

The Sphere of Influence and Linguistic Explanation with Reference to English*

Nahm-Sheik Park

1. Government and Concord

We say that one linguistic element governs another when the former determines the form of the latter. For example, a preposition is said to govern a noun phrase in the accusative case. In our terms, the preposition here is the influencer while the noun phrase in the accusative case is its influencee.

Now then let us compare the two sentences below with specific reference to the prepositional phrases with which they begin.

- (1) a. *Between you and me*, he is not an honest person.
b. *Between you and I*, he is not an honest person.

According to most school grammarians, *between* like all other prepositions should govern accusative-case pronouns only. They would thus say that (1a) is grammatical and acceptable whereas (1b) is not. However, the matter of the fact is that (1b) is also perfectly acceptable to a good many native speakers of English, at least in informal spoken English.

* This research, completed while I was a visiting scholar with the Department of English at the University of Washington, was supported by a Seo-Am Scholarship Foundation (서암장학재단) grant for the 1995~1996 academic year. I am grateful to the Seo-Am Scholarship Foundation for making this research possible and to Seoul National University for granting me an extended leave of absence without which this research would never have been completed. For their unfailing assistance and encouragement in all phases of the present research, I am also grateful to my colleagues at the Department of English, Seoul National University, especially Professor Emeritus Dr. Chongun Kim. My thanks also go to Messrs. Tai-Soo Kim and Yongkil Jeong of the University of Washington Department of Linguistics as well as Professor Thomas Lockwood of the University of Washington Department of English for the friendship and moral support with which they helped sustain me in all phases of my research in Seattle.

Given our sphere-of-influence concept, we can provide a fairly plausible account for the acceptability of (1b) above. Our account would consist in saying that the influencee *I* is sufficiently far removed from the influencer *between* to free itself from the sphere of influence thereof.

Let us now compare the prepositional phrases in (1) above with those in (2) below.

- (2) a. I won't let anything come *between me and my family*.
- b. *I won't let anything come *between I and my family*.

It may be noted here that (2a) is grammatical and acceptable while (2b) is not. (2b) is ungrammatical and unacceptable because the influencee *I* is too close to the influencer *between* to escape its sphere of influence, i.e. its power to govern a noun phrase in the accusative case.

It goes without saying that the account we have just provided for the sentences of (1) and (2) above also applies to the data comprising the two sentence pairs below.

- (3) a. They want to be friends *with you and me*.
- b. They want to be friends *with you and I*.
- (4) a. They want to be friends *with me and my brother*.
- b. *They want to be friends *with I and my brother*.

In (3b), the influencee *I* is sufficiently far removed from its influencer *with* to escape its sphere of influence. In (4b), in contrast, the influencee *I* is too close to the influencer *with* to escape its sphere of influence. This is apparently why (3b) is grammatical and acceptable while (4b) is not.

We can also account for the following data along similar lines.

- (5) a. Would you please *let John and me* play here?
- b. Would you please *let John and I* play here?
- (6) a. Would you please *let me and John* play here?
- b. *Would you please *let I and John* play here

Note that (5b) is acceptable to a good many people in the context of informal spoken English, whereas (6b) is definitely ungrammatical and unacceptable in either informal or formal English. (5b) here is acceptable because the influencee *I* is far enough removed from the influencer *let* to escape its sphere of influence. On the other hand, (6b) is ungrammatical and

unacceptable because the influencee *I* is too close to the influencer *let* to escape its sphere of influence.

Let us turn our attention to the following data with special reference to the preposition *for* and its complement *who(m)*.

- (7) a. *Who* is she working *for*?
 b. *Whom* is she working *for*?
 (8) a. **For who* is she working?
 b. *For whom* is she working?

In the sentences of (7), the influencee complement *Who(m)* is fairly removed from the influencer preposition *for*. Note also that the sphere of influence here operates counterdirectionally in that the influencee precedes its influencer. As a result, the power of the preposition to govern a complement in the accusative case is considerably weakened here, so that either the nominative *Who* or the accusative *Whom* is acceptable. It is worth observing, however, that *Who* is far more natural here than *Whom*, the latter being restricted mostly to stiffly formal English.

In the sentences of (8), on the other hand, the influencee complement *who(m)* immediately follows the influencer preposition *for* so that the former cannot escape the sphere of influence of the latter. Thus the power of the preposition to govern a complement in the accusative case is at its strongest, so that the complement here must be in the accusative case, i.e. *whom*. It is for this reason that (8b) is grammatical and acceptable whereas (8a) is not.

A similar account is applicable to the following data.

- (9) a. This is the person *who* you spoke *to*.
 b. This is the person *whom* you spoke *to*.
 (10) a. *This is the person *to who* you spoke.
 b. This is the person *to whom* you spoke.

Our next examples center around the power of the auxiliary verb *ought* to govern the infinitive-marker *to*. Let us compare the two sentence pairs below with specific reference to the structure of the verb phrase.

- (11) a. You *ought to* leave today.
 b. *You *ought* leave today.

- (12) a. You *ought not to* leave today./You *oughtn't to* leave today.
 b. You *ought not* leave today./You *oughtn't* leave today.

The influencer *ought* normally governs a main verb with the infinitive-marking influencee *to*, so that (11a) is grammatical and acceptable while (11b) is not. Our sphere-of-influence concept can help provide a highly plausible account for this range of facts. We may contend here that nothing extraneous comes between the influencer *ought* and its (underlying) influencee *to* in the sentences of (11), so that the two are maximally close to each other. As a result, the (underlying) influencee *to* cannot escape the sphere of influence of its influencer *ought* so that it may not get deleted. This is apparently why (11a) is grammatical and acceptable while (11b) is not.

Note that the influencer *ought* is not followed by its influencee *to* in (12b) so that the sentence should be ungrammatical and unacceptable. Yet (12b) is acceptable in informal spoken English for a great many people. We may argue quite plausibly here that in the sentences of (12) the extraneous *not* immediately follows the influencer *ought* so that its (underlying) influencee *to* gets far enough removed therefrom to be able to escape its sphere of influence and thus get deleted. This is apparently why (12b), which dispenses with *to* between *ought* and the main verb, is often perfectly okay in day-to-day, informal English.

The fact that *to* is optional for quite a few people when *ought* begins a *yes/no* question, as in the sentences below, is explainable along exactly the same lines.

- (13) a. *Ought* you to leave now?
 b. *Ought* you leave now?

With the extraneous *you* coming between the influencer *ought* and its (underlying) influencee *to* in (13) above, the influencer here may not always be powerful enough to keep its influencee from escaping its sphere of influence. This is apparently why (13b) is acceptable to a great many native speakers of English, especially in informal English.

It is interesting to note in this connection that *need* behaves somewhat like *ought* with respect to *to*-government. Let us consider the following sets of sentences.

- (14) a. We *need to* leave now.
 b. *We *need* leave now.
- (15) a. We do not *need to* leave now./We don't *need to* leave now.
 b. *We do not *need* leave now./*We don't *need* leave now.
- (16) a. *We *need not* to leave now./*We *needn't* to leave now.
 b. We *need not* leave now./We *needn't* leave now.
- (17) a. Do we *need to* leave now?
 b. *Do we *need* leave now?
- (18) a. **Need we* to leave now?
 b. *Need we* leave now?
- (19) a. Do we not *need to* leave now?/Don't we *need to* leave now?
 b. *Do we not *need* leave now?/*Don't we *need* leave now?
- (20) a. **Need we not* to leave now?/**Needn't we* to leave now?
 b. *Need we not* leave now?/*Needn't we* leave now?

As is well known, the influencer *need* has the inherent power to govern the (underlying) infinitive-marking influencee *to*, which is apparently why (14b), (15b), (17b), and (19b) are ungrammatical and unacceptable. When extraneous matter intervenes between the influencer *need* and its underlying influencee *to* here, however, the influencee is sufficiently far removed from its influencer to completely escape its sphere of influence. This is arguably why (16a), (18a), and (20a) are ungrammatical and unacceptable.

Incidentally, it may be observed at this point that the power of *need* to govern *to* is apparently weaker than that of *ought*. This is apparently why the deletion of the influencee preposition *to* is optional in (12) and (13) whereas it is obligatory in (16), (18), and (20). It is also worth observing in the context of our present discussion that (the verbal) *dare* is highly similar to *need* with regard to *to*-government.

Let us now turn our attention to the relevance of our sphere-of-influence concept to the explanation of the concord phenomenon. We will begin our discussion here with an examination of the phenomenon, as exemplified in the following pairs of sentences.

- (21) a. Either *your breaks* or *your eyesight* is to blame.
 b. Either *your eyesight* or *your breaks* are to blame.

- (22) a. Neither *Mr. Smith* nor *the Johnsons* were at the party.
 b. Neither *the Johnsons* nor *Mr. Smith* was at the party.
- (23) a. Not only *my parents* but *my sister* was at the movies.
 b. Not only *my sister* but *my parents* were at the movies.

In normal English sentences, the verb agrees in number with the head of the subject noun phrase. In the sentences of (21), (22), and (23), however, the problem arises as to which of the two conjoins should be treated as (containing) the head of the subject noun phrase.

It is to be noted here that, in all the sentences of (21), (22), and (23) above, the verb invariably agrees in number with the second of the two conjoins making up the subject noun phrase. It is also to be noted that the second conjoin here is closer to the verb than the first conjoin is. Thus we might argue that the verb falls in the immediate sphere of influence of the second conjoin, but not of the first conjoin, which is why (the head of) the second conjoin determines the number of the verb here.

The sphere-of-influence concept also throws light on the subject-verb number concord observable in the second member of each of the following sentence pairs.

- (24) a. *Either of them* is welcome.
 b. *Either of them* are welcome.
- (25) a. *Neither of them* is welcome.
 b. *Neither of them* are welcome.
- (26) a. *None of them* is welcome.
 b. *None of them* are welcome.

In each sentence here, the (grammatical) head of the subject noun phrase is the word that precedes the preposition *of*. And this head is notionally singular so that the verb is singular in deliberate, formal English, as shown in the first member of each sentence pair.

However, the portion of the subject that follows the preposition *of* is closer to, and thus wields a more immediate influence on, the verb than does the portion of the subject that precedes the preposition. This helps explain why the verb may normally be plural here in casual, informal English, as shown in the second member of each sentence pair above.

It should be noted in passing here that the sphere of influence may vary

well be considerably less long-range in casual, informal English than in deliberate, formal English. This is apparently true of not just (24), (25), and (26) but also much of the data dealt with in the remainder of the current paper.

The sphere-of-influence concept can also help explain why a singular verb is used with a notionally plural subject in sentences such as the following.

- (27) a. *More than one person was* killed in the accident.
 b. *Many a person was* killed in the accident.

Note here that *more* and *many*, which are both notionally plural, are farther removed from the verb than are *one person* and *a person*, which are both formally singular. Thus we may argue that the verb falls in the immediate sphere of influence of *one person* and *a person*, but not of *More* and *Many*, which is apparently why the verb is in the singular in both sentences above.

We can provide a similar account for the use of the plural verb in the following sentence.

- (28) *One or two reasons were* suggested.

Here the verb is closer to the second conjoin *two (reasons)* than it is to the first conjoin *one*. Thus the verb is in the immediate sphere of influence of *two (reasons)*, but not of *one*, which is apparently why it is in the plural.

We can also invoke our sphere-of-influence concept to explain why the verb is in the plural in the first sentence below while it is in the singular in the second.

- (29) a. *One and a half years have* passed since we last met.
 b. *A year and a half has* passed since we last met.

Note that the subjects of the two sentences of (29) mean essentially one and the same thing although they assume (marginally) different forms. Note also that the part of the subject closest to the verb is in the plural in (29a), i.e. *years*, whereas it is in the singular in (29b), i.e. *half*. Note further that the verb is in the immediate sphere of influence of, and thus agrees in number with, this part of the subject, i.e. the part of the subject that is closest to the verb itself.

Let us now consider the following cases of subject-verb concord in the

light of the sphere-of-influence concept.

- (30) a. *Are bicycles wise in heavy traffic?*
 b. *??Is bicycles wise in heavy traffic?*
- (31) a. *?Bicycles in heavy traffic are sheer madness.*
 b. *Bicycles in heavy traffic is sheer madness.*

In the sentences of (30) above, the verb *be* “immediately” precedes, and thus falls in the immediate sphere of influence of, the plural subject *bicycles*. This is not the case with the sentences of (31), in which the verb *be* immediately follows, and thus falls in the immediate sphere of influence of, the non-plural noun *traffic*. Thus the preference of the plural *are* over the singular *is* in (30), as opposed to the preference of the singular *is* over the plural *are* in (31), can apparently be explained in terms of our sphere-of-influence concept.

It goes without saying that the following data is also amenable to an essentially identical account.

- (32) a. *Are wall-to-wall carpets in every room their dream?*
 b. *?Is wall-to-wall carpets in every room their dream?*
- (33) a. *?Wall-to-wall carpets in every room are their dream.*
 b. *Wall-to-wall carpets in every room is their dream.*

In (32) here, the verb *be* is closer to, and thus falls more immediately in the sphere of influence of, the plural *carpets* than the singular *room*. This is arguably why the plural *are* is preferable to the singular *is* here. In (33), on the other hand, the verb *be* is closer to, and thus falls more immediately in the sphere of influence of, the singular *room* than the plural *carpets*, which is apparently why the singular *is* is preferable to the plural *are* here.

The sphere-of-influence concept also makes available a rather tidy account for the relative-pronoun alternation exemplified below.

- (34) a. These are *the people and things which* amused them the most.
 b. These are *the things and people who* amused them the most.

It is to be noted that, of the two conjoins making up the antecedent noun phrase in either sentence here, the one closer to the relative clause determines the kind of relative pronoun used. This clearly indicates that the relative pronoun in either sentence here falls more immediately in the sphere of

influence of the conjoin that is closer thereto than in that of the one that is farther therefrom.

2. Semantic Interpretation

The sphere-of-influence concept is often instrumental in explaining why a given expression is interpreted in a certain way, rather than in another way. For example, it helps explain why, of two possible interpretations for a given expression, one is favored over the other. Let us lead off our discussion here with a look at the following sentence.

(35) We *foresaw* the *disaster* in *December*.

There are two possible interpretations for this sentence. One interpretation is something like “We knew that *the disaster* would strike *in December*” while the other interpretation is something like “*Our foreseeing* (of the disaster) took place *in December*.”

Of these two possible interpretations, the first one is normally preferred to the second one. Our sphere-of-influence concept provides a rather neat account as to why the first interpretation should generally be preferred to the second here. Our explanation would consist in saying that the time adverbial *in December* is closer to *the disaster* than to *foresaw* with the result that *the disaster* falls more immediately in the sphere of influence of *in December* than does *foresaw*.

Let us now compare (35) above with (36) below.

(36) *In December*, we *foresaw* the *disaster*.

In (36) here, *In December* is closer to *foresaw* than to *the disaster* so that *foresaw* falls more immediately in the sphere of influence of *In December* than does *the disaster*. This is arguably why “*Our foreseeing* of the disaster took place *in December*” is normally the preferred interpretation for (36), if not the only possible interpretation.

We may explain along similar lines the phenomenon of preferred interpretation with reference to the following sentences.

- (37) a. *John* saw *my sister* in the *garden*.
 b. *In the garden*, *John* saw *my sister*.

Note that *my sister* falls more immediately in the sphere of influence of *in the garden* than does *John* in (37a) whereas it is the other way around in (37b). This should help account for the fact that *my sister* (rather than *John*) was definitely *in the garden* in (37a), whereas it is the other way around in (37b).

Needless to say, the following pair of sentences is amenable to a similar account.

- (38) a. *I heard a strange sound in the room.*
 b. *In the room, I heard a strange sound.*

It may be observed here that what was more likely *in the room* was a *strange sound* than *I* in (38a), while it is the other way around in (38b). This may again be explained as a consequence of the fact that a *strange sound* is more immediately in the sphere of influence of *in the room* than is *I* in (38a) while it is the other way around in (38b).

We may apply a similar account to the following data.

- (39) a. *I lent John five dollars to get home.*
 b. *To get home, I lent John five dollars.*

Both *I* and *John* may be in the sphere of influence of the purpose adverbial *to get home* in either sentence here. However, *John* is more immediately in the sphere of influence of *to get home* than is *I* in (39a), while it is the other way around in (39b). This is evidently responsible for the fact that *John* (rather than *I*) is definitely more likely to be interpreted as the logical subject of *to get home* in (39a) while it is the other way around in (39b).

Let us now turn our attention to the two sentences below, which consist of exactly the same words but are differently interpreted on account of a reversal in influencer–influencee relationship.

- (40) a. *She really may have left.* (=It is *true* that she *may* have left.)
 b. *She may really have left.* (=It is *possible* that she *really* has left.)

The adverbial *really* is the influencer with the auxiliary *may* as its influencee in (40a) while it is the other way around in (40b). This difference in influencer–influencee relationship between the two sentences here is apparently responsible for much of the difference in interpretation between the two sentences.

Note at this point that the adverbial *really* in (40b), which is an influencee vis-a-vis the auxiliary *may*, also functions as an influencer with what follows it as its influencee. To bring out this fact, we might rephrase the interpretation for (40b) as “It may be *true* that she *has left*.” So we can see from a comparison of (40a) and (40b) above that the interpretation of a sentence can vary considerably according to the position that an influencer takes in a sentence relative to other sentential constituents.

With this in mind, let us now turn our attention to the role played by the positional variability of the negative influencer *-n't/not* in the interpretations of the following two sentences.

- (41) a. Does *n't* *anyone* know the answer? (=Is it the case that *no one* knows the answer?/Does *no one* know the answer?)
 b. Does anyone *not know* the answer? (=Is there anyone who does *not know* the answer?)

The influencer *-n't/not* has in its immediate sphere of influence *anyone* and *know* in (41a) and (41b) respectively. As a result, what is negated is *anyone* in (41a) while it is *know* in (41b).

While we are on the subject of negation, let us take a look at the following pairs of sentences.

- (42) a. He did *not decide* to see the play.
 b. He decided *not to see* the play.
 (43) a. Do *not try* to talk to her.
 b. Try *not to talk* to her.

In the first sentence of each pair here, the negative influencer *not* is closer to the verb in the higher clause than to the verb in the lower clause. As a result, the verb in the higher clause is more immediately in the sphere of influence of *not* than is the verb in the lower clause. Thus it is the verb in the higher clause, not the one in the lower clause, that is negated here. In contrast, it is the other way around in the second member of either sentence pair above.

A similar phenomenon is observable in the following sentence pair.

- (44) a. *Hadn't* we better go? (= *Wouldn't* it be better if we went?)
 b. Had we better *not go*? (= Would it be better if we *did not go*?)

In (44a), the negative influencer *-n't/not* is closer to the higher verbal element *had better* than to the lower verbal element *go*. Thus *had better* falls more immediately in the sphere of influence of *-n't/not* than does the lower verbal element *go*, so that what is negated here is *had better*, not *go*. Exactly the opposite situation prevails in (44b).

Let us examine the following sentence pair, which also involves the use of the positionally variable negative influencer *-n't/not*.

- (45) a. I don't *really* know him. (=It is *not true* that I know him (well).)
 b. I really don't *know* him. (=The real truth is that I don't *know* him at all.)

In (45a), the negative influencer *-n't/not* has *really* as its immediate influencee, so that it is *really* that is negated. In (45b), on the other hand, the negative influencer has *know* as its immediate influencee, so that it is *know* that is negated.

Let us now examine the following data with specific reference to the sphere of influence of the positionally variable adverbial influencer *fervently*.

- (46) a. She *fervently hoped* to be *applauded*./She *hoped fervently* to be *applauded*.
 b. She *hoped* to be *applauded fervently*./She *hoped* to be *fervently applauded*.

In (46a), the adverbial influencer *fervently* has *hoped* rather than *applauded* as its immediate influencee, so that it was the *hoping* rather than the *applauding* that was done *fervently*. In (46b), the situation is reversed with the result that it was the *applauding* rather than the *hoping* that was done *fervently*.

A similar account is applicable to the sphere of influence of the adverbial *secretly* in the following sentence pair.

- (47) a. He *secretly urged* that she be *dismissed*./He *urged secretly* that she be *dismissed*.
 b. He *urged* that she be *dismissed secretly*./He *urged* that she be *secretly dismissed*.

In (47a), *urged* falls more immediately in the sphere of influence of the adverbial *secretly* than does *dismissed*, so that it was the *urging* rather than

the *dismissing* that was done *secretly*. In (47b), the situation is reversed with the result that it was the *dismissing* rather than the *urging* that was done *secretly*.

The sphere of influence of the positionally variable adverbial *completely* in the following sentence pair can also be accounted for along essentially identical lines.

- (48) a. They *completely rejected our proposal*.
 b. They *rejected our proposal completely*.

In (48a), *rejected* falls more immediately in the sphere of influence of the adverbial *completely* than does *our proposal*, so that what was done *completely* was *their rejecting*, not *our proposing*. In (48b), on the other hand, *our proposal* (rather than *rejected*) falls in the immediate sphere of influence of *completely*, with the result that the sentence means something like “*Our proposal in its entirety* was rejected.”

Let us now turn to the positionally variable adverbial influencers *proudly* and *obligingly*, as used in the two sentence pairs below.

- (49) a. *Proudly, he* accepted the award. (= *He was proud* to accept the award.)
 b. He *accepted* the award *proudly*. (= *His acceptance* of the award was done *in a proud manner*.)
 (50) a. *Obligingly, she* answered my questions. (= *She was obliging* enough to answer my questions.)
 b. She *answered* my questions *obligingly*. (= *Her answering* of my questions was done *in an obliging manner*.)

As can be seen from the rough paraphrases given in the parentheses, the adverbial in the first member of either pair here has in its immediate sphere of influence the subject of the sentence rather than the verb thereof. The same adverbial in the second member of either pair, in contrast, has in its immediate sphere of influence the verb rather than the subject. This difference in the sphere of influence of the adverbial is reflected quite faithfully in the different interpretations of the two sentences comprising either pair here.

The adverbial *seriously*, as used in the following sentence pair, illustrates another interesting case of positionally-conditioned sphere variation.

- (51) a. Do you *seriously believe* that? (Do you *believe* that *in a serious way*.)
 b. *Seriously, do you believe that?* (*I am asking this question seriously: Do you believe that?*)

The adverbial influencer *seriously* here has in its immediate sphere of influence the verb *believe* in (51a) and the clause *do you believe that?* in (51b). Again this difference apparently lies at the root of much of the difference in interpretation between the two sentences here.

Let us now consider the sentence pair below with particular attention on how the adverbial phrase *like his brother* changes its sphere of influence from one sentence to the other.

- (52) a. *Like his brother, Bill* writes poetry. (= *Bill is like his brother in that he writes poetry.*)
 b. *Bill writes poetry like his brother.* (= *Bill writes poetry in the way his brother does.*)

The adverbial phrase *like his brother* here is closer to *Bill* than to *writes poetry* in (52a) while it is the other way around in (52b). Thus the adverbial phrase has in its immediate sphere of influence *Bill* in (52a) and *writes poetry* in (52b). Needless to say, this difference underlies much of the difference in interpretation between the two sentences above.

Let us now turn our attention to the “variable” sphere of influence of the adjective *difficult*, as illustrated in the two sentences below.

- (53) a. *This jug is difficult* to pour *cream* out of.
 b. *Cream is difficult* to pour out of *this jug*.

(53a) here may be interpreted as meaning “*This jug* is so structured that it is *difficult* to pour *cream* out of it.” (53b), on the other hand, may be interpreted as meaning “*This cream* is so textured that it is *difficult* to pour out of *this jug*.” Thus the primary source of the difficulty involved here is *This jug* in (53a), while it is *Cream* in (53b). This difference in interpretation stems from the fact that *difficult* has in its immediate sphere *This jug* (rather than *cream*) in (53a), while the situation is reversed in (53b).

Let us examine the two sentences below with specific reference to the “variable” sphere of influence of the adjective *nice*.

- (54) a. *This violin is nice to play Mozart on.*
 b. *Mozart is nice to play on this violin.*

(54a) here may be interpreted as meaning “*This violin* is of such a nature that it *is nice* to play *mozart* on.” (54b), on the other hand, may be interpreted as meaning “*Mozart* is of such a nature that it is *nice* to play on *this violin*.” Thus the primary source of the niceness referred to here is *This violin* in (54a), while it is *Mozart* in (54b). This difference in interpretation stems, at least in part, from the fact that *nice* has within its immediate sphere *This violin* (rather than *Mozart*) in (54a) while the situation is reversed in (54b).

Let us conclude this section by taking note of the variable sphere of influence of the adjective *hot*, as exemplified in the following pair of sentences.

- (55) a. *Hot, I can't drink coffee.*
 b. *I can't drink coffee hot.*

The subject *I* falls in the sphere of *hot* more immediately than does the object *coffee* in (55a) whereas the situation is reversed in (55b). Thus normally (55a) means something like “Because/As I am hot, I can't drink coffee,” whereas (55b) means something like “I can't drink coffee when/while it is hot.”

3. Stylistic Explanation

Our sphere-of-influence concept can often be invoked to provide a principled account as to why one structure is stylistically superior to another. For example, we can use the sphere-of-influence concept to help explain why the second sentence below is sometimes preferred to the first, especially in informal English.

- (56) a. *It's true that you once thought of dropping out of school, isn't it?*
 b. *It's true, isn't it, that you once thought of dropping out of school?*

In (56a), the influencee *isn't it* is so far removed from the influencer *It's* that it is almost completely stranded therefrom. As a result, the influencer here may find it hard to exert its proper influence over this stranded influencee. We often help resolve this problem by bringing the (stranded)

influencee to a position that is maximally close to the influencer, i.e. to a position well within the immediate sphere of influence of the influencer, as in (56b) above.

Our sphere-of-influence concept also sheds light on why the second sentence below is often regarded as stylistically preferable to the first.

- (57) a. (?) Their research has *made lots* of things such as new techniques for brain surgery *possible*.
 b. Their research has *made possible lots* of things such as new techniques for brain surgery.

Note that in (57a) the influencee *possible* is too far removed from its influencer *made* (although the other influencee *lots* is not), so that the power of the influencer *made* over its influencee *possible* is seriously weakened. Once again we may help overcome this problem by advancing the (stranded) influencee to a position that is maximally proximate to the influencer, i.e. to a position well within the immediate sphere of influence of the influencer, as in (57b).

Suppose that the nominal influencee “*lots* (of things such as new techniques for brain surgery)” in (57a) were replaced with a clausal one beginning with the infinitive marker *to* or the subordinator *that*. Then the resulting sentence would get so monstrous stylistically as to be utterly ungrammatical and unacceptable. For, as I have argued in Park (1977a) and elsewhere, such a *to* or *that* would completely bar an influencer that precedes it from exercising effective control over an influencee that follows it. With this in mind, let us consider the following sentence.

- (58) *Their research has *made to* develop lots of things such as new techniques for brain surgery *possible*.

A sentence like (58) here is bad primarily because it contains an influencee that is too far removed from its influencer. This problem is rectified once again by bringing the (stranded) influencee to a position well within the immediate sphere of influence of the influencer (and inserting the expletive *it* between influencer and influencee). Incidentally, this inserted *it* kind of stands for the problematic influencee beginning with the infinitive marker *to*. Thus (58), for one, must be rewritten as (59) below.

- (59) Their research has *made it possible to* develop lots of things such as new techniques for brain surgery.

The expletive *it* being a substitute for the problematic clausal influencee here, we can see that in (59) both influencees are now sufficiently close to their influencer to be well within its immediate sphere of influence. As a result, (59) achieves a sufficient degree of stylistic equilibrium, which is lacking in (58).

It goes without saying that the second sentence in (60) below is stylistically superior to the first for exactly the same reason that (59) is stylistically superior to (58).

- (60) a. **I made to become fluent in English my # I objective.*
 b. *I made it my # I objective to become fluent in English.*

The second sentence in each pair below is a stylistic improvement over the first in the same way that (59) and (60b) are stylistic improvements over (58) and (60a) respectively.

- (61) a. **Something put that I was an easy mark into his head.*
 b. *Something put it into his head that I was an easy mark.*
- (62) a. **I owe that I am where I am to you.*
 b. *I owe it to you that I am where I am.*
- (63) a. **The young governor made that he is not running for president quite clear.*
 b. *The young governor made it quite clear that he is not running for president.*
- (64) a. **He regards that every one of us speak fluent English as very important.*
 b. *He regards it as very important that every one of us speak fluent English.*
- (65) a. **Those boys have proved that old age brings on wisdom a fallacy.*
 b. *Those boys have proved it a fallacy that old age brings on wisdom.*

In each sentence pair below, the first sentence is stylistically problematic in that one of the two influencees therein occurs stranded sentence-finally, very far from its influencer. We can correct this problem by advancing the

stranded influencee to a position maximally proximate to the influencer, i.e. well within the immediate sphere of influence of the influencer, as in the second member of each of the following sentence pairs.

- (66) a. ?He had *called the man* on whose judgment he now had to rely *a fool*.
 b. He had *called a fool the man* on whose judgment he now had to rely.
- (67) a. ?We *heard that* he had been stranded for days without food *from his own lips*.
 b. We *heard from his own lips that* he had been stranded for days without food.
- (68) a. ?He could not *turn the petition* signed by all the members of the committee *down*.
 b. He could not *turn down the petition* signed by all the members of the committee.
- (69) a. ?The boy had to *explain that* he was late because of the storm *to the teacher*.
 b. The boy had to *explain to the teacher that* he was late because of the storm.

We may note at this point that the distance between influencer and influencee is to be measured from head to head. That is to say, we should talk in terms of the distance not between influencer phrase and influencee phrase but rather between the heads of the two.

Let us now take a look at the following sentence pairs, in each of which the second sentence may often be stylistically favored over the first.

- (70) a. A *rumor that* the actress was secretly married to a retired army general *circulated widely*.
 b. A *rumor circulated widely that* the actress was secretly married to a retired army general.
- (71) a. The *problem of whether* or not we should cooperate with those people in Tokyo soon *arose*.
 b. The *problem* soon *arose of whether* or not we should cooperate with those people in Tokyo.

- (72) a. An organizing *committee consisting* of Joan Smith, Bob Walton, and Bill Jackson *was* formed.
 b. An organizing *committee was* formed, *consisting* of Joan Smith, Bob Walton, and Bill Jackson.

In each sentence pair here, the first member of the pair has a nearly stranded influencee in sentence-final position, whereas the second member does not. It happens that both influencees are safely within the sphere of influence of the influencer in the second member of each pair here whereas this is not the case in the first member. This is apparently why the second member of each pair above is often stylistically preferred to the first.

It is interesting to note at this point that (73a) below may be paraphrased as (73b), but not as (73c).

- (73) a. The *poor in spirit* deserve more help.
 b. People *poor in spirit* deserve more help.
 c. **Poor* people *in spirit* deserve more help.

(73c) above is unacceptable as a paraphrase for (73a) because the extraneous matter represented by *people* keeps the influencee *poor* from coming safely within the immediate sphere of influence of its influencer *in spirit*. (73b), on the other hand, is a perfectly acceptable paraphrase for (73a) because the influencee *poor* is sufficiently close to its influencer *in spirit* and thus safely within its sphere of influence.

It is interesting to note in this connection that our discussion here throws a great deal of light on the following data.

- (74) a. *He found *important everything* about her.
 b. He found *everything important* about her.
 (75) a. *I introduced *fantastic someone* to him.
 b. I introduced *someone fantastic* to him.
 (76) a. *Do you know *nice anywhere* for a picnic?
 b. Do you know *anywhere nice* for a picnic?
 (77) a. *We met *interesting nobody* at the party.
 b. We met *nobody interesting* at the party.

It should be observed here that the adjective in each sentence above modifies not the indefinite pronoun as a whole but rather the head thereof. In

the sentences of (74), for example, the adjective *important* directly modifies the head of the indefinite pronoun *everything*, i.e. *-thing*, rather than either *every-* or the entire indefinite pronoun *everything*.

It thus turns out that the extraneous matter represented by *every-* comes between the influencer *important* and its influencee *-thing* in (74a), thereby weakening the power of the influencer to immediately govern its influencee. This is probably the main reason that (74a) is “stylistically” so egregious as to be ungrammatical. In (74b), on the other hand, the influencee is maximally proximate to, and is thus in the immediate sphere of influence of, its influencer, so that the sentence is “stylistically” impeccable and perfectly grammatical. Needless to say, the account that we have just provided for the sentence pair given in (74) is applicable, *mutatis mutandis*, to (75), (76), and (77) as well.

The word *thus* is interesting in that it is bidirectional in reference, as can be seen from a comparison of the two sentences below.

- (78) a. You did not study and, *thus*, you failed the test.
 b. The dance teacher said, “The waltz is done *thus*,” and then demonstrated the steps.

The word *thus* is anaphoric in (78a) whereas it is cataphoric in (78b). The point worth noting here is that the anaphoric *thus* is always positioned toward the beginning of the clause in which it occurs while the cataphoric *thus* is always positioned toward the end of the clause in which it occurs. Evidently, this is designed to put *thus* in a position maximally close to what it refers to, that is, well within the immediate sphere of influence of its influencer referent.

Suppose that an anaphoric *thus* were positioned toward the end of the clause in which it occurs or, conversely, that a cataphoric *thus* were positioned toward the beginning of the clause in which it occurs. Then we would end up with stylistic absurdities such as those given in (79) below.

- (79) a. ??You did not study hard and you failed the test, *thus*.
 b. ??The dance teacher said, “*Thus* the waltz is done,” and then demonstrated the steps.

4. (Ortho)phonological Explanation

The sphere-of-influence concept also sheds plenty of light on a wide range of phonological and orthographic phenomena, including phonetic processes subsumed under the general heading of assimilation. Let us begin our discussion here with an examination of the following data.

- (80) a. synchronic/*sɪnkrʌnɪk*/*>*/*sɪŋkrʌnɪk*/
 b. synchronize/*sɪŋkrʌnaɪz*/*>*/*sɪnkrʌnaɪz*/

It should be observed at the outset here that the originally alveolar nasal coda of the first syllable is more likely to be assimilated to the following velar stop in the verb *synchronize* than in the adjective *synchronic*.

Note that this difference in assimilation behavior is correlated with the difference in the position of major stress in the two words in question. When the word-initial syllable here does not get (major) stress, as in the case of the adjective *synchronic*, then it is more or less loosely connected to the onset of the second syllable that follows. When it gets (major) stress, as in the case of the verb *synchronize*, on the other hand, it is far more tightly connected to the onset of the second syllable that follows. Thus we can argue that the originally alveolar nasal coda falls more immediately within the assimilatory sphere of influence of the velar onset of the second syllable in *synchronize* than in *synchronic*.

We can explain in exactly the same way why in each word pair below the coda of the prefix-final syllable, which is originally an alveolar nasal, is more likely to be assimilated to the following velar stop in the second member than in the first.

- (81) a. *increase* (verb)
 b. *increase* (noun)
 (82) a. *idiosyncratic*
 b. *idiosyncrasy*
 (83) a. *congressional*
 b. *congress*
 (84) a. *ingratitude*
 b. *ingrate*
 (85) a. *congruity*
 b. *congruous*

Let us now turn our attention to the following pairs of words with special reference to the voicing-assimilation of the onset of the stem-initial syllable to the prefix-final (voiced) vowel.

- (86) a. *re-serve*
 b. *reserve*
- (87) a. *re-sign*
 b. *resign*
- (88) a. *re-sent* (the past tense of *re-send*)
 b. *resent*
- (89) a. *re-sound*
 b. *resound*
- (90) a. *re-sort*
 b. *resort*

The onset of the stem-initial syllable is pronounced as the voiceless /s/ in the first member of each word pair here and as the voiced /z/ in the second member of the same pair. In the first member of each pair here, the prefix *re-* is rather loosely attached to the stem, which is orthographically indicated by the use of the hyphen between the prefix and the stem. This rather loose connection is also indicated by the fact that the prefix *re-* has a clearly discernible meaning of its own, i.e. “again.”

In the second member of the same word pair, in contrast, the apparently identical prefix *re-*, for which the original etymological sense of “again” is hardly discernible, is tightly welded onto the stem. Thus it may well be that the the onset of the stem-initial syllable falls far more immediately in the voicing sphere of influence of the prefix-final (voiced) vowel in the second member of each word pair above than in the first.

The sphere-of-influence concept is also instrumental in explaining the conditions under which the prefix *anti-* gives rise to its alloform *ant-*. Let us examine the following data which illustrates the alternation between *anti-* and its alloform *ant-*.

- (91) a. *anti-* + American \Rightarrow *anti-American*
 b. *anti-* + aircraft \Rightarrow *anti-aircraft/antiaircraft*
- (92) a. *anti-* + Arctic \Rightarrow *Antarctic/*?Anti-Arctic*
 b. *anti-* + acid \Rightarrow *antacid/*?anti-acid*

The prefix *anti-* is far more tightly attached to the stem in the words of (92) than in those of (91). This is attested to by the presence of the hyphen in (91), as opposed to its absence from (92). It is also reflected in the fact that the etymological sense of “against” is far less discernible in (92) than in (91). At any rate, the prefix-final vowel apparently occurs more immediately under the absorptive influence of the stem-initial vowel in (92) than in (91). This is arguably (part of) the reason that the prefix-final vowel gets deleted in (92), but not in (91).

Let us now compare (93) and (94) below with specific reference to the difference in assimilation behavior between the two negative prefixes *in-* and *un-*.

(93) The prefix *in-* has the following four phonologically-conditioned allomorphs.

- a. *in-* before bilabials: *immortal, immature, immovable, impossible, impersonal, impeccable, imbecile, imbalance*
- b. *il-* before /l/: *illegible, illogical, illegal, illegitimate, illicit, illiterate, illimitable*
- c. *ir-* before /r/: *irregular, irresponsible, irresistible, irreducible, irrational, irrelevant, irrelative, irreplaceable, irreproachable*
- d. *in-* elsewhere: *independent, intemperate, insensitive, incurable, ingratitude, invariable, infinite*

(94) The prefix *un-* is invariable.

- a. before bilabials: *unbalanced, unbending, unpopular, unprepared, unmanned, unmistakable*
- b. before /l/: *unlawful, unlucky, unlike, unlimited, unleaded*
- c. before /r/: *unreasonable, unreliable, unruly*
- d. elsewhere: *unnatural, untimely, undying, unseemly, unfamiliar*

Our explanation for this range of data basically consists in saying that the prefix *in-* is tightly welded onto the stem whereas the prefix *un-* is only loosely attached thereto. Thus the prefix-final /n/ arguably falls immediately under the assimilatory influence of the stem-initial consonant when the prefix is *in-*, but not when it is *un-*.

Parenthetically, the negative prefix *in-*, when it is welded onto the stem especially tightly, may exert upon the stem an influence of a rather exceptional nature. We find that this negative prefix *in-* sometimes pressures the

tense vocalic nucleus of a stem-initial syllable to get reduced to a lax vowel, as can be observed from examples such as the following.

- (95) a. finite vs. infinite (/ai/ ⇒ /i/)
 b. potent vs. impotent (/ou/ ⇒ /ə/)
 c. pious vs. impious (/ai/ ⇒ /i/)

In contrast, the negative prefix *non-* is only very loosely attached to the stem. As a result, this prefix does not have the power to pressure the tense vocalic nucleus of a stem-initial syllable to get reduced to a lax vowel, as can be seen from examples such as the following.

- (96) a. finite vs. non-finite
 b. potent vs. non-potent
 c. pious vs. non-pious

The next case of relevance to our discussion comes from the following data consisting of the plural and genitive forms of the nouns *wife* and *thief*.

- (97) a. wife + -s ⇒ wives
 b. wife + -'s ⇒ wife's
 (98) a. thief + -s ⇒ thieves
 b. thief + -'s ⇒ thief's

We have argued elsewhere (Park 1992) that the voicing of the stem-final /f/ and the plural suffix -s in the first member of either pair above results from pressure for the conservation of lexico-phonological space. Why is it then that stem-final /f/ and the genitive suffix -'s do not get voiced in the second member of either pair here? Our explanation would consist in saying that the plural suffix -s is suffixed far more tightly to the stem than is the genitive suffix -'s with the result that the former comes under more immediate and powerful pressure for space conservation than does the latter. Incidentally, the apostrophe in the second member of either pair here is an orthographic indication that the connection between the stem and the genitive suffix is less than maximally tight.

Let us now think of the interesting devoicing assimilation phenomenon illustrated by the following data.

- (99) a. This book was *used* to teach them English.
 b. I *used* to teach them English.

The interesting thing here is that the word *used* is pronounced differently in the two sentences of (99) in spite of the apparently identical phonological environment in which it occurs in these two sentences. In (99a), it is pronounced as /ju:zd/, which is the normal pronunciation for the (past-tense and) past-participle form of the verb *use*. In (99b), on the other hand, it is pronounced as /ju:st/.

In order to explain in a principled way this difference in pronunciation for apparently one and the same word, we have to realize that what we have to deal with here is not exactly one word but rather two different uses of one word. In (99a), the words *used* and *to* are two separate words and thus are not welded tightly together. In (99b), in contrast, the two words make up a lexico-semantic unit almost like a single word and, as such, are welded tightly together.

Thus the originally voiced *used*-final /d/ falls far more immediately within the devoicing sphere of influence of the voiceless *to*-initial /t/ in (99b) than in (99a). As a result, this originally voiced *used*-final /d/ gets devoiced to /t/ in (99b), but not in (99a). Once this *used*-final /d/ gets devoiced to /t/ in this way, then the originally voiced /z/ that precedes it also gets devoiced to /s/ under the influence of this devoiced /t/. This sequence of two devoicing assimilations gives rise to the final form /ju:st/ for *used* in (99b).

The originally voiced *supposed*-final cluster /zd/ in the lexico-semantic unit *be supposed to* is normally devoiced to /st/ for exactly the same reason. We should, of course, be able to explain along identical lines why we normally devoice the *have*-final /v/ to /f/ in *have to* when it is used as a lexico-semantic unit with the meaning of “must.”

Let us examine the following data with specific reference to the alternation between the voiceless and voiced “*th*.”

- (100) a. north + east ⇒ northeast
 b. north + -ern ⇒ northern
 c. north + -erly ⇒ northerly
- (101) a. south + east ⇒ southeast
 b. south + -ern ⇒ southern
 c. south + -erly ⇒ southerly

When *east* is added to *north* and *south* to form the compounds *northeast* and

southeast respectively, the voiceless “*th*” at the end of *north* and *south* remains intact. When the suffixes *-ern* and *-erly* are added to the same words, however, the same originally voiceless “*th*” gets voiced. The reason for this difference is that *east* is only loosely attached to *north* and *south* in *northeast* and *southeast*, whereas the suffixes *-ern* and *-erly* are quite tightly welded thereto in *northern*, *northerly*, *southern*, and *southerly*. As a result, the “*th*” in question here apparently falls in the sphere of influence of the following (voiced) vowel more immediately in *northern*, *northerly*, *southern*, and *southerly* than in *northeast* and *southeast*. Thus the “*th*” comes under greater pressure to get voiced in the former set of words than in the latter.

While we are on the subject of assimilation, let us consider the following data, which may be a bit baffling at first sight.

- (102) a. months /mʌnθs/ or /mʌns/
 b. sevenths /sevɪnθs/ or /sevɪns/
 c. ninths /nainθs/ or /nains/
 d. tenths /tenθs/ or /tens/
 e. elevenths /ilevɪnθs/ or /ilevɪns/

Note that the singular stem-final sound in each of the nouns here is the voiceless “*th*” sound. This voiceless “*th*” may get deleted when the plural suffix *-s* is tacked on to the singular noun in question. As a result, the plural suffix *-s* may come immediately after the voiced alveolar nasal /n/ in all the words of (102).

It is interesting to observe at this point that the plural suffix *-s* is not sounded as /z/ after this voiced /n/ here although it is normally pronounced as /z/ when it immediately follows a (singular-final) voiced sound elsewhere. We may account for this rather baffling phenomenon by saying that the deleted voiceless “*th*” sound here has left behind a distinctly voiceless trace in its place. If this line of reasoning is correct, then it would be the case that the plural suffix *-s* falls in the assimilatory sphere of influence of this voiceless trace, rather than that of the voiced consonant /n/ that now precedes it (only superficially).

Our sphere-of-influence concept enables us to explain quite rationally why certain suffixes, but not others, put pressure on the stem to undergo (ortho)phonological reduction. The reduction here usually takes the form of vowel laxing or consonant softening. The general rule here is: The more

tightly attached to the stem the suffix in question is, the greater this pressure for (ortho)phonological reduction. Let us see how this general rule works on the following data.

- (103) a. heal + -ed \Rightarrow healed /hi:ld/
 b. heal + -th \Rightarrow health /helθ/
 (104) a. deep + -er \Rightarrow deeper /di:pər/
 b. deep + -th \Rightarrow depth /depθ/

Our account for the data here should begin with the observation that a derivational suffix is, as a general rule, far more tightly affixed to the stem than is its inflectional counterpart. Thus in each pair above, the suffix is far more tightly attached to the stem in the second member than in the first. As a result, the stem falls more immediately in the sphere of influence of the suffix in the second member than in the first. Thus the pressure on the stem vowel to get reduced to a lax vowel is far greater in the second member than in the first, which is why we get vowel laxing in the second member, but not in the first.

From the data given below, we can see that the derivational suffixes *-ion* and *-ive* put far more pressure on the stem for phonological reduction than does the (underlyingly) inflectional suffix *-ing*.

- (105) a. evade + -ing \Rightarrow evading
 b. evade + -ion \Rightarrow evasion
 c. evade + -ive \Rightarrow evasive
 (106) a. include + -ing \Rightarrow including
 b. include + -ion \Rightarrow inclusion
 c. include + -ive \Rightarrow inclusive

We can see here that the stem-final alveolar consonant /d/ is not (substantively) weakened when the suffix is the inflectional *-ing*, while it is weakened to a (palato)alveolar fricative when the suffix is the derivational *-ion* or *-ive*. This is, of course, because the stem falls more immediately in the sphere of influence of the suffix when the suffix is derivational than when it is inflectional.

The same phenomenon manifests itself on the orthographical plane as well, as is evident from the following data.

- (107) a. spill + -s \Rightarrow spills
 b. spill + -th \Rightarrow spilth
- (108) a. till + -s \Rightarrow tills
 b. till + -th \Rightarrow tilth

The derivational suffix *-th* is much more tightly attached to the stems here than is the inflectional suffix *-s*. As a result, the pressure on the stem-final geminate consonant letter cluster *ll* to get simplified to *l* is much greater in the second member of each pair above than in the first. This is apparently why we end up with two tokens of the letter *l* in *spills* and *tills*, as opposed to just one token thereof in *spilth* and *tilth*.

We may note at this point that the phonological weight of a suffix often translates into the strength of its influence on the stem to which it is affixed. We can see this in examples of verbal conjugation such as those exemplified in (109) and (110) below.

- (109) a. spill + -ed \Rightarrow spilled
 b. spill + -t \Rightarrow spilt
- (110) a. dream /dri:m/ + -ed \Rightarrow dreamed /dri:md/
 b. dream /dri:m/ + -t \Rightarrow dreamt /dremt/

We can see in (109) that the stem-final geminate letter cluster *ll* is simplified to *l* before the phonologically stronger /t/, but not before the phonologically weaker /d/. We can also see in (110) that the tense stem-vowel /i:/ gets reduced to the lax vowel /e/ before the phonologically stronger /t/, but not before the phonologically weaker /d/. It may very well be the case that a phonologically stronger segment normally has a longer or stronger sphere of influence than does its weaker counterpart. Parenthetically, the orthographic contrast between the geminate letter cluster *ll* in *spilled* and the single letter *l* in *spilt* is psychologically real in the sense that *ll* stands for a phonetically longer /l/ than does *l*.

Note at this point that word-final silent letters often come back to life before derivational suffixes, but not before inflectional suffixes. This is evident from data such as the following.

- (111) a. bomb /bam/ + -ing \Rightarrow bombing /bamiŋ/
 b. bomb /bam/ + -ard \Rightarrow bombard /bambard/

- (112) a. condemn /kændem/ + -ing ⇒ condemning /kændemɪŋ/
 b. condemn /kændem/ + -ation ⇒ condemnation /kændemneɪʃən/

Note that the derivational suffixes *-ard* and *-ation* are more tightly attached to the stems here than is the inflectional suffix *-ing*. So the derivational suffixes *-ard* and *-ation* exert a more immediate and powerful resuscitating influence, as it were, on the silent letters here than does the inflectional suffix *-ing*. This is apparently why the silent “b” and “n” come back to life before the derivational suffixes *-ard* and *-ation* respectively here while they do not do so before the inflectional suffix *-ing*.

Of derivational suffixes, more productive ones are less tightly affixed to the stem than are less productive ones. For example, the agent suffix *-er* is derivational but far more productive, and thus far less tightly affixed to the stem, than, say, *-ard* or *-ation*. Thus it should come as no surprise that, in (113) below, the stem-final silent “b” and “n” do not come back to life before this highly productive derivational suffix *-er*.

- (113) a. bomb + -er ⇒ bomber /bʌmər/
 b. condemn + -er ⇒ condemner /kændemər/

It may be observed in this connection that, although both are derivational suffixes, the adjectival suffix *-ly* is far less productive than is the adverbial suffix *-ly*. With this in mind, let us examine (114) below, which contrasts the adjective *cleanly* with the adverb *cleanly*.

- (114) a. clean /kli:n/ + (adverbial) -ly ⇒ cleanly /kli:nli:/
 b. clean /kli:n/ + (adjectival) -ly ⇒ cleanly /klenli:/

It is clear from (114) that the less productive, more tightly affixed adjectival suffix *-ly* puts more pressure on the tense stem nucleus to get weakened to a lax vowel than does the more productive, less tightly affixed adverbial suffix *-ly*.

Of the derivational suffixes *-ity* and *-ness*, the former is far less productive and hence far more tightly affixed to the stem than is the latter. Given this difference between the two suffixes, it is only natural that the less productive suffix *-ity* exerts greater pressure on the tense stem nucleus to get reduced to a lax vowel than does the more productive suffix *-ness*, as is evident from data such as the following.

- (115) a. divine /divain/ + -ness \Rightarrow divineness /divainnis/
 b. divine /divain/ + -ity \Rightarrow divinity /diviniti:/
- (116) a. sane /sein/ + -ness \Rightarrow saneness /seinnis/
 b. sane /sein/ + -ity \Rightarrow sanity /sæniti:/
- (117) a. profound /prəfaund/ + -ness \Rightarrow profoundness /prəfaundnis/
 b. profound /prəfaund/ + -ity \Rightarrow profundity /prəfʌnditi:/
- (118) a. verbose /vərbous/ + -ness \Rightarrow verboseness /vərbousnis/
 b. verbose /vərbous/ + -ity \Rightarrow verbosity /vərbəsiti:/
- (119) a. serene /siri:n/ + -ness \Rightarrow sereneness /siri:nnis/
 b. serene /siri:n/ + -ity \Rightarrow serenity /sireniiti:/

5. Territoriality

Linguistic elements are often territorial in that they often have a fairly well defined territorial sphere of influence. We will lead off our discussion of linguistic territoriality with an examination of the following pair of sentences with specific reference to the interpretation of the noun phrase *the destruction of the bridge*.

- (120) a. *The destruction of the bridge* was not caused by the earthquake.
 b. The earthquake did not cause *the destruction of the bridge*.

As a preliminary to our discussion here, note that sentence-initial territory for the subject of a sentence is in the sphere of old information while the remaining territory of the sentence is in the sphere of new information. Thus in (120a) the subject noun phrase *the destruction of the bridge* occurs in the sphere of old (or given) information, so that it implies that the bridge was actually destroyed. In (120b), on the other hand, the same noun phrase occurs in the new information sphere of the (direct) object, so that it does not necessarily have such an implication.

This distinction between the spheres of old and new information also throws light on the slightly different interpretations assignable to the two sentences below.

- (121) a. *Two languages* are spoken by everyone in the room.
 b. Everyone in the room speaks *two languages*.

The noun phrase *two languages* refers to a given two languages in (121a),

where it occurs in the old information territory of the subject. On the other hand, it refers to any two languages in (121b), where it occurs in the new information territory of the (direct) object.

The distinction between territorial spheres of old and new information under discussion here can also help explain why the first sentence below is natural while the second is somewhat odd.

- (122) a. *Beavers* build dams.
 b. ?*Dams* are built by beavers.

A plural noun of the form *Xs* always implies “*Xs are such that all Xs without exception*” when it occurs in subject position, that is, in the territorial sphere of old information. Thus (122a) means “(Beavers are such that) all beavers (without exception) build dams,” which is true, whereas (122b) means “(Dams are such that) all dams (without exception) are built by beavers,” which is not true. The oddness of (122b) results from the patently counter-factual, fallacious claim that it makes.

Being the territorial sphere of old/given information, the sentence-initial position typically reserved for the subject of a sentence is normally occupied by an expression that is lightweight in both form and content. This helps explain why in each of the following sets of sentences the first sentence may be passivized into the second sentence, but not usually into the third.

- (123) a. They blamed *the broken glass* on *John*.
 b. *The broken glass* was blamed on *John*.
 c. **John* was blamed *the broken glass* on.
 (124) a. They blamed *John* for the broken glass.
 b. *John* was blamed for *the broken glass*.
 c. **The broken glass* was blamed *John* for.
 (125) a. They gave *me* a new book.
 b. *I* was given a new book.
 c. (?) A new book was given *me*.
 (126) a. They gave a new book to *me*.
 b. A new book was given to *me*.
 c. ??*I* was given a new book to.

Before we go into our discussion here, we should note that normally the in-

formation carried by an element closer to the beginning of a sentence is relatively more given and thus lighter than that carried by an element less close thereto. Thus of the two post-verbal noun phrases in each active sentence above, the first is lighter of information content than the second in that the information borne by the former is older or more given than that borne by the latter. This should help explain that the first noun phrase here is lightweight enough content-wise to fit comfortably into the old information territory of the (passive) subject while the second noun phrase is a bit too heavy to do so.

Note at this point that the existential *there* is often employed as a means of helping resolve the problem posed by an informationally overweight subject noun phrase. Let us examine the following pairs of sentences.

- (127) a. (?) *A book* was on the table.
 b. *There was a book* on the table.
- (128) a. (?) *Some animals* were in the zoo.
 b. *There were some animals* in the zoo.

Note that *a book* and *some animals* here are indefinite noun phrases and thus bear new information, so that they are both a bit too heavy to fit comfortably into the old information sphere of the subject slot. Thus both (127a) and (128a) are slightly odd. We may cope with this problem by putting the informationally empty existential *there* in the subject slot and shunting the problematic indefinite noun phrases back to post-verbal position, as in (127b) and (128b).

Other devices than the existential *there* are also sometimes resorted to as a means of circumventing awkward sentences like (127a) and (128a) above. Instead of (127b) and (128b), for example, we may use (129a) and (129b) below respectively.

- (129) a. *I saw a book* on the table./*I had a book* on the table.
 b. *I saw some animals* in the zoo./*The zoo had some animals* in it.

Note here that the subject noun phrase in either sentence of (129) bears old information. As a result, the subject noun phrase here is sufficiently lightweight information-wise, and so neither (129a) nor (129b) is encumbered with the kind of overweightness that renders (127a) and (128a) slightly odd.

Our distinction between the territorial spheres of old and new information is also instrumental in explaining why the second member of each sentence pair below is stylistically often favored over the first.

- (130) a. *A young man* benefited from *her will*.
 b. *Her will* benefited *a young man*.
 (131) a. *A book* resulted from *my research*.
 b. *My research* resulted in *a book*.
 (132) a. *An Englishman* married *her sister*.
 b. *Her sister* married *an Englishman*.

In the first member of each pair here, an indefinite noun phrase, which bears new information, occurs in the old information territory of the subject. In the second member of the same pair, on the other hand, a definite noun phrase, which bears old information, occurs in the old information territory of the subject. Thus in the second member of each pair above, but not in the first, the subject noun phrase is of the kind that can fit comfortably into the old information territory of the subject slot. This is why the second member of each sentence pair here is stylistically often preferred to the first member of the same pair.

Incidentally, we can offer an essentially identical explanation as to why the second member of each pair below are stylistically far superior to the first.

- (133) a. **A student* is *my brother*.
 b. *My brother* is *a student*.
 (134) a. *?*A good day* is *today*.
 b. *Today* is *a good day*.

It is interesting to note here that an indefinite noun phrase, the typical bearer of new information, is especially intolerable in the old information territory of the subject when the verb is a pure copula. Incidentally, this may have to do with the fact the post-subject portion of a sentence tends to be especially lightweight when the verb is a pure copula.

We may note here that another distinction between subject and object territory may be invoked to explain certain ways in which the relative pronouns *who(m)* and *that* are often differentially used. Let us take a look at the two pairs of sentences below with particular attention on the relative

pronouns that they employ.

- (135) a. I know the man *who speaks* ten different languages.
 b. I know the man *that speaks* ten different languages.
- (136) a. I know the man *who(m)* they want to *employ*.
 b. I know the man *that* they want to *employ*.

Who is generally favored over *that* for the subjective relative pronoun, while it is the other way around for the (direct) objective relative pronoun. Thus the first sentence is usually favored over the second in (135) above, while it is the other way around in (136). We may argue that this is because subject territory is such that the noun phrase that may occur in this territory is optimally human while (direct) object territory is such that the noun phrase that may occur in this territory is optimally non-human. Incidentally, this argument is highly plausible given the fact that noun phrases in subject position, more often than not, refer to humans, which is not the case with those in (direct) object position.

We will now turn our attention to the fact that a linguistic category is assigned an inherent territorial space of a more or less fixed size such that this space tends to be kept constant. Now then let us consider some implications of this contention by comparing the verb phrases in each pair of sentences below with specific reference to the variable semantic content of the main verb.

- (137) a. Has he *arrived*?
 b. Has he *arrived on time*?
- (138) a. He *kept the car*.
 b. He *kept the car in the garage*.
- (139) a. He *found the child*.
 b. He *found the child very charming*.
- (140) a. When did he *go*?
 b. When did he *go fishing*?
- (141) a. I *told him*.
 b. I *told him to be quiet*.
- (142) a. I *know him*.
 b. I *know him to be a very polite man*.

Since the semantic territorial space inherently assigned to the category *verb*

phrase is presumably invariant across sentences, the main verb should be heavier of semantic content in the first member of each pair above than in the second. For the main verb shares this fixed semantic space for the verb phrase with fewer elements in the first member than in the second. Indeed, it turns out that the main verb does have heavier semantic content in the first member of each sentence pair above than in the second.

It goes without saying that the territorial space of a linguistic category is often kept constant in non-semantic ways as well. Let us take a look at the (quasi-)acronyms given below, as opposed to the long forms from which they are derived..

- (143) a. DUI (← driving under the influence)
 b. MPG (← miles per gallon)
 c. ENT (← ear, nose, and throat)
 d. RN (← registered nurse)
 e. CT (← computerized tomography)
 f. CAD (← computer-assisted design)
 g. HOV (← high-occupancy vehicle)
 h. SOB (← son of a bitch)
 i. NP (← noun phrase)
 j. TV (← television)
 k. TB (← tuberculosis)
 l. H-bomb (← hydrogen bomb)
 m. T-storm (← thunderstorm)

We arguably use uppercase letters for the (quasi-)acronyms here in order to compensate for the orthographic territorial space that the original long forms lose in the acronymic abbreviation process involved here. In other words, the capital letters used for the (quasi-)acronyms here may help recover or otherwise retain much of the orthographic territorial space of the original long forms that would otherwise be lost.

Note that a similar tendency to maintain “territorial integrity” is observable on the phonological plane as well, as can be seen from a consideration of data such as the following.

- (144) a. demonstration
 b. *demo*

- (145) a. *recapitulate*
 b. *recap*
- (146) a. *rehabilitation*
 b. *rehab*
- (147) a. *high fidelity*
 b. *hi fi*

In each pair here, the nucleus of the second syllable is weaker for the longer form than for the shorter form. We may argue that the shorter form uses the stronger vocalic nucleus for the second syllable to help make up for the phonological space that would otherwise be completely lost in the clipping process involved here.

The genitive pronominal suffix *-s* is arguably often used to help maintain the “territorial integrity” of a noun phrase, as can be seen from a comparison of the two sentences comprising each pair below.

- (148) a. This house is *our house*.
 b. This house is *ours*.
- (149) a. This car is *their car*.
 b. This car is *theirs*.
- (150) a. Is that computer *your computer*?
 b. Is that computer *yours*?

The genitive pronominal suffix *-s* in the second member of each pair here arguably serves to compensate for the now deleted head noun of the original noun phrase for which the possessive pronoun stands. Parenthetically, we can see here that the tendency to maintain the “territorial integrity” of a linguistic element manifests itself on the grammatical plane as well.

Note incidentally that the word-final /n/ in the pronoun *mine*, as in “This car is *mine*,” is like the genitive pronominal suffix *-s* that we have just discussed. This /n/ also serves as a grammatical slot-filler of sorts for the underlying head noun for which it stands, thereby compensating for the territorial space that is lost when this head noun gets deleted.

The plural suffix *-s* serves a similar function in that it also compensates for lost linguistic space, as can be seen from a consideration of the following data.

- (151) a. one house + one house \Rightarrow two houses
 b. one book + one book + one book \Rightarrow three books
 c. one star + one star + one star + one star \Rightarrow four stars

From the plural formation processes shown in (151) above, we can see that the plural suffix *-s* fills in for one or more tokens of a noun over and above the one to which it is affixed. In other words, this suffix serves to take up the territorial space originally occupied by one or more tokens of the noun in question that get suppressed (in the process of plural formation).

The definite article *the* is also often used as a device for helping maintain the “territorial integrity” of a noun phrase. As can be seen from examples such as the following, the definite article here often appears to stand for *people*.

- (152) a. needy *people* \Rightarrow *the* needy
 b. rich *people* \Rightarrow *the* rich
 c. upwardly mobile *people* \Rightarrow *the* upwardly mobile

In each case here, the noun phrase on the righthand side of the arrow may be thought of as having been derived from the noun phrase on the lefthand side of the same arrow. If this is indeed the case, which is highly likely, the definite article *the* here apparently helps retain the territorial space that would otherwise be lost when *people* gets deleted in the derivational process involved here.

The particle *up* is sometimes used as a slot filler for helping maintain the “territorial integrity” of a verb phrase, as can be seen from the following examples.

- (153) a. Don't forget to *buckle your seatbelt*. \Rightarrow Don't forget to *buckle up*.
 b. *Open the door*. \Rightarrow *Open up*.
 c. The police *opened fire* at once. \Rightarrow The police *opened up* at once.

In each of the derivations here the particle *up* clearly fills in for the deleted (direct) object. It is thus apparently the case that the particle *up* helps maintain the “territorial integrity” of the original verb phrase in each of the derivations shown in (153).

6. Avoidance Phenomena

Interestingly, the adage that two suns cannot shine in one sphere appears to be applicable to human language also. Several of my earlier papers have in fact dealt in some detail with this theme under the general heading of the constraint on proximate repetition. (cf. Park 1977a, 1977b, 1980, 1982, 1983, and 1984) The main thrust of this constraint is that identical or nearly identical linguistic elements may not freely occur in the immediate sphere of influence of each other, that is, right next to each other.

Indeed, it appears to be the case that two identical linguistic elements are rarely allowed to occur in the immediate sphere of influence of each other. Let us lead off our discussion here with an examination of the following data.

- (154) a. *I cannot *not* like him.
 b. *I can *disdislike* him.
 c. I cannot *dislike* him.
 d. I cannot *but* like him.
 e. I cannot *help* liking him.

The sentences of (154) are supposed to be paraphrases each of the other and thus have one and the same basic meaning. The first two sentences of (154) are abnormal sentences whereas the last three are normal sentences. (154a) is not grammatical and thus not acceptable because two tokens of the negative word *not* occur in the immediate sphere of influence of each other. (154b) is also ungrammatical and thus unacceptable because two tokens of the negative prefix *dis-* occur in the immediate sphere of influence of each other.

Thus (154a) and (154b) are normally avoided even though they both seem to make perfect sense. On the other hand, the last three sentences of (154) are perfectly grammatical and acceptable because they are so structured as to keep identical negative elements from clashing in the immediate sphere of influence of each other. Note in this connection that underlyingly *but* in (154d) and *help* in (154e) are bona fide negative elements, on a par with *not* and *dis-*.

The following data may be accounted for along essentially identical lines.

- (155) a. *Money is *not not* necessary.
 b. *Money is *unnecessary*.
 c. Money is *not unnecessary*.

All the sentences of (155) are supposed to mean essentially the same thing. The first two sentences of (155) are abnormal sentences whereas the last one is a normal sentence. (155a) is ungrammatical and unacceptable because *not* is proximately repeated. (155b) is ungrammatical and unacceptable because *un-* is proximately repeated. Thus (155a) and (155b) are normally avoided even though they apparently make perfect sense. (155c), on the other hand, is perfectly grammatical and acceptable because it does not involve a comparable clash of identical (negative) elements.

Let us now consider the following set of (near paraphrase) sentences in connection with our contention that two suns may not normally shine in one and the same sphere of influence.

- (156) a. ?His house will *be being remodeled* soon.
 b. His house will *be getting remodeled* soon.
 c. They will *be remodeling* his house soon.

Note that the first sentence here is awkward on account of the two tokens of *be* clashing in one and the same sphere of influence. We may resolve this problem by using *get* in place of the second token of *be*, as in (156b), or by turning the whole problematic (156a) into its active version, as in (156c).

We may cite the following additional data in support of our contention that two suns may not normally shine in one and the same sphere of influence.

- (157) a. That they *are* trained here is not surprising at all.
 b. Their *being* trained here is not surprising at all.
 (158) a. That they *are being* trained here is not surprising at all.
 b. *Their *being being* trained here is not surprising at all.
 c. Their *being* trained here is not surprising at all.

Since we may derive (157b) from (157a), we should expect to derive (158b) from (158a). As it turns out, however, (158b) is ungrammatical and unacceptable because it contains two tokens of *being* colliding in each other's immediate sphere of influence. We may cope with this problem by

deleting one of the two tokens of *being*, thereby deriving a sentence like (158c).

It may be noted in passing here that (158c) is structurally two-ways ambiguous because it is a transform of not just (158a) but also of (157a). Thus the principle that two suns may not shine in one sphere apparently helps shed light on this rather interesting case of syntactic neutralization.

The data below may also be cited in support of our argument that two suns may not normally shine in one sphere of influence.

- (159) a. The young man *who teaches* English here studied at Harvard.
 b. The young man *teaching English* here studied at Harvard.
 (160) a. The young man *who is teaching* English here studied at Harvard.
 b. *The young man *being teaching* English here studied at Harvard.
 c. The young man *teaching* English here studied at Harvard.

Since we may derive (159b) from (159a), we should expect to also derive (160b) from (160a). However, (160b) turns out to be ungrammatical and unacceptable because it contains two tokens of *-ing* clashing in each other's immediate sphere of influence. Thus we should block a sentence like (160b) from being generated. We should derive in its place a sentence like (160c) by deleting *being* from (160b), thereby doing away with one of the two problematic tokens of *-ing*.

Incidentally, it should be noted here that (160c) is structurally two-ways ambiguous in that it is a transform of either (159a) or (160a) just as (158c) is a transform of either (157a) or (158a). It may be observed here once again that our sphere-of-influence concept makes available a highly principled account as to why and how we get this kind of syntactic neutralization.

The following data may also be accounted for along similar lines.

- (161) a. That he *works* here is surprising to me.
 b. His *working* here is surprising to me.
 (162) a. That he *keeps working* here is surprising to me.
 b. ?His *keeping working* here is surprising to me.
 c. His *continuing to work* here is surprising to me.

Since we may derive (161b) from (161a), we should also be able to derive (162b) from (162a). However, (162b) turns out to be awkward on account

of a collision between two tokens of *-ing* in one and the same sphere of influence. Thus we should block (162b) from being generated, replacing this problematic output with something like (162c).

The principle that two suns may not normally shine in one sphere can also help explain why nominal *to*-infinitive complements are not normally allowed after the preposition *to*. Let us consider the following sets of sentences.

- (163) a. We are looking forward *to* the concert.
 b. We are looking forward *to going* to the concert.
 c. *We are looking forward *to to* go to the concert.
- (164) a. He was accustomed *to* two meals a day.
 b. He was accustomed *to having* two meals a day.
 c. *He was accustomed *to to* have two meals a day.
- (165) a. She is used *to* salty food.
 b. She is used *to eating* salty food.
 c. *She is used *to to* eat salty food.
- (166) a. He objected *to* the use of English at home.
 b. He objected *to using* English at home.
 c. *He objected *to to* use English at home.

We can see here that the preposition *to* may take nominal complements other than those taking the form of the *to*-infinitive. Thus in each set of sentences above the first two sentences are grammatical and acceptable whereas the last one is not. Note that the last sentence in each set here is ungrammatical and unacceptable because it contains two tokens of *to* colliding in one and the same sphere of influence.

Given what we have said in the immediately preceding paragraph, we can now easily explain why the third sentence in (167) below is ungrammatical and unacceptable while the first two are not.

- (167) a. I prefer fried eggs *to* boiled eggs.
 b. I prefer frying eggs *to boiling* eggs.
 c. *I prefer to fry eggs *to to* boil eggs.

The principle that two suns may not normally shine in one sphere also sheds light on data of the following sort.

- (168) a. John is *more eager* to go than I am.
 b. *John is *eagerer* to go than I am.
- (169) a. John is the *most honest* boy in the neighborhood.
 b. *John is the *honestest* boy in the neighborhood.

The comparative suffix *-er* on *eager* in (168b) results in a head-on clash in one and the same sphere between two tokens of *-er*, i.e. the suffix *-er* and the *eager*-final *-er*. This clash renders the sentence ungrammatical and unacceptable. The superlative suffix *-est* on *honest* in (169b) leads to a head-on collision in one and the same sphere between two tokens of *-est*, i.e. the suffix *-est* and the *honest*-final *-est*, which renders the sentence ungrammatical and unacceptable.

It may be observed at this point that the present participle of the verb *lightning* is not **lightninging* but *lightning*. Thus we say "It was *lightning* when I woke up in the middle of the night" instead of "*It was *lightninging* when I woke up in the middle of the night." It goes without saying that the form **lightninging* is avoided apparently because it contains two tokens of *-ing* clashing head on in one and the same sphere of influence.

The data below comprises examples of derivational prefixation supportive of our contention that two suns may not normally shine in one sphere of influence.

- (170) a. trans- + Siberian \Rightarrow trans-Siberian
 b. trans- + Sahara \Rightarrow trans-Sahara
- (171) a. trans- + spire \Rightarrow transpire
 b. trans- + scribe \Rightarrow transcribe

The prefix *trans-* is attached far more tightly to the stem in (171) than in (170). This difference is quite clearly indicated in orthography by the presence of the hyphen in the words of (170), as opposed to its absence from the words of (171). It is also indicated semantically by the fact that the etymological meaning "across" of the prefix *trans-* is quite clearly discernible in (170) while it is only vaguely discernible in (171).

The two tokens of /s/ here, the prefix-final /s/ and the stem-initial /s/, are thus far more immediately in each other's sphere of influence in (171) than in (170). As a result, the pressure on one of the two tokens of /s/ to get deleted is far greater in (171) than in (170), which is why we end up

with only one token of /s/ in (171), as opposed to two tokens thereof in (170).

The degree of proximity between two tokens of one and the same linguistic element is a factor of crucial importance in our account for the following data also.

- (172) a. *There are* lots of dollar bills in his wallet.
 b. **There're* lots of dollar bills in his wallet.
- (173) a. *Here are* some interesting examples.
 b. **Here're* some interesting examples.
- (174) a. *Where are* your friends?
 b. **Where're* your friends?

Note that the two tokens of *-re* are far more proximately repeated in the second member of each pair here than in the first member of the same pair. Thus the second member is in far more serious violation of the principle that two suns may not normally shine in one and the same sphere of influence. This is arguably why the second member of each pair is ungrammatical and unacceptable while the first member of the same pair is not.

The second member of either sentence pair below is ungrammatical and unacceptable for precisely the same reason.

- (175) a. *This is* my fault.
 b. **This's* my fault.
- (176) a. *His is* the best house in this neighborhood.
 b. **His's* the best house in this neighborhood.

It is worth noting in this connection that the negative contraction *-n't* is suffixed straightforwardly to all auxiliary verbs or operators with the sole exception of *can*, as can be seen quite clearly from the data below.

- (177) a. *is + -n't* ⇒ *isn't*
 b. *was + -n't* ⇒ *wasn't*
- (178) a. *are + -n't* ⇒ *aren't*
 b. *were + -n't* ⇒ *weren't*
- (179) a. *do + -n't* ⇒ *don't*
 b. *did + -n't* ⇒ *didn't*
- (180) a. *have + -n't* ⇒ *haven't*
 b. *had + -n't* ⇒ *hadn't*

- (181) a. can + -n't \Rightarrow can't/*cann't
 b. could + -n't \Rightarrow couldn't

On the analogy of all the other examples above, we should expect the derivative form in (181a) to be *cann't with the geminate letter cluster *nn*. This form is "ungrammatical" and unacceptable, however, so that it should be blocked from generation. For the proximate repetition represented by the geminate letter cluster *nn* in *cann't is in serious violation of the principle that two suns may not normally shine in one and the same sphere.

It appears to be in order here to point out that all known instances of haplology and dissimilation may be explained as a consequence of the principle that two suns may not normally shine in one sphere. Let us take, for example, the derivation of *lunch* from the now obsolete *nuncheon*. In the process of this derivation, we replace the word-initial /n/ with /l/ and delete the the word-final /n/, so as to keep the three tokens of /n/ from clashing in one and the same sphere of influence. Note that both the haplology and dissimilation involved here serve to make the resultant form of the word better comply with the principle that two (or more) suns may not normally shine in one sphere.

It is interesting to note in this connection that general expressions of present reference are ordinarily suppressed. Note here that all acts of utterance are grounded in the general temporal matrix of the present. Thus the use of general expressions of present-reference in the general temporal matrix of the present would kind of violate the principle that two suns may not shine in one sphere. Thus, when one introduces his wife, (182a) below would be appropriate while (182b) would not be.

- (182) a. This is *my wife*.
 b. This is my *present wife*.

Needless to say, (182b) would be perfectly okay in the highly unlikely event that the speaker's intention is to contrast his present wife with his former or future wife. In contrast, the adjectives *former* and *future* are appropriate (and, in fact, obligatory) in the following sentences, where the use of either qualifier does not result in a similar clash of two suns shining in one and the same linguistic sphere.

- (183) a. This is my *former wife*.
 b. This is my *future wife*.

Given our discussion here, we can also explain in a principled way why the temporal adverbial *now* is normally out of place in sentences such as the following, except in a contrastive context.

- (184) a. We live in Seoul *now*.
 b. It is raining *now*.

Incidentally, *now* may sometimes be used non-contrastively in sentences like (184) with the proviso that it be pronounced in a rather suppressed manner. The suppressed pronunciation employed here is evidently no coincidence; it is apparently designed to reduce to a minimum the awkward problem that may be caused by two suns shining in one sphere.

The reason that the locative adverbial *here* is normally out of context in sentences such as the following can also be accounted for in exactly the same way.

- (185) It's raining *here*.

Since an utterance like (185) is grounded in the general locative context of *here*, the use of the expression *here* would result in a violation of the principle that two suns may not shine in one and the same sphere. Thus we normally leave the expression *here* out of sentences like (185).

It is interesting that *here* may be sometimes retained in sentences like (185) on condition that it be pronounced very faintly, that is, pronounced in a rather suppressed manner. Once again, this is evidently intended to reduce to a minimum the awkwardness that may arise from two suns shining in one sphere. Needless to say, *here* would be perfectly normal in (185) if and when *here* is contrasted with somewhere else.

Our discussion also throws light on why prepositional complements are often deleted in sentences such as the following.

- (186) a. Do not play *on, in, or around*.
 b. Dispose *of* properly.

(186a) is a warning often encountered on streetside garbage containers while (186b) is a direction sometimes found on soda cans. Note that direc-

tions such as those given in (186) are affixed to the referents of the deleted prepositional complements under discussion here. Thus should the deleted complements be used, there would result a clash between two suns shining in one and the same sphere. That is, we would be faced with a clash between the prepositional complements and their actual referents in each other's immediate sphere of influence. This is evidently why the prepositional complements normally get deleted here.

A similar account is applicable to the deletion of verbal objects in sentences such as the following.

- (187) a. *Twist* off.
 b. *Keep* out of reach of children.

(187a) is a direction often found on beer bottle caps while (187b) is a direction often used on chemical-spray cans. Should the object noun phrases for *Twist* and *Keep* be used here, it would lead to a clash between two suns shining in one sphere, that is, between the object noun phrases and their actual referents in each other's immediate sphere of influence.

It may be noted at this point that we usually do not make specific mention in speech or writing of what is universal or normal in the real world. This is because its mention here would clash with its referent in each other's immediate sphere of influence. This should explain why the first sentence in each pair below is normally odd while the second sentence in the same pair is perfectly natural.

- (188) a. **A handed man* came to help us.
 b. *A left-handed man* came to help us.
 (189) a. ?He teaches at *the school for the sighted*.
 b. He teaches at *the school for the blind*.
 (190) a. ?The police have just arrested *a female prostitute*.
 b. The police have just arrested *a prostitute*.

Our discussion here should also help explain why a Chinese in Taiwan would normally refer to the Chinese mainland as just *the mainland*, that is, without using the specific nationality adjective *Chinese*. Needless to say, the use of *Chinese* here would result in a collision between two suns shining in one and the same sphere. Thus this Chinese in Taiwan would normally say something like (191a) below, rather than (191b), when he or she has plans

to visit the Chinese mainland.

- (191) a. I'm going to *the mainland*.
- b. I'm going to *the Chinese mainland*.

By the same token, Americans in the Hawaiian Islands would refer to the US mainland as just *the mainland*. Thus they would say something like (192a) below, rather than (192b), concerning their plans to go to the US mainland.

- (192) a. We're planing on going to *the mainland*.
- b. We're planning on going to *the US mainland*.

Needless to say, *Chinese* and *US* would be perfectly justified in (191b) and (192b) respectively if these nationality adjectives were used contrastively.

It goes without saying that we may similarly explain why Koreans, for example, normally refer to their president as just *(the) president* without using the nationality adjective *Korean*. It is worth noting at this point that, of the two differing references to the current US administration given in (193) below, Americans would normally use the first one rather than the second one. That is, unless the current administration is contrasted with a past or future administration.

- (193) a. the Administration
- b. the Clinton Administration

The use of *Clinton* here would lead to a kind of clash between two suns shining in one sphere, that is, a clash between the mention of the name *Clinton* and its actual referent, i.e. the current occupant of the White House. In contrast, a reference to a past or future administration must include the name of the president in question, as can be seen from the following expressions.

- (194) a. the Kennedy Administration
- b. the Nixon Administration
- c. a Dole Administration
- d. a Gore Administration

Our current discussion throws light on the interesting fact that exophoric pronouns such as *I*, *you*, and *we* do not have antecedents. We may argue

that antecedents for exophoric pronouns are already given contextually with the result that specific reference thereto would violate the principle that two suns may not shine in one and the same linguistic sphere.

Our principle that two suns may not shine in one and the same linguistic sphere can help explain why the indirect object is optional in the second member of each sentence pair below (while it is not in the first member thereof).

- (195) a. *He* bought *me* a radio.
 b. *He* bought (*himself*) a radio.
 (196) a. *I* got *him* a good watch.
 b. *I* got (*myself*) a good watch.

Note that the subject and the indirect object refer to two different persons in the first sentence in each pair above while they refer to one and the same person in the second. Thus two suns kind of clash in one and the same sphere in the second sentence in each pair above, but not in the first. We often delete the indirect object in the second sentence in either pair above to make way for the “other” sun shining in the same sphere of influence. It is worth pointing out here that the second member of either pair above is usually more normal without the parenthesized indirect object than with it. The parenthesized indirect objects would, of course, be perfectly natural when they are used contrastively, however.

The (near) obligatory deletion of the “direct” object noun phrase in the second member of each sentence pair below may be accounted for along essentially the same lines.

- (197) a. *I* got *him* up.
 b. *I* got (?*myself*) up.
 (198) a. *I* woke *her* up.
 b. *I* woke (?*myself*) up.
 (199) a. *They* kept *us* from leaving the house.
 b. *They* kept (?*themselves*) from leaving the house.
 (200) a. *I* put *him* up at the new inn.
 b. *I* put (?*myself*) up at the new inn.

If not deleted, the parenthesized “direct” object noun phrase in the second member of each sentence pair here would be in competition with the subject

in the same sphere of influence, that is, in referring to one and the same person. We usually circumvent this problem by leaving the direct object slot vacant.

Note incidentally that the retention of the "direct" object in (197)~(200) is apparently less tolerable than that of the indirect object in (195) and (196). This may be because underlyingly the direct object is tied more proximately to the subject than is the indirect object.

References

- Bolinger, D. (1977) *Meaning and Form*, Longman, London.
- Bronstein, A. J. (1960) *The Pronunciation of American English*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N. J.
- Chomsky, Noam and Morris Halle (1968) *The Sound Pattern of English*, Harper and Row, New York.
- Fillmore, C. J. (1968) 'The Case for Case,' *Universals in Linguistic Theory*, eds, E. Bach and R. T. Harms, 1-90, Holt, Reinhart and Winston, New York.
- Fowler, H. W. (1965) *A Dictionary of Modern English Usage*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Gimson, A. C. (1980) *An Introduction to the Pronunciation of English*, 3rd Edition, Edward Arnold, London.
- Gleason, Henry A., Jr. (1965) *Linguistics and English Grammar*, Holt, Reinhart and Winston, New York.
- Jespersen, Otto (1909~1949) *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles, Parts I-VII*, Munksgaard, Copenhagen.
- Kreidler, Charles W. (1989) *The Pronunciation of English*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
- Park, Nahm-Sheik (1977a) 'Variables in Sentential Readability with Special Reference to Korean Learners of EFL/ESL,' Georgetown University.
- _____ (1977b) 'Structural Density as a Comprehensibility Variable,' *Language Research* 13.2, 95-103, Seoul National University, Seoul.
- _____ (1978) 'Contiguity as a Comprehensibility Variable,' *Language* 2.2, 65-74, The Linguistic Society of Korea.
- _____ (1980) 'The Distance Variable in Linguistic Description with Special Reference to English,' *Languages and Linguistics* 6, 9-32, Hankuk

University of Foreign Studies, Seoul.

- _____ (1981) 'Distance and Length in Language with Special Reference to English,' an unpublished paper read at a seminar co-sponsored by the East-West Center and the University of Hawaii Department of Linguistics.
- _____ (1982) 'Constraint on Proximate Repetition with Special Reference to English,' *Language Research* 18.1, 217-231, Seoul National University, Seoul.
- _____ (1983) 'Proximity and Reduction,' *Language Research* 19.1, 75-102, Seoul National University, Seoul.
- _____ (1984) 'The Constraint on Proximate Repetition and Phonological Explanation in English,' *Language Research* 20.4, 367-415, Seoul National University, Seoul.
- _____ (1985) 'Natural Word Order in English,' *English Studies* 9, 11-32, Seoul National University, Seoul.
- _____ (1989) 'Weight as a Linguistic Variable with Reference to English,' *Language Research* 25.4, 711-894, Seoul National University, Seoul.
- _____ (1992) 'The Law of Conservation and Linguistic Explanation,' *Language Research* 28.2, 267-334, Seoul National University, Seoul.
- _____ (1995) 'Some Apparent Irregularities in English,' *Language Research* 32.2, 213-250, Seoul National University, Seoul.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*, Longman Group, London.

ABSTRACT

The Sphere of Influence and Linguistic Explanation with Reference to English

Nahm-Sheik Park

The main point of this paper is that there is a sphere of influence in human language such that it is of crucial importance to the explanation of

numerous otherwise baffling linguistic phenomena. The present paper is designed to specifically demonstrate that this sphere of influence is indeed operative in contemporary English. It is also designed, albeit secondarily, to help validate (and build upon) many of the points of relevance that I have already discussed in considerable depth and detail in a number of my earlier publications, especially Park (1977a, 1977b, 1978, 1979, 1980, 1983, and 1985).

A sphere of influence may be defined in terms of two linguistic elements, i.e. an influencer and its influencee. It may be said that an influencer has such and such an influencee in its sphere of influence. For example, a transitive verb may be said to have such and such an object noun phrase in its sphere of influence. For another example, a preposition may be said to have such and such a complement in its sphere of influence. For still another example, old (or given) information may be said to have the sentence-initial position of the subject in its sphere of influence.

Other things being equal, the power of an influencer in relation to its influencee may be said to be in direct proportion to the proximity between the two. In other words, the general tendency here is: the more proximate an influencer to its influencee, the more powerful the influence of the former on the latter.

It is interesting that this linguistic sphere of influence is not much different in nature from such spheres of influence as may be encountered in the real world, be they physical, psychological, social, or otherwise. It may also be noted that this sphere of influence is an apparent linguistic universal in that it appears to be applicable to all languages, not just to English on which the current paper happens to focus.

It may be in order at this point to observe that a linguistic sphere of influence is generally directional in that an influencer is usually either antecedent, or is otherwise superordinate to, its influencee. What this means is that the influencer normally comes before, or occurs in a higher-level structure than, its influencee. If the sphere of influence in question operates counter-directionally, that is, if the said tendency of directionality is not complied with, an influencer may suffer a loss of power vis-a-vis its influencee.

In a sphere of influence, the influence exercised by the influencer on its influencee may be either positive or negative. On the positive side, the influ-

ence may take the form of government, concord, attraction, absorption, assimilation or the like. On the negative side, it may manifest itself in the form of rejection such as dissimilation.

서울특별시 관악구 신림동 산 56-1
서울대학교 인문대학 영어영문학과
151-742