it would be odd for him to wear this hat.

This hat would be odd for him to wear.

it would be odd for him to say that he likes this hat.

This hat would be odd for him to say that he likes.

BUT

it is odd that he bought this hat.

*This hat is odd that he bought.

NB *a likely book for him to want to read

but I would say a book which is likely for him to want to read

Early on it is
NB - I Neg in that clause - it's been deleted of the {farthest} {greatest distance} {which} ever walked {2 miles} {not very far} from NY & LA 2 miles farther than you have.

the {latest} {earliest} {that} {which} could come would be {on} Friday {at} 2 o'clock 2 hrs earlier than he can.

the soonest {that} I could come would be by Friday. the most often {that} {which} can come is {once every four hours} very seldom still far less often than he can come.

the {highest} {tallest} {widest} {broadest} {deepest} {thickest} {that} I ever get's is {2 ft} than that the highest that I've ever swum.

the most expensive {that} I have ever seen them is {2 ft} still fairly cheap.

the longest {that} I have ever forced them to wait is {2 hrs} not very long.
the hottest it ever gets is { 20 ° below zero } { 20 mph } not very hot
{ 2 ° warmer than room temperature } so fast that I was really scared

the fastest I have ever driven was { 20 mph } at a speed which defies description

? the oldest I have seen them get is 20 years
I never walked farther than 2 miles.

She never danced more prettily,
I never desired you more,
I never ran faster,
I never felt more lonely.

\{ \text{at 4 o'clock last Christmas} \}
\{ \text{when we lived in Tparama} \}
\{ \text{at your house if I was drunk} \}

I never ran faster than I ran at the Yale meet.

I ran my fastest (ever) at the Yale meet.

Problem: where can I get So's like this, but w/Neg?

He didn't run his fastest (ever) at the Yale meet.
But this derivation is clearly preposterous in cases like

He is taller than 2 ft

(obviously not from He is taller than he was when he was 2 ft tall)

Also seems hopeless in cases like

I have never seen them more expensive than 2 ft
Another proof that annoyed at isn't a passive

I was amused at myself

* I was seen by myself

NB he has

But NB his nomination by himself

so these can't come from passive nominalization.

I was annoyed at him for interrupting me

was excessive

? my annoyance at him seems to indicate that for Bung in part of object distance is saved
Comparatives

1. Notice that Neg must have been deleted in this clause — it's not good enough to say that Neg - attraction can work after than because of

   a. He has a bigger house than we can afford
   b. He goes out with uglier girls than I can stand looking at.
   c. We marched farther than he got until Friday.
      NB & * he got {10 miles into the park} until Friday there etc.

   NB — all these examples also work w/ as as S — this indicates that there should be a Neg deleted in the as-clause.

2. So howbout saying that Comparative come from this:

   Harry is taller than Joe... 

   d. Harry is tall to a degree to which Joe is not (tall)

   [NB - we have to have a rule optionally deleting this]
   [anyway, because d. is grammatical w/ or w/o tall.]
3. How about the by phrase? NB = possibility of by-phrase in Neg sentences with [that]

I'm not that rich by $10
I'm not that ugly (by a long shot?)
I'm not tall by 10 cm

NB These 5's are not that [that *] I'm not tall by 10 cm

NB I'm not as rich as Tom by $10

He's taller than Pete by 5 in. <=
He is tall to a degree to which Pete is not (tall) by 5 in.

4. *** PROBLEM ***

How can I get

I married an uglier girl than Tom (did) <=
I married a girl who was ugly to a degree to which the girl that Tom married was not (ugly)
NB – * I know a taller girl than Tom does by 0 ft.

**Rules**

0. **Adj Deletion** (OPT)

1. **-er formation** (OPT)

   to a degree to which \(x \text{ Neg } Y\)

   \[2 \text{ } 3 \text{ } 4 \implies\]

   er than

   \[2 \text{ } \varnothing \text{ } 4\]

   **Cond:** \(2 \neq W + \text{Neg } + Z\)

II. **Aux be Deletion** (OPT)

Unordered wrt the above:

A. **Wh-PRO be Deletion** (OPT)

B. **N Adj formulation** (OPT sometimes OBL 16)

C. **One Pronominalization** (OPT)

D. **(the)one Wh-PRO Deletion** (OPT)

Prove that this rule is OPT.

We invited a more famous professor than we would ever expect to come.

NB
key-phrases are $D_{DEG}$ comparatives and in the presence of \textbf{That} (see p.2).

but they are also possible with \underline{Neg} as as S

he's \{not\} as tall as Pete (is) by a good deal \{about 5 inches\}

so let's derive that from as as S

as X as that $\Rightarrow$ that X

He is as tall as Harry (is) \{not\} $\Leftrightarrow$

He is tall to a degree which is the same as the degree to which Harry is tall

\downarrow\text{normal rules}

He is tall to the same degree as [the degree to which] Harry is \textit{not} $\Rightarrow$

He is tall to the same degree as he is as tall as Harry (is) $\Rightarrow$
Comparatives
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So — Tom is taller than Jerry (ii) $\Rightarrow$

Tom is tall to a $d_{\text{deg}}$ [Jerry is not tall to a $d_{\text{deg}}$ the degree is the same as the [Tom is tall to W/ some degree] $d_{\text{deg}}$] $d_{\text{deg}}$ degree

The problem lies in the relativization on this cycle

Another problem

Why I ever after same in A but not in B?

A He's as tall as he ever was
B * He's tall to the same extent as he ever was
He is not tall to the degree to which John is

He is not as tall as John is

⇒ He is less tall than I is

This suggests that as a comes from

⇒

He is tall to the degree to which John is

⇒

He is as tall as John is

NB - why is a D here?

He is tall to a degree to which John is not

⇒

And why oh why is the situation reversed when Neg in the rel cl.
Jack is

\{ 
\text{too tall to be drafted} \\
\text{taller than Bill} \\
\text{tall enough to be drafted} \\
\text{5 ft. tall} \\
\text{as tall as Mary} \\
\text{so tall that he has to duck}
\}

\text{extremely} \\
\text{very tall} \\
\text{quite}

\* the tallest of the brothers

NB these two are the worst — only an argument for getting rest from le

* Jack is tall, and Harry is that tall too.

But "Jack is tall, is Harry that tall?"
Than-clauses extrapose - further proof that they are relative clauses.

A taller man came into the room than I had ever seen here.

NB - * I know a taller man than John is

but ?? E un man taller un

MYSTERY

NB - when E deletion in the than-clause, # extraposition

* A taller man came into the room than John
The bigger the car that he tries to force me to drive is, the stronger the seat belts that I want to have installed in it are.

This rule apparently requires an ady or Adv to be moved forward—it can come from indefinitely far down.

The better (that) he thinks (that) the car is, the happier (that) I would expect him to seem to you.

The better he thinks he has treated us, the more money he will try to force us to pay.

The sooner he thinks you have gone to church, the sooner I think your mother will ask you to be in before twelve.

Problems in getting this form if then

* The better the car [*were], the more I would drive it
The more often he had written me, the longer my letters would have been.

Maybe it's only counterfactual conditionals that are excluded though:

The better he behaves tomorrow, the more I will raise his allowance.

NB - if *he behaves well tomorrow*

So if box as if a deletion of will here

NB - the zero must be a constant of this rule, for not in than-clauses (in general)

* The faster he runs than Bill walks, the more) will be pleased.

The richer he is (than my father), the faster I'm going to marry him (*than I married you)

NB The more desirous he is of you (than of her), the more you'll be bothered by him
Won't work w/ sentence adverbs

* The more probably he is sick, the more certainly you should call a Dr.

Is thisably an indication that I still coordinate structure in the case of probably and possibly

This construction is blocked in NP contexts:

The sicker you believe (*the claim) that he is, the faster you should call a Dr.

In coordinate contexts:

* The heavier you're tired and the box is

But NB The heavier the box gets the sphere seems to be, the quicker you should call me

* * * IMPORTANT EXAMPLE * * *
The Xer Y, the Zer W

This last example means that adjectives can be
typicalized (maybe only in context of -er)

cf. also

The heaviest that it ever seemed to get was 10 lb.
(This is another argument for relating -er and -est)

Then why can't V be typicalized?

But if Adj can be typicalized in American, this
makes wish sentences more understandable - they've
just relaxed this restriction

It was happy that I was

M3 - ~O → Neg in first clause WHY?

* The heavier it didn't get, the more tired I became.

But E The more obnoxious he gets, the more I couldn't stand him

The better it got, the more often we didn't shave.
Since & Neg O in 1st clause, let's try to prove it's been deleted:

\[ \square \text{The more anybody complains about the food, the more he gets whipped} \]

NB (ever)

Why is never O?

Doesn't work

\*[The sicker I can help being, the better my chances are for the job.

he got until I left,...
What to do with

every time (that) he goes I cry

*which

What is this?
The rule allowing Neg-Attraction in rel. cls. on N which have a certain set of determiners:

reach

all, every, no, any, the only, the one, -est, 1st, last

is anti-cyclic, because any's can result from its application

I never worked in some office where somebody who sang folk songs called up:

First pass — NB — it is not to invert ever here yet

I never worked in any office where anybody who sang folk songs ever called up

Now it is possible:

I never worked in any office where anybody who ever sang any folk songs ever worked.
Whatever it was that she bought, I will bring it.
Chapter 5 with new

How we will prove it is by using math induction.
Proof that in what he did 5's
really a sentence taken out of here

1. Neg
What he never did was try any tests

2. What I did to John was
\{ hit him \*

3. What I did in 20 minutes was walk to NYC
\{ 20 mi \*

4. What I tried to persuade her to force John to do was share these
\*nerv
\*why

5. If ANC is right about \( \phi \), then where is the selection of \( \checkmark \) in the NP Comp specified (i.e., it must be non-stative)

6. Further, do won't be inserted in cases like what he didn't do was
because no affix
NB - θ Neg-attraction even in NP

What he never presented was any conclusive evidence that's

What we never mentioned was that he had ever drunk anything
\[ X \rightarrow Y \]
\[ 1 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 3 \Rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 3 \]

Condition:

\[ \text{If } 2 < NP_i \text{ and } S_j \text{ directly dominates } NP_i \]
\[ \text{then } 2 = NP_i \text{ and } \]
\[ \# X \in S_j = X + NP_i + Y \]
Chomsky's argument about a *coda* Ss in after clause won't work for *until*, when, since, where, while clauses

I didn't leave until

\[
\begin{cases}
\text{dead} \\
\text{he was asleep} \\
\text{tall} \\
\text{heavy}
\end{cases}
\]

Tom gave me that gun

* It was that gun that Tom gave me

I took care of him while

\[
\begin{cases}
\text{she was sick} \\
\text{Tom wrote a letter to my father}
\end{cases}
\]

* It was my father that Tom wrote a letter to

I'll take care of you when

\[
\begin{cases}
\text{your husband is drunk} \\
\text{Tom is writing that article}
\end{cases}
\]

* It is that article that Tom is writing

I've been here since

\[
\begin{cases}
\text{you were asleep} \\
\text{Tom wrote that letter}
\end{cases}
\]

* It was that letter that Tom wrote

I lived where

\[
\begin{cases}
\text{the water was drinkable} \\
\text{Tom found that cat}
\end{cases}
\]

* It was that cat that Tom found
The fact that you don't get

* I left {after} John was tall

supports Geis's analysis:
you also don't get

* John was tall {early

late}
Comparison obeys the \( NP \) \( \not \in \) \( NS \) condition too:

The box is heavier than they believed (*the claim) that the book is.

or than also behaves like Compare with conjunction:

the box is heavier than John fell asleep and the book is (that) expected the picture to be and they thought the book was (that) John was a Common
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WH and OR
(when)

Did you go or {did you call him up?}

* who left?

* what did you eat?

* Who left or what fell?

It was John who went or it was his father {who went}

{who read the book}

(Firm-DP) ? it was yesterday that the letter came.

(Firm) ? I bought books or it was magazines that I bought
Flak for Yuki
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Yuki can't be right about an [its] stopping being a NP when the it is deleted because of

They typologize

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{it} \quad \text{was that he left that surprised me that I mentioned}
\end{array} \]

the do-something cases

... of also? Did that he left surprise you

So maybe my condition is the correct one.

\( \begin{array}{c}
\hat{N}^1 \\
\downarrow
\end{array} \)

(Notice that this helps explain the relativization in after, etc.) clauses

NB also it was after he came that I got sick.
Exposition w/ WfH

What he meant is [not known]

It is [unclear] what he meant     NB

I asked [who came]

It was asked [that he came]

I discovered [where he went]

It was never discovered

Found out [what he liked]

Seems to require Neg or Q

? it was

DITTO

OK w/ Was it or It was not
Exposition W/WH
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The above's must clearly be related - NB that

E S if X why iff E S

why he came is a mystery

\[
\uparrow
\]

\[\uparrow\]

\[\uparrow\]

\[\uparrow\]

why X

It is a mystery why he came.

versus

* why he came is possible.
* It is possible why he came.

NB

what she cooked was not kept

\[\uparrow\]

\[\uparrow\]

\[\uparrow\]

\[\uparrow\]

* It was not kept what she cooked

what she cooked was not known

\[\uparrow\]

\[\uparrow\]

\[\uparrow\]

\[\uparrow\]

* It was not known what she cooked
Extrapolation w/ WH

[any] reason for his coming
[The reason that he came]
[why he came]
[what place he came]
[where he lives]
[at which place he lives]
[the time at which he arrived]
[? when]

[What time (*) when he arrived]

[how he got here]
[the way that (*) he got in]
*a *
[any] *how

[whether he came (or not)]
[But: we couldn't ascertain whether he came or not]

[that he came]
Exposition w/ WH

We couldn't / guess

Did you / figure out

Find out / at certain

Imagine

Who did it / * the one who did it

What fell / * the thing which fell

What / Which

Man did it /

Thing fell

At / * which

What time he left

At Which

What time he left
NB - # extrap w/ reason, way, time

the [reason] that he came is not known.

* """

* P is not known the [reason] that he came

the time {at which} he left do not known {at which} he left

NB This can be attributed to the [the] maybe a plan was made for us to go

But # extrap w/ how, why, when q.p.

So this argues that there aren’t derived from

the reason that S

way

time when S

This all suggests that Q be choosable not only in tip S but also after wonder, ask and [Neg] know, etc.
Extraposition w/ WH

\[ \text{it is not known} \begin{cases} \text{what (else) she cooked} \\ \text{what it was that she cooked} \end{cases} \]

\[ \begin{align*} * & \text{ whatever she cooked} \\ * & \text{ whatever it was that she cooked} \end{align*} \]

\[ \text{But:} \begin{cases} \text{(*) knew} \\ \text{figured out} \end{cases} \begin{cases} \text{ascertained} \\ \text{was sure of} \end{cases} \begin{cases} \text{guessed} \end{cases} \]

\[ \text{Whatever she cooked} \]

\[ \text{whatever it was that she cooked} \]

\[ \text{though} \begin{cases} \exists \text{ ate.} \end{cases} \]

Reason: eat is \([+-] \text{[conc]}\)

\[ \text{know, guess etc are} \begin{cases} + \quad [\text{-conc}] \end{cases} \]
Extraposition w/ WH

But

I can't figure out { * whatever she believes },

I found out the \{ \text{reason (that)} \} he got there

\( \exists \text{ underlying } N \) \text{ reason, way, time}\

because \( \exists \text{ Extrapol (} * \text{ it was known the reason why became) } \)

so there aren't from \( \exists [it S] \)

\( Q \times NP \)

Rather, \( \exists \text{ underlying } N \) \text{ reason, way, time}\

\( \text{the reason } A \) \text{, just like } \text{ reason, way, time}\

\( \text{def } N \) \text{, } S \text{, } Q \text{, NP, VP} \)
Restriction on $Q$ in embedded $S$ is just the same.

Moreover, these are precisely the abstract $N$ that we have to get after ascertain, learn, find out anyway:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{learn} & \quad \text{fact} \\
\text{ascertain} & \quad \text{verdict} \\
\text{figure out} & \quad \text{evidence} \\
& \quad \text{truth} \\
& \quad \text{reason}
\end{align*}
\]

* boy
* dog

So I figured out why he came.

(it was that)

for what reason

Why
But I figured out the reason (why) he came.
the one who came was John

the one who asked the question I was John

It was Sunday that he visited us on Sunday that

when he visited us was Sunday

where he lives is Boston

The only condition under which I will go is if you drive

NB
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The one thing I did was build the house.

The finest thing he’s been doing is working with his kids.

2 things

a/1 thing

all I did was go home.
I do

it was [peas] that I ate. [What] was it that I ate?

NB — It shouldn't be possible to extrapoate over [its]

that NP

NP

be Pred

NP

do

VP

it

S

NP

eat NP
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Argument for that
What he did was he went home

Q: Where's the ... come from in

What he's doing is building a house

* to go home

NB * go home

or the ... in

What he has done is taken my car

or The to in

What I forced him to do was build a house

* building a house

* build a house
it was this question that I was disturbed by their treatment of
Wang's Problem

 Tone Sandhi in Mandarin (?)

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & \rightarrow & 2 & \quad \frac{B}{A} \\
\uparrow & & \downarrow & + \\
5 & \leftarrow & 3 & - \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
[B] \rightarrow [-B] / [A] \\
[-B] \rightarrow [B] / [-A] \\
[A \ B] \rightarrow [-A \ B] / [A] \\
i.e. \quad [A \ A] \rightarrow [-A \ B] \\
[-A \ B] \rightarrow [A \ A] \\
[A \ B \ B] \rightarrow [-A \ B] \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\{A \ B\} \rightarrow -\{B\} \\
\{[-A \ B]\} \rightarrow \{A\}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\{A \ B \ A\} \rightarrow \{A \ B\} \\
\{A \ B \ B\} \rightarrow \{A \ B\}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\]

- \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
1 \rightarrow 2 \\
2 \rightarrow 3 \\
5 \rightarrow 1 \\
3 \rightarrow 5
\end{array}
\end{array}
\]
Case Marking

How's Ed explain

Him I like

but Who do you like?

in the same dialect
In Latin, the fact that the phrase 'amor est gone' suggests that 'amor' is deleted when 'est' goes.

homo amat puellam quasi bella est

won't permute

homo bellam amat puellam

comes from here
Topicalization

NP
  | be
  | Pred
Adj
  | tall
  | to
  | Det
  | NP
  | extent
Art
  | NP
  | some extent
  | be
  | Pred
  | -er
  | PP
  | NP
  | NP
  | than
  | Det
  | Art
  | extent
  | the
  | WH
  | NP
  | Pred
  | John
  | Adj
  | tall
  | to
  | NP
  | N
  | extent
Topicalization

Unless he is deleted, Arr era blocks this from being topicalized.

But why can't this (the whole thing) be topicalized?

Mystery

How about stating the rule as follows — you can't prepare things out of a complex NP?
A letter which I wrote & sent off & was received probably out.

NB - 2 things gone!

2/8/65

Definitely out - this means

Kima's right - these don't come from

It was this letter which I wrote & it was this letter which was received

a letter which you wrote and was received
accessible

study, personal observation, inspection, investigation, manipulation, inquiry, question

the general reader

by rail

These phenomena are accessible to statistical description, formulation, treatment, handling

Computers are accessible to use by trained personnel

These books are accessible to study by seminar members

Seminar members can have access to them, if seminar members study those books

Professors have access to the investigation of such facts by researchers.
1. They can access the NML they study these books by them.

2. Study of these books by them.

3. The study of these books is accessible to by them.

4. These books are accessible to study by them.

Maybe better to do it in one fell swoop from this.
NB: if only seeming to have one emphasized word.

who gained what?

All day long...

Who gave what to whom?

NB- if something is conclusively alleged, and it is.

They the instruction stays high up the end of the 
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61/
Multiple Q + Contrastive Stress

It seems that Top must be restricted so as not to operate over an [N] if the shifted wh. is indef.

Indef

Who ate what?

What did who eat?

Who was what eaten by whom?

Who was what eaten by whom?

This provides a smidgen of evidence bearing on the Q of which order is basic

[Top [NP] [NP] ]

or

[Top [NP] [NP] ]

On the basis of the following 5's, this would appear to be more basic

What did who give to whom?

Who did who give what?

Who did who give what to?
Multiple Q and Contructive Stress

Q's in a rel. cl. can only be w/ emphatic 6/22/65

He bought the car from a man who shot whom?  

The cheese which who ate was bad?  

NB: reading annotation.
What I wouldn't give for a piece of ice! — I would give anything for

in order for me to have

where I wouldn't go to see a Chaplin movie! — I would go anywhere

who I wouldn't talk to if I could help you! — I would talk to anyone

NB: D Purp is required in all these constructions, so maybe I link

betw. if (in some sense) and

D Purp

No! It seems rather that this for to

stuff is a reflex of if in this environment.

How I'd work to get to NY! — I would work to get to NY!

NB
Extrapol of my P/L Check

6/18/65 11

How about S's like

Two men got through the lines, crawling on their hands and knees.

If this is to be derived by Extrapol, why doesn't the node S vanish when who is \[\Rightarrow \emptyset\]?

Maybe because S still branches.

NB

corroboratory evidence - 2 men gambled seems to be complex, e.g.

* No shot 2 men gambling down

NB - \[\rightarrow\] keeps Aux alive, so to speak.
Maybe the opposite is the case with passive SRL Cls. Actually, there's no strong motivation yet for attaching them to VP or Aux.

It certainly seems that *Ven* is an Adj.

*We captured several men ordered to spy by him.*

*We killed several recaptured prisoners.*
These all mean: He was X when he \( \frac{\text{died}}{\text{woke up}} \) etc.

Whereas these mean

My aunt, who was unaware, sent me the letter.

My friend died (,) unaware of the war in Vietnam.

\( \exists \triangle \exists \) We gave a man some food who looked hungry.

\( \exists \) We gave a man some food (happy?):

These must be from a different rule then a man entered the house, who was.

Here, \( \triangle \) is definite, but in them it is \( \triangle \).

Are these different from my aunt sent me the letter, serene in her innocence.

She fell asleep blissfully unaware of the perils which the morrow would bring.

NB: This is \( \square \) here, \( \checkmark \) here.
Extrap. blocking

I said (that) [it that he came] NP had surprise.

I said (that) [evidence that he killed her] NP will be given.

It was evidence that he killed her that I said will be given.

It was evidence that I said will be given that he killed her.

NB - Extrap. box if on [NS] NP has been cleft.
Restrictions on draft 5 in red cir.
and sub cir.

* It was the Phila. circ. which it was Amos who conducted.
* He sent me a book which it was John who read.

NB. He left, because it was just that book which he wanted to read.

Why OK??

NB. Also

He would leave if it had been the buffalo that I had shot.

Although even though

He left despite the fact that it was I who shot her.

Why? * or (and)

When all along
He broke the dishes [during the time when he was before the time at which shot her was she who I shot] since.

He didn't break the dishes until.

But NB.

He broke the dishes after Tom said it was his brother they were searching for.

Also it was him that Tom said it was who they were searching for that.

But? If it was my brother (then it was) who I shot.
1. Reflexives: wash your own car?
   {yourself}

2. make [his]
   do [your] best
   {his}

3. Short for [them, me, you, him/her, John]
   to stop hitting the cat.
   {you}

4. Tag Q
   go home, {will you?}
   {won't you}
German

Surmise (look wrong - Schiff)

\[
\{ \text{set of } V \text{ with which have funny passives} \} = \{ \text{set of all } V \text{ with inner obj.} \}
\]

es wurde getan

geschaffen

gekommen

= ein komischen Tang tangen
tiegen Schlafens Schiff

eine X Kunst kommen
June 9, 1965

He is another of those men who all they have is work.

I got a letter from my brother; who, after he left, nobody did anything.

The book which I asked where you put it.
Maybe sub. els. at the end of a S are stuck there by Extrap — maybe this I can apply twice

2. that he is scared was obvious because he was trembling

2. "..." "..." "..." "..."

3. [it was obvious because he was trembling that he is scared]

This thing is OK, of course, but only in the way that we elected plus the man Pbk.

is OK, i.e., by means of length inversion.

So maybe Extrap
Extrap doesn't work over a NP

1. This would explain cases like prove, demonstrate, etc.

2. "why rel. cl. postposition is only for intransitive V. (also in German)

3. This could be so only if the argument that Flipflop has applied in cases like surprise, amaze, etc. and obvious, evident, etc. (also beneficent, profitable) is right. Then the order of rules would be Extrapol Flipflop (maybe Passive is a special case)

A bridge was blown up by a man which crossed the river at Amsberg.

An old woman was shot down by a Viper who was stealing an egg (I think)
Problems w/ anal. suggested on p. 2.

Why E

I gave a gun to the police which had recently been fired.

Answer (Yay!)

Extrap doesn't work over a \([V(p) NP Y]_{vp}\)

although it will work over \([x NP Y]_{vp}\)
Maybe it has to be

Extrap
Topic Shift
Typicalization

because of

? A book which it says one for you to be able to find.
but if "it" for you to be able to find. swap me.

? the clothes which that I were surprised you.

? the "it" I surprised you (+that) I were.
V-V Selection

I have to be able to come

* I am able to have it come

I planned for the rat to have to press this bar to get food.

I was able to plan for the rat to have to press this bar to get food.

NB - this seems to indicate that Botsch's conjecture about selection only being between "adjacent" verbs is correct.
Typicalization of NEG

\[ \exists \begin{cases} \{ \text{no man, everybody} \} & \text{who saw him} \\ \{ \text{not each, neither of us} \} & \text{who he saw} \\ \{ \text{all of them, every body} \} & \text{who we gave the book to} \end{cases} \]

* It was \{ my many friends \} who came.

It was \{ the 2 boys \} who came.

\[ \text{but} \]

It was for no reason that we did it.
I. Underlying St/ (tree)

1. Why?
   - it was/ that it was
   - why

2. N/A - # Cliffs in rel. cls.
3. Subj - Aux Conversion

Sample problem in topicization

II. Cyclical or Not?
   - has to be cyclical clitics w/ clitics rel cls w/ match
   - to w/in cl's

III. A over A

   A. State
      - Evidence for
         1. NP+NP
         2. Rel. Cl. + N
         3. N A -> AN
         4. Pol's Rule
         5. German Rule

   B. Evidence against
      1. NP+NP is more general
         *it would be odd S + S*
      2. AN - wrong formulation

IV. Ed's Idea
   - NPc - Inversion
   - 1. St's Rule
   - 2. Yuki's Idea
   - 3. Latin
   - 4. P vs. vs. than
   - 5. A P (No) Very
      - NS reflexive examples
I told them her story at one
told them her picture [me
a picture of myself
b. key for but not key in
np. the cat
h. I was aware of them washing
[washing myself (the cat
w. suggest modification - disjunctive deletion
x. differences

I mentioned that he had seen me

The man who I mentioned (that) he had seen

a plan which I discussed their rejection?

\[
\text{My idea:} \quad \text{NP} \quad \text{NP} \quad \text{NP}
\]

\[
\text{Modal T}
\]

A. That sentences
B. For to + ing examples
V. Adverbs that don't topicalize

A. 1. although, since, unless, as much as, insofar as
2. after, before, since, therefore until

B. $ subclassification

C. Ambig w/ set

D. Comp w/ force, help, cause, have
5/13/65

◊ argument for getting who is X from P is X that S instead of vice versa as ESK suggest:

Not all of them have this variant

3 it was for this reason that we came.
4 why we came was for that reason.

But NB 3 it was because it rained that we left.
4 why we left was because it rained.

?? 3 because it rained was why we left.
4 only because it rained was why we left.
Maybe typicization works like this:

1. Some preparable const is duplicated under top and the feature vpro is kept behind.

\[ \text{It be John that I saw atop} \]

Then \( \exists \) rule

\[ \Box \Rightarrow \emptyset \] except

in certain environments.

It was that man \{ that \} the box was too heavy for him to carry.

It was that brown \{ that \} he killed her when he was wrong

\text{over}
Can topics stop halfway to the top in English?

Yes, sometimes.

It was the problem that I preferred to try to solve. I would prefer it to be the problem that I tried to solve.

I could prove it was cyclical in English if I could show that you never got topicalization if S's up when you don't get it if S's up.

How about the rules?

\[ S \rightarrow \text{TIP} \text{Com} \]
\[ \text{Com} \rightarrow \text{NP VP} \]
\[ \text{Tip} \rightarrow \text{NP VP} \]

Then filter out everything here except if the be \( \Delta \) VP.

\[ \text{S} \]

\[ \text{NP} \]

\[ \text{VP} \]

\[ \text{NP} \]

\[ \text{be} \]

\( \Delta \)

\[ \text{Com} \]

\[ \text{NP} \]

\[ \text{VP} \]

\[ \text{NP} \]

\[ \text{PP} \]

\[ \text{in} \]

\[ \text{the} \]

\[ \text{house} \]

\[ \text{John saw the girl} \]
I asked Mary to persuade Tom to go.

I asked Mary for it to be at 4 o'clock that she persuaded (?) Tom to go.

I kept it being at 6 that I left.

We began for it to be at 6 that we left.

Fantastic insight!

I asked Mary for Tom to go.

For it to be Tom that she visited.

Dad visited.

I asked Mary for it to be the book that burnt up.

I asked Mary for it to be [Mary] who went.

I'm going to ask you for it to be you who go...
Topicalization

4 Tips: It was this problem that I wanted to watch you trying to solve.
3 Tips: I wanted it to be this problem that I watched you trying to solve.
2 Tips: *I wanted to watch it being this problem that you tried to solve.
1 Tip: *I wanted to watch you trying for it to be this problem that you solve.

2 Tips: It was this problem that I watched him solving.
1 Tip: *I watched it being this problem that he solved.

No good – watch requires doing something.

* I watched him being told existing the answer.

YAY!
Example from Bierwisch (via Klum):

ich bitte Sie, gehen zu

wollen — Sie gehen

Ditto in English —

to be allowed to go — go

to be compelled to go — go

maybe ambig?

beg of you

to be interested in going — you go
Can it be that weability depends on the fact that the N so last in a constituent? e.g.,

\[ \begin{align*}
\phi & \quad \text{A play which I took my son downtown to see} \\
\phi & \quad \text{in order for him to see} \\
\phi & \quad \text{The child who I went downtown in order to see a play} \\
\phi & \quad \text{A man who I went downtown to give a book} \\
\phi & \quad \text{in order to give a book to} \\
\phi & \quad \text{A book which I went downtown to give} \\
\phi & \quad \text{a man} \\
\phi & \quad \text{The policeman who I'm afraid of hurting me} \\
\phi & \quad \text{the policeman of whose hurting me I've been afraid for a long time} \\
\phi & \quad \text{The children whose irresponsibility we talked about} \\
\phi & \quad \text{being cruel} \\
\phi & \quad \text{whose \{hating each other, having to leave school, constructing a dome, starting a club\} we talked about} \\
\phi & \quad \text{The man whose \{refusal to go we talked about} 
\end{align*} \]
the croxx where I planned

"last NP" won't do:

3. Come much which I got to make [and press?]

(in order)

but 3. a man who) called up to tell that I was leaving

3. a college which I moved to Brookline for you to be able to go to

1. than

# 2** The bus which he walked to school more often than he taken

3. They hired a pitcher who I can hit better than

3. There's nobody on the team who I can't hit better than

3. The cheese which I want. I don't go more than I want you to buy
Thought

How about having the rule

\[ NP \rightarrow \lambda e . S \] in the PS

and getting rid of \( e \) deletion?

(This would make Extrap obligatory, thus getting rid of the BLOCKS condition in the rule.)

No ich habe vers, als en ten

TS would be OBLIG
I said [that] [The boy is here.]

ich habe es angefangen, das Haus zu bauen  (2E) 4/30/65 1.2a

1st  2nd
1. DNA  1. Φ
2. Φ  2. Φ
3. £→Ø  3. £→Ø
4. DNA  4. £ OBLIG [des... bauen] →

das Haus zu bauen habe ich angefangen  (2 deriv)

1st  2nd  1. £ OBLIG
2. £ [das Haus]  2. £ [des... bauen]
3. Φ  3. Φ
4. DNA  4. Φ

*$*$ das Haus zu bauen habe ich es angefangen 3 3E 3P

won't be derived, because if £ es, then [das Haus zu bauen]

won't be a NP, although it is an S. The Prepose rule

Box if NP = a. S

HURRAY!
Sentence 9

The rules produce 4 distinct derivations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>3. ( \leftarrow \text{[das Haus]} )</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>3. $</td>
<td>3. $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>1. OPT</td>
<td>1. OPT</td>
<td>1. OPT</td>
<td>1. OPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. C/1</td>
<td>2. C/1</td>
<td>2. C/1</td>
<td>2. C/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. ( \leftarrow \text{[das Haus zu bauen]} )</td>
<td>3. $</td>
<td>3. ( \leftarrow \text{[das Haus zu bauen]} )</td>
<td>3. $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. $</td>
<td>4. $</td>
<td>4. $</td>
<td>4. $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>1. OPT</td>
<td>1. OPT</td>
<td>1. OPT</td>
<td>1. OPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. C/1</td>
<td>2. C/1</td>
<td>2. C/1</td>
<td>2. C/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. ( \leftarrow \text{[[das Haus] zu bauen] angfangen} )</td>
<td>3. ( \leftarrow \text{[[das Haus] zu bauen] angfangen} )</td>
<td>3. ( \leftarrow \text{[[das Haus] zu bauen] angfangen} )</td>
<td>3. ( \leftarrow \text{[[das Haus] zu bauen] angfangen} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. $</td>
<td>4. $</td>
<td>4. $</td>
<td>4. $</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sentence 10

Das Haus angfangen zu bauen habe ich versucht.

I provide only one derivation - no there more than one stress possibility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>3. ( \leftarrow \text{[das Haus]} )</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>3. ( \leftarrow \text{[das Haus]} )</td>
<td>3. ( \leftarrow \text{[[das Haus] angfangen zu bauen]} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2. C/1</td>
<td>2. C/1</td>
<td>2. C/1</td>
<td>2. C/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. ( \leftarrow \text{[das Haus]} )</td>
<td>3. ( \leftarrow \text{[das Haus]} )</td>
<td>3. ( \leftarrow \text{[[das Haus] angfangen zu bauen]} )</td>
<td>3. ( \leftarrow \text{[[das Haus] angfangen zu bauen]} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. $</td>
<td>4. $</td>
<td>4. $</td>
<td>4. $</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sentence 13
Ich habe das Haus zu bauen angefangen versucht.

Again, 4 distinct derivations, and there should be 4 distinct stresses. **ASK Paul**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>3. ( \leftarrow \text{[des Haus]} )</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>3. ( \emptyset )</td>
<td>3. ( \emptyset )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>1. OPT</td>
<td>1. OPT</td>
<td>1. OPT</td>
<td>1. OPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. C/1</td>
<td>2. C/1</td>
<td>2. C/1</td>
<td>2. C/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. ( \leftarrow \text{[des Haus zu b.]} )</td>
<td>3. ( \emptyset )</td>
<td>3. ( \leftarrow \text{[des Haus zu b.]} )</td>
<td>3. ( \emptyset )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. ( \emptyset )</td>
<td>4. ( \emptyset )</td>
<td>4. ( \emptyset )</td>
<td>4. ( \emptyset )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|   | Top - Top - ~ | Top - ~ - ~ | ~ - Top - ~ | ~ - ~ - ~ |

Sentence 14
Ich habe das Haus versucht zu bauen angefangen

Only one derivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3. ( \leftarrow \text{[des Haus]} )</td>
<td>1. OPT</td>
<td>1. ( \uparrow \text{[des Haus]} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. C/1</td>
<td>2. DNA</td>
<td>2. DNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. ( \emptyset )</td>
<td>3. ( \emptyset )</td>
<td>3. ( \emptyset )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. ( \emptyset )</td>
<td>4. ( \emptyset )</td>
<td>4. ( \text{zu bauen angefangen} \rightarrow )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top - Top - TS Ex
Sentence 15: Ich habe das Haus versucht anzufangen zu bauen

One derivation:

1. OPT
2. C/1
3. $\Leftarrow$ [das Haus]
4. [zu bauen] $\Rightarrow$

Top - Top - TS Ex

Sentence 16: Ich habe {das Haus zu bauen} versucht anzufangen

A

B

Two derivations:

A

1. OPT
2. C/1
3. $\Leftarrow$ [[das Haus zu bauen]]
4. $

B

1. OPT
2. C/1
3. $\Leftarrow$ [[das Haus zu bauen]]$_{\text{VP}}$
4. $

Top - Top - TS Ex

~ - Top - TS Ex