

(5), for example: (i) "I had a book stolen from my car when I stupidly left the window open," that is, "someone stole a book from my car"; (ii) "I had a book stolen from his library by a professional thief who I hired to do the job," that is, "I had someone steal a book"; (iii) "I almost had a book stolen, but they caught me leaving the library with it," that is, "I had almost succeeded in stealing a book." In bringing to consciousness the triple ambiguity of (5) in this way, we present no new information to the hearer and teach him nothing new about his language but simply arrange matters in such a way that his linguistic intuition, previously obscured, becomes evident to him.

As a final illustration, consider the sentences

(6) I persuaded John to leave

(7) I expected John to leave

The first impression of the hearer may be that these sentences receive the same structural analysis. Even fairly careful thought may fail to show him that his internalized grammar assigns very different syntactic descriptions to these sentences. In fact, so far as I have been able to discover, **no English grammar has pointed out the fundamental distinction between these two constructions (in particular, my own sketches of English grammar in Chomsky, 1955, 1962a, failed to note this).** However, it is clear that the sentences (6) and (7) are not parallel in structure. The difference can be brought out by consideration of the sentences

(8) (i) I persuaded a specialist to examine John

(ii) I persuaded John to be examined by a specialist

(9) (i) I expected a specialist to examine John

(ii) I expected John to be examined by a specialist

The sentences (9i) and (9ii) are "cognitively synonymous": one is true if and only if the other is true. But no variety of even weak paraphrase holds between (8i) and (8ii). Thus (8i) can be true or false quite independently of the truth or falsity of (8ii). Whatever difference of connotation or "topic" or emphasis one may find between (9i) and (9ii) is just the difference that exists be-

tween the active sentence "a specialist will examine John" and its passive counterpart "John will be examined by a specialist." This is not at all the case with respect to (8), however. In fact, the underlying deep structure for (6) and (8ii) must show that "John" is the Direct-Object of the Verb Phrase as well as the grammatical Subject of the embedded sentence. Furthermore, in (8ii) "John" is the logical Direct-Object of the embedded sentence, whereas in (8i) the phrase "a specialist" is the Direct-Object of the Verb Phrase and the logical Subject of the embedded sentence. In (7), (9i), and (9ii), however, the Noun Phrases "John," "a specialist," and "John," respectively, have no grammatical functions other than those that are internal to the embedded sentence; in particular, "John" is the logical Direct-Object and "a specialist" the logical Subject in the embedded sentences of (9). Thus the underlying deep structures for (8i), (8ii), (9i), and (9ii) are, respectively, the following:¹³

- (10) (i) Noun Phrase — Verb — Noun Phrase — Sentence
(I — persuaded — a specialist — a specialist will examine John)
- (ii) Noun Phrase — Verb — Noun Phrase — Sentence
(I — persuaded — John — a specialist will examine John)
- (11) (i) Noun Phrase — Verb — Sentence
(I — expected — a specialist will examine John)
- (ii) Noun Phrase — Verb — Sentence
(I — expected — a specialist will examine John)

In the case of (10ii) and (11ii), the passive transformation will apply to the embedded sentence, and in all four cases other operations will give the final surface forms of (8) and (9). The important point in the present connection is that (8i) differs from (8ii) in underlying structure, although (9i) and (9ii) are essentially the same in underlying structure. This accounts for the difference in meaning. Notice, in support of this difference in analysis, that we can have "I persuaded John that (of the fact that) Sentence," but not "I expected John that (of the fact that) Sentence."