs whose labels do NOT end with a null R-sign. (Recall that SFG labels are sequences of R-signs). The resulting collection is stipulated to be a tree, is the locus of linear precedence constraints, etc. -- i.e., it represents constituent structure. In SFG, the analog to an EC is simply the head/target of an arc whose label ENDS with one of these null R-signs, e.g., [2,/L] signifies a direct object constituent C that has been left-extracted. In HPSG, C would show up as the value of SLASH. Hence, following the early lead of MGG, SFG has no ECs either.

(3) I am left wondering what substantive differences there might be in this area? Presumably they exist, but the convergence is striking.

To sum up my rough observations, using the term "node" to mean the relevant structure rooted by an appropriate node:

#### **CORRESPONDENTS TO GB's ECs in HPSG, MGG, SFG, LFG**

**GB:** EC: kind of phonologically null node in S-structure.

**HPSG:** kind of node occurring as value of SLASH feature (arc labeled SLASH) but not occurring in corresponding position of feature structure defining constituent structure.

**MGG/APG:** kind of node that is the head(target) of an erased arc.

**SFG:** kind of node that heads an arc whose label ends with a null R-sign.

**LFG:** kind of node in f-structure but not in corresponding position in c-structure.

What do you think?

Seems to be an intriguing convergence in at least this area, and thus it would also seem the tact Paul and I took in 1977 (the year APG was written; published 1980) is now indirectly receiving quite wide support.

Best wishes,  
David

Date: Tue, 22 Mar 1994 15:59:19 -0800 (PST)  
From: Haj Ross <haj@unbc.edu> Subject: fyi (fwd)

**Paul -**

**Adverbial ones**

**NP-ones (like after describe, etc.)**

**I live (right/down/back) where  
I work.**

**I described (\*right/\*down/\*back)  
where I work.**

**I think that the evidence is good for a deletion analysis of the  
adverbial ones - to wit, the deletion of "at the place," a la Mike Geis.**

**NB: I live (up/down/in/out/back/around/\*on) (at the place)  
where you work.**

**Since there are a bunch of parentheses, let me tell you: the  
p[repositions which, like in/out/up/down/ etc. can modify "at the place"  
are just those which can modify adverbial where-clauses. The ones which  
can't modify "at the place" (like on/beside/between/under/etc.) are also  
crummy before adverbial where-clauses.**

**P.P.S.**

**There is this recurring problem: nothing modifies wherever-clauses.  
(\*I will work back wherever you live(. This feels, does it not?,like a  
sort of factivity violation: "wherever" makes the location a  
non-specific indefinite, but the guys like "right/back/down/etc." seem to  
make it factive, if you will pardon the term. Why should this be?  
Why can't I know thatr you are going to move somewhere below me in the  
valley and say**

**I will visit you (\*down) wherever you move to.**

**Baffling. English has been designed by cretins (do you know  
that the etymology thereof is "Christian"?), am seeking a language  
non-made by committee.**

**From: Bill Poser <poser@crystals.stanford.edu>To: haj@unbc.edu  
Subject: fyi**

**Is your manuscript 213 words too long with the deadline in 10 minutes?  
Do the last two citations run over the 10-page limit? Are your lines  
already running off the page? Is the move from 5-point to 4-point  
looking inevitable?**

**-\- NO MORE -/-**

**Now, No-Knuthing Technologies presents SquishTeX, the first  
typesetting program with a compression coefficient, alpha, that allows**

you to continuously vary the length of your document from original size to zero without ever violating journal submission guidelines. If  $\alpha = 1$ , SquishTeX performs in the same uncompromising, idyllic fashion as the original TeX.

As  $\alpha$  is decreased towards 0, SquishTeX uses a variety of proprietary devices to cleverly condense your text.

- \* Substitution of almost-equivalent citations, but with shorter names and fewer authors. Elimination of citations of authors unlikely to be on review boards.
- \* Elision of unnecessarily pompous literary devices: adjectives, adverbs and prepositions, for instance.
- \* Automatic use of thesaurus to find short equivalents of long words:
  - relativistic - fast
  - superlative - rad
  - $1.56 * 10^{37}$  - a lot
- \* Elimination of vowels and consonants that seem "obvious enough".
- \* Wide-scale deletion of mindless drivel.
- \* Use of the "you can guess the rest" syntactic construct.

Turn a 200 page thesis into an 8 page conference paper ( $\alpha = .04$ )!  
No document is too complex. New users will marvel at the sophisticated foreign air about their papers!

Come, test SquishTeX at this week's

## G I R L S C O U T B E N E F I T

to be held at 5 p.m. on Friday, March 4th, 1994, in the Cordura foyer, where we will drink a toast to Donald Knuth.

Paul -

Gotcher thing about Richard (as I think Andy Rogers called the "looks like" Raising rule) aand Regular Copper-Clad All-Amurrican Raisin' - and I think you're right. Certainly your facts hold for me - how do these do for you?

I remember that fake NP's in general don't like to raise twice:

- 1) It seems that track was said to have been kept of his comet.

(2) \*Track seems to have been said to have been kept of his comet.

Exceptionally, "there" can raise twice, at least in some contexts:

(3) There seems likely to be an investigation.

Though note that without the "to be" being zapped, (3) would have been the questionable ??(4):>

(4) ??There seems to be likely to have been an investigation.

So anyway, pending the six end-to-end theses that all this would require to get this stuff tied down right, let's say that you can't double-raise either with "there" or with fakes. Now observe that as PMP would predict, Richard and Raising work identically (well purty near) with respect to this restriction:

(5) ?It looks like tabs seem to have been kept of his campaign spending.

(6) \*Tabs look like they seem to have been kept of his campaign spending.

Q. E. partially D., no?

Peace - haj

30 Mar 94 09:41 PST

Date: Wed, 30 Mar 1994 09:12:23 -0800 (PST)

From: Haj Ross <haj@unbc.edu>

Subject: Russians, crossover, apartments, Texas, exceptives, other things, some under the sun, some not

The facts about "nobody but" etc. are magnificent. Intuitively, it is obvious that in "Nobody but Max left," there should be/have been some clause like "Max left" somewhere around.

Query: if "\*Nobody but Bob admires him" is a crossover violation, is also "\*Bob admires him"? I don't immediatley see how you are going to pull off this prestidigitation for the exceptive - would it extend to the "plain" reflexive too?

And hark! (or some helpful interjection): shouldn't (1) be crummy for des raisons de crossover fort aussi?

(1) \*None of the students but the Mazeltov twins kissed each other.

It **\*is\*** bad, right? My mind is a bit clouded by la peste this AM, but I think it's foutu.

And on this cheery note - ah non! Permet-moi de dire que of course I would love to coauteur a squib on any topic which is even slightly legal. Fusing Raising and Richard is certainly a candidate.

Not even close to "by" the way - but have you ever noticed things like:

(2) I realized that wow/well/hell/damn/fuck **\*I\*** could be drafted too.

Note that verb class is critical - these mommas are out with "hope," "doubt," "be surprised," etc. Also, such clauses are crummy subjects:

**\*That wow he had never telephoned was soon realized.**

Resembling thus the squid, retreating while leaving behind a murky cloud, je recule (probably unrelated to "cul," though who but you knows?/?doesn't know?)

Peace -Haj

Date: Thu, 31 Mar 1994 12:08:13 -0800 (PST)

From: Haj Ross <haj@unbc.edu>To: Paul Postal

Thanks to you for that Edwin sentence (**\*What did you hop from the table to the bench to?**), I think I understand what is going on. Edwin's sentence shows that these double-to S's are coordinate; note that they require that the initial from be there:

(1) I will go **\*(from LA) to SF to Seattle.**

What I have discovered is that Brazilian and German (and I bet french etc.) don't have the double-to construction. They have to say:

(2) Ich werde von LA bis SF **\*(und von dort) bis Seattle gehen.**

But they can say:

(3) Ich werde von LA bis SF und dann bis Seattle gehen.

So all (???) languages have a rule, called Chained Source Deletion, which will make things like (3), and then English goes one step further, and allows the and then (or things like it) to delete, assuming

that there is a preceding from-phrase (Cf. (2)).

I would love to find some context in which this latter rule refuses to work - all suggestions rewarded with a quarter if they work, and a footnote in the patent application.

Peace - Haj

Date: Fri, 01 Apr 1994 21:48:59 -0800 (PST)

From: Haj Ross <haj@unbc.edu> Subject: Remember the What?

There is one immense momma of a topic which our squib in embryo might latch onto: the squish, pardon, between Raising and Equi, visible in such facts as the one (\*) that (1) shows what "will" useta mean:

(1) God's will that man eat Twinkies

namely "desire", a solid Equi citizen, and that fact that it now let's stuff through like (2)

(2) There will be an inquest into this parking ticket.

which presumably shows that some form of "will" is now a Raiser. Or take Dave's facts about two "begin"'s or whatever. There are lots of things which show that old transitives turned into Raisers, in addition to facts abot some verbs which suggest that they are stuck halfway in the middle, allowing some Raisings, but not all:

(3) This problem is now able to be solved computationally.

(4) ?That he left early is now able to be written.

(5) ??This tack is now able to be taken.

(6) \*There is now able to be a makeup exam.

Etc. but now I must flee, and will reconvene, after fleeeeeeing a bit -  
Haj

4 Apr 94 09:33 PDT

Date: Mon, 04 Apr 1994 08:50:05 -0700 (PDT)

From: Haj Ross <haj@unbc.edu>

I have some stunning news on the AC front. Consider:

(1) Mike ran up/down the stairs/\*them.

(2) The book is on/by/under/etc. the stairs/\*them.



- (3) Zack skipped from the stairs/\*them to the sink.
- (4) The Mounties reached the stairs/\*them in a trice.
- (5) The silkworm left the stairs/\*them.

But in not all of stairs usages are pronouns crummy:

- (6) The stairs/They are steep.
- (7) I fixed the stairs/them.

So, hard to belively, this splendid noun refuses to be a wdp, or whatever you call them, \*\*just when it is used adverbially\*\*, or as some scholars would say, when it is part of a path.

Note that there are a lot of doubtless related crumminesses revolving around various plural impossibilities:

- (8) These stairs need a coat of paint.
- (9) Don't go up these \*(stairs).
- (10) Many \*(flights of) stairs needed patching up.
- (11) Mort loves to photograph (the) stairs.
- (12) Mort always leaves albums on \*(the) stairs.

Rosalia points out that there are other what I will insightfully call fake locational plurals which have (doubtlessly only partially similar) weirdnesses: check out shelves, salt flats, surroundings, environs, city limits, outer reaches of the galaxy. The maximally yechy noun, thus far, seems to be "crossroads," which may not ever be plural at all, depending on how you feel about stuff like:

- (13) Near the/?\*those crossroads was a KFC.
- (14) The crossroads are/?is poorly lighted.
- (15) Gloria photographed the crossroads/\*\*them.

This doubtless?(ly) ties in with something which one of us told the other on some occasion now lost in the mists of time/\*them about "whereabouts", and note also, as this fucker keeps expanding outward at

the speed of light, that there are lotsa other languages (like French, Brazilian and prolly even German, to achieve maximal typological separation from English) in which the (partially) same mess rears its ugly head: think of les environs, nos confins [= in-the sticks, boonies, q.v.], can't find any German examples now.

Anyway, this looks like a fertile ground for you to mine with your AC goggles on.

Flash! "Grounds" is one too:

- (16) The grounds/They are fenced in.
- (17) Mark takes care of the grounds/?them.
- (18) Opossums (Opossa??) have been sighted on the grounds/\*\*them.

And note the metaphorical spinoff:

- (19) The grounds for making this distinction/They are clearcut.
- (20) He resigned on the grounds that he was being unjustly made to work/\*\*them.

Doubtless (note how little doubt this e-mailing seems to be containing) something along these lines/\*them can be said for

- (21) She likes to work evenings/\*\*them.

We end our little tour through the vastnesses/\*them of Uncharted English with the demonstration of a Rule which will doubtless attain new heights of popularity on the banks of the Charles/\*\*them: the Much Beloved Rule of Print-Deletion.

First, note the NP (or sumpn) incorporation involved in

- (22) She is mean like an East Texas Hooker.
- (23) She is East Texas hooker mean.

This is in fact quite general, works with lots of adjectives, is formulable, etc. But now note the sentence, actually observed on the fly, in Life, an article about Edith Wharton:

- (24) Lenox is Currier and Ives lovely.

**Can only have come from "lovely like a Currier and Ives  
\*(print)", by judicious Sumpn Incorporation, gives/gave:**

**(26) Lenox is Currier and Ives print lovely.**

**which then mutates, via Print Zap, into (24). Q. E. D.**

**Haj**

**Date: Sun, 24 Apr 1994 10:09:25 -0700 (PDT)**

**From: Haj Ross <haj@unbc.edu>**

**Sorry about no gold - or oil in your trench.**

**I have thought about buy before, noting that anyone who grets  
(1) I can't buy that he got there alone.**

**must get (2) I can't buy your story / that / it**

**but not conversely, which suggests that sometimes lexical items sneak in  
with high nouniness, and only later fade it out to sententiality, etc.**