PAPERS FROM THE
NINTH REGIONAL MEETING
CHICAGO LINGUISTIC SOCIETY

APRIL 13-15, 1973

Edited by:
CLAUDIA CORUM
T. CEDRIC SMITH-STARK
ANN WEISER

Goguen, Joseph. 1973. "Axioms, Extensions, and Applications for
    Fuzzy Sets: Language and the Representation of Concepts."
    Mathematical Sciences Department IBM Watson Research Center;
    xeroxed.

Gordon, James D. 1972. The English Language: An Historical
    Introduction. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell.

Lakoff, George. 1970. "Natural Logic and Lexical Decomposition."
    Papers from the Sixth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic
    Society. Chicago: Department of Linguistics.

Lakoff, George. 1972. "Hedges: A Study in Meaning Criteria and
    the Logic of Fuzzy Concepts." Papers from the Eighth Regional
    Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society. Chicago: Department
    of Linguistics.

Postal, Paul. 1970. "On the Surface Verb 'Remind'." Linguistic
    Inquiry. Vol. I, No. 1.

Read, Allen Walker. Forthcoming. "The Segmenting of Meanings in
    Lexicographical Practice." Journal of Linguistics.

Reddy, Michael J. 1969. "A Semantic Approach to Metaphor." Papers
    from the Fifth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society.
    ed. by Robert I. Binnick et al. Chicago: Department of Linguistics.

Reddy, Michael J. 1972a. "Reference and Metaphor in Human Language."
    Unpublished Ph. d. Dissertation. University of Chicago, Department
    of English.

Reddy, Michael J. 1972b. Linguistics and Literary Skills (Preliminary
    Draft). Columbia University Department of English: Reproduced.

Dictionaries:

Gove, Phillip B. (ed.). 1970. Webster's Seventh New Collegiate
    Dictionary. Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Company.

Guralnik, David B. et al. (eds.). 1968. Webster's New World
    Dictionary. Cleveland: The World Publishing Company.

IS THERE A RULE OF SUBJECT-TO-OBJECT RAISING IN GERMAN?

Marga Reis

M.I.T. and University of Munich

0. I presume that a rule of subject-to-object raising (hence-
forth SOR) whenever invoked, is supposed to handle situations
of the following kind:
    (i) There are two basic types of transitive complementation
    in deep structure - $[NP [V S]_{VP}]_S$ and $[NP [V NP S]_{VP}]_S$.
    Both are characterizable in terms of the matrix verb; both,
    subject to the usual conditions on complementizer type and
    coreference, can be processed by EQUI.
    (ii) There is a class of infinitival complement structures,
    again definable by a list of matrix verbs, which falls in
    between: On the one hand, there are syntactic and semantic
    reasons for considering them instances of $[NP [V S]_{VP}]_S$ in
    deep structure. On the other hand, there are syntactic phe-
    nomena for which an otherwise well-confirmed explanation can
    be upheld only if, at the pertinent stage of the derivation,
    these structures are instances of $[NP [V NP S]_{VP}]_S$, or, to
    be more general, if supposedly embedded constituents can be
    considered members of the matrix clause.
    Any such deep-surface disparity suggests postulating a syn-
tactic mechanism that produces changes in clause allegiance.
Given the present syntactic framework, there are only two ways
in which such changes can come about, either by a specific
raising transformation, or as a consequence of tree pruning.
A case for the raising option, in particular for a rule of SOR,
can be made just in case that the changes in clause allegiance
are partial, pertaining to embedded subjects only:
    (iii) It is necessary for a subclass of embedded elements
    (subjects) to move up, and for the remainder clause to stay
    behind.
    In terms of general justification, the case for a raising
rule, or for a particular raising rule like SOR, is clinched,
if it turns out to be non-ad hoc:
    (iv) There are several syntactic phenomena whose individual
    raising needs, or explanatory gaps respectively, converge.
    Given (i)-(iv) as necessary and sufficient conditions, SOR
must be a rule of English grammar[1]. By the same token, however,
I contend, there cannot be a rule of SOR in German. My argument
will be, first, that only conditions (i)/(ii), but not (iii)/
(iv) can be satisfied; second, that, in accounting for the data,
a tree pruning approach might indeed be a viable alternative.
This established, I shall address myself to some consequences
these findings might have for rule-oriented comparative grammar.

1. Let me first sketch the class of putative raising structures in German. This class is quite restricted. It comprises _lassen_ with the full range of syntactic complement types; possibly _machen, sehen, hören, fühlen, spüren_ with a more restricted range, and a number of verbs like _glauben, wissen, erklären, halten für, wünschen,_ taking _sein_ predicate complements only[2]. _sein_ is moreover subject to obligatory deletion in all 'raising' structures.

(1)a. Hans$_i$ glaubt, dass er$_i$ allein ist.
   b. Hans$_i$ glaubt, ___$_i$ allein zu sein.
   c. Hans$_i$ glaubt sich$_i$ (acc) allein (*sein/*zu sein).
(1') DS: [Hans$_i$ [[Hans$_i$ VP]$_S$ glaub-]$_{VP}$]$_S$.

(2)a. Emma lässt den Freund (acc) allein (*sein/*zu sein).
   b. Emma lässt den Freund (acc) kommen.   (intr)
   c. Emma lässt den Freund (acc) den Wein holen. (act)
   d. Emma lässt den Wein (acc) von dem Freund holen. (pass)
(2') DS: [Emma [[der Freund VP]$_S$ lass-]$_{VP}$]$_S$.

The reasons for assigning deep structures like (1'), (2') are these: In the case of verbs like _glauben,_ the synonymy of _dass,_ EQUI and 'raising' complement sentences such as those given in (1) could otherwise not be expressed; moreover, _if_ those verbs take animate deep structure objects, these objects appear in the dative case:

(3) Hans$_i$ glaubt ihm$_j$, dass er$_j$ allein ist.

In the case of _lassen,_ the main argument is the enormous variability of object types this verb would otherwise exhibit, cf. (2), (4):

(4)a. Emma$_i$ lässt sich$_i$/mir (dat) von Paul helfen.
   b. Emma$_i$ lässt ihrer$_i$/meiner (gen) von Paul gedenken.
   c. Emma$_i$ lässt an sich$_i$/an mir (PP) von niemand herumnörgeln.
   d. Emma$_i$ lässt mit sich$_i$/mit mir (PP) reden.

Moreover, even if this variability were conceded, it would be impossible to derive (4) by the EQUI analysis to which this concession would commit us. Since German EQUI applies to nominativizable subject NP's only, deep structures like (4a')

(4)a'. [Emma$_i$ [Emma$_i$ (dat) [von Paul pass-helf-]$_{VP}$]$_S$ lass-]$_S$.

could not be processed, and, thus, none of the sentences in (4) would have a source.
   On the other hand, on the _lassen/glauben_ cycle, embedded elements behave like elements of the matrix clause. With respect to embedded subjects, the German evidence comes mainly from

clause internal rules like REFLEXIVE and PASSIVE; all other prima facie evidence from _lassen_ NP ellipsis, from infinitive formation and the like, has so far turned out to be inconclusive (s. Reis, in preparation). Nevertheless, condition (ii) — the existence of a deep-surface disparity in clause allegiance — is undoubtedly satisfied, and so is condition (i). I shall now turn to examining the German evidence with respect to conditions (iii) and (iv). In doing this, I shall concentrate on _lassen,_ the prime example of a putative German raising verb.

2. Let us first take up (iv), the question of ad-hocity. Does the available evidence converge on a uniform rule of SOR?

2.1. As far as _lassen_ passives are concerned, we meet with the following situation: Only a small subclass of embedded subjects can undergo passivization with _lassen_ – the subjects of intransitive complements, cf. (5).

(5)a. Das Kind wurde spielen gelassen.
   b. Ich wurde warten gelassen.
   c. Das Geschirr wurde stehen gelassen.
   d. Der Gefangene wurde schmoren gelassen.

All other _lassen_ passives are ungrammatical, although this ungrammaticality admits of degrees. Thus, in general, leaving lexical variations aside, _lassen_ passives with passive complement subjects seem to be better than those involving active complement subjects, especially if the complement objects are still present, cf. (6)-(8).

(6)a.?*Hans wird töten (pass) gelassen.
   b. *Hans wird töten (act) gelassen.
(7)a.??Mir wird mitteilen gelassen, dass ...
   b. *Ich werde mitteilen gelassen, dass ...
(8) **Der Lehrling wird vom Gesellen dem Meister den Spielplan des Fussballvereins mitteilen gelassen.

The restrictions on _lassen_ passives must probably be stated in global terms, even if only the basic distinction between intransitive and all other complement subjects is taken into account[3]. To us, however, this is less important than the following question: Will a general rule of SOR facilitate stating these restrictions? As far as I can see, the answer is no. To give just one argument: PASSIVE is a lexically governed rule; hence, _lassen_ should be markable as either +PASS or -PASS. But this is obviously impossible once the complement subjects have been raised wholesale: Passivizeability would continue to depend not (only) on _lassen_ and the presence of the NP's raised,

but on the basic syntactic properties of the sentence left be-
hind. Hence, if at all, a partial SOR rule, raising intransitive
subjects only, must be adopted.

2.2. With lassen reflexivization, the situation is almost ex-
actly the reverse. Even under the most liberal definition of
"transformationally available subject in German"[4] is it true
that all complement subjects coreferential to the matrix sub-
jects undergo reflexivization, cf. (4), (9),

(9) Hans$_i$ lässt sich$_i$ (acc) fallen.

and, beyond that, a great many embedded non-subject NP's do so
as well. Thus, all optional noun and prepositional phrases, like
adverbials, free datives, and the like, reflexivize freely:

(10)a. Hans$_i$ lässt Paul$_j$ zu sich$_i$/?zu ihm$_i$ kommen.
   b. Hans$_i$ lässt Paul$_j$ bei sich$_i$/?bei ihm$_i$ wohnen.
   c. Hans$_i$ lässt Paul$_j$ für sich$_i$/für ihn$_i$ ein Bier bestellen.
   d. Hans$_i$ lässt sich$_j$/*ihm$_i$ (dat) mal das Bürschchen$_j$ kommen.
   e. Hans$_i$ lässt es zwischen Emma$_j$und sich$_i$/*ihm$_i$ zum Streit
      kommen.

So do the obligatory NP's (objects), unless a non-coreferential
deep structure subject intervenes, cf. (11)-(13) (subject NP's
underlined)

(11)a. Hinz$_i$ lässt sich$_i$/*ihm$_i$ von Kunz$_j$ den Brief geben.(pass)
    b. Hinz$_i$ lässt Kunz$_j$ *sich$_i$/ihm$_i$ den Brief geben.   (act)
(12)a. Hinz$_i$ lässt sich$_i$/*ihm$_i$ von Kunz$_j$ die Frau rauben.(pass)
    b. Hinz$_i$ lässt Kunz$_j$ *sich$_i$/ihm$_i$ die Frau rauben.   (act)
(13)a. Hinz$_i$ lässt es sich$_i$/*ihm$_i$ schmecken.   (FLIP)
    b. Hinz$_i$ lässt sich$_i$/*ihm$_i$ die Suppe schmecken.   (FLIP)

and even this constraint can be escaped by prepositional (and
therefore less obligatory?) object NP's, although a good deal
of lexical variation is to be observed, cf. (14) - (16)

(14)a. Hans$_i$ lässt die Müdigkeit$_j$*sich$_i$/ihn$_i$ überkommen.
    b. Hans$_i$ lässt die Müdigkeit$_j$über sich$_i$/?über ihn$_i$ kommen.
(15)a. Hans$_i$ lässt die Männer$_j$ *sich$_i$/ihn$_i$ überfallen.
    b. Hans$_i$ lässt die Männer$_j$ über sich$_i$/über ihn$_i$ herfallen.
(16)a. Hans$_i$ lässt die Kinder$_j$?*auf sich$_i$/auf ihn$_i$ warten.
    b. Hans$_i$ lässt die Verantwortung auf sich$_i$/auf ihn$_i$ zukommen.

Again, the pattern of lassen reflexivization is not easy to de-
scribe. My account suggests the relevance of syntactic notions
such as deep vs. derived subject, obligatory (pure case) vs.

optional noun phrases, although the influence of such factors
as coreferential (non)ambiguity and, possibly, agentivity of
the subject should not be ruled out[5].

Leaving aside further details, the answer to our Gretchen-
frage is clear: A rule of SOR, by itself, will not close the
explanatory gap between the reflexive pattern of lassen struct-
ures and the clausemate constraint on reflexivization. If a
raising rule is adopted at all, it will have to be a general
NP-O-R rule, with restrictions on NP which are as yet not en-
tirely clear.

Putting 2.1 and 2.2 together, we are faced with the follow-
ing situation: On the strength of the respective clausemate
constraints on PASSIVE and REFLEXIVE the need for some NP rais-
ing clearly exists. But, obviously, this neither motivates a
uniform raising rule, nor, in particular, a subject-to-object
raising rule for German. If at all, two separate, and eo ipso
entirely ad hoc raising rules have to be posited: A rule of
partial S-O-R, ordered before PASSIVE and a rule of general
NP-O-R ordered after PASSIVE and before REFLEXIVE.

3. Turning now to condition (iii), I shall show that two
crucial generalizations hold which a SOR proposal fails to
capture:
   (A) It is essential for all elements of the matrix and the
   complement clauses - subject NP's, other NP's and PP's and
   verbs alike - to be clausemates when the matrix clause is
   processed.
   (B) The putative German raising structures behave in many
   respects like simple sentences.
   With respect to noun phrases, (A) is already well supported
by the data from lassen reflexivization. Further evidence comes
from case phenomena like case assignment, historical case
changes, and case agreement. To give just one example, consider
the embedded appositions in (17):

(17) Hans$_i$(nom) lässt sich$_i$(acc) nicht mehr länger wie ein
      kleiner Bub$_i$(nom)/wie einen kleinen Buben$_i$(acc) behandeln.

Slight differences in meaning between the options of case as-
signment notwithstanding, the firm possibility of assigning nom-
inative case in agreement with the coreferential matrix subject
can be accounted for only on the basis of something like (A).

But (A) is also correct for the remaining elements - the
matrix and the complement verbs. This is borne out most clearly
by their compound behavior. Thus, lassen+complement infinitive
acts like a bona fide compound verb with respect to verb order
and extraposition, while EQUI infinitival structures do not, cf.
(18),(19) vs. (20), (21):

(18)a. Hinz hatte Kunz niedergeschlagen.
   b. Hinz hatte Kunz vergiften(ge)lassen.
(19)a. *Hinz hatte geschlagen Kunz nieder.
   b. *Hinz hatte (ge)lassen Kunz vergiften.
(20)a. ?Hinz hatte Kunz zu treffen befürchtet.
   b. *Hinz hatte Kunz ihn zu vergiften gedroht.
(21)a. Hinz hatte befürchtet, Kunz zu treffen.
   b. Hinz hatte Kunz gedroht, ihn zu vergiften.

Furthermore, considering lassen+infinitive as a compound verb
provides us with a better understanding for the restrictions on
lassen passive as noted: However vexing they may be, they can
at least be stated now in the usual way - as restrictions on
the (compound) verb involved. Likewise, the intuitive principle
underlying the scale of lassen passivizeability can now part-
ially be accounted for in a natural way: The more lassen+infin-
itive looks like, "is", one compound verb, the easier it is
passivizable.
   Another case in point is lassen idiom formation, examples of
which are provided in (22), (23):

(22) fahren lassen "give up", hängen l., aufsitzen l. "leave
      in the lurch", sein l., bleiben l. "stop", durchblicken l.
      "hint", gehen l. "stop bothering s.o.".
(23) sich gehen l. "be undisciplined", sich gefallen/bieten l.
      "tolerate", sich nicht lumpen l. "be generous".

For all these idioms, "compound verb status" is, syntactically
as well as semantically, a necessary intermediate stage in their
historical development. Since lassen idiom formation seems to
be still productive, this intermediate stage must also be re-
presentable in synchronic German grammar. The reflexive lassen
idioms show, moreover, that the reflexive NP belongs, or must
have belonged, to both verbs or clauses, which is just what
(A), in obvious conjunction with (B), but not a NP raising hypo-
thesis predicts.
   It will be apparent that all evidence in favor of (A) also
supports (B). Additional support for (B) comes from rules re-
lating to the sentence internal order of constituents. In Ger-
man, neither neg placement, nor the distribution of adverbs,
nor the operations of scrambling and topicalization seem to
discriminate between bona fide simple sentences and the 'rais-
ing' structures in question. Furthermore, no lassen sentence
can accommodate more than one place adverb, one causal adverb,
one negation etc., at a time; nor are these singletons beset by
any significant relational ambiguity (s. Bierwisch 1963, 122ff.).
These facts, although derivationally troublesome under any ana-
lysis involving a bisentential source, provide strongest evidence

that, on the lassen cycle, the complement structure has, semant-
ically as well as syntactically, become a unit clause.

4. In substance, then, the derivation of German 'raising'
structures does not involve moving a subclass of embedded ele-
ments up, but breaking the sentence barriers down. It is whole-
sale clause destruction that is going on. A selective NP rais-
ing analysis does not adequately reflect this, and should,
therefore, on the strength of (iii)/(iv), be rejected.
   Clause destruction is, however, accurately reflected by an
S-pruning analysis. S-pruning captures exactly those generaliza-
tions discussed in section 3 which a raising proposal invariab-
ly misses. Nevertheless, S-pruning can be considered a good
solution only if it can be implemented without adhocity.
   Is there a universal tree pruning convention (or one aspir-
ing to universal validity) that guarantees S-pruning for all
the German lassen structures? Obviously, Ross' convention (s.
Ross 1967, 24ff.) does not: If no subjects are raised, the em-
bedded S will always continue to branch, and thus fail to be
pruned. But there is Hankamer's revision of Ross' proposal that
almost does:

   "An embedded S is pruned just in case its complementizer
   is deleted". (Hankamer 1971, 358)

for in no putative German raising structure is a complementizer
ever present in surface structure. Three facts, however, have
to be noted: First, there is no evidence that a complementizer,
or zu was ever assigned to these structures in the first place.
On the contrary, sentences like (24) indicate that placement of
zu triggers EQUI, provided the matrix verb can take it.

(24)a. Er glaubte, allein zu sein.
   b. Er glaubte sich allein.
   c. "Er sass noch lange, bis ... er alles schlafen glaubte".
      (cf. Curme 1922, 277).

Second, zu complements contrast with 'raising' complements with
respect to AUX: In the latter, neither perfect infinitives nor
passive morphology nor modals can ever occur, whereas, in the
former, they do so freely. Since the von agent phrases show
that PASSIVE does apply in lassen/glauben complements, s. (4),
this surface fact can only mean that AUX has later been deleted.
Third, any complementizer condition on S-pruning gives the
right results for German only if zu is a complementizer; for
zu complements permit EQUI and also extrapose, cf. (20), (24a).
While the last point can be granted at once - German zu seems,
in fact, to be a complementizer more than anything else (s.
Reis, in preparation) -, the first calls for extending Han-

kamer's tree pruning proposal so as to refer to absence of complementizer in general, no matter how induced. The second point can be taken to indicate that the 'null-complementizer' on 'raising' structures is discontinuous – just as with English for – to, the AUX of the complement is also affected.

I propose, then, to amend Hankamer's tree pruning convention in roughly the following way:

"An embedded S_i is pruned, whenever it appears without a complementizer after COMPLEMENTIZER PLACEMENT on cycle S_{i+1}".

This formulation covers all the former cases of complementizer deletion and the German case in question as well. Given this convention, German verbs like lassen, glauben can be said to be subcategorized for (obligatorily or optionally) taking $\emptyset - \emptyset$ complements. Assignment of $\emptyset - \emptyset$ on cycle S_{i+1} will then cause the embedded S_i to be immediately pruned. Thus, it seems that an S-pruning account of the 'raising' data presented in sections 2 and 3 is feasible without too much adhocity, although the details have yet to be fully worked out.

5. The arguments I have presented generalize to all putative German raising cases. This is almost trivially true for the 'raising' verbs restricted to sein predicate complements like glauben, vermuten, halten für, wünschen etc. For them, obligatory (zu) sein deletion would have triggered S-pruning in all 'raising' instances even under an SOR analysis. However, even in this case, the straight S-pruning solution has slight advantages: Since on cycle S_{i+1} deletion of the AUX occurs anyway, no rule of (zu) sein deletion need be invoked at all to derive the correct surface structure. Thus, an S-pruning account seems to be the preferrable analysis for all putative German 'raising' instances.

To be sure, S-pruning does not solve all of the problems these structures raise. The exact restrictions on lassen passive, on 'raising' structure reflexivization, or on the class of admissible sein predicate complements with glauben etc. still remain to be stated. The latter, in particular, seem to be so erratic[6], that a reanalysis of reduced 'raising' structures as one-sentential in origin should be seriously considered – if not synchronically, then at least as the long term target of historical change. But these are obviously problems independent of any particular approach to the raising question. At best, it can be said that S-pruning provides necessary, though insufficient, prerequisites for the usual accounts of reflexivization and passive, whereas a SOR proposal does not even that.

6. Let me, by way of conclusion, turn to a question of some universal importance – the problem of standards in comparing languages.

This study has shown in several respects that surface similarities can be quite misleading. In particular, the lexical and structural similarities between the English and German 'raising' data did not warrant an identical description. Yet, looking at the latter case in terms of rules does not bring out the real (dis)similarities either. Taken at face value, a description like "English has SOR where German employs S-pruning" says, incorrectly, that the situation in both languages is entirely different. To be sure, we know that the notions involved – S-pruning and SOR – partially overlap in structural effect, but, at present, Universal Grammar provides no systematic concept by which this common element could be factored out, thus expressing their similarity.

A similar point can be made if we compare French and German 'raising' cases. Both languages, although historically unrelated, are startlingly alike in this area: French epistemic 'raising' verbs take only être complements with subsequent être deletion; the only raising verbs exhibiting the full range of complements are faire, laisser. Likewise, S-pruning undoubtedly occurs. However, following Kayne (1969), much more is going on, for deep structures like (25) do not have (26) but rather (27) as corresponding grammatical output:

(25)a. [Paul fai- [Jean part- $]_S]_S$
   b. [Paul fai- [Jean li- le livre $]_S]_S$
(26)a. *Paul fait Jean partir.
   b. *Paul fait Jean lire le livre.
(27)a. Paul fait partir Jean.
   b. Paul fait lire le livre à Jean.

In terms of rules, then, German and French 'raising' structures would compare as follows: German has S pruning only, whereas French employs Predicate Raising (s.(27a)), a rule inserting à on complement subjects, a further rule moving the à subjects to the end (s.(27b)), and S-pruning'. Again, this comparison tells us something about the different syntactic mechanisms each language employs. It tells us nothing, however, about the identical goal they serve – to make the resulting surface structure look as much like a bona fide "simple sentence" as possible. This concept of 'target structure' has explanatory value: Given the differences in French and German simple sentences – German allows for discontiguous verbal constituents and sequences of direct (nonprepositional) objects, while French does neither – it explains fully why French must have an array of additional rules. Otherwise, starting from equivalent deep structures, the equivalent target could not be reached.

Both cases argue the same point: Not only syntactic rules but also syntactic targets are important comparative notions. These targets should be conceived of as implementable by

various syntactic devices, transformations, phrase structure
rules, tree pruning, or any combination of these, - thus also
reflecting accurately what formally different devices like
S-pruning and SOR so obviously have in common.

Generalizing, then, to cover the English, German and French
'raising' cases, the relevant target seems to be "clause inte-
gration". In terms of this - unavoidably gradient - notion, the
similarities and differences between the three languages can be
correctly, if at present only figuratively, described: French
and German integrate fully, with practically no traces of the
bisentential origin left; English, however, only redraws the
boundaries, with two separate (and equal?) clauses lingering
on.

FOOTNOTES

[1] For abundant evidence, particularly with respect to conditions
(i/ii), (iv), cf. Postal, to appear. That (iii) is also satis-
fied can be argued, for example, from reflexive data, cf.
Bill$_i$ believed Mary$_j$ to have treated him$_i$/*himself$_i$ badly.

[2] For a more complete listing of all the putative raising verbs,
and discussion of the unclear cases, s. Reis, in preparation.

[3] The two sentences Hinz lässt Kunz töten (act), Hinz lässt Kunz
warten (intr) have different potential for lassen passiviza-
tion, but identical constituent structure on the relevant
cycles. Thus the pertinent restrictions will have to be stated
globally, by taking previous transformational history (the
first sentence has undergone UNSPEC OBJ DEL) into account.

[4] Under the most liberal definition, all initial NP's, whether
originating in initial position or having arrived there by
PASSIVE or FLIP, would count as transformationally available
subjects. Rules like German EQUI and NUMBER AGREEM, however,
delimit a much smaller class, countenancing nominativizable
NP's as subjects only, thus excluding dative, genitive and
prepositional NP's in derived initial position. The behavior
of the modal wollen underlines this basic division, cf. Er
will unterstützt werden vs. *Ihm will geholfen werden. Judg-
ing from this convergence, the less liberal notion is prob-
ably correct, especially since the only rule in need of the
broader notion - German subject-to-subject raising - is not
entirely uncontroversial.

[5] Again, the relevant distinction deep vs. derived subject
spells global trouble, for, in view of EQUI's applying to
nominativizable deep and derived subjects alike, the distinc-
tion cannot be translated into phrase structure differences
on the pertinent cycles. Note also, that the Specified Sub-

ject Constraint (s. Chomsky 1971) cannot handle the data
either, nor can it - in view of sentences like (12b), (14a) -
be taken for granted that a simple semantic, and, moreover,
nonglobal notion of "agentivity" will alternatively do the
job.

[6] This has been convincingly demonstrated by Jürgen Lenerz in a
talk on German zu sein deletion (M.I.T., March 1973).

[7] Kayne (1969), employing Ross' S-pruning convention, considers
S pruning in faire/laisser sentences as a consequence of these
three rules. This interpretation has the advantage of explain-
ing certain asymmetries about clitic placement in laisser
structures. It commits one, however, to treating the croire
'raising' cases in a totally unrelated fashion. Moreover,
Kayne's proposal implies a violation of the Primacy Constraint,
since à insertion and the subsequent subject movement occur
downstairs only. Under my S-pruning proposal, this could be
avoided, since both rules would apply after S has been pruned.
As to the unity of the French 'raising' cases, the situation
looks so much like German that a parallel, and eo ipso uni-
fied S-pruning analysis might be worth pursuing.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bierwisch, Manfred (1963) Grammatik des deutschen Verbs. Berlin
1966³.

Chomsky, Noam (1971) Conditions on Transformations. Reprod. by
the Indiana University Linguistics Club.

Curme, George O. (1922) A Grammar of the German Language. Rev.Ed.

Hankamer, Jorge E. (1971) Constraints on Deletion in Syntax. Un-
publ. PhD dissertation, Yale University.

Kayne, Richard S. (1969) The Transformational Cycle in French
Syntax, Unpubl. PhD dissertation. M.I.T.

Postal, Paul (to appear) On Raising.

Reis, Marga (in preparation) "The Grammar of German lassen Con-
structions".

Ross, John R. (1967) Constraints on Variables in Syntax. Re-
prod. by the Indiana University Linguistics Club 1968.