

5. For some speakers, however, the judgments of the source sentence versions of (69-70) are nearly as bad as the judgments for the TI and PPEX versions. This means that, for these speakers, the hypothesis that TI and PPEX produce results of equal grammaticality cannot be tested in these cases, since we don't know whether the ungrammaticality of (69-70)b,c results from the badness of their sources or from the application of TI and PPEX.

#### REFERENCES

- Aissen, J. (1975) "Presentational There-Insertion: A Cyclic Root Transformation," in Proceedings of the Eleventh Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society
- Borkin et al. (197?) "Where the Rules Fail," unpublished paper, University of Michigan
- Milsark, G. (1974) Existential Sentences in English, unpublished MIT doctoral dissertation

#### RAISING IN MODERN GREEK: A COPYING PROCESS?

Brian Joseph

#### 1. Introduction

In Modern Greek, there exist surface alternates of the following sort:

- (1) a. *Θelo na figi o yanis*  
want-1sg ptl. leave-3sg-SUBJ John-NOM  
'I want John to leave'
- b. *Θelo ton yani na figi*  
John-ACC  
'I want John to leave'
- (2) a. *Θeoro pos o yanis ine eksipnos*  
consider-1sg COMP NOM he-3sg smart-NOM  
'I consider John to be smart'
- b. *Θeoro ton yani pos ine eksipnos*  
ACC  
'I consider John to be smart'

where the (a) sentences have an embedded clause with a fully-specified NP subject in the nominative case, and the (b) sentences have an NP, corresponding to the embedded subject of the (a) sentences, which is in the accusative case, and has moved to the left of the verbal particle *na* or the complementizer *pos*. Each sentence pair has the same basic meaning, perhaps differing only in some ill-defined way as to emphasis or focus. Moreover, with respect to similarities between the (a) and the (b) sentences, it is important to note that there is no difference, morphological or otherwise, in their respective embedded verbs--in each case, the verb is fully finite, marked for both person and number. Thus,

the case-marking and the word-order are the only superficial differences between the (a) and the (b) sentences.

Nonetheless, it can be shown that these differences are not merely due to idiosyncrasies of Greek case-marking and/or word-order, but rather that they are indicative of the fact that a rule has applied in the derivation of the (b) sentences which has not applied in the derivation of the (a) sentences. This rule is the rule of Subject-to-Object-Raising, by which a subject NP<sup>1</sup> in a lower clause becomes the object in a higher clause. The concerns of this paper, then, will be two-fold. First, arguments supporting this proposed Raising analysis for the (b) sentences will be given. Once this analysis has been established, the nature of the Raising process will be investigated, with the purpose of determining whether the rule operates by removing the lower subject from its clause, leaving behind a "punctured" clause-remnant, or by copying that NP out of its clause, so that the embedded clause is still intact after Raising has taken place. This last question is not as trivial as it might seem, for Greek independently has a rule of Subject-Pronoun-Drop, so that under normal conditions, a copy left by the raised subject would not get a chance to surface as such. More will be said later about Subject-Pronoun-Drop.

#### 2.0 Arguments for Raising

In order to prove that the rule of Raising is operative

in the derivation of the (b) sentences above, two types of evidence are necessary.<sup>2</sup> First, it must be shown that in the structure represented by the (b) sentences, the accusative NP is not the underlying object of the matrix verb, as it would be if the verb were subcategorized for two NP's, analogous to the English verb *persuade*. This type of structure will be referred to throughout as an Object-EQUI subcategorization. Second, it must be shown that the accusative NP is in fact a member of the upper clause.

2.1: The Greek verb *pi0o* 'persuade' must have an Object-EQUI subcategorization because of sentences such as the following:

- (3) episa ton yani pos i maria agapai ton yorgo  
 persuaded-1sg ACC COM Mary-ACC love-3sg George-ACC  
 'I persuaded John that Mary loves George'

Thus, it is instructive to compare its properties with those of the putative Raising verbs *0elo* 'want' and *0eoro* 'consider'.<sup>3</sup> In particular, there are several differences in behavior between *0elo* and *0eoro* on the one hand, and *pi0o* on the other, differences which argue against an Object-EQUI subcategorization on *0elo* and *0eoro*.

2.1.1: For one thing, there is synonymy between a sentence whose clause embedded under *0elo* is active and the corresponding one whose embedded clause is passive:

- (4) a. 0elo ton yani na eksetas0i apo ton yatro  
 John-ACC examine-PASS-3sg by the doctor  
 'I want John to be examined by the doctor'  
 = b. 0elo ton yatro na eksetasi ton yani  
 the doctor-ACC examine-ACT-3sg John-ACC

'I want the doctor to examine John'

The only difference between (4a) and (4b) is whatever difference of emphasis there is between active and passive sentences in general--both refer to the same event which is desired to take place. The same holds for Georo, for (5a) with an active complement is synonymous with (5b) with a passive complement (consisting here of the copula plus the past passive participle):

- (5) a. Georo ton petro pos eklepse afto ton skilo  
Peter-ACC CCMF stole-3sg this-the-dog-ACC  
'I consider Peter to have stolen this dog'  
= b. Georo afto ton skilo pos ine klemenos apo ton petro  
be-3sg stolen-NOM by  
'I consider this dog to have been stolen by Peter'

Crucially, this is not the case with the verb riGo 'persuade':

- (6) a. episa ton yatro na eksetasi ton yani  
persuaded-1sg doctor examine-3sg John-ACC  
'I persuaded the doctor to examine John'  
# b. episa ton yani na eksetasqi apo ton yatro  
examine-PASS-3sg  
'I persuaded John to be examined by the doctor'.

This is exactly the result that would be expected if Oelo and Georo did not govern underlying Object-EQUI subcategorization, but rather were subcategorized for only a sentential NP complement, and would constitute an explanatory problem if these verbs governed two NP's underlyingly, since (4a) and (4b), as well as (5a) and (5b), would have different deep structures, but would have the same basic meaning. The accusative NP in (1b) and (2b) therefore cannot be underlyingly an object of the matrix verb, and consequently must gain that status in the

course of the derivation.

2.1.2. Furthermore, for at least some speakers of Greek, an idiom consisting of a verb plus an accusative object can be passivized and embedded under Oelo in the construction of (1b) and still preserve the idiomatic reading. This is impossible with piGo, where such a sentence is ungrammatical. Thus in the phrase dino ksilo se kapyo, literally "I give wood to someone" but idiomatically "I spank someone", ksilo 'wood' can be passivized, and the whole phrase embedded under Oelo with the idiomatic reading intact:

- (7) Oelo ksilo na tu doqi  
him-GEN give-PASS-3sg  
'I want him to be spanked' (Idiomatic)

The corresponding piGo sentence is ungrammatical in the idiomatic reading:<sup>4</sup>

- (8) \*episa ksilo na tu doqi  
'I persuaded him to be spanked'.

It would be impossible for Oelo to have Object-EQUI subcategorization and still preserve the idiomatic reading of this phrase, under the reasonable assumption for semantic interpretation that only the parts of idioms that are together in deep structure will be interpreted idiomatically. Even more importantly, ksilo here has no reference, and therefore could not trigger EQUI, whose primary condition for applicability is co-reference.<sup>5</sup> The facts in (7) are exactly what would be expected if Oelo had only a sentence as complement in underlying structure.

(9) a. Oelo ksilo na pesi se afton  
fall-3sg on him-ACC  
'I want him to suffer (in the fight)' (Idiomatic)  
b. Georo ksilo na exi pesi se afton  
have-AUX fallen  
'I consider him to have suffered (in the fight)'

(10) \*episa ksilo na pesi se afton  
'I persuaded him to get hurt (in the fight).'

2.1.1: Finally, given the evidence of the preceding sections, there is another argument against taking Qelo and Georo to be Object-EQUI verbs. If these verbs were subcategorized for the Object-EQUI construction, then heavy restrictions would have to be put on the appearance of this sub-categorization. In particular, sentences of the type Qelo/Georo NP<sub>i</sub> COMP NP<sub>j</sub> VP, would have to be prevented from surfacing; that is, when such a construction occurred underlyingly, the conditions for Object-EQUI would have to be met obligatorily to avoid such sentences as:

- 7-

2.2: The evidence that the accusative NP in (1b) and (2b) is in fact a member of the upper clause comes from two sources, Reflexivization facts, and the allowable readings for sentential adverbs.

2.2.1: Reflexivization in Greek involves the use of the nominal form ton eafton, 'literally "the self"', plus a possessive pronoun coreferent with the antecedent--although this type of reflexivization is somewhat elevated stylistically, and is representative of more educated speakers, nonetheless it is a part of current colloquial Greek.<sup>6</sup> The process which introduces this reflexive must be clause-bounded, as indicated by the following sentences:

-8-

- (12) a. \*ego nomizo pos den agapai ton eafton mu  
 I think-1sg CORP not love-3sg the-self-of me  
 'I think that she doesn't love myself'  
 b. ego nomizo pos den me agapai  
 me-ACC-CLIT  
 'I think that she doesn't love me'.

In (12), we see that the presence of a clause-boundary between two coreferent NP's requires that the second NP be a non-reflexive form, under normal discourse conditions.<sup>7</sup> We shall refer to this Reflexivization process as Ordinary Reflexivization, a process which is restricted to operating within the limits of the simple clause.

The evidence for Raising comes from the fact that the accusative NP in (1b) and (2b) may be the reflexive form, ton eafton, when coreferent with the matrix subject:

- (13) a. Oelo ton eafton mu na petixi  
 want-1sg the-self-of me succeed-3sg<sup>8</sup>  
 'I want myself to succeed'  
 b. Georo ton eafton mu pos ine eksipnos  
 consider-1sg be-3sg smart-NCL  
 'I consider myself to be smart'.

If the accusative NP in the putative Raising sentences were not a member of the upper clause, then Ordinary Reflexivization would have to be needlessly complicated to account for these cases. Raising therefore has indeed made the downstairs NP a member of the upper clause.

2.2.2. The argument from the reading of adverbs is based on the following sentences:

- (14) a. iGela o yanis fonakta na diavasi to vivlio  
 wanted-1sg NCL loudly read-3sg the book

-9-

- 'I wanted John to read the book loudly'  
 b. iGela ton yani fonakta na diavasi to vivlio  
 John-ACC read-3sg  
 '(I made it known) loudly (that) I wanted John to read the book'  
 (15) a. Georo o yanis distixos ine kakurgos  
 consider-1sg ACC unfortunately be-3sg criminal  
 'I consider John to be, unfortunately, a criminal'  
 b. Georo ton yani distixos pos ine kakurgos  
 John-ACC CLIT  
 'Unfortunately, I consider John to be a criminal'

The (a) and (b) sentences in (14) and (15) differ as to what the adverb modifies. In (14a) and (15a), the adverb modifies the embedded verb<sup>9</sup>, while in (14b) and (15b), it describes the manner in which the action of the main verb is carried out.

Given these contrasts, there is an argument for the accusative NP ton yani in (14b) and (15b) being in the upper clause based on the following principle, formulated in Postal (1974)<sup>10</sup>:

- (16) A "sentential" adverb cannot be inserted in a complement clause.

This principle allows "insertion of main clause 'sentential' adverbs between the immediate constituents of the main clause, but not in a position inside complement sentences" (Postal (1974), p. 147). Assuming this principle to be applicable to languages other than English,<sup>11</sup> the facts of (14) and (15) can be accounted for straight-forwardly if the accusative NP's in the putative Raising sentences are members of the upper clause. That is, the contrasts of (14) and (15) are explicable if the

operation of raising changes the clause-boundaries, so that the adverb's position between the accusative NP and the complementizer *pro* or the particle *na* is to the left of the embedded clause-boundary. This presupposes that in sentences such as (14a), where the nominative NP is to the left of the particle *na*, it is still under the domination of a sentence-node. These contrasts in adverbial reading would be difficult to account for if Raising did not change the clause boundaries. In that case, one might try to base these contrasts on the case-marking of the adjacent NP (that being the only superficial difference between (14a) and (14b), for instance), but that is the sort of analysis that cries for explanation, for there is no reason to presume that case-marking on an adjacent noun should have any effect at all on adverb interpretation.

However, if we take the change in case-marking to be a reflection of a structural change in the position of the embedded clause-boundary, then we can easily account for the difference in adverbial reading, because in the (a) sentences, the adverb will be in the lower clause, while in the (b) sentences, it will be in the upper clause. In this regard, it should be noted that the case-marking of accusative on the putative raised NP is exactly what would be expected for a direct object of a verb, whereas if that NP were not the object of the matrix verb, the case-marking assigned to it would be anomalous. Thus, we may conclude that sentences of

type of (1b) and (2b) are in fact derived by a rule of raising which makes a subject of a subordinate clause into an object of a superordinate clause.

### 2.0. The Nature of the Raising Process

Given, then, that such a rule of raising does exist in Greek, there are some properties of the raising sentences in particular and Greek syntax in general which make it possible to consider the following question concerning the nature of this process--is the Raising accomplished by the actual removal of the subject NP of the lower clause or by the copying of that NP out of its clause? That is to say, is the process one in which the lower clause becomes deprived of a subject, or one in which the lower clause remains intact after the application of Raising?<sup>12</sup> The surface structure under a copying analysis would be derived by pronominalization of the lower NP, if it is not already a pronoun, and then deletion by the independently-needed rule of Unstressed Subject Pronoun Drop. An analysis similar to this has been proposed for Raising in English<sup>13</sup> but was ultimately rejected by Postal (1974, p. 266-267) because it would require an otherwise unmotivated rule for English to delete the lower occurrence of the NP.

It is important to note that the independent rule of EQUI-NP-Deletion, which in earlier accounts (e.g. Postal (1971) and Grinder (1972)) was taken to be the rule performing the necessary deletion of the lower NP in fact cannot operate here, for

-12-

as Postal (1974) points out, it would then have to delete such NF's as there, tabs (in tabs be kept on), and others, which can be Raised, but which must be considered to be non-referential, and thus unable to trigger the rule of EQUI, which depends on conditions of co-reference. Moreover, even if it were possible to redefine the conditions on EQUI so that NF's such as there could be subsumed under it, there would still be a problem with having EQUI apply to the output of a Raising-by-Copying process in English. This is so because EQUI would have to be obligatory whenever Raising occurred, since no overt NF can surface in the lower clause of a Raising sentence, even though it is generally a lexically-governed rule which is optional with many verbs (e.g. I expect that I'll go, I persuaded John<sub>i</sub> that he<sub>i</sub> should go). That is to say, for the Raising cases, EQUI would be governed not by the matrix verb involved, but rather would depend on the application of another rule. Thus, by any account, a Copying analysis for English Raising would involve an unmotivated complication of the grammar, either by extra statements about the application of EQUI, or by the addition of an otherwise unnecessary deletion rule.

For Greek, though, Raising by Copying would not entail any such complication of the grammar. As has been mentioned earlier, Greek independently has a rule deleting unstressed subject pronouns. A normal Raising sentence would not be a situation in which the subject pronoun would receive stress,

so the deletion, and resultant stress form, would automatically be accounted for by the grammar. Thus the theoretical problems for English inherent in an analysis of Raising as a copying process do not appear to hold for Greek.

Moreover, there is one superficial property of Raising sentences in Greek which might lead one to suspect that Greek Raising is something other than a rule by which the lower verb is simply deprived of its subject. As noted above in section one, the verb in the embedded clause after Raising is fully finite, showing marking for both person and number. Thus, there is no de-finitization accompanying the Raising process.<sup>14</sup> Postal (1974, p. 269, 366) has conjectured that Raising is always accompanied by the de-finitization of the clause that loses its subject. Though Postal does not make explicit what he actually means by "finite verb", his remarks make sense if we take it to mean a verb inflected for person and number. Although this hypothesis cannot be maintained in its strongest form, because in Japanese, Raising leaves behind a fully finite clause, it may be tenable, as Postal himself suggests, but does not make explicit (1974, p. 366), in a weaker form, ad hoc though it may seem, that excludes verb-final languages. Greek, however, would be a counter-example to even the weakened form of this universal, for it is not a verb-final language, yet the verb in the lower clause continues to keep the person and number marking appropriate before Raising.

In this regard, it should be mentioned that in general, Greek does not have non-finite verb-forms--there is no infinitive proper in the language, only inflected subjunctive verb forms marked with the verbal particle na, which appear where other languages have infinitives.<sup>15</sup> However, under at least one interpretation of Postal's claim, that only languages with appropriate non-finite verb forms could have a rule of Raising, we might expect to find that Greek did not have a Raising rule.<sup>16</sup> Thus the Greek facts can be taken to bear on the validity of Postal's claim, and conversely, whatever validity his claim may have can be grounds for suspecting that there may be more to Raising in Greek than just the simple removal of a subject from its clause, for if the subject of the lower clause is copied out of its clause, the lower clause would still have a subject after Raising and there would be no reason to expect the verb to become de-finitized.

3.1. The syntactic evidence for Raising-by-Copying in Greek is of two types. The first concerns both the fact that a pronominal form corresponding to the Raised NP can appear overtly on the surface, and also the conditions under which it can occur. The second is based on the nature of the apparent clause-remnant after Raising. If Raising is accomplished by Copying, then the prediction is that the embedded clause will behave with respect to certain processes as if it were a full clause that had a subject, and not a "punctured" clause that had lost

its subject before the operation of the process in question. Thus the nature of the complement after Raising can specifically be compared with the one in Object-EQUI structures, as with the verb piōo 'persuade', under the crucial assumption that there does exist a rule of Object-EQUI in the language. This is not a trivial assumption, since Greek has a rule of Subject Pronoun Drop. Thus, it is conceivable that instead of EQUI applying, what is operative in the derivation of (18) from (17):

- (17) epiōa ton yanis [pos o yanis fevgi]  
 (18) epiōa ton yanis na fiēi  
 persuaded-1sg John-ACC leave-3sg-SUBJ  
 'I persuaded John to leave'

is simply pronominalization of the lower occurrence of o yanis and then Subject Pronoun Drop, which is presumably a late rule, since, among other things, it is discourse-conditioned. Evidence that bears on this assumption comes mainly from the contrasts in the behavior of the respective sentential complements to piōo and to Raising verbs such as ōelo, for they seem to be hard to account for if piōo sentences have a subject in their lower clause throughout the course of their derivation, up to the point at which Subject Pronoun Drop applies. Although the question of Raising-by-Copying and the existence of EQUI are independent problems, they intersect in the second set of data to be treated here. Thus, these data will in essence be testing the following bi-partite hypothesis:

- (19) Modern Greek has Raising-to-Object-Position by



Copying and not by Removal of the subject of the lower clause, and an actual rule of EQUI-Deletion from Object-Position (Object-EQUI)

while the first set of data will be of relevance only to the first part of (19), namely, that Greek Raising is by Copying. Finally, it should be said here that in testing to see whether Greek Raising is by a Copying process, it is being tacitly assumed that a language would not have both Raising-by-Copying and Raising-by-Removal of the lower subject. If this assumption is wrong, then the task becomes one of determining what the conditions for Copying as opposed to Removal actually are. Nothing more will be said about this assumption here.

3.2: As mentioned above, a pronoun coreferent to the Raised NP can appear in the downstairs clause, under appropriate conditions, so that (20) is a possible variant of the Raising construction in (21):

(20) (?) *Georo ti maria pos afti ine eksipni*  
consider-1sg mary-ACC she-NOM be-3sg smart-NOM-FEM.  
'I consider Mary to be smart'

(21) *Georo ti maria pos ine eksipni*  
'I consider Mary to be smart'

This is a situation which directly points to Raising as a Copying process, for the occurrence of the pronoun would be difficult to account for if Raising removed the lower subject entirely from its clause. Such sentences would either have to be due to an underlying Object-EQUI subcategorization on these verbs, a possibility which was rejected earlier (see pp. 3-7), or else to an ad hoc rule which, after Raising had operated,

copied the appropriate pronoun downstairs.

Sentence (20) is marked (?) to indicate that it is well-formed only if the pronoun receives emphasis. Otherwise, the presence of the coreferent pronoun downstairs is superfluous and makes the sentence unwieldy while it is perhaps not ungrammatical, neither is it really Greek. The reason for this is that subject pronouns in Greek generally must be stressed on the surface; compare (22), with no surface subject pronoun, with (23), where the pronoun appears:

(22) *ida ton yani xtes ke mu ipe kati*  
saw-1sg John-ACC yesterday and me told something  
'I saw John yesterday and he told me something'

(23) (?) *ida ton yani xtes ke aftos mu ipe kati*  
he-ACC told-3sg  
'I saw John yesterday and he told me something'

Sentence (23) without emphasis on aftos, has the same unwieldy feel to it as the Raising sentence (20). Thus it appears that the conditions governing Subject Pronoun Drop are the same as those which control the appearance of the pronominal form in the Raising cases. This is an important point, because one of the theoretical considerations which made it conceivable that Greek Raising was by Copying was the fact that an extra rule to delete the lower occurrence of the NP would not be needed, for a rule already existing in the language would be able in principle to perform the necessary deletion. This would only hold, though, if that rule did not have to be complicated in any way in order to account for the Raising sentences.

The parallelism of the conditions on Subject Ironoun Drop and the occurrence of the pronoun downstairs in Raising sentences is confirmed by the following data. Certain conditions favor or in fact require the presence of a pronoun. The adverb mono 'only', for instance, requires that the pronoun be retained in order to have the reading in which it modifies the subject of a sentence; compare (24) with (25) as responses to the question "What do you think of Peter?":

(24) *mono aftos ine eksipnos*  
only he-NOM be-3sg smart-NOM  
'Only he is smart'

(25) *mono ine eksipnos*  
'He is only smart (and nothing else).'  
/\*'Only he is smart'

We find the exact same situation in the Raising cases:

(26) *Georo ti maria pos mono afti ine eksipni*  
she-NOM smart-NOM-FEM  
'I consider only Mary to be smart'

(27) *Georo ti maria pos mono ine eksipni*  
'I consider Mary to be only smart (and nothing else).'  
/\*'I consider only Mary to be smart'

To treat this as an idiosyncrasy of pronominalization in Greek, saying perhaps that the adverb mono requires a pronoun along with it which is copied onto it from its antecedent, so that if Raising deprived mono of its head NP, some later rule would copy the appropriate pronoun back onto it, would completely miss the clear connection between the occurrence of the pronoun in (26) and its appearance under emphasis in (20), not to mention the totally ad hoc nature of the copying rule required. Thus, the conclusion seems to be warranted that Raising in

Greek is by copying, and that the lower occurrence of the NP that is copied out of its clause is later deleted by the rule of Unstressed Subject Ironoun Drop.

2.3: The second argument for Raising-by-Copying centers on the hypothesis given in (19), and is based on the behavior of the intensive reflexive o idios 'the same, very, oneself, etc.', a form which is inflected for gender, number, and case. It generally occurs next to its antecedent, as in (28):

(28) *o petros e iwier ide ton yani*  
Peter-1st the same-1st saw-3sg John-ACC  
'Peter himself saw John'

but can float to the right in a simple sentence:<sup>17</sup>

(29) *o petros ide ton yani o idios* / \**j*  
'Peter himself saw John'.

And, it need not float to sentence-final position:

(30) *o petros ide ton yani o idios* / \**j sto dromo*  
on-the street  
'Peter himself saw John on the street'.

One restriction on this floating is that in complex sentences, it seems that o idios cannot float over a full embedded sentence<sup>18</sup>:

(31) *\*o petros ipe pos i maria efige, o idios*  
Peter-NOM said-3sg Mary-NOM left-3sg NOM  
'Peter himself said that Mary had left'

(32) *\*o petros pistevi pos i gl ine tetragoni o idios*  
believes-3sg the-earth-NOM square  
'Peter himself believes that the earth is square'

(33) *\*o petros nomizi pos i maria agapai ton yorgo*  
thinks-3sg loves-3sg George-ACC  
*o idios*  
'Peter himself thinks that Mary loves George'

With the Raising verb qelo 'want' and the verb piGo 'per-

source', we find the following situation--o idios cannot float off of the subject of Gelo over the clause left after Raising, but it can float off of the subject of pico to the end of the sentence, over the complement clause; these facts are shown in (34) through (37):

- (34) \*o petros<sub>i</sub> Geli enena na ton agapiso o idios<sub>i</sub>  
           want-1sg me him love-1sg  
       'Peter himself wants me to love him'
- (35) \*i maria<sub>i</sub> Geli ton yani na erai edo i idia<sub>i</sub>  
       Mary-NOM John-ACC come-3sg here NGR-FEM  
       'Mary herself wants John to come here'
- (36) i maria<sub>i</sub> epise ton yani na ine kalos i idia<sub>i</sub>  
       persuaded-3sg be-3sg good-NOM-MASC  
       'Mary herself persuaded John to be good'
- (37) i maria<sub>i</sub> epise ton petro na ine kalo agori i idia<sub>i</sub>  
       Peter-ACC good-boy-NTR-NOM  
       'Mary herself persuaded Peter to be a good boy'

If the hypothesis of (19) were not accepted, then separate restrictions would be needed to account for the impossibility of floating o idios across a full clause and across the apparent clause-remnant left by Raising. Furthermore, some *ad hoc* statement would be needed to distinguish the pico remnant from the Gelo remnant, because of the contrast in their behavior. On the other hand, hypothesis (19) would account for the observed facts straight-forwardedly, for at the time the Float rule applies<sup>19</sup>, the Raising remnant would be a full clause and the EQUI remnant would not be. Therefore, the one restriction on the Float rule, independently needed because of (31) through (33), plus hypothesis (19), would explain (34) through (37).

In the face of this evidence, it is quite hard to main-

tain the converse claim that there is no Object-EQUI and that Raising is by complete removal of the subject of the lower sentence, for if the pico sentences arose by Ironominalization and then subject Ironoun drop, we would expect o idios not to be able to float off of the subject of pico, if the right rule applied before Subject Ironoun Drop, or if the ordering were the opposite, then both Gelo and pico should behave alike in this regard. It is crucial to this argument that Raising and EQUI occupy similar positions in derivations, in particular, that Raising not be post-cyclic if EQUI is cyclic. The evidence for the cyclicity of EQUI has to do with the removal of the EQUI trigger from the position from which it would ordinarily trigger the rule, by other rules such as Passive or Question Formation. The evidence for the cyclicity of Raising is of the same type as is found in English, e.g. interaction with Reflexivization and with Passive. Thus, these facts of o idios-Float provide rather strong evidence in favor of the hypothesis advanced in (19).

And, the argument can be taken even one step further, for having Raising be by Copying eliminates the need for an extrinsic ordering of cyclical rules.<sup>20</sup> If Raising is by Copying, then free ordering of the rules of Raising and o idios-Float is possible, because o idios will not be able to float over the complement clause either before or after Raising under this hypothesis, for the complement clause is a full clause both be-

fore and after Raising. On the other hand, if Raising is not by Copying, the o idios-Float rule would have to be extrinsically ordered before Raising to prevent it from allowing o idios to float across the "punctured" clause left after Raising in that hypothesis, or else an ad hoc extra statement would have to be placed on o idios-Float blocking its application specifically whenever Raising has first applied. In view of the lack of evidence for extrinsic orderings between cyclic rules in syntax, such a consequence has to count against a non-copying analysis for Raising in Greek. It should be stressed, however, that this is not necessarily a separate argument for Raising-by-Copying, but is rather a further consequence that the facts of (34) through (37) would impose on a grammar that did not have Raising by a copying process and did not have a rule of Object-EQUI.

#### 4. Conclusion

In conclusion, it can be stated that the evidence of section three makes it very likely not only that Greek does have a true rule of Object-EQUI-NP-Deletion, but furthermore, that Raising-to-Object-Position in Greek is a Copying rule, and not a rule which deprives the lower clause of a subject altogether. In that case, the putative universal discussed in section 2.0, Postal's de-finitization universal, is not violated by the facts of Greek, for the lower verb will continue to have a subject after the operation of Raising, and so would not be ex-

pected to become non-finite.

Finally, we can consider the more interesting question of whether languages that have no infinitival verb forms can have rules such as Raising operate so as to deprive embedded verbs of their subjects. We can entertain the possible hypothesis that only languages without infinitives will have Raising-by-Copying and furthermore, that in such languages, Raising necessarily will be a copying process. Raising is similar to EQUI in its typology, in that they are both rules which operate between two and only two clauses. Moreover, EQUI strips an embedded sentence of its subject, just as Raising does in those languages where it does not operate by Copying. Thus, the fact that EQUI has been shown to exist in Greek would seem to indicate that a non-copying Raising rule should be possible in a language with no infinitives. These, however, are all questions that can be determined empirically, and so it is better that they be left to further investigation.

-24-

## APPENDIX

Possible Counter-Evidence

The evidence of section three does in fact appear to support the claim that Raising in Greek is a Copying process, and that furthermore, Greek has a rule of OBJECT-EQUI. However, there are a few sets of data which at first glance appear to be troublesome to these results, in that under certain assumptions about the process involved, hypothesis (19) makes the wrong predictions. However, such counter-evidence will turn out to be just apparent and not real counter-evidence, since there are reasonably well-motivated analyses of the phenomena involved under which the data become irrelevant to the issues which hypothesis (19) deals with. The first such set of data is concerned with the reference of the present active participle, and the second with the conditions under which the complementizer pos may be deleted.

A.1: The present active participle is indeclinable in form, and occurs with no overt subject, so that there can be ambiguity as to which NP in a given sentence the participle refers to. In general, it seems that the participle is interpreted as going with a nominative NF, that is, the subject of some verb. Thus in a simple sentence, the participle is read as going with the subject:

- (38)  $ida_i$   $ton\ yani_j$   $perpatondas_i/*_j$   $sto\ dromo$   
saw-1sg John-ACC walking-PTCPL on-the street

-25-

- \* I saw John as I was walking on the street.  
/ I saw John as he was walking on the street'.

In a complex sentence, where there is more than one nominative M subject, the position of the participle generally affects the possible reading--when it is sentence-initial, it goes with the matrix subject only, but when it is sentence-final, it can be read with the matrix or embedded subject:

- (39)  $kapnizondas_i/*_j$   $sto\ puro\ tu,$   $o\ petros_i$   $nomise$   
smoking-PTCPL on-the cigar his Peter-ACC thought  
 $pos\ o\ yanis_j$   $xamogelase$   
CCOMF John-ACC smiled-3sg  
'while he<sub>j</sub> was smoking his cigar, Peter<sub>i</sub> thought  
that John<sub>j</sub> smiled'.  
(40)  $o\ petros_i$   $nomise\ pos\ o\ yanis_j$   $xamogelase\ kapnizon-$   
 $das_i/*_j$   $sto\ puro\ tu$   
'while he<sub>j</sub> was smoking his cigar, Peter<sub>i</sub> thought  
that John<sub>j</sub> smiled'.

Whether this process is one of finding a referent by an interpretive rule for a participle generated with no subject underlyingly, or one of deleting, by some form of an EQUI rule, the subject of the participle under coreference with another M in the sentence, probably cannot be decided on the basis of the Greek facts, regardless of the theoretical status each approach may have. It will be assumed here that the two are equivalent with respect to these facts, and the neutral terminology of the "reading" the participle has will be used, with no theoretical bias to be understood.

Concerning the Raising and Object-EQUI sentences, there are the following facts which would seem to run counter to the

-26-

claims of hypothesis (19):

- (41) *Qelo<sub>i</sub> ton petro<sub>3</sub> na skotoGi apo ton yani<sub>k</sub>*  
 1sg<sub>i</sub> Peter-ACC<sub>i</sub> kill-PASS-3sg by John<sub>k</sub>  
*fevgondas<sub>i/j/\*k</sub> apo to spiti*  
 leaving-PTCPL from the house  
 'I want Peter to be killed by John, as I/\*he  
 am/\*is leaving (from) the house'
- (42) *episa<sub>i</sub> ton yani<sub>j</sub> na me<sub>i</sub> ksanadi, fevgondas<sub>i/j</sub>*  
 1sg John-ACC<sub>i</sub> me see-again-3sg  
*apo to spiti*  
 'I persuaded John to see me again, as I/he was  
 leaving (from) the house'.

In (41), where Raising has occurred, the present active participle is not read with the former lower subject, but instead goes with the matrix subject, whereas in (42), an Object-EQUI sentence, the participle is read with either the matrix subject or the matrix object. Sentence (41) contrasts with (43), where Raising has not taken place, and both referents are possible with the participle:

- (43) *Qelo<sub>i</sub> na skotoGi o petros<sub>i</sub> apo ton yani<sub>k</sub>, fev-*  
 1sg<sub>i</sub> 3sg Peter-NOM by  
*gondas<sub>i/j/\*k</sub> apo to spiti*  
 'I want Peter<sub>i</sub> to be killed by John<sub>k</sub>, as I/he<sub>j/\*k</sub>  
 am/is leaving (from) the house'.

These facts run counter to what hypothesis (19) would predict, under the necessary assumptions that the process by which the referent of the participle is fixed takes place after Raising, possibly post-cyclically, and, before Subject Pronoun Drop. In that case, (19) would predict that the participle will be read with the former lower subject in Raising cases, because there would be a nominative NP present in the lower clause, in the

-27-

in the form of the intact downstairs subject, which the participle could be associated with. And, for the Object-EQUI cases, since (19) provides for there being no subject in the lower sentence after EQUI, the participle should be read only with the matrix subject, inasmuch as it otherwise does not appear to be able to go with accusative NP objects.

however, (41) is not representative of the whole situation with Raising and the reading of the participle--it seems to be more complicated than (41) would indicate, for in fact, there do exist some sentences in which the participle is read with the Raised NP:

- (44) *o petros<sub>i</sub> itele ton yani<sub>j</sub> na tragudai, perpaton-*  
 NCL<sub>i</sub> wanted-3sg ACC<sub>i</sub> sing-3sg walking-  
*das<sub>i/j</sub> sto xolio*  
 1TCPL<sub>i</sub> to-the school  
 'Peter<sub>i</sub> wanted John<sub>j</sub> to sing, while he<sub>i/j</sub> was  
 walking to school'.
- (45) *Georo<sub>i</sub> ton yani<sub>j</sub> pos ine filiros, milondas<sub>i/j</sub>*  
 consider-1sg ACC<sub>i</sub> be-3sg talkative talking  
*sti taksi*  
 in-the class  
 'I consider John to be garrulous, when {he is }  
 talking in class'.

These sentences, especially (45) suggest that semantic factors may well be at work in allowing the various possible readings; talking is more likely to be an action connected with someone who is identified as garrulous, rather than with one who is doing the mental activity implicit in Georo. Furthermore, even though sentence-initial participles are generally read with the matrix subject, the proposed version of (45) still

-28-

has the reading of the participle going with the Raised IF:

- (46) milondas<sub>i/j</sub> sti taksi, Georo<sub>i</sub> ton yani<sub>j</sub> pos ine  
filiaros  
'when {he is} talking in class, I consider John  
to be {?I am} garrulous'.

If semantic factors control the participial readings, then the apparent generalization that the participle is read with nominative NP's only cannot be maintained, and the counter-evidence to hypothesis (19) disappears. A particular set of semantic factors, possibly, though not necessarily, coupled with any considerations of particular structural configurations, would be the crucial determinant for the participial reading.

Moreover, there are other grounds also why the counter-evidence to hypothesis (19) may not be real counter-evidence, for the two assumptions that the participial-referent reading process takes place after Raising and before Subject Pronoun Drop, have no independent motivation. Clearly, the deep structure configuration is not crucial to this process, because a subject derived by Passive, and not the demoted subject, is linked to the participle:

- (47) o petros<sub>i</sub> skotose ton yani<sub>k</sub> fevgondas<sub>i/\*j</sub>  
NOM<sub>i</sub> killed-3sg ACC<sub>k</sub> leaving-PTCPL  
apo to spiti  
'Peter<sub>i</sub> killed John<sub>j</sub>, as he<sub>i/\*j</sub> was leaving (from)  
the house'  
(48) o yanis<sub>j</sub> skotoike apo ton petro<sub>i</sub> fevgondas<sub>i/j</sub>  
NOM<sub>j</sub> kill-PASS-3sg by  
apo to spiti  
'John<sub>j</sub> was killed by Peter<sub>i</sub>, as he<sub>i/j</sub> was leaving  
(from) the house'.

-29-

Since the process must therefore wait until after passive has applied, we can hypothesize that it is the cycle-final state of affairs which is crucial to the operation of this process. If this hypothesis is valid, and clearly, it is a question that must be determined empirically, then the participial-referent process becomes irrelevant to the hypothesis of (19). This would be so because if the process is dependent on the cycle-final subject, then it would either be a cyclic process itself or else be global but able to determine the cyclic subject of any earlier stage in a derivation. The process would then operate only with the pre-Raising and pre-EQUI situation, when the complement clauses of these two are identical in terms of having a subject, and thus be irrelevant to hypothesis (19).

And, as to the second assumption, we need only look at the contrast between (41) and (49), where Raising has taken place, but Subject Pronoun Drop has not deleted the lower occurrence of the NP because it is stressed, occurring with the adverb mono. Accordingly, the participle can only be read as going with the lower subject:

- (49) iola<sub>j</sub> ton yani<sub>j</sub> na skotoi mono aftos<sub>j</sub> apo ton  
wanted-1sg ACC<sub>j</sub> only he-NOM by  
petro<sub>k</sub>, fevgondas<sub>i/j/\*k</sub> apo to spiti  
'I wanted only John<sub>j</sub> to be killed by Peter<sub>k</sub>, as  
{\*I  
he<sub>j/\*k</sub>} was leaving (from) the house'.

Sentences such as (41), then, may indicate that where various derivations are possible, and there is no semantic factor that

influences the appropriateness of a particular reading, then the participle is interpreted as going with the nearest nominative NP on the surface. The participial-referent reading process would then be dependent on the surface structure configurations, and so would be affected by the application of Subject Pronoun Drop.

It is unclear which of these various proposals is in fact correct, and obviously, more work will have to be done concerning these problems with the reading of the participle. But, it seems likely that at least some of the suggestions given here will prove to have relevance to the final solution. Thus, the apparent counter-evidence to (19) can be considered to be no more than just apparent.

A.2: The second set of apparently troublesome data centers on the deletion of the complementizer *pos* 'that'. We find the following pattern for Raising verbs such as *Georo* 'consider' which occur with *pos*.<sup>21</sup>

- (50) *o petros Geori* {*pos*} *o yanis ine eksipnos*  
 3sg NOM smart-NOM  
 'Peter considers John to be smart.'  
 (51) *o petros Geori ton yani* {*pos*} *ine eksipnos*  
 ACC  
 'Peter considers John to be smart.'

That is, *pos*, apparently optional with full clauses, is obligatory with the clause left over after Raising.<sup>22</sup> This is potential counter-evidence to the analysis of Raising as a Copying process because it appears to be a way in which the embed-

ded clause after Raising does not behave like a full clause. The non-optionalness of *pos* in (51) would then indicate that there is in fact no subject to the lower verb *ine*. This counter-evidence, however, does not hold up, for the ungrammaticality of (51) may be attributed to factors which make it irrelevant to the question of Raising by Copying. In particular, it is the case that *pos*-deletion, although not completely impossible, does not produce perfectly acceptable sentences when a complement clause has lost its subject by Subject Pronoun Drop:

- (52) *nomizo* {*pos*} *aftos efige ya tin aθina*  
 think he-NOM left-3sg for the Athens  
 'I think that he left for Athens.'  
 (53) *nomizo* {*pos*} *efige ya tin aθina*  
 'I think that he left for Athens'.

The disappearance of the subject pronoun contributes to the unacceptability of (51). This suggests that *pos*-deletion applies late in a derivation, after Subject Pronoun Drop has deleted the lower pronoun in (53), and thus in (51). In that case, *pos*-deletion would have no bearing on the question of how Raising is carried out.

Still, though, *pos*-deletion in (53) is not as bad as in (51), so other factors may be at work as well. It is possible, although perhaps not provable, that the juxtaposition of an accusative NP with a finite verb is what causes the further unacceptability of (51). The impossibility of *pos*-deletion in



-32-

the Raising cases could then perhaps be connected with the need to be able to identify clause-initial boundaries; the presence of the complementizer would facilitate this process, whereas its absence would hinder it.<sup>23</sup> The pos-Deletion data therefore would not constitute counter-evidence to the claim that Greek Raising is by Copying.

## Footnotes:

\*I would like to thank Judith Aissen and Jorge Hankamer for their help and suggestions on earlier versions of this paper, and Elias Dinopoulos for his native judgements.

1. This Raising process is restricted to subjects of lower clauses. Despite the existence of sentences such as:

- (i) Oelo ton yari na (ton) agapisi i maria  
 John-ACC him love-3sg Mary-NOM  
 'I want John that Mary love him'

which superficially appear to involve the raising of a non-subject (since ton yari is the object of agapisi), it is clear that ton yari has not become part of the upper clause. For one thing, such an NP cannot become the reflexive form ton eafton, but can only be a non-reflexive pronoun, and this Reflexivization process is clause-bounded (see pp. 7-8):

- (ii) iOela emenu/\*ton eafton na agapisi i maria  
 me the-self of me  
 'I wanted Mary to love me'

nor can it cliticize onto Oelo:

- (iii) \*me iOela na agapisi i maria  
 me-CLIT  
 'I wanted Mary to love me'.

Therefore, (i) must be the result of a Scrambling rule which moves constituents around within a clause. The presence of the clitic ton, then, would be due to a dislocation process occurring within the lower clause. Furthermore, the verbal particle na must be regarded as not signaling a clause-boundary, and so is not a complementizer proper.

2. I assume here that a Phrase-Structure rule generation of the putative Raising sentences is not at all motivated--the standard sorts of arguments against such a generation, e.g. those based on lexical facts, the possibility of passive morphology in the embedded clause, etc., all hold for Greek.

3. This class of verbs is rather small, and throughout, Oelo and Oeoro will be taken as paradigmatic for this class.

4. The literal reading is also ungrammatical with piOo, presumably because piOo requires an animate NP object, and ksilo is non-animate.

-34-

5. This presumes that Greek has a rule of  $\bar{E}\bar{A}\bar{U}$ --for evidence supporting this assumption, see below pp. 19-22, section 2.3.

6. The middle voice of the verb is by far the most common way of expressing reflexive actions.

7. This last stipulation is necessary because of sentences such as:

- (iv) ego nomizo pos o eaftos mu  $\bar{O}\alpha$  figi se ligo  
 I think the-self-NOM of me FUT leave soon  
 'I think that as for myself, I will leave shortly'

Here the reflexive appears across a clause-boundary from its antecedent, and is nominative; this however, seems to be a different case from the reflexivization in (12). The nominative reflexive can be used only in contexts which imply a marked dichotomy between opposing desires or effects within the same person (a distinction that is hard to capture in an English translation). Furthermore, it can appear several clauses away from its antecedent, and in fact, need not have any overt antecedent--the non-nominative reflexive requires an antecedent, though:

- (v) a. nomizo pos i maria epise ton yani na pi  
 think-1sg Mary-NOM persuaded-3sg John-ACC say  
 pos prepi na figi amesos o eaftos mu  
 is necessary leave immediately the-self-NOM my  
 'I think that Mary persuaded John to say that it was necessary for myself to leave (even though I really wanted to stay)  
 b. o eaftos mu  $\bar{O}\alpha$  fevgi se ligo  
 the-self-NOM of-me FUT leave-3sg soon  
 'Myself will (probably) be leaving shortly (even though I really want to stay)  
 c. \*o yanis xtipise ton eafton mu  
 John-NOM hit-3sg the-self-ACC of-me  
 'John hit myself'.

Since (iv) cannot have the unmarked reading of 'I think that I'll go soon', with no emphasis or contrast involved, and (12) does not have the contrastive reading, we can conclude that the phenomenon in (iv) and (v) is truly distinct from that in (12).

8. Note that the Reflexive form ton eafton requires that the downstairs verb have third person agreement on it. For a dis-

... (11b) and (11c) are not possible, cf. Perlmutter (1978: 100-101) (hereafter P).

9. In both (11b) and (11c), the reading where the adverb modifies the matrix verb is possible, but this reading in each case requires there to be some signal the adverb, so that it is evident that (11b) and (11c) have, under normal interpretation, (11b) and (11c) have only the reading with the adverb modifying the embedded verb.

10. Postal (1977) develops a similar argument for raising in English based on the reading of adverbs; see p. 147-148. The argument here is based on that.

11. Evidence from (12) indicates that it holds in English as well.

12. This formulation is not intended to have any theoretical bias--talking in terms of the "removal" of the subject of sentences is amenable to either a transformational framework in which there is actual movement of an MI out of one clause and into another, or a relational framework in which an MI ceases to bear the grammatical relation "subject-of" to the lower verb.

13. Cf. Postal (1971), p. 142-143; Ross (1968), p. 275, 283-4; and Grimshaw (1973), p. 97-98.

14. As Postal himself (1974, p. 386n) notes, this therefore also entails a violation of Chomsky's Tensed-S Constraint (cf. Chomsky (1973), p. 237-238), to whatever extent it was intended to be or may be taken to be universal. Chomsky's system denies the existence of rules such as Raising, but the fact that the Raised MI passivizes (e.g. with the verb georo) upstairs is a violation of the constraint.

15. The one form which is non-finite, the present active participle, is impossible as the verb in the embedded clause after raising:

- (vi) a. \*Gelo ton yani trexondas sto dromo  
 want-1sg John-ACC running-PTCPL on-the street  
 'I want John (to be) running on the street'  
 b. Gelo ton yani na trexi sto dromo  
 run-3sg  
 'I want John to be running on the street'

However, the inappropriateness of a present active participle as the embedded verb could perhaps be motivated on semantic grounds; therefore, Greek would be irrelevant to Postal's uni-

-36-

versal because it lacked the appropriate non-finite verb forms, but see p. 15.

16. This in itself is an interesting point, for Raising in Modern Greek appears to be rather limited in its scope--there do not seem to be many predicates that allow it, and those that do have the non-Raised form as the more common variant. In earlier stages, Greek had Raising as a much more productive and widespread rule, and furthermore, had infinitival verb forms. Thus, we may have here an instance of a language in the process of losing a syntactic rule.

17. This float process is not restricted to occurring only off of subjects, but such cases are the only ones of interest to us here. Other quantifier-like elements can float but do not show the relevant properties for this argument.

18. The proper generalization, it seems, must involve the notion of "full" clause, as opposed to one that has been "punctured" by the loss of its subject due to a rule such as EQUI. This must be so because *o idios* cannot float over embedded sentences containing Weather-Verbs, which presumably have no subject underlyingly (although possibly this could be taken to support a view that such verbs have dummy subjects in deepest structure):

- (vii) \*o yanis pistevi pos vrex1/xionizi tora o idios  
John-NOM believe-3sg rain / snow now NOM-MASC  
'John himself believes that it is raining/snow-  
ing now'

Furthermore, the level at which this constraint applies must be before Subject Pronoun Drop, or else the removal of a subject by this rule must be considered different from the removal by a rule such as EQUI (a proposal which may be independently justifiable in languages where EQUI triggers de-finitization of a verb but Subject Pronoun Drop, naturally, does not), because of sentences such as (viii), in response to the question "What does Mary want concerning Peter?":

- (viii) \*i maria elli na ine kalo agori i idia  
Mary-NOM 3sg be-3sg good-boy NOM-FEM  
'Mary herself wants him to be a good boy'

This fact ties in with the observations regarding *o idios*-Float in Raising sentences.

19. This assumes that the Float rule applies before Subject Pronoun Drop and after Raising and EQUI. Subject Pronoun Drop

-37-

has been argued to be post-cyclic at least for other languages, and a late ordering for the rule in Greek seems to be warranted on the basis of these facts (and, cf. footnote 19). As to the Float rule and EQUI, if it applied before EQUI, special statements would be needed to allow *o idios* to float across the complement clause.

20. Evidence for Raising being cyclical is of the same type as in English, cf. p. 21. If *o idios*-Float had to apply before Raising, then it too would have to be cyclical.

21. The verbal particle *pa* that occurs with *elo* can never be deleted; thus only *egoro* is of interest here.

22. These facts can also be used as an argument that the KI has in fact been Rained into the upper clause, under the assumption that *pos* is required to maintain the delineation of the clause boundary; cf. below and footnote 23.

23. This functional constraint on complementizer deletion was inspired by a similar observation for English made in Euno (1974), p. 136, n.16.

## References

- Chomsky (1973) "Conditions on Transformations", in A Festschrift for Morris Halle, eds. S. Anderson & J. Kiparsky, pp. 232-287.
- Grinder (1972) "On the Cycle in Syntax", in Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 1, ed. J. Kimball, pp. 81-111.
- Kuno (1972) "Subject Raising in Japanese", Papers in Japanese Linguistics, 1, Number 1.
- Kuno (1974) "The Position of Relative Clauses and Conjunctions", Linguistic Inquiry, V.1.
- Ferlmutter and Joseph (forthcoming) "Adjective and Verb Agreement in Modern Greek".
- Postal (1971) Cross-Over Phenomena, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.
- Postal (1974) On Raising, MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Ross (1968) "Guess Who?", in Papers from the Fifth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society.

## TURKISH COMPARATIVES\*

Laura Knecht  
MIT

## Table of Contents

0. Introduction	1
0.1 Goals and Outline	1
0.2 Some Basic Facts about Turkish	2
1. The Phrasal and Clausal Comparative: Terminology and Description	3
1.1 Terminology	3
1.1.1 English	3
1.1.2 Turkish	4
1.1.3 Pro Drop	6
1.2 Comparative Ellipsis and the Phrasal Remainder	7
1.2.1 CE Proposed	7
1.2.2 Properties of the Phrasal Remainder	9
2. The Targets of Comparative Deletion	13
2.1 Extraction of Major Constituents	14
2.1.1 Adjectives and Adverbs	14
2.1.2 Direct Object NP's	15
2.1.3 Oblique NP's	16
2.1.3.1 Datives	16
2.1.3.2 Locatives	17
2.1.3.3 Ablatives	19
2.1.4 Subject NP's	20
2.1.5 Summary	21
2.2 Extraction of Sub-Constituents	22