when did [John or Bob] leave?

when did she ever kiss John or Bob?
N Incorporation

* blätterlos. / = * grün blätter

and suggests that plural is a constituent

b) that blätter is formed by incorporation

10/20/70

Notice what happens when we further compound

1 2

slave state ≠ slave labor

1 3 2

slave state worship = slave labor worship

1 3 2

The fact that this exists shows that it would be wrong to say that this is an NP.

full NPs don't incorporate - only bare NPs.
Substantiation and Rp

invagination, if it exists at all, can only be a causative:

* John's invagination was achieved electrically

Therefore, we predict*

* Her doubts as to John's invagination were justified.
Three arguments for this:

1. \( \tilde{\Phi} \neq \text{Agatha} \)

2. \( \tilde{\Phi} \neq \text{...} \)

3. \( \tilde{\Phi} \neq r\tilde{a}\tilde{O}\tilde{t}w, \text{paralleling reception} \)

All this can be explained by saying *\( \Phi \) / 0/0/.

A solution which did not use geminates would need two statements.
Pervasive Segments

10/70

# palatals /\[
\text{ex}c \text{ arch rival enemy}\\
\text{but archiphenomenal}
\]

# palatals /\[
\text{ex}c \text{ sure etc}
\]

\text{ex}c \text{ a charge change etc}

\text{ex}c \text{ back etc}

agility\ etc

10/23/70

Notice that:\
steps other regularity:
hashishational

\text{ex}c channel
Output condition on any

NB: # "fake" negation for anyone would have helped

(* anyone would not have helped)

This means that the OC is a stupid one — there doesn’t have to be a connection between the Neg and the any.

Why then do this bad?

That anyone had left is what I didn’t say.

How about this?

* That anyone was here can’t what I said.

* That anyone was here can’t what I said.

It’s not that stupid after all.
What I don't claim is (or is it) that she kissed anyone.

If this is just "fake", how come this?

Maybe what happens is this:

Cyclical errors are let through (cyclical because of Paul's so that anyone he appeared to me to be doubtful)

Then a stupid OC throws out some more
Which and?

For some insane reason, rhetorical Qs w/ which are out:

* Which do you do about that?

Am let him go — what did he do wrong?

* Which

But there is one rhetorical—feeling type of P with which

Which do you think I took?

* 

Why Why Why?
These guys never occur in the possessive:

Thus a. * 'Hub's / that's destruction

b. * We talked about Hub's being the case

c. * A defect of these's

Since I at least 3 distinct sources of

Pro, an OC 40 D.
Since getting rid of clause-waters is OBC in forward gapping, the fact that it is both

shows that backwards gapping ≠ forwards gapping
Fact from George's class, relayed by Paul

Neubauer:

I don't know \( \{ \) which \( \} \) Sam ate - (whether) apples or pears

I have no idea \( \{ \) which \( \} \) Sam ate - apples or pears
Embedded Q's and Lexicalism

The question as to whether or not Bill is fit
The man that he has (lit) become
The (amount of) headway that I [expected]

* was surprised

that you would make

//

The way in which I [didn't] solve the problem
Alphabet Soup + Names

10/5/20

Facts from Richie Carter:

1. You're a good city,
   \{ Boston \}
   \{ The Hague \}
   \{ The Bronx \}

2. The name of that is
   \{ Mass \}
   \{ The Moon \}

3. Its name is
   \{ IBM \}
   \{ The FBI \}
(1) All acronyms (NAT0, UN, etc) are straight paper N's.

(2) All countries are the USA/GDR/USSR/DRV etc. VAR

(3) Businesses are IBM/ITT/AT&T/GM/VW/BMW/MGM/UA/MTA

(4) Colleges are UCLA/UMich/UNH/MIT/CIT

(C) USC/RPI/ICU/TCU/FUB

(5) Agencies are CIA/FBI/FCC/FTC/SEC/WHO

(6) Anything containing and or P is the A&P B&0/Cbo

(7) Networks are CBS/WSY/BST/PP&M

(8) But small political parties are YAF/SDS/COR (?) of the SMC

(9) Newspapers are the NYT/GH/Tim/WJ

(10) Magazines are SR/AM/PM/CR/INL/PLN/NNB

but: the OPR
(11) Cars are the - the VW/BMW/DKW

(12) Machines are the - the TFX/SST/PDP/LTD

(13) Stations are the - CBS/WJZ/NBC etc. But - the BBC

(14) Courses & majors are the - (I'm taking) ROTC/OS/PE

(15) Degrees are the - the Ph.D./MA/BA/LLD

(16) Chemicals are the - DDT/H2O/LSD/STP/TNT

(17) Sports (?) are the - the ERA/RBI

(18) Countries (VW, BLT, RBI, Ph.D, SST, etc) are the, minus N (Bo, TNT, etc) and the (but why the EMF?)

(19) Den. Action 6 (emp) - I think it would mean different things w/ and w/o the

(20) Books are the - SPE/CILT/RIPL/LS2T

(21) All the's - the GNP/BLT/G&T/ECG/SOS/SOB/EMP

odd's - est/DST/ANZ

(22) Initials are the - LBJ/FDR/HH/H/FAS/AST
Alphabet Soups and The

(28) Branches etc are The - The USMC/USAF/USN

(24) Ships are The - The NSP (naval)
(count N)

(25) Cities are 0 - LA/NY(C)
Alphabet Soup + The

- Goes with greyhounds?
- Big deals?

- Cars
- Machines
- Count N
- Countries
- Organizations
- Agencies
- (Newspapers)
- Armed

- Businesses
- Stations + networks
- Courses + majors
- Colleges
- Small groups
- Magazines
- Small (political?) groups
- Initials
- Cities

- GWHS
- PA
- UCLA
- Help
- PA
- BUT
- THE PDS

- Minimal pairs:
  - NBC but THE FCC
  - NYC but THE VAR

- Chemicals

Either

DAG: I'm working at (the) ELI
ELI: (The) ELI can't lobby anyone
The fact that transparent readings are possible only if E N or rel cl I again argues that N are from rel cls.

I.e., this do not ambiguous exx write CA

then believes that it was raining in CA

whereas this do 4 ways away

then believes that the rain was falling in CA
Musing with Jim

1. Bill believes it's raining — # opacity reading
   • NP for there to be 2 readings

2. V with only transparent reading — Haregawa couldn't stop this — can we?

9/16/70 – evening

Ans: yes, glorious yes — the way we keep manage etc.

from having opaque readings is by saying that and
  can't be the next V down.

We can't however ever stop a transparent reading
  because seeing having variables, is an unprocessed rule!
If there are credits of the IO of a performer then we shouldn't get them in IO's w/ NO IO. But we do.

Your Majesty, I christen this ship the HMS Junk.

Mr. Chairman, I move that we groan.

So that means their str. for this.
Conj + Dieg 9's

9/11/20

It's unclear as to who left

As to only goes with dieg 9's

Dieg 9's only

Who - whether Tom or Max - left is unclear

*Wild
As an imperative

Fact from Sin.

Open the door!

Yes, I will

Generalization: yes + no = follow Viper

False:

Jack's tall

Yes, he's a great basketball player.
RCF must be an across-the-board rule —

1. which pleased me but *(which) displeased Ed
   a. which pleased me but *(which) displeased Ed
   b. which I was pleased by but *(which) displeased Ed
   c. which I liked but *(which) Ed disliked
   d. which I liked but *(which) displeased Ed

Therefore, the versions of a. and c. which have only one which must derive from 2. which S's vid Conj Red.
This constraint explains why this is bad.

(then)

I said he was crazy, and he [that] I was

Shin also points out the difference between these So, where $V_1$ can delete and persuade/expect cases, where $V_1$ can't.

A nice minimal pair:

\[ \text{which girls do you believe} \]"
9/9/70

Then points out that we can’t have the order

Elucidaion

Reattaching

Ripping

to account for the have/jestion offy 5

contrast, because in

I had an offy to visit Rome

both this

and Rome can rip.

So, how about saying that the constraint
must be that you can’t rip anything out if
something which remains an 15P node in the 55

This would be good for the 55C.

Counterexample: extraped reveals
Shin Harada suggested, in effect, that they were the same phenomenon.

My sentences:

1. Jack wants \{ \text{a picture of a man} \}

2. I \{ \text{had mentioned an opportunity to meet a man} \}

3. I want \{ \text{to respect Marge's wishes and date a girl from LA} \} \text{to go downtown and pick up a girl from LA}
I bet the fact that *if* editing devices and the fact that *if* a long-text editing device are the same.

In other words, it wouldn't surprise me for *if* incorporated full NPs not to be islands.
All rules, even expressions, which move things to the right are upward bounded.

Thus

That he was arrested, my father, shocked Sarah.

Thus nothing like Naomi's analysis will work.
Chopping in Japanese

Bun ga sakana o tate, Tonn ga teriyaki o tateba.

The rule of pseudo-cleft formation can take NP₂ but not NP₁.

Gasp.

But the CSS is operative in Japanese, because of

watakusi ga [rotsuku o kiri koto to] [boooji o kaburu koto ga]

suki da

Neither of these can rip out, even

for PC-formation
Terrific! CRd does obey Island constraints.

I have a picture of Bill and Tony.

I had opportunities to visit Bill and Tony.

I was expected to meet Jane and Sue.

I was surprised.
I bet it's das Picasso Bild
but der Ford Wagen
etc - great rule, if true.

Paul tells me I'm wrong - *  
der Picasso
* die Kollartz
Conf (red + islands)

If CR obeys island constraints, what does that say about how it's ordered?

9/1/70

I.e., I believe the claim that you all hear: speakers must come from.

9/4/70

I believe the claim S + S

This predicts that there should be 2 sources for some conj NP, one for others.

I deduced that S₁ and that S₂ - always

I deduced the report that S₁ and that S₂ - only embedded from conj.
The fact that $\parallel$ between

*I + you are friends

and

Tom told Ann that he and she were friends

is OK because

(a) only $I + you at out$ — we $NP$ is OK

(fact from Bruce)

(b) Embedded I $NP$ is also out
Neg in these clauses

Is better to have friends than not
   * go home

But why?
   To have friends is better than not to have friends.

Another proof that the rule that deletes think is different from the general deletion in [ ]:
   I think not

But why? Is friends is good?
I want to know that you are OK tomorrow

* you are OK tomorrow

* I (will) know that you are OK tomorrow

I will see you to be OK tomorrow

I must know that you are OK tomorrow
I bought Ann's picture of Fred of me

Here, the CSC throws out a string

I thought of Ann's picture of Fred of me

and he

AMBIG

MONOG

Here, the CSC throws out a reading

If rules which throw that reading are semantic rules and rules which throw out strings are syntactic rules then the CSC should span the gap.
If there is a difference between these

I don't *claim* that buying anything would be easy for him.

Holy Shit! I think there is!

I don't *think* that for you to eat anything just yet.

*claim* would be a good idea
Variables vs Constants

3. Apples take things out of sentential subjects

1. Not Napping

2. Subject Raising

3. Predicate Raising

And, as Kinsuke points out, Neg goes in in that he ever left is not true

But Neg from upstairs doesn't go in:

* I don't claim that buying anything would be easy for him

So it looks like we really must have a distinction between variable and constant rules.
Another test for disj Ps:

where: \[ \text{he left it} \] \[ \text{I couldn't determine} \]

\[ \text{in the world} \]

\[ \text{I determined} \]

Also, namely it only possible w/ conj Ps.

Thus

who he buried: \[ \text{where - namely author here} \text{ } \text{here} \]

\[ \text{unknown} \]

\[ \text{wild} \]

Hrm. Why is it ok to say? what he ordered - something from a

ab wild

\[ \text{What he's planning - whether anything big or not -} \]

\[ \text{so unknown / wild} \]
Who he wants to appoint - either Max or Bart - is [wild]
*wucker*
Last year more tourists had opportunities to visit more towns mentioned.

* More men ate rice and more ham last year.
The two conditions are:

\[
\text{NP}\ {\text{NP}}\ {\text{NP}}
\]

all must be w/o prep.

\[
\text{NP}\ {\{\text{NP}\}\ {\{\text{PP}\}\ {\{\text{VP}\}\ {\{\text{S}\}\ {\{\text{X}\}\}}}}}}\]
\]

This is to because of

I talked to Mary about war

And she to me about sex

\[
\text{and he}\ {\text{about sex}}\]
\]

But I talked to Mary about putting herself up

* and Bill (to Susan) about getting herself a job
This order is D: Bounded out by Kajita

Typicalization

Reattacking — This is D to get an Yffy 5 I never had

Gapping

This is do to get

* Bill had an Yffy 5,
and Tom — an Yffy 5.
I am eager to go, but Bill (46) reluctant (47 
Bill is difficult to please, but Tom is easy (47 to please) 
The is likely to win, and Bill is certain (75 to win) 

But not! 

Therefore, Bill is likely (75 to win) and Tom certain. 

I think it has to be by —

I was surprised that Bill wasn’t afraid 

but Bill wasn’t afraid 

I liked to swim, but Bill disliked to swim

I am self-sacrificing, but Tom is not fond

Tins.
Tests for clause-mates:

1. Refl
2. Unlocking
3. Nobody... (actual checks for command)
The usual men had opportunities to visit the usual women mentioned.
Bad, bad news:

Why can Japanese have P's like Anna do dare to happy couple demoka?
John and Bill were willing to kiss each other. They were surprised to have kissed each other.

8/27/70
8/26/70

It was difficult to get along with Bill, and

with Fred easy

Mogad!

To get along with Bill was difficult, but

with Fred easy

{ * It would bore me to go to Panb
   { *For Ann) to go to Panb would bore me

but

& Rome (*would) please me

This term, if the facts are right,

fucks up everything I've thought.
The reason we don't get

I said that it had rained on Bill and Billome

should be the same as this

I want it to rain on Bill and he on me

I forced Ann to shave Bill and he on me

Hypothesis: If the subject / the that-clause has been first-ripped out, we should get 5's parallel to

which girls do you want to give books to and

which girls records?

Test (8/26/76 10:02 AM)

which girls did you think had gone to Paris and

which girls

Yay!!
Prediction: in languages like Spanish, where no NP subject of that-clauses is I, it might be possible to get its like:

Bill thinks that I am sick and

She lazy

(depending, of course, on how late the rule which deletes these unstressed NPs)
Hey! The reason that sometimes gappage is obligatory

(c.f. I sliced the salami with a knife on Friday and Bill [* the salami * with a knife * on Saturday *]
\{ The cheese [ with a hatchet ] \}

and sometimes not

due e.g. I wanted to visit Bill and he [* to visit me *]
\{ me * \}

Do this: identical clause-mates must gap
This restriction shows something interesting about Aux — namely that Noam was right about the structure of the Aux, at least from some point in the derivation on.

Thus, I will write him and he (*wrote) me.

I am writing him and he (*writing) me.

I have written him and he (*written) me.

The general rule for *jappening is:

1) All of the highest V must go and all other identical clause-mates of this V with the constraint that if it is the V which "unlocks" the other deletion.

(i.e. *I sliced the okra with a knife and fried it..."
2) then the V and all of its clause-mates of the next lower clause go.

Thus the fact that 

*I will write* him and *call Telephograph him* etc.

are out is to be explained by saying that we have not "unlocked" the rule of getting the whole V has not been deleted.

This could all be explained if we were to say this:

```
S_1  |  S_{R}
V_1  |  V_1
  \|  \|  \|  \|  \|  \|
NP   | NP   | NP   | NP   | NP   | NP

\[ V_1 \rightarrow \text{will} \]
\[ V_2 \rightarrow \text{write} \]

\[ \text{I} \rightarrow \text{him} \]
\[ \text{him} \rightarrow \text{I} \]
```

Predicate Raising
Note that it is not ad hoc for us to use
Fred Raising here, because we'll need it
was outside the Aux, for "expected" I like keep
stop begin G.

*I kept writing & Bill telegraphing

*I continued writing him and he writing me

* Ted stopped moaning and Carlita growing

NB - that I do ok if moaning it from

other guys moan