

Cool93

(1) *Who did you call t after regretting he ignored pg?

Theory: (1) is bad cause an extractee from factive complement gets controlled which is a no no. Thus (1) is bad for same reason as (2):

(2) *Who did you convince t that I regretted that Glenda insulted pg?

(2) contrasts with:

(3) Who did you convince t that I believed that Glenda had insulted?

do (2) vs. (3) with proud/aware

(4) *Who did you convince t that Jack resigned after hiring pg

(4) contrasts with (5):

(5) Who did you convince Selma that Jack resigned after hiring pg?

(4) is bad cause the extractee arc from the adjunct is not (nouveau) reflexive (A is nouveau reflexive iff it is reflexive and not a successor of a reflexive arc).

(6) Longobardi cases

*the cattle that we eliminated without calling a vet instead of killing

general fact is adjunct inside of adjunct...this is also bad cause extractee arc from lower adjunct is not reflexive

(7) *What aliens did you convince t that my hiring pg would be legal?

Contrast:

OK What aliens did you convince t that it would be legal for me to hire pg

bad because extractee arc from 1 is not reflexive

(8) I have myself/her/*himself for Bob to take pictures of
what about ? There remains himself for Bob to take pictures of.

Certainly better than:

***Himself is hard for Bob to take pictures of.

why Law if a reflexive 31 arc has a local successor, it is not a central arc.

(9) *Who did you talk to about? except Williams

(10) *I believe Billx tx to have said Mary loved pgX

Bad cause the 31 arc is nonfinal, as has 2-arc local successorI in main clause.

But:

(11) *Who do you believe t to have said Mary loved pg?

(12) *Who do you believe t said Mary loved pg?

This is some kind of chasing violation...in say clause, antecedent is nominative, to get accus one must rise above believe

(13) Whox did you convince Sally/*tx that Bob would resign without talking to pg

(14) *Who did she convince pg t was doomed?

This is bad because on analysis A it has a nominative pg, which is a no no and on analysis B the 31 arc headed by who in convince clause is final and reflex antecedes the pro 2-arc, yielding a strong crossover violation.

(15) *Who did you convince tx cx to say I insulted pgx

(16) *Which professor did Mary convince t that Jack invented that without consulting....
Aoun and Carter type example...violates requirement that adjunct extractee arc be reflexive.

(17) That book will be hard to review before reading.

shows tough yields pgs

(18) That book is too boring to memorize after buying.

same for object deletion

(19) Serve after icing without crushing

same for recipe deletion

(20) get other cases from Jones, purposives, etc.

(21) I have Mabel to debrief without frightening.

(22)a. Joe is too stupid for me to approve of your hiring him/null

b. Joe is too stupid for me to approve of it, your hiring him/*null

(23) Joe is too stupid to approve of it, reducing himself in rank.

(24)a. Who did you convince t that I approved of it, their firing him/*pg

- b. Who did you convince t that I approved of their firing him/pg**
- (25)a. Who did you convince t that their firing him/*pg you didn't approve of?**
- b. It was Frank who I convinced t that I didn't approve of their firing pg.**
- c. *It was himself that your describing (him to) pg led him to talk to**
- d. Which book did Bill buy after reviewingb without reading**
- d. shows pgs induce other pgs..many cases in literature.**
- (26) *Who do you believe to have died before Bob could revive?**
- same as earlier SORaising case.**
- (27) How strong an intention did he (*go there and) notice in Linda toretire?**
- (28) a. What do you think of the movie.**
- b. I think that/very little/*it of it**
- c. *What would you prefer it if I thought of the movie.**
- d. Who did you (*go home and) invite with blonde hair**
- e. What plan did he (*go there) in May and formulate to solve the problem for us in June.**
- f. What did he go there in May and send to them /except/besides Condoms in June.**
- (29) the book which he went to Barnes and Nobel, bought t and said that he understood pg/linguistics and zeroxed**
- (30) Who said stories about whom were circulating**
- b. Who said that stories were circulating about whom**
- (31)a. Who did you ask them whether they called?**
- b. *Who did you ask t whether they called pg?**
- c. *Who did you ask t to say that I called?**
- d. *Who did you convince t that they knew whether IU called pg**
- e. Who did you convince Sally that they knew whetrher I called t**
- (31) shows that extraction from interrogative selective island is possible but not control of extractee.**

(32) *Joe is difficult to ask her whether you like.

(33) Chomsky 86b p. 55

a. *Who did you convince t that Tom should visit Bill before we talk to pg?

b. *This is the man John interviewed before reading the book/anything you gave to pg

c. ??This is the man John interviewed t before announcing the plan to speak to pg.

(34) *the person who your saying that his attack on pg was illegal amused t

(35)a. Who did Jack resign after claiming you favored t?

b. *Who did you convince t that Jack resigned after claiming you favored pg?

(36)a. *Who did Jack's resigning after claiming you favored pg amuse t?

(37) *Sally is impossible for me to be proud that you are dating t

(38) *Sally is hard to go home after kissing.

(39)a. Who did Joe convince Sally that you regretted that I slapped t?

b. *Who did Joe convince t that you regretted that I slapped pg?

(40)a. Who did he regret that he went to England without interviewing t?

b. *Who did he sigh after going to England without interviewing t

c. *Who did he die without regretting he fired after saying he loved t

(41) *Who did he die after saying he would prefer it if I married t?

(42) the woman who your disliking pg made me go home without inviting t

(42) is very important case..it shows that extractee from adjunct cannot induce p-gap in subject..can it in other things:
Hmm...maybe this is ok

(43)a. Who did you convince Sally (immediately after meeting pg) that I was in love with t?

b. Who did you convince Sally (*immediately after meeting pg) that I left without mentioning t.

c. *Who did you buy Ted's pictures of soon after meeting?

(44) How can these be bad via strong crossover but not:

(45) who did your carving of outweigh my carving of

(46)a. who did you compare Dan's picture of to Drew's pictures of

b. *the person who I compared Dan's picture of to that

c. *the person who I compared that to Dan's picture of

Question is silly if strong crossover mentions non-31 arc reflexively paired to final 31 arc.

could rule be that something can be a 31 arc extractee from Joe's... only if it advances to 4 and is controllinked with another such sucker. No, that is false cause of simple p-gap cases ...aha, that could be nonadvance but this is coming very complicated.

(47)* the woman who I will sell you my nude pictures of after dating

(48) *the woman who he believed even before interviewing pg that I lied after raping t

(49) Maybe these show that constraint on extractee from Adjunct, others is that if escapee arc A has r-successor which is control-linked, A is reflexive.

(50) who did Ted believe even before meeting pg that I had stolen pictures of t

(51) Who did Ted believe even before meeting pg that I had stolen your pictures of t?

(51) seems worse. why doesn't it satisfy control-link requirement.. maybe this has to be local and satisfied immediately. But then why is (52) ok????????????????????

(52) the woman who your carvings of made me redo my carvings of

(53)* who did they arrest bill without a. reading your story about

b. questioning anyone who saw

c. being proud that they caught

(54) *the woman who Frank bought your carving of pg after dating t

(55) the woman who I will shortly after meeting run away without calling

hmm this sucker does not sound too bad despite origin of both inside adjuncts.

Now note that in this case rightmost has to be source of real gap and the extractee there exists, is never controlled, hence needs no reflexive. Other one exits and is reflexive due to rise of other, and

is controlled as is allowed.

(56) *Whox did they warn tx that hex would learn that I hated pgx

(57) *Whox did the police warn tx that I would tell himx you had kissed pgx

(58) *Who did the police warn tx that he meant pgx to die

This must be from principle that a CTRL arc whose commencement is a realization of a 1-arc is a 1-arc.

(59) *Himselfx, I talked to Johnx about tx after describing himx topgx.

(60) *Whox did she convince tx that I had proved pgx (was) infected.

(61) *Who did she convince tx that I had prevented pgx from winning.

Hukari and Levine NLLT 1987 p. 204

(62) *Which one of those men tx did Mary persuade/expect tx to let Ellen accompany pgx

(63) Which manx did Ellen convince tx that Mary would criticize pg.

but Hukari and Levine star (63), which is fine for me.

Hukari and Levine NLLT 1987 p. 212

(64)a. Harold persuaded Mary that she is clever

b. *Who did Harold persuade is clever

Why is *Who did Harold persuade John is clever...perceptual reasons

Hukari and Levine (1987: 209)

(65)a. *Who will persuade to pan?

b. Who will persuade himself to pan himself.

(66) check with pullum

who did you convince tx that I would talk to him about

(3.2) Definition

$\text{Insert}(A,B)\}; \&\text{iff. Sponsor}(A,B) \&\text{and. Ghost}(B)$

"A inserts B if and only if A sponsors B and B is a ghost arc"

'Insert' simply picks out that special case of the Sponsor relation where

the sponsored arc is a ghost. I also assume, without here defining them formally, the existence of two further terms: one is 'SPELLED', which represents a logically transitive predicate; this holds of an arc A and a morphophonological string :hp1.p:ehp1. just in case :hp1.p:ehp1. is the string associated with the head node of A. <2>

The other is 'FINITE', taken here to designate a property of an arc, namely, an arc whose tail node is also the tail of a P-arc whose head is a finite verb. <3> Given these concepts, a first try at specifying the necessary conditions on the distribution of

(3.6) Definition

Catalyst(3.A,C){; &iff. (&exists.B)(Cosponsor(A,B,C) &and. Not(Successor(C,A) &or. Replace(C,A)))

"A is a catalyst of B if and only if there is an arc B distinct from A such that A and B both sponsor C and C neither is a successor of A nor replaces A"

(3.7) Definition

Create(A,B){; &iff. Sponsor(A,B) &and. Not(Catalyst(A,B))

"A creates B if and only if A sponsors B and A is not a catalyst for B"

'Create' simply picks out all noncatalyst cases of Sponsor.

(3.8) Definition

Reciprocal-:hp1.R:ehp1.{
(A,B){; &iff.
:hp1.R:ehp1.(B,A)

"A bears reciprocal-R to B if and only if B bears :hp1.R:ehp1. to A"

(3.9) Definition

Realization(A,B){; &iff. Reciprocal-Remote-Create(A,B)

"A is a realization of B if and only if B remote-creates A"

(3.15) Definition

Eliminate(A,B){; &iff. Threaten(A,B) &and. Erase(A,B) &and. Not(+Predecessor(B))

"A eliminates B if and only if A and B are facsimiles and..., A erases B, which is not a predecessor"

(3.16) Definition

Covers(A,B){; &iff. Inserts(B,A) &and. Eliminates(A,B)

"A covers B if and only if B inserts A and A eliminates B"

The term 'Covers' now picks out that subset of ghost arc structures in which a ghost arc erases its sponsor and where the latter has no successor. <7> Given (3.16), (3.5) can be reformulated as (3.17):

(3.41)a. Definition

**Post-:hp1.R:ehp1.
(A,C){; &iff. (&exists.B)(:hp1.R:ehp1.(B,C) &and.
Realization(A,B))**

"Post-:hp1.R:ehp1.(A,C) holds if and only if there is an arc B bearing :hp1.R:ehp1. to C and A is a realization of B"

b. Defintiion

**Doublepost-:hp1.R:ehp1.
(A,B){; &iff. (&exists.C)(&exists.D)
(:hp1.R:ehp1.(C,D) &and. Realization(A,C) &and. Realization(B,D))**

"Doublepost-:hp1.R:ehp1.(A,B) holds if and only if there are arcs C and D such that C bears :hp1.R:ehp1. to D, A is a realization of C and B is a realization of D"

<20> Analogous to the definitions in (3.41), one can define parallel concepts in which the realization relations are 'reversed', as in (i):

(i) a. Definition

**Pre-:hp1.R:ehp1.
(A,C){; &iff. (&exists.B)(:hp1.R:ehp1.(B,C) &and. Realization(B,A))**

"Pre-:hp1.R:ehp1.(A,C) holds if and only if there is an arc B bearing :hp1.R:ehp1. to C and B is a realization of A"

b. Definition

**Doublepre-:hp1.R:ehp1.
(A,B){; &iff. (&exists.C)(&exists.D)
(:hp1.R:ehp1.(C,D) &and. Realization(C,A) &and. Realization(D,B))**

"Doublepre-:hp1.R:ehp1.(A,B) holds if and only if there are arcs C and D such that C bears :hp1.R:ehp1. to D, C is a realization of A and D is a realization of B"

(Rule for Adjuncts in English)

**Extract(A,B) iff (\exists .C){31} Foreign Successor(A,C) &and. Neighbor(A,B)
&and. Branch(C,B)**

**={Adjunct}Extract(A,B) \rightarrow . (++Pre-Control(A) \rightarrow .
++Local Double Pre-Control(A) &and. Commencement(C,A) \rightarrow .
++Copies(C) &and. Copies(D,C) \rightarrow . Pre-Reciprocal Control(D,A)**

Extraction arc = 31 arc without Central R-successor

Xover = nothing can be locally anaphorically paired with an extraction arc

**note does NOT block who did you talk to about or does it yes it does so
replace by**

no CENTRAL arc can be locally anaphorically paired with an extraction arc

**note allows extraction arc to be locally anaphorically paired with a Central
arc.**

(100) *Himself, talking to pg made Joe understand t.

(101) talking to himself made Joe understand himself.

(102) Himself, nothing can make Joe understand.

**(103) *Himself, everyone who told him not to talk to tried to make Joe
understand**

**Mary, everyone who told him not to talk to tried to make Joe understand
ADD key sentences from Browning thesis
Date: 11 Feb 1993 13:33:11-EST (Thursday) From: POSTAL@YKTMV
To: meyers@acf5.NYU.EDU Subject: reply**

**In my view, equi cases like 'Frank tried/wanted/hoped to become famous'
do indeed involve an invisible pronoun. The question of finding
evidence for that is hard...what is needed is subject antipronominal
contexts. Unfortunately, I have been unable to find many. One I know
about is represented in (1):**

(1)a. The prizewinner is you. b. *He is you

But I am doubtful this does much good. While true that e.g. (2) are bad:

(2) *The prizewinner tried/wanted/hoped to be you.

These would probably be blocked anyway on semantic grounds. However,

(3), which involves non-equi cases is notably pretty good:

(3) *The prizewinner seems to be you.

The question is can we find a case like maybe (4), where the finite version is ok but not the infinitive equi:

(4)a. The amnesiac victim fears/is afraid that he will be you.

b. *The amnesiac victime fears/is afraid to be you.

I am not sure that (4a) is as good or (4b) as bad as marked, but there does seem to be a difference.

See also the backwards cases:

(5)a. For the amnesiac to be you would surprise Sally.

b. *To be you would surprise the amnesiac.

added later the amnesiac is afraid he will turn out to be you,

***the amnesiac is afraid to turn out to be you.**