syntactic way and preserving the idea that the pronominalized NP may contain a relative clause). Note also that if we do not include the relative under this account we have to somehow prevent sentences like this:

*The man, who lives next door said that he, who lives next door would mow my lawn during vacation.

Other examples of reductio ad infinitum:

I gave the book that he wanted to the man who asked for it.
The girl who was asking for him finally found the man she wanted.

One conclusion might be that there is no such thing as pronominalization except as a name for a semantic relation between independently chosen NPs and pronouns (from the base), a relation which must then be determined (at least) on the basis of surface structure relations. This conclusion must obviously stand or fall together with other such putatively surface-structurally determined semantic relations. This would destroy the relevance of the Oscar + realizing sentence\(^2\) for the question of whether or not there is a cycle, but would leave possibly a harder question to answer; namely, how would the semantic theory account for the interpretations of that sentence?

---

**AN ARGUMENT AGAINST PRONOMINALIZATION**

*Joan Bresnan,
Massachusetts Institute of Technology*

This argument presupposes a cyclic rule of There-Insertion, a transformation with a regrettable derived structure. Nevertheless, it is implausible that there is present in deep structure, and there are arguments that There-Insertion is cyclic. For example, consider the sentences (due to Haj Ross):

There was believed to have been a tiger shot.
There was a tiger believed to have been shot.

and the awkward but apparently grammatical

There's a man from Berkeley believed to be proving there to be no real numbers.

There-Insertion, as usually formulated, precedes Adverb-Preposing, because the latter destroys its environment; and Adverb-Preposing precedes Pronominalization, for otherwise one can't get:

If Tom, can go, he, will go.

Finally, it is useful to note that There-Insertion occurs before

---

any nondefinite subject NP followed by *be*, regardless of stress-factors or semantic variation:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{There are some smart students there.} \\
\text{There are some smart students there.}
\end{align*}
\]

Now consider the sentence:

Some students believe that they are running the show.

If there is a rule of Pronominalization applying to such sentences, it must operate on a deep structure something like the following:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{S} \\
\text{NP} \quad \text{VP} \\
\text{V} \quad \text{NP} \quad \text{NP} \\
\text{Aux} \quad \text{Tns} \quad \text{Prog} \quad \text{V} \quad \text{NP} \\
\text{Det} \quad \text{N}
\end{align*}
\]

There-Insertion may apply on the embedded S (cf. *He said that there were some students running the show*). On the next cycle Pronominalization will apply to the coreferential *some students*, yielding

*Some students believe that there are they running the show.*

If the pronoun *they* had already been in deep structure, There-Insertion could not have applied:

*There are they in the room.*

This seems to be a clear indication that *they* should appear in deep structure.