Superlatives

Tom of the littlest
+ little
a little boy

little can only occur personally

Therefore, there was an N here

But if *a content van

no? Tom was the most content

Is this really good?

I need more examples
I don't know when either Tom or Bob left

= I don't know when Tom did and I don't know when Bob did

? I don't know whether it was Bob who came and I don't know whether it was Tom who came

I don't know (either) whether it was Bob who left or whether it was Tom who left

[Note: The handwriting is very difficult to read, and corrections may be required.]
If agreement is always copying,
Greek agreement destroys the insertion constraint.
Apparel Deletion

11/18/70

He took Sally's pants off.

Whose pants did he take off (his/her)?

Sally's pants Joe took off.

Sally's pants Joe took off (his/her)?

Sally's pants were taken off by Joe (of Sally) (his/her)?

Who took whose pants off = who stripped who who directed himself?
I bought Mary a knife * which is * to shave herself with.

* Proving

Shows we need $\text{WHIZ} \rightarrow \Delta$

$\text{EQU}$ ← Proving

because EQU only works out NP under identity

with members of next clause up
From Pat Brogan:

It wasn't until 5 that he left.

From me: It was until 5 that he didn't leave.

I don't believe that it was until 5 that he left.
It doesn't happen that he likes cheese.

but 

* He doesn't happen to like cheese (I don't think)

hēlas

(From he happen not to like cheese?)

* I don't think

But again? * Tom didn't happen to visit Harriet

*hēlas ² OK Tom didn't happen to visit her, did he?

*
They're not, because

(a) They exclude negatives and stative.

(b) a knife for [poking the grapes (with)]
   \[ \text{the trip} \]
   \[ \text{leaving the napkin}^{*} \text{(on)} \]

Cf. This knife is for [poking the grapes (with)]
   \[ \text{leaving the napkin}^{*} \text{(on)} \]

That is, with deletes optionally here, but
no other prepositions.
John realizes that Bill will, however, sign the bill.

Mary, who has, however, certain reservations, will sign only the people who had (however) reservations. Signed affords are in obj of performative. Vo.
When, please was it, *(I wonder)*?

This suggests that these aren't P's.

But if the source of I wonder is alone, how come E

who, besides yourself, knows him?

Ham.
1. Arnold argues that without fail it only on hips.
   (in manner of speaking)

2. by all means is

   You must come, [without fail] [by all means]
It has not been determined as to when he left. I couldn't determine (as to) when he left. I'm not sure (as to) when he left. The question (as to) when he left has not been settled. I've been wondering (about, as to, for) when he left. What's the environment for this rule?
I couldn't determine whether either Max or Tom was there when either Max or Tom will go there. Either Max or Tom went there. (all of these?)

Are OK, I think. Why 5, or why 3.

Why either Max or Tom are there.

how long (either) Max or Tom stayed.

NB: *I was able to determine how long (either) Max or Tom had slept.
Sylvia Schwartz's conjecture, that only embedded O's delete, is supported by these facts:

I \[\underline{\text{can't}}\] determine
\[\underline{\text{*can}}\]
Conjunctive φ's

Best argument that conj φ's come from that-clauses as the parallel complementarity of doug φs, and [conj φ's or that-clauses] after determine, which Barbara noted.

Maybe what is quantified over in conj φs is the set of n-ads that could satisfy the frame.

Who slept where — Kurt upstairs + Fritz downstairs — is all.

No — I still don't understand it.
Who left? presupposes not only that someone left, but that more than one could have.

* What picture took in your set do you want me to fix?
Emphatic so is only possible in affirmative clis, which proves that they come from upstairs, and are the DO's of performatives.
Maybe this unambiguity
I found a woman to kiss my genitalia, and
Bell found her too
It just because her it visible

What about?

and Bell found two of them

This also seems unambiguous so everyone
be right in saying that two ≤ two of them
the source doesn't have the right affiliation.
Jack approved of the picture of his horse,
and Tom approved.

That Ed would have to shoot up was obvious.
And that Bill would was obvious, too.
Bill believes that something fell

This doesn't have an opacity ambiguity, is this because the purported other reading has to be at least as specific?

Or what?

Whatever it is, it's more evidence for some coming from or:

too believes that we will get ham or egg

Either ham or egg has opacity ambiguous, but not the whole object.
Opacity and Audibility

should be that, because if any
A has a physiological function-getting now,
Bague and B not? it will behave like a

you said that Tom kicked the piard but Bill doesn't believe that he kicked

That would account for the

non-ambiguity of

Joe believes that it was muddy there.

If specify is only a property
of visible NPCs.