### Sentence 18
Ich habe das Haus angestanden zu bauen versucht.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>3. L [das Haus]</td>
<td>3. $\xi$</td>
<td>3. $\xi$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2. C/1</td>
<td>2. C/1</td>
<td>2. C/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>4. $\xi$</td>
<td>4. $\xi$</td>
<td>4. $\xi$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tip - Tip - Ex - $\ldots$

### Sentence 19
Ich habe versucht, das Haus zu bauen angestanden.

4 ways ambiguous

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>3. L [das Haus]</td>
<td>3. $\xi$</td>
<td>3. $\xi$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2. C/1</td>
<td>2. C/1</td>
<td>2. C/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3. $\xi$</td>
<td>3. $\xi$</td>
<td>3. $\xi$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>4. $\xi$</td>
<td>4. $\xi$</td>
<td>4. $\xi$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tip - Tip - Ex - $\ldots$
Sentence 26

A

B

ich habe angemessen { das Haus zu bauen } versucht.

Two ways ambiguous

A

1st
3. \llbracket \text{aus} \rrbracket

2nd
1. OPT
2. C/1
3. \llbracket \rrbracket
4. \llbracket \text{aus} \rrbracket 

3rd
1. OPT
2. C/1
3. \llbracket \rrbracket
4. \llbracket \rrbracket

VP ~ EX ~

B

3. \llbracket \rrbracket

1. OPT
2. C/1
3. \llbracket \rrbracket
4. \llbracket \text{aus} \rrbracket 

same

VP ~ EX ~
Sentences which Rules E will generate

Sentence 27
A
B
Anzufangen {das Haus zu bauen} habe ich versucht.

Two ways ambiguous:

1st
3. \([\text{das Haus}]\)

2nd
1. OPT
2. C/1
3. \(\emptyset\)
4. \([\text{das Haus zu bauen}] \rightarrow_{VP}\)

3rd
1. OPT
2. C/1
3. \([\text{anzufangen} [\text{das Haus zu bauen}]] \rightarrow_{VP}\)
4. \(\emptyset\)

Top - EX - Top

\(~ - \text{EX} - \text{Top}\)
Performatives: [surprise, etc.]

1/23/65

* I wonder whether you'll come, don't you? (yes)

Motivation for flip-flop

* My tooth hurts, doesn't it? (only if it hurts)

* This cheese tastes good to me, doesn't it?

* It surprises me that you came, doesn't it?

* John surprises me, doesn't he?

Unfortunately, it's also no good in the action sense.

* John is [appalling] me, isn't he?

[Confusing]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbs w/ this property</th>
<th>Verbs of flip-flop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>think</td>
<td>surprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guess</td>
<td>strike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imagine</td>
<td>obvious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conjecture</td>
<td>evident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree</td>
<td>apparent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[perceive]</td>
<td>NB - not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[perceive]</td>
<td>valuable, beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[perceive]</td>
<td>available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[perceive]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What V occur in "present" w/o my being habitual?

[ surprise ...? ] - only w/ I

[taste, ... ]

[ know, believe, think, mean ... ]

[ force, persuade, make, cause ]

NB all these are very weak w/ you as deep subject unless = tag

You know that he loves you, don’t you?
He died, which fact surprised me.

He died and the fact that he died surprised me.

That that he died was so.

Q: do all so-called which is come like this, fact?

NB. I maintain the fact.
   
   But is there? He's a liar, which I've maintained all along. I've been claiming for 2 wax.

He may be queer, which I've thought for years.

NB. He's a liar, which I always said.
Kinds of sentential which clause.

He got there, which

I can hardly believe (+ fact)
I don't believe (? - fact)
I surprised me
I counted on (- fact)

is fantastic 
is (in) true 
was necessary 
was necessary 
was necessary 
bad

incredible

unbelievable

believable

fortunate

unknown

That he sent a telegram means

the fact 
indicates

That he sent a telegram indicates

OK w/ the fact that

Torn said he got there, which is true

Torn hoped that I was OK, which was true

I hope that you're OK, which surprised me

Which would surprise me

What's going on here?
he asked when she died, which

where the hell does this come from

NB O: some difference between

he asked when she left, which

what is it?

which I did

which I didn't want to do.

he insisted that I go home which was D.

which is unknown

which will be pleasant

Tom got there, which I did

which

was unknown

was obvious

wasn't clear

I couldn't answer

p. 3

4/22/65
He asked me to visit him, which would be nice

I am going to visit him, which would be nice, which was nice

Sentimental which I'm not

You asked me to leave, which I did

He asked who came, which I didn't know

He's going there now, which doesn't surprise me.

He promised me to help out, which you did (not)

which he will, which he will, which he will, which he will

All bad w/ not

He promised me, he wouldn't interfere, which he did

 wouldn't interfere, which he hasn't
*You forced me to stand still, which I didn’t.
OK I’ll force him to stand still, which he won’t.

Permuted

I asked him when you were going, which I didn’t know.

I asked him why you were going at some time, and

why I didn’t know it [why you were going at some time]?

He loves me, why I don’t know
He went there, when?
[how often]

If he loves me, I don’t know it

Weak maybe, but what else can you say for the
whether - paradigm.
1. es - Deletion

2. Extrapolation

3. Special es - Deletion in Subordinate Clauses
If \( \text{fact} = [\text{so}] \) now, why do you get A but not B?

A: that that he's here is so. Is so.

B: The fact that he's here is \( \{\text{so} \} \)

C: He said that that he had died was so.

He said the fact that he had died
Appositives

there + P \iff NP \times P + NP \quad \text{where } 1 = 3

I will now some popular views of phonology with particular reference to Mr. View, thereof.

A show, and thereafter some chaos.

The firmament, and all that is contained therein.

The constitution and amendments, thereof.

NYC and thereabout.

I will examine these axioms, and therefore the whole system.

The table wherein the book lay.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{NP} & \quad \text{there + } \{ \text{out before, toward, down along, despite, among, around(?) \}} \\
\text{compound prep} & \quad \text{therein, point of, therefor(?)} \\
\text{there} & \quad \{ \text{by, with, for, at, of, about(s), in, by, upon} \}
\end{align*}
\]
I gave the manuscript to a man who found several mistakes therein.

A man who had found several mistakes therein was paid off.

This is OK, the

{ state was loaned the manuscript }

The man who was going to fit our front door w/ hinges lost the key thereto.

In this 5, the pron ed N is in a rel. cl. and the pro-PP is too.

I'll give it you if you find any part thereof.
I watched him eat

* what I saw was him eat

what I saw was him eating

kept
rel-cl-s on conj. NP's must be N-R

The man and the dog who had been eating

the man and the dog who were killed came from NYC.

NB ≠ Neg-attraction into N-R clause

But Neg-attr. with rel-cl seems to depend on the articles in the matrix S anyway:

° I didn't talk to any girl who ever came here.

° to some girl

So it looks as if Neg-attr. is after Neg-attr. in and Rel Cl embedding and depends on the presence of an indefinite (er... (what?)) Det N
Takes an NA object where the A must be static

NB: He rendered him sterile

* cruel, stubborn, clever

* rendered the table breakable

* red

He rendered the pie tasty

The bomb harmless

He rendered physics interesting

The clause imperative

The theory testable
* * We didn't see a man, who is a friend of mine.

\{ John the man \} or \{ my doctor \}

**NB**

This suggests that maybe a in the object of Negged V should be derived from any.

**NB**

Howbout:

OK: We didn't see 2 men, who were standing in the shadows around

But: many men,

in one sense only if this means "but we did see the woman"

Then it's OK

Probably requires stress on men.
No good with
accurate

afford
believe

informed her of it 

made her know it

persuaded for it 

made her remember it

reminded her of it 

made her sure of it

maybe to F. are the

proves anything?
Maybe pre-noun adjectives shouldn't be dominated by S. Why?

Because that move applies over AN but not around N RelCl

OK: He killed the vociferous objector off
Poor: He killed the objector who was vociferous off
Worse: He killed the objector who was vociferous and long-winded off

NB also: He brought the fact that he was dead out

Maybe the general assertion is that $\{\text{length} = S \}$
$\{\text{complexity}\}$

Other reasons: the AN $\leq$ the N, App Cl,

These don't behave the same wrt Neg, Q

∃ He didn't see the tall girls
∀ He gave the bone to the dogs, who were tall
∃ Did he give the bone to the dogs, who were hungry?

But ∃ hungry dogs?
Last Christmas, {when} Dad died, X
* Last Christmas when Dad died X

We drove to Boston {in which} was born.
* in which was born in

* He took me [to a place], where Paul lived
  {the some place there}

* They came [at a time], when none had much
  [then]
* He disappeared in a manner, which puzzled the authorities

* The Boston, (that) used to love,
  {which}
* The Thanksgiving when Dad died
  that

* We stayed there, where Tom used to live
* I'll tell you then, when you get back
to use that w/ appositives

my father { who (m) ?} I hadn't seen for 2 years

With #2, you can only have appositives, if anything (cf AD II 253)

The ladies, who were two, X

{*-}               {*_}

Are there other adjectives w/ this property?

Yes -- few, many, several, numerous

ANY OTHERS?

The tulips, which are flowers,
I was hungry \( \Rightarrow \) ate

\( \text{because} \)

\( \text{He died \{ and thereafter \} stayed home} \)

\( \text{I stayed home after he died} \)

\( \text{* He[will die] and thereafter \} stayed home} \)

\( \text{* I stayed home after he will die/dies} \)

\( \text{* He has died, and thereafter \} stayed home} \)

\( \text{* I stayed home after he has eaten} \)

\( \text{* was tall} \)

He drank too many beers \{ and thereafter \} became very nasty

\( \text{He became very nasty} \) upon having drunk too many beers

\( ? * \text{ arrived late} \)

\( ? * \text{ was tall} \)

\( \text{she left home, thereby surprising me} \)

\( \text{Yes \} she lowered the towel, together thereby making a curtain \} 3/11/65 \)

\( \text{She coughed, thereby attracting the sentry's attention \} \}

\( \text{and thereby she attracted} \)

\( \text{she attracted the sentry's attention by coughing} \)
Both require anim. subj

He duped them by saying he was poor.
He stopped the car by putting on the brakes.

* The tree fell down \( \text{by ing} \) \( \text{in order to} \) \( \times \)

* These books cost \#10 \( \text{by x} \) \( \times \)
if that

it's nice that S

it would be nice

* Y S

it was nice that he stayed

it is nice that he is staying / will stay

* it was nice in an

it will be nice that he

* stayed

* is staying

* will stay

* stays

it will be nice if he

* stayed

is staying

stay

would stay

will stay

can stay

e etc

Rules 1. [ if that X ] Fart X

1 2 3

⇒ 1 if 3

2. (oA) it is

3. #[if Y X] NP3 Y ⇒ for to 2 3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matrix 5</th>
<th>Comp</th>
<th>Past</th>
<th>Past</th>
<th>Past</th>
<th>Past</th>
<th>Past</th>
<th>Fat</th>
<th>Fat</th>
<th>Fat</th>
<th>Fat</th>
<th>Cond # 00198</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if on foot</td>
<td></td>
<td>? √</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>? x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>* should</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it is a</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td></td>
<td>? x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td></td>
<td>? x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it is good</td>
<td></td>
<td>? x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it will</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td></td>
<td>? x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td></td>
<td>? x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But NB: it will surprise you that I am here.

You are probably surprised.

It will be nice that she is there.

*It would
posing the only would result in an ungram. sentence

letting him come would force us to let everyone go.

doing that would scare them

NB: * your

WHY?

4/7/65

don't agree w/ stars anymore

your shooting him might scare them
How can you explain the ungrammaticality of this sequence?

Who came? \[ \begin{cases} \text{John} \text{ came.} \\ \text{sombody} \end{cases} \]

While this is a little better

Nobody came? (but they did write)

(still not an answer)

Also NB

Q

Who built the house?

OK Ans

It was built by John.

John built it

\[ \begin{cases} \text{John built it.} \\ \text{In built the house} \end{cases} \]

Also, how about the ungrammaticality of

Who bought the house? alongside of the grammaticality of

\{ Where \} did he go? etc

NB also \{ What \}
NB: What do you see? is OK because it contrasts with Where do you see? but

* What does this arc subtend? is out.

How about Where did you put it? I guess it's out to.

Another problem: NB ≠ * What did {nobody} do?

You can't question Y when subj is indef.

WHY ???

[⇒ special context, where it's OK]

June 27, 1965

Probably for same reason as this

⇒ Who did what to whom?

⇒ What did who do to whom?

⇒ To whom did who do what?
Can either in I didn't either be related
to either in the Determiner?

Easier Q: can the 2 neither be related?

Neg the boy_1 past go & Neg the boy_2 past go
(did) \downarrow
Neither the boy_1 go nor (did) the boy_2 go
Neither the boy_1 nor the boy_2 past go

neither the boy_2 past go
n of n n n

Neither boy is derived similarly, except

But is tricky.
NB. It can be:

1. went & M went
2. I went and M went too
3. I wasn't here & M wasn't here
4. I wasn't here and M wasn't here either

Let's call it Addition (Add)

It's clearly universal, and it will pose a lot of problems as to how it's inserted. I imagine it's introduced under the in the PS and then the semantics weeds out bad 5's like.

She had six fine sons, and onions can be used in purées too

Scott is a blatant homo and I've also got 10 pages to read

the water never reached the 10 ft mark either

the men and the boys [also] were dissatisfied

Both...
NB (either) that it be left or that it's going to rain [must be true?]

* the fact that S is true

Why? Could it be that fact is a nominalization of true? YES! NO! It's of course a non-fact.

possibility
possible

true

He did so could be that he did it is so

NB This explains why you don't get

* the fact that he did so do it
We didn't go

\{(and) nor did he

\{ and neither did he

Neither did he

(and) he didn't go either

I will neither consent to go nor will I consent to stay

He refused to touch any so I declined too

Nor did I want any from not having done all the reading

Nobody's going to fail and neither will I pass anyone because he has done it all.

He refused to touch any and they I part want some
I dread the coming of snakes. It is dreadfully frightening to me.

I hate X. X is hateful to me. Other abhorrent loathsome valuable despicable fearful/feared/shameful

Why?

1/14/65
Possible meanings?

frighten - make fear
startle - n start?
amuse - n laugh (wrong semantics)
annoy - n mad
embarrass - n shame?
encouraging - give one courage
heartening - n heart

Looks helpless

Start appeal
* No matter when he doesn't come
  * Whenever

* { No matter where? }
  he can't sleep
  wherever
  seldom eats
  nobody eats anything

≠ { no matter when? } + Neg sentences

NB

I also restrictions on words like... often, always, frequently

No matter [where?]
  he *usually says "hello",
  *often
  *frequently

Is this related to the badness of?

? ≠ Many languages [always] have postpositions
  but ≠ Many languages [have] postpositions [often]
  ≠ Many languages often use

From MH's class

\( \text{I kept the car in the garage} \)

Ambig \( \text{NP} \quad \text{Comp} \)

or \( \text{NP} \quad \text{rel} \)

\[ \text{but} \quad \frac{1}{\text{I kept [the gun] pointed at myself}} \]

\[ \frac{2}{\text{I kept [the gun] pointed at me}} \]

\[ \text{NP} \]

\( \text{① is not ambiguous. NB: ① must have} \)

\( \text{the same subject in the Comp 5 as} \)

\( \text{in the whole 5.} \)

\( \text{①) I kept the gun pointed at myself} \)

\( \text{yourself} \)

\( \text{OVER} \)
Only V with [missing] subj can have this type of D.

† the proof consists of 3 lemmata so that you can follow it.

† the tank disintegrated in order to clear the way.

†† The train vanished in order to go to Boston.

† The gas evaporates in order to restore the equal.

NB: The book costs $10 in order for us to get gold feet

= prof. "We have priced the book at $10 so that we will make bread fast."
Relative Clauses

We can't say that △ is the element deleted in the who-is deletion T-rule.

The game here tomorrow will be between Harvard and Yale.

Clearly from

The game will be here tomorrow.

The men in town yesterday

The men were in town yesterday.
Concrete Nominalizations

milkshake (why unlike cream? does it have weight)

thirst of lemon

break (bone,)

tite (mosquito, flea, etc.

catch (if a door ag.)

shot (grape, buck, etc.)

rise (of ground)

depression

top (organ)

gearshift

swing

slide

jump (ski)

seat (of primary)

trap

invention

clip (paper)

catch

drift

swift

change (of clothes, etc.)
TENSE RESTRICTIONS

N.B. These all have 10 CMPS

Adj w/ Rent:
- good
- nice
- terrible
- awful
- suspicious
- helpful
- convenient
- appropriate
- surprising

Adj w/ Rent2:
- unnecessary
- unlikely
- improbable
- impossible
- true
- doubtful
- obvious
- clear

9/26/64
P. S. Rosenbaum and D. T. Langendoen have suggested for word of mouth, summer 1964

that there are verbs in English which are followed by an indirect object. They argue that the underlying form of (1) should be (2), because of the presence of to in (3).

(1) his dishonesty surprises me
(2) [his dishonesty] +ps surprise [to me]  
  NP       indirect obj
(3) his dishonesty is surprising to me

The same rule that deletes to, for, with, at, and towards in 4a–9a to produce 4b–9b respectively would be used to derive (1) from (2)

(4) a) gave the book to the cheeseburger
     b) gave Harry the cheeseburger
(5) a) wrote for her a song
     b) wrote her a song
(6) a) played with Raskolnikov a game of bingo
   b) played Raskolnikov a game of bingo

(7) a) asked of them this question
   b) asked them this question

(8) a) Judy shot at him a glance
   b) Judy shot him a glance

(9) a) bear towards you no ill will
   b) bear you no ill will

I am indebted to Myrna Gopnik for calling my attention to the fact that some prepositions than just for and to can be deleted by the indirect object rule.

The rule that affects these changes can be stated as follows:

(10) $X \{V \{\text{Prep NP} \} \text{NP Y}

\begin{array}{ccccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\
1 & 2 & 0 & 4 & 5 & 6
\end{array}$
It is necessary to mention the feature [+IO] in the second constituent of the structural description of (10) because there are verbs like attribute, rob and fire to which (10) must not apply. The ungrammaticality of *(*) attributed Massaccio the fresco; *The pirates robbed the jewels the king and *We fired the plane the pistol leads us to mark attribute, rob and fire with the feature [-IO], so that (10) will not apply.

It has often been noted that verbs like surprise, shock, amaze, startle, etc. require an animate object. But if we follow fn. cf. Chomsky,

Rosenbaum and Langendoen’s suggestion and derive the noun phrases following verbs of this class from indirect object (hereafter IO) phrases of the form to + NP by applying (10), a greater generalization can be made: the head noun of an IO phrase must have the feature [+animate] or [+institution].

fn. I am indebted to Bruce Fraser for pointing out that a broader class than is specified by
the feature [+animate] can occur in IO phrases.

That is, (11) is grammatical, while (12) is deviant.

(11) D

\[
\begin{align*}
&\{\text{built a cabin for}\} \\
&\{\text{gave the money to}\} \\
&\{\text{played a game with}\} \\
&\{\text{surprised, fascinated}\} \\
&\{\text{depressed}\} \\
&\{\text{my dog, Tom Collins, Harvard, the US fort, the Class of 04, the DAR, charity}\} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(12) *D

\[
\begin{align*}
&\{\text{seven potatoes, the fact that he's dead}\} \\
&\{\text{liberty, a force field, the exhaust fumes}\} \\
&\{\text{my dog, Tom Collins, Harvard, the US fort, the Class of 04, the DAR, charity}\} \\
\end{align*}
\]

For 1 Some of these possibilities may have to be excluded. In particular, the verbal idiom shoot a glance at seems to require that a [+conc] noun follows: *Harry shot a glance at the DAR is very odd. Maybe a similar restriction is necessary in the case of play a game with.
It is strange, but it seems that English categorizes charity as an institution. Possibly charity should be derived from a phrase like charitable institutions.

Now let us consider the problem posed by the ungrammaticality of (13) - (16).

(13)* arranged for that he left to astound them

(14) * We begged whether he left to remain a mystery.

(15) * I reported for him to leave to have proven his guilt.

(16) * I know why he came to puzzle his father.
Chuck Fillmore's fact: such that requires the future.

Choose \( x \) such that \( x + y \) \{will\} = 20.

We chose \( x \) such that \( x + y \) \{would\} = 20
\{might\}
\{will\}
2. I'm not sure what this means. The phrase seems to be cut off.
3. Is there a typo? 'IV' seems out of place.

4. Is the middle of the page meant to be 'III' or is it a scribble?

5. The writing is very difficult to read. It appears to be a combination of letters and numbers, possibly a page from a book or a notebook.

6. There's a note at the bottom that looks like 'Convince Persevere Believe'.

7. The numbers 9/23/64 are written on the page, possibly a date.
THAT - IF

as a sub
for N + V+ often means if, it... and often

that’s

This depends on tense of containing V

for him to like her { * yesterday } surprised me

{ * tomorrow }

for him to like her { tomorrow } { ? will would } surprise me

{ yesterday }

( almost Dets in object ) expect him to come { tomorrow }

{ * yesterday }

I expected him to come { yesterday }

{ tomorrow }

NB - this has to be explained somehow.

We know that [ that ] in obj. of certain V

I doubt [ that ] we will ever know

I don’t doubt [ * if ] we will ( ever ) know

Can’t we set up some more abstract element which will dominate all 3 of these and let syntactic facts ( i.e. )
negation, dub, asp)

for him to want to be able to be willing to consider doing

Contraposition for him to have eaten there yesterday would have surprised then yesterday

Past + false

Past + false

Past + Dub

Past + Dub

Habitual *

Past - Habit?

Past for him to like her surprised me

arrive at 10 PM

Past for him to [have en] eat there yesterday surprised me

Past
That = whether


If he comes, I want to know if he has I want to know if he has I'm trying to remember if S I remember if S He would remember if S

That = whether

NB

afraid

worried

sure

certain

positive

skeptical

NB

prefer

The...

NB

forget

question

NB

forget

regret

think

guess

imagine

NB

doubt

NEG (know)

Q (remember)

imp

tell me

Mis

forget

NB

ask

wonder

discover

Q (know)

Neg

hope

believe

promise

think

guess

{whether} if that

{NEG} that

{IMPL} that
Hypothesis: all abstract nouns are nominalizations.

Exceptions

1. N's where a convenient verb

2. Designated elements?
   - way
   - manner
   - extent
   - reason
   - time
   - place

3. Feature nouns
   - rank
   - color
   - order
   - shape
   - grade
   - size

4. Units
   - {ca., un-}
   - {sec., un-}
   - Are these abstract or not?
   - Yes, probably

5. Solutions
   - {quantity} \approx \{many\}
   - {amount} \approx \{much\}
   - ?? diameter \approx \{across\}
   - {sex} \approx \{male, female\}
   - rate/temp \approx \{fast, slow\}
Verbs whose progressive tense has future

If I have time, I'm going to Cannes

If I get the money, I'm wearing a fur coat

buying a car

If I go in, I'm getting wet

if I'm staying in (for a long time)
he seems to
I like/hate me
understand the prob.
? get wet
* chip the tree down
* arrive in Boston (? be chopping down the tree)
? cough
* hit the target
* * "a"
work hard
? drive a car
? shoot the gun
know the ans.
[my]
[some]

Maybe there is some kind of restriction on
the aspect of the verbs which can occur after seem.
\( a = \text{adjective, adverb} \)

\begin{align*}
\text{Faa} & \quad \text{surprisingly, amazingly} \\
\text{Fae} & \quad \text{very} \\
\text{Fee} & \quad \text{very} \\
\text{Fab} & \quad \text{very} \\
\text{Fbd} & \quad \text{not} \\
\text{Fac} & \quad \text{too} \\
\text{Fag} & \quad \text{too} \\
\text{Fgg} & \quad \text{too} \\
\text{Fca} & \quad \text{much} \\
\text{Fgd} & \quad \text{not}
\end{align*}
Complements

V NP so that NP would V+ ⇒
V NP to V P

\[ \frac{\text{paid him to go, tube}}{	ext{urge, make, urge, from}} \]
\[ \begin{array}{l}
\text{keep it running, start}
\text{leave me, prevent}
\text{make let}
\end{array} \]

\[ \text{have yet} \]

\[ \text{Badly no good} \]

NB: Why did you pay him?
Who nnn nnn n

\[ \text{An: I paid him to sing} \]

\[ \text{Q: Why did you want him?} \]
\[ \text{I wanted him to sing} \]

7/13/64

want him to go
prefer would like it

\[ \begin{array}{l}
\{ \text{see, watch} \\
\text{I think that maybe there are all different though want and urge may be the same want urge pay} \end{array} \]
Symmetric relations

- Each other
  - $x$ resembles $y \Rightarrow$
  - $x + y$ resemble e.o
  - $x$ marries $y$

- No constant $\square$
  - $x$ is the same as $y$
  - $x$ is identical to $y$
  - $x$ is equal to $y$
  - $x$ is equivalent to $y$
  - $x$ is comparable to $y$
  - $x$ is similar to $y$

- Is other than $y$?

- From apart
  - $x$ is far from $y$
    - keep $x$ from $y$
    - separate
    - tear
    - rip
    - [apart]

- To together
  - $x$ is near $y$
  - close
  - $x$ is with $y$
  - mix $x$ with $y$
  - combine
  - put
  - glue $x$ to $y$

**NB**: $x \mapsto x$ with $x \Leftarrow$ NB

These aren't strictly symmetric relations -- this $T$ is only a further step after the middle $T$

- Inter
  - $x$ is dependent on $y \Rightarrow$ interdependent
  - $x$ is related to $y$
    - acts on
    - twine
  - $x$ married $y$
Symmetric Relations

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{inter-} & \\
\times \{ \text{mingle, changes, breed, communicate} \} & \text{with } Y \\
\downarrow & \\
\{ \text{lock} \} \times & Y \\
\{ \text{lace} \} \times & \text{together} \\
\{ \text{interwined} \} & \subseteq ? \\
\{ \text{intersect} \} & \subseteq ?
\end{align*}
\]

Howabout:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{interracial, international} & \\
\text{intramarital, interstate, interurban} & \subseteq \text{between} \{ \text{race, nations} \} \\
\text{etc.} &
\end{align*}
\]
she said that he is coming tonight
was coming that night

she said that he is coming that night

NB

Choice of this - that is the same as the choice of \( b \) or not.

? * she said that you can come the week after

July 10: "I'll be there on July 20."

Tom \( \to X \)

July 15: "Tom said that he [will] be there on July 20."

\( X \to Y \)

2 weeks later: "Tom said that he would be there on July 20."

\( X \to Z \)
Epistemics

**CAN**

{ * he can
  Can he }

want to go there.

he can't

? he could

? * can't he

Can { they } be serious?

{ they } can't be serious.

{ he } could be { serious }.

{ they } could be { serious }.

* he can be paid

{ could }{ you
  can }{ he } have cancer?

{ you }{ couldn't }{ have cancer }.

{ you, etc. } { you couldn't } { have cancer }.

{ you, etc. } could have cancer.

NB: ≠ can { I, we }{ you
  could (n't) }{ can't (n't) }{ couldn't (n't) }{ couldn't }{ could (n't) }{ can't (n't) } (n’t) be crazy

* } can be delicious

you { could (n't) } be ill
Possibility

That

\{ ? \} be sick is \( \square \) \( \implies \) \{ \} may be sick

\{ you \} have been

\{ ? \} can't be sick

\{ you \} have been

\{ ? \} might be sick

\{ you \} have been
I can go — ability/perm

have cancer —

have fun/lunch — ability/perm

? be crazy — ? ability / ?? perm / ??? Φ

* be tall

* have gone

? * have had c. — ??? Φ

* have had fun

? * have been crazy — ??? Φ

* be going

be writing * by NP — ability

* be having cancer

be having lunch by NP — ability

? be being nasty by NP — ability

both Φ

? have been working out for 3 hrs by Tuesday — ability

? " " having trouble with it for 3 hrs — ability

? " " being nasty
he has

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{fun} &\quad D_{\text{cond}} \\
\{\text{cancer}\} &
\{\text{cholera}\} \\
T3 &
\end{align*}
\]

hope/patience/courage/persist

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{trouble} &\quad D_{\text{cond}} \\
\text{difficulties} &\quad D_{\text{cond}}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{lunch} &
\{\
\text{supper} \\
&
\} \quad D_{\text{cond}}
\end{align*}
\]

he is having

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{fun} &
\{\text{cancer}\} \\
* &
\end{align*}
\]

*hope/*patience/*courage/*perseverance

difficulties

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{lunch} &
\{\
\text{supper} \\
&
\}
\end{align*}
\]
Require animate
Subj - conscious,
voluntary act

[dictate: whole, prick, blood, whitehead]
jackass, jerk
sap
stup

gentleman
pedant

coward, scaredy cat

?? hero
digt

optimist

pest

assurance
father
pain in the X

[ bastard, cur, scoundrel]
heel, cad, bound

cad, rogue, witch

?? pal

? recluse

a child - only in metaphorical sense

These are only related to those N about which one can say "he's such a -"
J is never a dull pupil \( \leftarrow \) J is a speaker who is so interesting that

\[ \checkmark \] J is never a dull pupil \( \leftarrow \) J is a speaker who is interesting

\[ \checkmark \] J is a pupil who is never dull

Maybe this rule can be used to account for

\{ a too severe measure, a more intelligent child, a so large meal, a as large house, a big enough man \} \( \Rightarrow \) \{ too severe a measure, more intelligent a child, so large a meal (oblig), as large a house (oblig), ? big enough a man (oblig) \}
he must go \iff \Box \text{ that he } \text{ fut go }

I must that he go \iff I must that he \text{ fut go }

\Box \exists \text{ a selection of aux in Comps of } V \text{ like } \text{ inut, demand, etc. and in Comps of } A \text{ like } \text{ necessary, obligitory, mandatory, etc. (Also in nominalizations of there: the necessity that he go, the demand that he go.)}

But now how? \underline{He must have gone}

Can this come from \underline{it is \Box \text{ that he have gone} }?

Is this gram. Wo a DT like by NP or \underline{[before} \underline{NP]?}

\underline{Must clearly have futurity in its semantics}

I must go there \underline{\{tomorrow \text{ or } last week\}}

But this is also true of should and may
SHOULD

Now bout saying this comes from preferable?

NO — EUREKA

should comes from good!!

{ should
had [better]
ought to

Why isn't would o?

for somebody

{ if I were to go

it would be good

{ if I were best

that I went

it's better that I do it
Supposing we get the may-might distinction, it would be possible to be possible.  

Also: it is said that *that X is said  

\[ \exists \text{ it seems that } X \]

\[ \exists \text{ it appears that } X \]

\[ \exists \text{ it looks like X} \]

So, let's say the base forms are \{appear\} true and that true can only delete if followed by a Comp.
he may(not) kill me [next week] \(\iff\) that he [not] kill me next week is \(\Box\).

\(\n\) might(not) \(\Box\) n n

he must(not) have killed her [last week] \(\iff\) that he did not kill her last week.

he must(not) be killing her [next week] \(\iff\) that he is not killing her now is \(\Box\).

he [must] go \(\iff\) that he [not] kill me is \(\Box\).

he [had to] go [the next day] \(\iff\) that he [not] go [the next day] is \(\Box\).

NB - show it was future.

he must not go tomorrow \(\iff\) it is \(\Box\), that he [not] go tomorrow.
Tom say "Tom Pat be hungry"
I pat say that Tom Pat be h.  ⇒
I pat say n  n  Pat Pat n  n

Rule: Pat ⇒ Perf / Pat

Tom say "I Pat be h."

Rule: Pros ⇒ Ø  No change

Tom says that he was h.

T Pat say
Deletion of Aux #0002 6/19/64

go to
(also (?) other
in PsA Blog) only in context

NB

I was coming today

where?

I was driving there tomorrow

walking

sailing [to Greece next week]

building the house

diff? (planning on going

thinking of going


1. HAVE I asked him to have seen her report. I myself pack. I intend to discover. NB: must have done so now. We continue.

"I know him to have seen her report. I prefer to like my wife and have packed. I discovered. NB: must have done so now. We continue."

2. BEING

"I know him to be working. I prefer to like."

"Persuaded J. to have seen the Dr. I wish to have convinced."

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.

NB: THEE WRITE - something different.
Utterance

"I'll be there by 5 PM."

She should be there by now.

He left 10 years ago.

I'll come tonight.

today, tomorrow.

She went yesterday.

I'll come tomorrow.

He came last week.

I'll come next month.

Quote

he said "he would be there by 5 PM."

she should have been there by then.

he had left 10 years before then.

"he would come that night."

he would come the day after that.

he had come the week before that.

he would come the month after that.

next day:

tomorrow, the day after today.

day which is after today.

next month:

month, year, week, Sunday.

last:

next, year, last, Christmas.

yesterday:

last day.
**Utterance**

Joan was here the day before yesterday.

She'll be in NYC the day after tomorrow.

Yes, yes!

That is ambiguous.

Mg. 1 by the day after tomorrow.

Mg. 2 on the day after tomorrow.

I wash them thirdly to keep them fresh.

Go home.

**Quote**

He said, "Joan had been there the day before the day before that one."  

Em: Joan had been there two days before.

Em: She would be in NYC in 2 days.

Em: 2 days after.

Em: In 2 days from them.

Em: He washed them in that way to keep them fresh.

Em: Time that I should go home.

Em: He ordered that I go home.

Em: Told commanded.
Holmes → Watson
ARREST ROSS!

Geis → Julia
"Bob went there yesterday."

Bever → Indy
Geis said that Ross had gone there the day before

6/16/64.

Pete said, "I was there."

Haj → Elke: "Pete said that I was there."

I heard from Pete: "I've been hurt."

We greeted Pete's arrival with "Where've you been?"
Words bearing some relationship to the speaker

here - there - yonder
now
this
ago / back
? ahead

away off
? ← from this

? have + en

{ next
{ last

? self

) - we

thus

{ hence

{ hence

{ hence
you is simply derived from any name(s) when the name(s) happen to refer to the person the speaker is talking to.

Chomsky says to Halla:

"I'll give it to Postal"

Ross to Postal:

"Chomsky said he would give it to Postal."

but Ross to LSA meeting

which happens to contain Postal

* Chomsky said he'd give it to you

≡ You + I + WE

"are" simply derived from any name(s) referring to the speaker
Ross \rightarrow \text{GeVs}

"Chomsky will visit Halle today"

Chomsky \rightarrow \text{X}

"I will visit Halle today"

Halle \rightarrow \text{X}

"Chomsky will visit me today"

Chomsky \rightarrow \text{Halle}

"I will visit you today"

Halle \rightarrow \text{Chomsky}

"You will visit me today"
Order of Prepositions

Temporal Prepositions

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{before} & \quad \text{after} \\
\text{from} & \quad \text{at} \\
\text{at/on} & \quad \text{around/about} \\
\text{towards} & \quad \text{until} \\
\text{since} & \quad \text{by} \\
\text{every} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{before} & \quad \text{after} \\
\text{until/till} & \quad \text{up to} \\
\text{since} & \quad \text{by} \\
\text{ago/back} & \quad \text{towards} \\
\text{every} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{before} & \quad \text{after} \\
\text{during} & \quad \text{towards} \\
\text{ago/back} & \quad \text{then} \\
\text{every} & \\
\end{align*}
\]
Order of Propositions 6/1/64

TEMPORAL

{ ago } * before
{ ? back } * after
{ near } * since
{ around } * from ... (on)
{ about }* during
{ circa }* by
Reason for saying 2,000 yrs ago

from on high

by [now]

by [then] ⇐ by at [this] time

P [where] ⇐ at [P at what [time] place]?
ORDER OF PREPS

{down} {up} {out from}
{off} {on} {in} to (ward)
away from along
through across

under behind

at

[back out off] of

X loc beside

议事

above
near
above
about
against

side

along
in
out
be
ORDER OF PREPS

* out
  go off to Berlin — * go off to pieces
  * all — * all to pieces

Fog comes down from the hills — * Cirrhosis comes south from overdrinking
  * all

{ ran } off through the woods — { ran } south through his speech
{ went }

drive { out }
  { off }
  { away }

{ by }
{ by }
{ by } now = { by } me at this time
Bruce: NB — {look at} — look {look down} — look {look down into the pit}

similarly with hand x to y

got x to y

put x on y

* rely {down} on

trust in

walk at

remark at

NB also: from on high, I'm sending this to you from at Harry's

It may be D to form a directional from a Dir followed by a

Ploc.
AND
6/1/64

I wrote letters to, and they elected poor, our worst enemy.
I handed over, and he gave up the pirate, our largest ship.
I wrote letters, and you gave her, the man who...
he went [away], a (happy) man
he built the house
he left the country
she called me up
he died in his sleep
he died
he left drunk
he was wiser than when he had come
he arrived eager to start work
he took the test drunk

How about: he died here?
Is this to be construed as a Post-S modifier of Subj?

Similar to: evidence was presented that S

cf. card on favoritism of Subj. NP- under theory, Pazy, DC, length
determined
located
isolated

Now, how:

Drunk
Inebriated
Intoxicated

Closed
Shut

Magnetized

Lost
Not lost

Tired
Exhausted
Fatigued
Kneaded

Arranged (≠ un)
Decided
Settled

Grown up

Gold
Bought

These can, in general, occur with un-; can't occur w/ being, can follow be-righters

The boy seemed unhurt

*The house was being located at 15th St.

*The tree seemed cut down.
color  

below  

standard  

\{  

\text{on occasion}  

\{  

\text{of}  

\text{value}  

\}  

\text{interest}  

\}  

\text{on beam target}  

\}  

\text{part}  

\}  

\text{under}  

\text{above}  

\text{below}  

\}  

\text{for}