

Raising to Oblique in Modern Greek*

Brian D. Joseph

University of Alberta

0. Introduction

Modern Greek has a syntactic process, which can be called Raising to Oblique, by which the subject of a sentential object of a preposition can be raised to become the object of that preposition. This process relates cognitively synonymous pairs of sentences as in (1) through (3):

- (1) a. me to na filai i Maria ton Yani, teliose
with the/NTR Part. kiss/3SG Mary/NOM John/ACC ended/3SG
to ergo
the-play/NOM
'With Mary kissing John, the play ended'
b. me tin Maria na filai ton Yani, teliose to ergo
Mary/ACC
'With Mary kissing John, the play ended'
- (2) a. me to na stekome eki, den voleftike o Yanis
stand/1SG there not was-comfortable/3SG John/NOM
'With me standing there, John was not comfortable'
b. me emena na stekome eki, den voleftike o Yanis
me/ACC
'With me standing there, John was not comfortable.'
- (3) a. me to na kalipti i maska to prosopo, anasenete fisika
cover/3SG the-mask/NOM the-face/ACC breathe/2PL natu-
'With the mask covering your face, breathe normally' rally
b. me tin maska na kalipti to prosopo, anasenete fisika
the-mask/ACC
'With the mask covering your face, breathe normally'

The (a) sentences above involve a preposition (me 'with') with a full sentential complement as its object--the neuter definite article to nominalizes the clause and thus serves a complementizing function.¹ The (b) sentences have the preposition me followed by an NP which corresponds to the embedded subject in the (a) sentences, which is then followed by a clause--there is no overt nominalizing/complementizing definite article with the clause in this sentence pattern

Thus these two types differ in the case-marking (nominative versus accusative) and position of the NP which answers semantically the role of subject of the embedded clause, as well as **in** the presence versus absence of the definite article nominalizer. It is claimed that the relation between these two sentence-types is to be captured by means of a Raising rule of the sort described above; from a source corresponding roughly to the (a) sentences of (1) to

(3), the (b) sentences arise by the raising of the clausal subject to become the object of the preposition.²

In this paper, then, this construction is explored in some depth, and the proposed raising analysis is defended. The broader implications of this analysis for purposes of cross-linguistic comparison and for Linguistic Theory in general are brought forth. In particular, this construction is compared to a superficially similar one in English, and the validity of this comparison and the lesson to be drawn from it concerning such comparisons are then discussed. Furthermore, Raising to Oblique is shown to be a counterexample to the Host Limitation Law proposed within the framework of Relational Grammar as developed by Postal and Perlmutter (see Perlmutter (In Press a, b) for details).

1. Arguments for the Raising Analysis

In arguing for the raising analysis, it is necessary to contrast it with an analysis in which the NP to the right of the preposition in the (b)-type sentences is generated underlyingly as the object of the preposition, with a clause tacked on after it. This analysis would involve, then, a double subcategorization option for a preposition like me, me + NP (which could be a clause) and me + NP + S. Furthermore, to prove that raising has occurred, it is necessary to show that the putative raised NP is no longer in the clause it originated in.

The base-generation analysis is immediately suspect because the "tacked-on" clause is in no way a complement to the NP, i.e. it is not a "legitimate" NP + S configuration such as a relative clause or a complex NP like the fact that S. Moreover, there are arguments, of a fairly standard type, involving evidence from idiom chunks, semantic relations, and economy of subcategorization statements, which lessen the credibility of the base-generation analysis.

For example, Greek has idioms, such as that in (4a), which can occur in the proposed Raising to Oblique pattern with no loss of idiomatic meaning, as in (4b):

- (4) a. o kombos ftani s to xteni
 the-knot/NOM reaches/3SG to the-comb/ACC
 'Things are coming to a head' (Lit. "The knot reaches the comb")
- b. me ton kombo na ftani s to xteni tora s to Egio
 with the-knot/ACC now in the-Aegean
- den mu fenete kali idea na pas s tin Turkia
 not to-me seems/3SG good-idea/NOM go/2SG to Turkey/ACC
 'With things coming to a head in the Aegean, it doesn't strike me as a good idea for you to travel to Turkey'

This preservation of the idiomatic reading is an automatic consequence of the raising analysis, whereas in the base-generation analysis, two unrelated statements about the composition of this idiom,

one allowing for kombos (Nominative) and the other for kombo (Accusative) as "subject" would be needed.

Similarly, an idiomatic expression like (5a) can passivize with no loss of idiomatic meaning, as indicated in (5b)--this passivized version can occur in the proposed Raising to Oblique pattern with the idiomaticity of the expression preserved, as in (5c):

- (5) a. anigome ton dromo ya kati
 open/1PL the-road/ACC for something
 'We pave the way for something'
- b. o dromos anigete ya kati
 the-road/NOM is-opened/3SG.PASS
 'The way is paved for something'
- c. me ton dromo na anigete ya tin metanastefsi
 with the-road/ACC open/3SG.PASS for the-immigration/ACC
 su, boris na figis amesos ya tin Ameriki
 your can/2SG leave/2SG at-once for America/ACC
 'With the way paved for your immigration, you can leave
 at once for America'

Again, these facts are an automatic consequence of the raising analysis, and constitute a complication in the grammar under the base-generation analysis.

A further argument comes from sentences such as those in (6):

- (6) a. me tin Maria na filai ton Yani, teliose to ergo
 'With Mary kissing John, the play ended'
- = b. me ton Yani na filiete apo tin Maria, ...
 John/ACC is-kissed/3SG.PASS by
 'With John being kissed by Mary, ...'

These sentences show that there is synonymy between sentences of the (1b) type with an active embedded verb and the corresponding sentences with a passive embedded verb. This synonymy is predicted by the raising analysis, but whereas it can be accommodated within the base-generation analysis (e.g. by allowing Passive to operate on a string with an accusative NP to the left of the verb instead of the nominative NP generally found with finite verbs), it certainly is not an automatic consequence of it.

Finally, one can cite the extra subcategorization statement needed in the base-generation analysis as an argument against it. As noted above, this approach would **have to allow me** to occur underlyingly with either a plain NP (which could be a clause) or with an NP followed by a clause, whereas the raising analysis requires only the me + NP subcategorization. More importantly, though, the NP + S subcategorization would need an additional constraint to guarantee that the NP was coreferent with the subject of the following clause, in order to block sentences like (7a)--the raising analysis predicts the ungrammaticality of (7a) because its

2. An Extension of This Construction

Besides the Raising to Oblique sentences with me as in (1) to (3), there is an extension of this construction to genitival clausal complements to a head noun. Thus, (11a) alternates with (11b), with the (b) version being the raised version; similarly in (12):

- (11) a. i θ ea tu na piani ton Yani
 the-sight/NOM the/NTR.GEN catch/3SG John/ACC
 i astinomia me tromakse
 the-police/NOM me/ACC scared/3SG
 'The sight of the police catching John scared me'
 b. i θ ea tis astinomias na piani ton Yani me tromakse
 the-police/GEN
 'The sight of the police catching John scared me'
- (12) a. i tasi tu na epaner θ i to lastixu
 the-tension/NOM the/NTR.GEN return/3SG the-rubber-band/NOM
 s tin arxiki tu θ esi kani to mikro aeroplan θ
 to the-original its position makes/3SG the-little-airplane/ACC
 na ksekinai
 move/3SG
 'The tension of the rubber-band returning to its original
 position makes the little airplane move'
 b. i tasi tu lastixu na epaner θ i ...
 the-rubber-band/GEN
 'The tension of the rubber-band returning ...'

The same sorts of arguments given for Raising to Oblique with me hold for Raising to Oblique with complements to head nouns, so they need not be repeated here.

These sentences are parallel to the sentences with me in having the alternation in the case-marking and position of the NP answering to the role of subject of the embedded clause, and in the alternation between the presence versus absence of the definite article nominalizer/complementizer in the two sentence-types. Also, the genitive case-marking on the raised nominal in the (b) sentences suggests that it has become the complement to the head noun. Thus the sentence-type illustrated in (11) and (12) seems in all respects to be parallel to Raising to Oblique with me as in (1) to (3).

3. Raising to Oblique and Other Greek Raising Rules

Raising to Oblique as described above has all the properties of other raising rules in Modern Greek. Greek has (at least) three other raising rules, Subject-to-Object Raising, Subject-to-Subject Raising, and Object Raising (= Tough Movement), as shown in (13):

(13) a. Subject-to-Object Raising

- θ elo ton Yani na ka θ ete (mono aftos) edo
 want/1SG John/ACC sit/3SG only he/NOM here

'I want (only) John to sit here'
 (Lit. "I want John that (only he) sit here")
 b. Subject-to-Subject Raising

fenome na ime (ki ego) fliaros simera
 seem/1SG am/1SG even I/NOM talkative/NOM today
 '(Even) I seem to be talkative today'
 (Lit. "I seem that (even I) am talkative today")

c. Object Raising (Tough Movement)

ta anglika ine diskola na ta katalavo
 the-English/NOM are-difficult/PL them/ACC understand/1SG
 'English is difficult for me to understand'
 (Lit. "The English (things) are difficult that I understand them")

One important feature of these rules is that they are copying rules,⁴ and so leave behind a copy of the raised nominal in the clause out of which the raising occurs. In the case of the subject-raising rules, the copy is generally absent on the surface due to Subject Pronoun Drop, but it may appear overtly on the surface under proper conditions of emphasis, as indicated by the parenthesized elements in (13a) and (13b)--in the case of Object Raising, the copy always appears on the surface since Greek has no rule sanctioning the absence of definite object pronouns on the surface. As noted above in connection with sentence (8), Raising to Oblique is a copying rule also, and thus parallels the other Greek raisings in this regard.

Furthermore, both Raising to Oblique and the other Greek raising out of a non-subject clause (i.e. Subject-to-Object Raising) are restricted in the same way to applying only to subject nominals contained in that clause.⁵ Thus (14a) with Raising to Object applied to an object of the complement clause is ungrammatical just as (14b) with Raising to Oblique raising a non-subject is:⁶

- (14) a. ?*θelo ton Yani na (ton) pianun i astifilakes
 want John/ACC him/ACC catch/3PL the-policemen/NOM
 'I want that the policemen catch John'
 b. ?*i θea tu Yani na ton pianun i astifilakes me tromakse
 John/GEN him/ACC me/ACC scared/
 'The sight of the policemen catching John scared me' 3SG

Thus Raising to Oblique differs from the other raising rules of Modern Greek only in the type of clause from which it occurs and in the grammatical relation assumed by the raised nominal.

4. Broader Implications of this Analysis

The preceding sections have established that Raising to Oblique is a syntactic rule of Greek operative in the generation of sentences such as (1b) and (11b) above. In this section, some of the implications this analysis for matters outside the realm of Modern Greek are explored.

4.1: First, Raising to Oblique in Greek offers a cross-linguistic comparison with English sentences of the type in (15) through (17):

- (15) a. With John's having stepped forward to confess, your good name is cleared.
 b. With John having stepped forward to confess, your good name is cleared.
- (16) a. I was surprised at John's arriving on time.
 b. I was surprised at John arriving on time.
- (17) a. The thought of John's arriving on time was too much to bear.
 b. The thought of John arriving on time was too much to bear.

in which there is a superficial alternation in the marking of the nominal which serves semantically as the subject of the gerund verbal form in -ing--in the (a) sentences, this subject nominal has possessive marking ('s) whereas in the (b) sentences it has a zero-marking. This difference in case-marking, as it were, is the only difference in the variants; hence there is no clear indication of how the relation between them is to be captured.

A comparison with the Greek Raising to Oblique construction, though, suggests that perhaps the (b) sentences in (15) to (17), with bare NP plus gerund complementation, involve a raising to oblique in English. That is, in (15b), it is perhaps the case that John alone functions as the object of with while in (15a), the whole clause, John's having stepped forward to confess is the object of with; a similar bracketing contrast would hold between the (a) and (b) sentences of (16) and (17). Such an analysis of these English sentences would be motivated almost solely by the parallel with the Greek construction--both the English and the Greek sentences have similar forms, involving clausal objects of **prepositions** (and note that Greek me = English with) and (genitive) clausal complements to a head noun (e.g. thought of versus Θεα tu).

This analysis of English, then, would illustrate how cross-linguistic evidence in superficially similar cases could be used to determine ambiguous cases in one language. Greek sentences like (1) offer more morphological clues as to what is going on than do the corresponding English ones, e.g. the presence of the nominalizing (and hence complementizing, here) definite article to/tu in the non-raising versions versus its absence in the raising versions, the different case-marking and the different word-order between the two variants. Thus Greek gives a clear picture of how any such variants in a language can be related.

However, as attractive as such a comparison might be, the English facts are not as clear-cut as they first appear, casting some doubt on this proposed analysis for (15) to (17). In particular, the bare NP + gerund combination can appear in contexts in which a raising analysis is excluded,⁷ such as subject position:

- (18) a. Jane dumping John like that was hard on the old boy.
 b. John being promoted created discontent among his co-workers.

Ross (1973: 115) has noted that many people reject bare NP + gerund complementation in subject position, as in (18), but accept it elsewhere (e.g. (15) to (17))--this suggests that perhaps raising to oblique sentences have been reinterpreted by some speakers as a complementation option and then extended to novel uses, e.g. as subject. However, sentences like (18) have been around in English for a long time, apparently co-terminous chronologically with sentences such as (15b) or (16b), as shown by the evidence in Visser (1966: 1172 ff.). Therefore, this reinterpretation account of sentences like (18), which would rest on Raising to Oblique being a rule of English at some point in its history, is probably not valid. In addition, there is wide idiolectal and dialectal variation in the acceptability of possessive versus zero marking on the nominal with the gerund even in superficially parallel sentences, due in part to prescriptive grammarians advocating the possessive marking,⁸ so the raising analysis could not hold for all dialects nor even for all registers within the same dialect.

Thus these putative Raising to Oblique sentences in English may well involve no raising at all and rather may be better analyzed as involving an optional spelling out, possessive versus zero, of the marking for the subject of a gerund. Therefore, even though Greek offers a suggestive parallel with the English sentences in question, the comparison may be just a mirage.

This situation in itself, though, is still of some theoretical interest. Despite the fact that two constructions are superficially so parallel that one is tempted to relate them cross-linguistically, in actuality, they turn out to be quite different, the Greek construction being a "legitimate" raising whereas the English being perhaps best viewed as an optional marking of the subject of a gerund. This shows, then, just how careful one must be in making cross-linguistic comparisons.

4.2: The second point of theoretical interest deriving from the analysis of Raising to Oblique in Greek concerns its implications for one of the proposed laws of Relational Grammar.⁹ In particular, Raising to Oblique provides an apparent counter-example to the Host Limitation Law:

(19) Only a term (i.e. Subject, Direct Object, Indirect Object) can serve as the host of an ascension rule.

The host of an ascension rule is the nominal (possibly a clause) out of which another nominal is raised.

Raising to Oblique is a counter-example to (19) because although it involves a raising (i.e. is an ascension rule), the nominal out of which the ascension occurs is not a dependent of a verb, not a subject, direct object, or indirect object, and therefore not a term, by any conceivable test for termhood in Greek. Rather, it is what may be called an "oblique" object. Nonetheless, the evidence of section 1 indicates that this construction is a raising construction--therefore some revisions to the Host Limita-

tion Law are needed.

Before considering some such revisions, it is important to note that Greek Raising to Oblique is "well-behaved" with respect to other laws of Relational Grammar. In particular, it obeys the Relational Succession Law:

- (20) A nominal promoted by an ascension rule assumes the grammatical relation borne by the host out of which it ascends.

Thus in the raisings with me (e.g. (1)), the subject is raised out of an oblique object (the clausal object of me) and, as predicted by the Relational Succession Law, the raised nominal itself becomes the oblique object of the preposition. As noted above in section 1, the case-marking and immediate post-me position indicate that the raised nominal is the new object of me. Similarly, in raisings out of genitival complements to head nouns (e.g. (11)), as predicted by (20), the raised nominal becomes the complement to the head noun, and in this situation, takes on the appropriate genitive case-marking. These considerations show that Raising to Oblique in Greek is not in some sense a "crazy" rule, one which might not be expected to conform to certain general constraints, since it obeys at least some of the basic laws of Relational Grammar. Therefore, the counter-example it provides to the Host Limitation Law cannot simply be dismissed as being from a rule which is strange in other respects as well, and so some revision to this law must be sought.

One possibility, though by no means the only one, would be to treat the complement of a noun such as θea 'sight' or a preposition such as me 'with' as standing in the same relation to its head as a dependent of a verb does to its governing verb. That is, with configurations such as in (21), one could unify these three types of complements, though there are certainly problems with such an approach:

- (21) a. VERB (e.g. kiss)
- ```

 'subject' 'object'
 / \
 / \
 John Mary
 \ /
 'John kisses Mary'

```
- b. NOUN (e.g. θea 'sight')
- ```

      'subject'  'object'
       /      \
      /        \
     INDEF    catch
              /  \
             /    \
            /      \
           police  John
              \    /
            'The sight of the police catching John'
  
```
- c. PREP (e.g. me 'with')
- ```

 ?? 'object'
 / \
 / \
 ?? kiss
 / \
 / \
 / \
 'subj.' 'obj.'
 \ /
 Mary John
 \ /
 'With Mary kissing John'

```

In this way, the Host Limitation Law could be redefined to hold for

nominals bearing a "term-like" relation to some governing element.

This is perhaps not so radical a suggestion regarding nouns (i.e. (21b)), especially nouns which clearly express a somewhat active verbal notion, such as 'sight' (Greek  $\Theta\epsilon\alpha$ ). However, with certain other nouns and with prepositions, this proposal is somewhat more radical and certainly more problematic, and may well involve too great a stretching of the notion "dependent" or "term" to be tolerated. For example, with nouns such as tasi 'tension', as in (12) above, it is harder to motivate the analysis in (21b), for this noun has no clear active verbal sense underlying it, i.e. tasi is not an action noun.

In the case of prepositions, this suggestion essentially involves treating prepositions as verbs,<sup>10</sup> which is perhaps plausible but not at all an obvious step. It is interesting to note, though, that the so-called "co-verbs" in Chinese are essentially instances of verbs being used to express "prepositional notions":<sup>11</sup>

- (22)  $\bar{t}\bar{a}$   $\bar{g}\bar{e}\bar{i}$   $w\bar{o}$   $\bar{m}\bar{a}\bar{i}$   $y\bar{i}b\bar{e}\bar{n}$   $\bar{s}h\bar{u}$   
 he give I buy one-volume book  
 'He bought a book for me'

In (22), the co-verb gei is used to express a benefactive notion. On the other hand, it is hard to imagine what a "subject" of a preposition might in fact be, parallel to the indefinite or unspecified subject of a noun like  $\Theta\epsilon\alpha$  'sight', though perhaps an apparent reduced relative clause such as:

- (23) the building by the bank

may have building as a "subject" of a preposition.<sup>12</sup> Still, the parallelism is far from solid, and this analysis as a way of revising the Host Limitation Law may well be vitiated.

There may yet be a way out of this problem, with regard to prepositions, at least. The prepositional phrase which participates in the Raising to Oblique construction, i.e. me 'with' + S, is one which is semantically reducible to a PP consisting of a preposition with an abstract head noun with a sentential complement to that head noun. For example, with Mary kissing John in (1) could be paraphrased in this way as "with the fact of Mary kissing John" and with me standing there in (2) as "with the knowledge of my standing there" or even "with the expectation that I would be standing there". Thus a more abstract analysis of these prepositional phrases could provide a link with the analysis proposed for noun complements in (21b). In that way, notions like "dependent" or even "term" could be restricted just to constellations of noun and verb heads as "governors", and the Host Limitation Law could be appropriately defined to cover just these configurations.

On the other hand, maybe the Host Limitation Law simply must be given up, and these attempts at revisions abandoned. These revisions are meant as suggestions only, and should thus be taken on-

ly--they simply are not yet worked out in sufficient detail. Still, they do show that perhaps the counter-example to the Host Limitation Law provided by Raising to Oblique in Greek might be handled by a fairly simple and natural extension of the question of which linguistic elements can serve as "governors" upon which nominals may depend.

## 5. Conclusion

Thus the Raising to Oblique construction in Modern Greek has an intrinsic interest in terms of the description of the syntax of Greek. Yet it also has a more general interest; the analysis offered here extends the knowledge of the types of raising rules that can occur in natural language and thus contributes to the understanding of what constitutes a possible grammar of a language.

### FOOTNOTES

\* This work was supported in part by a Post-Doctoral Fellowship awarded by the Izaak Walton Killam Memorial Scholarship Committee of the University of Alberta. I would like to thank David Perlmutter for discussion that originally sparked some of the ideas contained herein, and Lee Becker and John Hogan for helpful discussion.

<sup>1</sup>This use of the neuter definite article is parallel to the so-called "articular infinitive" nominalization found in Classical Greek.

<sup>2</sup>It should be noted in passing that me seems to be the only preposition in Greek which occurs in this Raising to Oblique pattern. Me is also used in Greek for accompaniment and for instrumentation, as is its English counterpart with, and thus seems to qualify for the designation "preposition".

<sup>3</sup>The fact that Maria is no longer in the clause it originated in means also that this pattern cannot simply be taken as a "spell-out" option (of accusative) for a fronted subject of the embedded verb. Such an analysis, as suggested in section 4.1, may be correct for English, but it seems that it could not stand for the facts from Greek.

<sup>4</sup>As indicated by sentences (9) and (10), the application of a raising rule is necessary in order for the copy of a subject nominal to appear. See also Joseph (1976) and Joseph and Perlmutter (Forthcoming) for more details concerning these facts.

<sup>5</sup>There are some sentences in Greek which may involve the raising of a non-subject out of an object clause, and may therefore fall-

sify this generalization, for example:

- (i) *iðan ton Yani pu ton epiase o astifilakas*  
 saw/3PL John/ACC COMP him/ACC caught/3SG the-policeman/NOM  
 'They saw the policeman catch(ing) John'

However, all of these examples involve perception verbs, the analysis of which, as in English, is especially hard to determine. Thus, (i) may well have ton Yani as an underlying object of iðan.

<sup>6</sup>To the extent that such a sentence is acceptable, it can be shown that it really involves a topicalization within the embedded clause--an NP such as ton Yani in (14a) passes no tests for membership in the matrix clause; it cannot cliticize onto the matrix verb when pronominalized, it cannot become the reflexive form under conditions of coreference with the matrix subject, and with appropriate matrix verbs (i.e. ones which can passivize) it cannot be promoted to subject by Passive.

<sup>7</sup>One might suppose that (18) involves a raising of Jane, for example, from subject of dumping John to main-clause subject status, i.e. schematically  $s[s[\text{Jane dumping John}]_s \text{ was hard ...}]_s \implies s[\text{Jane } ?[\emptyset \text{ dumping John}]_? \text{ was hard ...}]_s$ . However, with a conjoined or plural subject in the same sentence-type, plural agreement on the main verb causes an ungrammatical sentence:

- (i) Jane and Mary both dumping John in successive weeks  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{was} \\ *were \end{array} \right\}$   
 hard on him.

Thus it seems unlikely that Jane in (18a) is a main clause subject. Note that the sentence-type illustrated in (i) is probably distinct from that in (ii):

- (ii) Jane and Mary were/\*was hard on John, both dumping him  
 in successive weeks.

in which both dumping him ... seems to be a modifying clause, less closely connected to the sentence, almost an aside (note also the comma/pause intonation preceding it).

<sup>8</sup>See Visser (1966: 1177-1179) for an account of this prescriptivism, with relevant citations.

<sup>9</sup>The statement of the laws in question comes from Class Lectures by David Perlmutter at M.I.T. in the Spring of 1976.

<sup>10</sup>It seems possible that preposition-like elements in some languages must be etymologizable as coming from earlier verbs, although most of the prepositions in Indo-European that I am aware of seem to come from case forms of nouns. Possibly, though, the use of given, in Modern English, which is clearly verbal in origin, but

seems prepositional in some of its functions, cf.:

- (i) Even given his shortcomings, you could still do a lot worse for a husband.
- (ii) Given (the fact) that  $2 + 2 = 4$ , we can construct a theory of arithmetic.

offers an instructive parallel to the notion of prepositions as verbs.

<sup>11</sup>Thanks are due to John Hogan for bringing these Chinese facts to my attention.

<sup>12</sup>Thanks are again due to John Hogan for this example.

#### REFERENCES

- Joseph, B. (1976) "Raising in Modern Greek: A Copying Process?", 29Or\*: Harvard Studies in Syntax and Semantics Vol. II, ed. J. Hankamer and J. Aissen, Cambridge: Harvard Department of Linguistics, pp. 241-278.
- Joseph, B. and D. Perlmutter (Forthcoming) "On the Empirical Content of Cyclical Theories of Grammar: A Study of Modern Greek".
- Perlmutter, D., ed. (In Press a) Studies in Relational Grammar I.
- Perlmutter, D., ed. (In Press b) Studies in Relational Grammar II.
- Ross, J. (1973) "A Fake NP Squish", New Ways of Analyzing Variation in English, ed. C-J. Bailey and R. Shuy, Washington: Georgetown University Press, pp. 96-140.
- Visser, F. (1966) An Historical Syntax of the English Language II, Leiden: E.J. Brill.

#### ADDENDUM

Questions raised after the presentation of this paper pointed out that the nature of the oblique element out of which Raising occurs in this construction was not made clear, nor were all the possible avenues for testing the obliqueness of the raised nominal (especially Reflexivization as a test) explored. This addendum is an attempt to rectify this situation.

The me + S part of sentences like (1) to (3) is not an "integral" part of the main clause; rather it appears to be an adverbial adjunct to the whole sentence. Since the me + S adverbial specifies the conditions under which the activity in the main clause takes place, it can be identified as a "circumstantial" adverbial. Therefore, since

adverbials such as locatives or temporals are generally held (in Relational Grammar) to be oblique relations, it seems reasonable to treat a circumstantial like me + S as an oblique also.

Regarding the possibility of Reflexivization with the new oblique object in the raising versions of these sentences, the following comments are in order. Oblique objects in Greek normally can reflexivize:

- (i) milisa s ton Yani ya ton eafton mu  
spoke/1SG to John/ACC about the-self/ACC my  
'I spoke to John about myself'.

However, the oblique object in the Raising to Oblique sentences with me seems not to reflexivize well; (iia) is (almost completely) ungrammatical while the source sentence (iib) is fine:

- (ii) a. \*?me ton eafton mu na vgazi to psomi tu,  
the-self/ACC my take-out/3SG the-bread/ACC its  
ekana tus gonis mu eftixis  
made/1SG the-parents/ACC my happy/ACC.PL  
b. me to na vgazo to psomi mu, ekana  
the/NTR take-out/1SG my  
tus gonis mu eftixis

'With me earning my own living, I have made my parents happy'

(for a discussion of the third person agreement in the complement clause with the Reflexive form, as indicated in (iia), see Joseph and Perlmutter (Forthcoming)). Reflexives can occur as these oblique objects somewhat more acceptably, but they seem not to be instances of Ordinary Reflexivization; for example, in (iii):

- (iii) ?me ton eafton mu na dulevi toso sklira, teliosame grigora  
the-self/ACC my work/1SG so hard finished/1PL quickly  
'With myself working so hard, we finished quickly'

there is a first-person plural main clause subject, and so the antecedent conditions for Reflexivization are different from Ordinary Reflexivization (the equivalent in Greek of \*We hit myself is unacceptable).

With oblique raisings out of a complement to a head noun, one finds Reflexives occurring acceptably:

- (iv) i skepsi tu eaftu mu na pianete apo  
the-thought/NOM the-self/GEN my be-caught/3SG.PASS by  
tin astinomia me tromakse  
the-police/ACC me/ACC scared/3SG

'The thought of myself being caught by the police scared me'.

These, however, seem to be a variety of "Picture Noun" Reflexivization, and again are therefore probably not instances of Ordinary Reflexivization. Thus the main evidence for the raised nominal being oblique itself is the case-marking and position relative to the governing word (preposition or head noun) that it displays.