Facts from Sin Harada:

I made the claim that $S_1$ and Max that $S_2$

I had an opportunity to visit Max and he *an opportunity to visit me*

This * indicates that have an opportunity may be a verb. Because NB E

I discussed an opportunity to visit Max and he — an opportunity to visit me
(\(\Phi\)') Disjunction

(*both*) What man (and) what 2 girls broke it?

** either what man or what girl broke it**

But OK

(*either*) What professor or what student could demand that?

\[\text{WHY?}\]

From Jim: ? which men [all] sneezed

** [all]\(\bigwedge\) [of which men sneezed**
Q: Did he write in French or in German?

A: 1) Yes

2) He wrote very very slowly, slowly.

But

Similarly, similarly, similarly, similarly, similarly.

Q: Did he write either in French or in German?

A: 1) Yes

or no

Either to France or to Germany?

Thus the or which is connected with P's is a different one from the one in either or
Who (the f*ck) did he talk to — John or Harry?

Fine. Well, what [the f*ck] are you going to tell him — that you're going or that you're not?

Another place where either or

1. (either)

He's sick, or at least his phone is out of order

2. (either)

He's sick, as I possible, or he really doesn't
care for me any more.
either Bob or the girls are going to do it?

is n n n

Generalization: usually any plural disjunct makes plural agreement preferable.

either the girls or Bob is going to do it.

are either the girls or Bob going to do it?

There was either a boy or 2 girls there?

were either 2 girls or a boy there?

Same forms with V5I — were there either a boy...

were there either 2 girls...

Now in hell
8/26/70

If there are out, then we’re in

Buying anything is not easy [To do]

*£ avoid

That anybody danced is (not) easy to doubt

No — because they're out w/o Tony Moore too.
Within Fuller's set of terms, there seems to be no way to say

The Land of the Rising Sun

(= the land where the sun sets)

1/24/80
Bill was easy to please.

& Jack's difficult.

* to get along with.
I believe that Ann bought a picture of me and so does Bill

I believe that Ann had an opportunity to visit me and so does Bill

BUT CSC and CNPC w/reels do not

Ed believes that he and Martha are similar, so do I

Ed knows calculus + gets his work done fast, so do I?

Ed read the book that Ann sent to him, so did Bill
8/23/70

SSC

Ed believes that going out with him is good for Jane,

+ so does Tom — AMBIG (? — I think)

Weird shit w/ other CNPs:

Ed believed the claim that he was popular,

and so did Bill — AMBIG

Ed regretted Anna's claim that he was popular

and so did Bill — MONOC

Ed mentioned the fact that he was popular

and so did Bill — both AMBIG.
From Ed

Say hello to Ed from you from me?

Argument for you-del

Bill asked him to say hello to you from me.

An es.

A rule of PP del under identity w/ subject of higher request.
This city looks interesting

8/23/70
This problem was knotty for me = difficult for me to solve

* I was knotty for the problem

This bintness parallels the badness of

* I was easy to solve this problem

What argues for this derivation is that

all the easy problems for us have been solved already

This could only remain behind

The knottiness of this problem. This suggests that the real content is on experience.
Note the contrast of

\[ \text{it was } \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\text{* than} \\
\text{of John}
\end{array} \right\} \text{ that I wonder how many pictures of} \]

you took

This shows we must do OF of clef/RCR

Gesp. This puts OF in the cycle

But the same is shown by

It's that which I don't know whether to read where than put
Tell me the time that he ever had a chance to buy anything.
Proves that he is a COP.
I took advantage of her + she of me

What about?

I took cruel advantage of her, + she of me

She - it works to
He was possessed of knowledge that would help him.
Fred and Marge are an interesting pair,
and Tom and Marge are an interesting pair.

* (Fred + Tom) and Marge are interesting pairs.

So Comp Red keeps the C5C
Fact from Jan Anward:

I was surprised to be sent to Rome,
and Fred was surprised to be sent to Paris.

This can thus explain the

Unappallability.

8/13/70
Why is difference here?

They bought a picture of somebody. I think of Mary.

They had an envelope.

John + somebody from LA were dancing together. I think Mess.

If deletion rules obey the constraints, this kind of dancing isn't obedient.

Hrm — could it be that what follows Think, etc.

Is the remark a pseudo check?

If so, what would predict this:

John ate something — I think (even) Wheaties.

But John sampled various brands — I think even Wheaties.
Deletion islands

pp. 7

NB: E

He fell asleep during one movement - I think during the best.

This rule seems to totally ignore past variations.

NB - this clause must follow

* Although I don't think the best, he fell asleep during one movement.
Object incorporation + Lex insertion

8/14/20

$x$ stung $y = x$ clips the wings of $y$

This last looked like a violation of Paul's strong constraint:

If more contains a variable, it has to follow the antecedent

But Paul pointed out that this is really from

$x$ clipped $y$'s wings

It hence

$x$ wing-clipped $y$'s ones

So it's just object-verbs, with subsequent deletion.
Object Incorporation + Lexical Motion

Prediction: $\phi$ V like frie w meaning

clips

\text{clip clips rose}$

\text{clip clips rise}$

Only inalienably possessed guys should undergo this rule.

A real counterexample would be a verb which brought up a referential verb (by pred. rather
8/4/20

* self-paying
* self-behavior

So these "NP's" never function as such.

Shit! Why self-expression?

(If this related to the fact that I express my disagreements)
get old

red
sick
hungry
tall
fat

* dead
* surprised
* opposite: Here

like for

It's absolute adjectives that work like this?
Postal on Presuppositions

8/4/70

I lack nuclear weapons (lack presup norm to have)

* I'm out of rotten food (out of presup norm to have)

Mother is ill (presup bearer is in immediate family)

Hanoi gov't (presup what the country of which Hanoi is capital is)

Senators Eastland & [Long] * [Lincoln] divided into at least 2 parts

Peter, Harry, Smith — get to be in same Congress

Mother-in-law language

In-Bose

happy vs. * gappy (w/ presup that it's raining in City)

That is a * presup because it's not about any NP in the S

who came to see you was a [man]

[?gay]

Ask here about the difference between "in"/"not in" context; vs. Where is/it such context.

The [black bird] is found in NE

* bird

* The blackbird is so called because X
S', from Paul:

finding anyone was shown by [someone] not to be easy

Here the art doesn't command a preceding any

Shitfuckjeb
Inception Prohibition

Maybe the reason that this is

I won't force you to marry anyone

\[ \downarrow \]

I will force you to marry someone

\( \because \text{ not a whole} \)

\( \because \text{ no remnant} \)

NB also

* For me, there was no one else luckily
I was benefited by yr adv

Yr adv was benefited from by me

benefited

beneficial to

I was surprised at her readiness

He was surprised at me

was surprising to
What follows: expect must denote action event
That means that other

I expect him to resemble his father

should come from

I expect that I will discover that he resembles but

[find out]

This will explain

1) I expected her to be very early
   [surprised]

2) I expect that he will have kissed her by noon
   [I will have told you by noon]

But since this is good, this should be too

* I expect him to have been here yesterday
S's from Elke:

I hear us
I see us probably ok because us is part of a lower S.

I'll get us off the road

I'll feed us
I want to praise us
I'll put us in the Green Room

as opposed to

I want to [excuse us]
[kiss us]

By and large, activities are worse
Nasal Assimilation and Nasalization

8/7/70

mf → ñf before (i.e., in less rapid speech than) mf does.

inference → [ĩfrɛns] but

symphony → [ˌsɪmfrəni]

only in very fast speech

8/7/70 Dave suggests that it is only VnC which goes to Vc – not Vnc. Not quite true – I possible. [Play?] _Epower _but it's probably on the right track.

mf → mf only in OK words, w/ or across syllables

mv → mv

So mv has to be ruled out w/ and across

So what happens to \( \text{bl}^{\text{inf}} + \text{Latin} \)

It can't be pronounced, but it can't undergo the rule, either

Interestingly, if morphemes begin w/ ñV or ñhV, w/ ñV, so the ruling out has reached a pretty high level
Fact with Paul

Suppose S. (Then) I [think] that S

So this has been ripped out of this clause

8/8/70
"Thematic" Hierarchy

7/31/70

Because of *S's like his mind is blown

* she cool was lost by him
* his mind was not by him etc

we can see that the real difficulty is not in having antecedents higher on the hierarchy (because this NP bears no relationship to the agent, if indeed the former of even in R5), but in having the agent be a person.

Cf. The speech by him about himself

* put himself by him
* by himself about him

* act act by himself by himself
Remember Ed Witten's mind-stopper:

Backwards pronoun is only possible when the pronoun is in an island.

Wild! If this is true, then maybe in a language like Serbo-Croat where $\exists 55c$, backwards pronoun would not be.

Check out
Dougherty can't get this:

They talked to each other about each other.

for 2 reasons:

1) ~0 ε 2 each's on they

2) ~0 to move each exe from any position

* I talked to the boys each aft communion

Aha! The boys (But hrm: I gave the boys each a dozen)

* I attributed the paintings each to Missells.

* I sent them each a letter

Helke pointed out // belia e a x self

*We talked about each other to ourselves // each other
* What are these, please?

Why bad?
Tokyo Seminar
August 24 - Sept. 5, 1970.

I. Islands
   A. Review
      1. NA
      2. CVS
         B. Definition of Islands - insertion constant + slipping [NP]
         C. VSP
   D. Consequences - PP = NP (but why is this not a problem? can it apply to VSP?)

II. Deletion
   A. Getting rid of Han-Dei Slating
   B. Relations and constraints
   C. Slippy TD - movement rules and TD
   D. Demote theory + care, P's + phantom NP

III. Derivational constraints

IV. Consequences for the theory of grammar
The lexical hypothesis says that there can be no rule which could apply to a substantivization, but not of an underlying N.
Bill might be hard, and Tom might not.

Bill will be rude, and Tom may \( \text{be} \) too.

Tom will be arrested, and I think Fred will be too.

Fred should be too.

WILD! - be deleted only after the same modal.

Text: 1:48:40

I expect him to be polite, and Fred should too.

Fuck shit, pick.
Why do that out?

* Max is in Rome tomorrow and Ted will too

That grant enabled them to be careful

and we [can] too

Shut

There would be done like these. [would (be)]

have been
Agent Phrases

by-phrases in substantives are always agents.

by-NP postposponed S and NP are ≠ rules.

† the belief by Max in God
Why oh why do R D Flax
upward bounded
That no one takes her out is a shame
your sister
Wild—can the clause-mate constraint on hub be flanked be what's governing the possible antecedents of home in I take her home if
I said that she could go home?
Across the Board (Ishak)

[1] A man whose father and whose son were similar
* Who
* A picture of whom

[2] He read a novel about whom and * whose picture
* Who
* A picture of whom

were similar

What goes on here? Some kind of superficial skin
Lowering Constant

Maybe Noam is partly right:

When stuff moves up, the whole S need not be moved, but when stuff moves down (e.g., $S$ lifting)

Q Lowering

Adv Lowering

Schreiber's rule for adv. like

Fordishly as in Be spoke, fordiskly

I find S odd 23 ($S$ is odd to me)

So things move around on their islands, but when they move down, all upper material must go.
Verb gapping is a domain phenomenon

Conversation w/ Janet:

What excludes... + Tom for $

2 things:

a) Any string of 3 non-VP NPs → out

b) Any string NP NP V X → out

Thus

John forced Max into Y, and
Max Bill into Z, ok to stay
Fact from Bruce:

He'll pick up some wine or some beer

Acknowledged that she had picked up some wine or some beer

* was surprised

NB also

I knew

didn't know

That Fred had asked pit or Sam back

Thoughts with Jan

9/16/70

Doesn't this S suggest that this or comes from and via DeMolay?

But then where does this one come from?
Two Kinds of Conjunction
Derivational Constraints

Ed said:
- that he & Ann were similar
- intelligent
- that he was fat and Ann (was) thin
- that he & Ann were fat & thin, neat

Bob said, too.

The first two F's show that a derivational constraint will be necessary.