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Q. I presume that a rule of subject-to-object raising (henceforth 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 ]yp] and [NP [V NP S ]yp]. Both are characterizable in terms of the matrix verb; both, subject to the usual conditions on complementizer type and coreference, can be processed by EQU.

(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 ]yp], in deep structure. On the other hand, there are syntactic phenomena 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 ]yp], or, to be more general, if supposedly embedded constituents can be considered members of the matrix clause.

A superficial deep-surface disparity suggests postulating a syntactic 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. 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.

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, hören, schreiben, spüren with a more restricted range, and a number of verbs like glauben, wissen, erkennen, halten für, wünschen, taking sein predicate complements only. sein is moreover subject to obligatory deletion in all 'raising' structures.

(1a). Hans glaubt, dass er allein ist.
(1b). Hans glaubt, dass er allein ist. 
(1c). Hans glaubt sich allein zu sein. 

(1d). Das [Hans] [Hans VP Jp glaub= Jyp Jj].

(2a). Emma lässt den Freund (acc) allein (*sein/*zu sein). 
(2b). Emma lässt den Freund (acc) kommen. (intr)
(2c). Emma lässt den Freund (acc) den Wein holen. (act)
(2d). Emma lässt den Wein (acc) von dem Freund holen. (pass)

(1d). Das Kind wurde spielen gelassen.
(2a). Ich wurde warten gelassen.
(2b). Das Geschirr wurde stehen gelassen.
(2c). Der Gefangene wurde schmoren gelassen.

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

(3). Hans glaubt ihm, dass er 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):

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

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


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 (e.g. 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 situations: Only a small subclass of embedded subjects can undergo passivization with lassen - the subjects of intransitive complements, cf. (5).

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

(6a). *Hans wird tütten (pass) gelassen.
(6b). *Hans wird tütten (act) gelassen.
(7a). *Mir wird mitteilen gelassen, dass ...
(7b). *Ich werde mitteilen gelassen, dass ...
(8). **Der Lehrling wird von 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. 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; passivisability 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 behind. Hence, if at all, a partial SOR rule, raising intransitive subjects only, must be adopted.

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

(9) Hans_1 lässt sich_1 (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_1 lässt Paul_2 zu sich_1 ofu ihm_1 kommen.
    b. Hans_1 lässt Paul_2 bei sich_1 ofu ihm_1 wohnen.
    c. Hans_1 lässt Paul_2 für sich_1 ofu ihm_1 ein Eier bestellen.
    d. Hans_1 lässt sich_1/*ihn_1 (dat) mal das Hühnchen kommen.
    e. Hans_1 lässt es zwischen Samm_1 und sich_1/*ihn_1 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. Hans_1 lässt sich_1/*ihn_1 von Kus_2, den Brief geben. (pass)
    b. Hans_1 lässt Kus_2 *sich_1/*ihn_1 den Brief geben. (act)
    c. Hans_1 lässt sich_1/*ihn_1 von Kus_2, die Frau rauben. (pass)
    d. Hans_1 lässt Kus_2 *sich_1/*ihn_1, die Frau rauben. (act)
    e. Hans_1 lässt es sich_1/*ihn_1 schmecken. (FLIP)
    f. Hans_1 lässt sich_1/*ihn_1 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_1 lässt die Mįdigkeit/*sich_1/*ihn_1 überkommen.
    b. Hans_1 lässt die Mįdigkeit/*über sich_1/*über ihm_1 kommen.
    c. Hans_1 lässt die Männer/*sich_1/*ihn_1 überfallen.
    d. Hans_1 lässt die Männer/*über sich_1/*über ihm_1 herfallen.
    e. Hans_1 lässt die Kinder/*auf sich_1/*auf ihm_1 warten.
    f. Hans_1 lässt die Verantwortung/*auf sich_1/*auf ihn_1 zukommen.

Again, the pattern of lassen reflexivization is not easy to describe. 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.

Leaving aside further details, the answer to our Gretchenfrage is clear: A rule of SOR, by itself, will not close the explanatory gap between the reflexive pattern of lassen structures and the clausal 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 entirely clear.

Putting 2.1 and 2.2 together, we are faced with the following situation: On the strength of the respective clausal constraints on PASSIVE and REFLEXIVE the need for some NP raising 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 ego igeo 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 clauses 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_1 (nom) lässt sich_1 (acc) nicht mehr länger wie ein kleiner Bub_2 (nom) wie einen kleinen Buben_2 (acc) behandeln.

Slight differences in meaning between the options of case assignment notwithstanding, the firm possibility of assigning nominative 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-compound infinitives 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):
that, on the lassen cycle, the complement structure has, semantically 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 elements up, but breaking the sentence barriers down. It is wholesale clause destruction that is going on. A selective NP raising 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 generalizations discussed in section 3 which a raising proposal invariably misses. Nevertheless, S-pruning can be considered a good solution only if it can be implemented without adhocracy.

Is there a universal tree prunes convention (or one aspiring to universal validity) that guarantees S-pruning for all the German lassen structures? Obviously, Ross' convention (e.g. Ross 1967, 22ff.) does not: If no subjects are raised, the embedded S will always continue to branch, and thus fail to be pruned. But there is Hanksmer'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 EQU, provided the matrix verb can take it.

(24a). Er glaubte, allein zu sein.
    b. Er glaubte sich allein.
    c. "Er ass 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 zu agent phrases show that PASSIVE does apply in lassen/plauchen 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 EQU 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. Neis, in preparation) --, the first calls for extending Han-
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 S0R 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 S0R - 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 sait [Jean part-]].
   b. [Paul sait [Jean li- le livre]].

   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 a subject 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 goals 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 discontinuous 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 integration". 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

1For abundant evidence, particularly with respect to conditions (i/ii), (iv), cf. Postal, to appear. That (iii) is also satisfied can be argued, for example, from reflexive data cf. Billy believed Harry to have treated him/himself, badly.

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

3The two sentences Hans Mast Kunz füllt (act), Hans Mast Kunz warten (intr) have different potential for lassen passivisierung, but identical constituent structure on the relevant cycles. Thus the pertinent restrictions will have to be stated globally, by taking previous transformatinal history (the first sentence has undergone UNSPEEK GW DEE) into account.

4Under 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 NUMER AGREEM, however, delimit a much smaller class, countenancing nominizable 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 unterschiedlich werden vs. *Er will geholfen werden. Judging from this convergence, the less liberal notion is probably correct, especially since the only rule in need of the broader notion — German subject-to-subject raising — is not entirely uncontroversial.

5Again, the relevant distinction deep vs. derived subject spells global trouble, for, in view of EQUI's applying to nominizable deep and derived subjects alike, the distinction 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.

This has been convincingly demonstrated by Jürgen Lenzer in a talk on German au sein deletion ( M.I.T., March 1973 ).

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 explaining certain asymmetries about clitic placement in laisser structures. It omits 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 co ipso unified S-pruning analysis might be worth pursuing.
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