Bluntly

7/22/70

* I opined him a dime

Who

* Nobody
phonologically ill-formed words (proks)

syntactically ill-formed idioms (by + large)

There should also be morphologically ill-formed words.

(e.g. ? speedometer)
Who's I read
Whose did you read?
*The man whose I read

7/16/70
Semi-Idioms

This one is creeping up:

He thinks the world owes him a living

? The world owes me a living
he kept at it

here is another aspectual type V that takes 'ing' but apparently can delete the preposition

but why is what he kept at...

is a mystery
These are the same fact

1. The fact that 3, not 4, readings of
   John said he had found her wallet. Ed said so too
   (i.e. Ne reading... Ed said that John had found her)

2. Who thought she had attacked Sue
   & who thought she had been attacked by Sue

3. Tim & I said that Bill & Sue respectively had left
   that Ed & Bob respectively had raped Sue
   & that Susan had been raped by Ed & Bob
   (Tim I said that
   being recognized had worried him & Ethel too)

4. I won't give something to anyone
   (someone something)

5. Away in Russian of Devils wheat

6. Multiple relatives
So far, there are two phenomena that look like they might come under the heading of Subtrees: 1) Multiple Relatives [the \textit{Rx} scope of deletion must be defined in terms of Subtrees].

2) \textit{SOME/ANY} phenomena. Subtrees intuitively seems \textit{m} better than \textit{mX} trying to use Immediate Primacy for this.

Russian \textit{svoj} may provide another area in grammar where we need \textit{m} Subtrees.

Sasha pointed out:

(1) \textit{Ja dovolen analizom moix o\v{s}ibok.}

(2) \textit{Ja dovolen analizom svoix o\v{s}ibok.}

Differs in who's the agent who did the analysis.

Now consider:

(3) \textit{Ja dovolen moim analizom moix o\v{s}ibok.}

\textit{svoim}

Both sound ok to me.

But now consider

(4) \textit{Ja dovolen svoim analizom svoix o\v{s}ibok.}

(5) \textit{Ja dovolen moim analizom svoix o\v{s}ibok.}

(5) sounds a bit funny to me, but I can't tell. OJO. Meaning is definitely involved here.

NB: Since \textit{svoj} is only possible when the \textit{svoj} and its antecedent are clause mates, all examples for testing must involve infinitival command.

NB if (5) is bad, we could be dealing with Subtrees.

NOW - Maybe Subtrees must be defined in terms of Immediate Primacy. In this case, for example, what does it mean to define a subtree? IT MEANS THAT THERE IS NO INTERVENING NP BETWEEN THE ANTECEDENT AND THE \textit{svoj}. Go into this \textit{Rm} further, to show that if 'intervening' is correctly defined, it includes Command as well as Precede, and \textit{Rm} in fact IS Immediate Primacy. Because to say this is to say: The NP \textit{mX} that has Primacy over the SVOJ such that this NP has Primacy over SVOJ and there is no other NP \textit{j} such that NP \textit{j} has Primacy over SVOJ and \textit{mX} NP \textit{j} has Primacy over NP \textit{j}.}
DOMINO PHENOMENA

I. some/any

II. Sloppy Identity

(1) John said that he found his wallet, and so did Max.
Three meanings. The one that is excluded is:
Max said J found M's wallet.

III. respectively

John and I said that Tom and Bill, respectively, had kissed Susan.

*Susan had been kissed by Tom and Bill, resply.

XXX IV. Who said that who had kissed Susan?

*Susan had been raped by whom?

The above XXX four things by Haj.

Now, note that we're dealing with TERRITORIALITY. Same phenomenon is also found in:

V. The Controller Prob for Super Equi-NP Deletion

VI. Multiple Relatives

VII. swoj in Russian

VIII. LeRoy Baker's stuff on question movement. The WH moves to the Q which IMMEDIATELY COMMANDS IT.

IX. Hungarian object Agreement.

This is a very important example, which makes XXX it necessary to extend the notion from Immediate Command to Immediate Primacy,

e.g. János láttja az embert és egy kislányt.

János látott egy kislányt és az embert.

And same thing with an embedded sent below with a verb of Perception in the top S.

The Hungarian case also shows that we need this to be a symmetrical relation if the rule is stated in terms of a verb agreeing with something. It remains to be seen whether or not this is needed elsewhere. If this does not need to be a symmetrical relation for any other cases, that is a strong argument for treating agreement as clitic movement rather than stating which verb 'agrees with' what.

X. Some stuff formerly accounted for by Crossover.
Stuff formerly done by Crossover:

the girl who Joe annoyed by tickling (her)
*the girl who Joe annoyed her by tickling

The constraint is: Immediate Command.
This one seems to have to be symmetrical too.

Note that this is distinct from the subadditivity hypothesis, I think, in connection with multiple relatives.

This is Langacker's PRINCIPLE OF RG CONTROL.
"Mirror Image" Rules

7/18/70

Too strong - the only cases

where it's D and around V.
The video is produced

in a laboratory

in a room.

They discovered,

They found.

Chin announced his results.

Chin announced his results.

Chin announced his results.

Chin announced his results.

The results were

The results were

The results were

The results were

The results were

The results were

The results were

The results were

The results were

The results were

The results were

The results were

The results were

The results were

The results were

The results were

The results were
what did who eat

But

what did he buy where

where did he buy what
whether Bill left or whether Tom left is unclear
whether Bill left or Tom left is unclear
whether Bill or Tom left is unclear
Who - whether Bill or Tom - left is unclear
Who - Bill or Tom - left is unclear
Who - (whether) Bill or Tom - left is unclear

Attempt at proof: 3 differences between

who ate anything
when anybody ate

So: whether Bill ate anything or (whether) Tom ate anything

whether anybody ate on Friday or whether anybody ate on
Tuesday is unclear
But notice there's never any problem with any's in yes-no q's (whether anyone left behind) so the previous 5's can't just be "regular whether clauses".
Focus

7/16/70

The head of the Chemistry Dept. and I have the same name.

≠ The head of CD has the same name as me.

≠ I have the same name as the head of the CD.
The former rule probably selects adjectives.

So we get

The man [ [ [ we'll hire man [ [ Adv Prep [ [ [ Pol Cl Formation [ [ who, if, if [ [ we'll hire [ [ [ Adv Prep [ [ well hire man [ [ y E $ [ [ we'll hire

 Nash - junk this page, except for this
Jack, you took how many pictures of? Legal? (i.e. how many pix of) isn't an island.

But NB

It was \[ \text{Jack} \] that I wonder how many pictures you took.

* * * It was Wash. DC which I wonder how many stories you read about pix of.
7/13/70

Forward getting allows slippy to

I washed my fence on Friday & Bill on Sat

but not (I bet) backwards getting

i.e. up this am

weil Hans Freitag
und

Max Dienstag vore Hunde warert
Why are extraposed clauses not islands?

Maybe because they haven't been formed by a rule w/ a real variable.
THEOREM: DELETION RULES ALLOW SLOPPY IDENTITY; MOVEMENT (CHOPPING) RULES DON'T.

(1) Bill thinks that his mother is sick, which Sam doesn't believe. [Can't be Sam's mother. Here we have Movement, and no Sloppy Identity.]

(2) Bill thinks that his mother is sick, and Sam does too. [Ambiguous. Deletion, and Sloppy Identity.]

THIS THEN IS A GENERAL TEST FOR WHEN WE HAVE MOVEMENT AND WHEN DELETION.

Considered the extra NPs that go in Multiple Relatives.

(3) We discussed being unpopular, which Bill described before allowing Ed to experience.

[Ed experience Ed being unpopular.]

The other reading is out because of *Ed experienced Sam's being unpopular.]

This reading that we get would not come through unless Sloppy Identity was going on. Hence, this is further evidence for Sympathetic Deletion, i.e. it isn't Relzation.

And it's nice further evidence for the Theorem above.

Use this now also to distinguish forwards from backwards Gapping.

(5) because Bill on Friday and Tom on Wednesday his knife sharpens.

(6) Bill sharpens his knife on Friday and Tom on Wednesday.

I think that (5) is unambiguous, and (6) ambiguous. Thus (6) would come about by Deletion, and (5) by Movement [Node Raising].
Presuppositions

Consider those of recommend

7/11/70
Thoughts on Ed Wilden's observation:

* Bill bought Tal Frank a picture of himself (namely, Node Raising doesn't allow fuzzy identity)

Theorem: only deletions admit fuzzy identity

dropping rule doesn't:

A. Rel El Formation - Bill has a picture of his mother which Luke wants

Grafting problem: Tom began, I stopped, saying why do this OK?

B. Explains why they can be any which he can

C. Predicts: forwards gapping will have fuzzy identities, backwards (Node Raising) none

D. Shows Node Raising is a dropping rule

Problem: why do cars not come here? He sells I buy cars
Sloppy Identity

What Bill bought was a picture of his ma,
and what Tom bought was too.

Sort the old commanded by antecedent theory of FO5
Facts w/ Dave:

\[ \text{Je} \ (\text{*estime}) \ \text{difficile d'y aller} \]

But

\[ \text{il est estime difficile d'y aller} \]

So: E empty NP, which gets personified, but only shows up as it before a

Teased V
Elizabeth

Presumably necessary because of a bug.

* * Elizabeth
Peters's 5's must be derived by a deletion rule!

Cf. idioms

One more crack like that & I'll buy you one.

Any more headway on this & we'll have to ask for more funds.

Etc.

The "alternative" is to say:

1) Any NP goes here (false anyway — cf.*Then+5)

2) Certain V can be interpreted in

(then it's an accident that make is one such verb)
7/8/70

In it doesn't say, who left

These V are factors
So maybe Conj Q's only go with factors?
They'd better or I have no explanation of my Q's & matches
 Conj Q's are also exhaustive.

* It's funny who's been dating whom,
but I don't know whether May
 has been dating Mike or not.
Fact  
from  
Kuki

7/7/70

All realized that Tom was sick, as you know - AM816

as you know

Also a

tom was not sick, as I had suspected - AM816

Tom was not, as I had suspected, sick - MW06

My fact: There are the same fact(s)
This car corners well

This feels like a middle,
but from what source?

Obviously parallel to:
This pen writes well
The constraint on backwards influence will make unnecessary the left-most constraint on Neg Incorp (i.e. *He gave anything to nobody)

{*Anyone didn’t show up*}
Another text for conj Q’s:

what he cooked, which was tasty, is \{well known\} \{* unknown\}

And another: conj Q’s are referential

what he cooked is (un)clear, but nobody liked it

Why both OK? Cf.

what he cooked is (*un)known. It was delicious.
how long he stayed is unbelievable.

I (believe it)

I (don't believe it)

how long he stayed

Sam doesn't believe it how long he stayed.
Vowels

How to use these for the back V?

\[ \text{y} \quad \text{w} \quad \text{u} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{i} \quad \text{e} \]

\[ \text{I know not if it is as fair as} \]
6/28/70

I'm surprised that anybody came.

Why are any of you out in camp Q's?
6/26/70

? Who said that you left with whom? Do Tom and Bill say that I had left with Betty? Am rep?

* who he said left with whom is fantastic
  * with whom he said who left

Who? who? are similar
  * T outr

This must be OK because I pied piping? Or across the board piping?

But then why is this bad?

Why is this bad?

* The fact (that) who left with whom is amazing

Obviously * with whom did who leave? Must be out because of crossover (which is maybe Fred Crossin)
who did he think had left with whom?

* who n n n who had left with?

Only the leftmost moves.

Hass

Sugie  UNTV614

Yuki
Why can one not say

* Bill acknowledged whom slept with whom

liked

approved
1. *V requiring statues in DS
2. *Adj which are only mentioned
3. be * transparent:

He seems to know it

It seems to be known by him

But *He seems to eat it

*It seems to be eaten by him

out except as needed
(Cong. R's + Variables)

6/26/70

NB that noone can get the "re"o of that

by saying...

* Who ate rice + what?

by saying that "hit can't attach inside an island" or some shit, because

NB that is OK

He ate rice + what?
I have a picture of Fred.
Fred a picture of Sally.
Sally of me

* I have a picture of Fred.
Fred of Sally.
Sally a picture of me.

Reminds me of the funnel of specificity.

Intuitively, this must be out because of backwords' pronoun.
Conjunction Q

6/25/78

Why CO mean I correspond of a CO?

Huh! Maybe here do what people are wearing these days?

How tell be do?
What things? This out?

* Who drank what and soda?

Better yet, *who drank what + soda as well as trunk*?

Note left-rightness necessary in multiple Q's

* Who gave what to Bill?

Bill what?

* Pete gave what to whom?

* Who gave a pistol to whom?

To find even more strongly in conjunctive Q's:

* That Pete gave what to whom if so.

Only factives take conjunctive Q's,

only the negative of factives - intransitives -

take conjunctive Q's.
Conjunctive Questions

Who's been dancing with whom — Max with Sarah and Tom with Sally

It's fantastic

This must come from

That Max has been dancing with Sarah and that Tom has been dancing with Sally

It's fantastic by some rule that forms variable slots

Who said that if who was sick it's fantastic

Who had been arrested

If I had arrested whom
Conjunctive Questions

Thus who's been dancing with whom is fantastic

must come from

that x lb d w y + that w lb d w y... is fantastic

So the source for when did he go - on Tuesday?
must be

he went on Tuesday or he went any or...

What - lox or bagels or cheese - did he eat?

he ate what - lox or bagels or cheese?

he ate lox or he ate bagels or he ate cheese
Questions + Reeds - Cleft

From Adrian:

Arguments against embedded Q analysis:

1. else - * what else I ate was a tomato

2. ever any - * what I ever ate was a tomato

3. whether, how long etc. have no pseudo-clefts which may

5. No double wh-word Q's

6. No proposed PP's

7. * The thing that it was that I bought was a box

8. what I ate was a steak

↑

This has reference, but embedded Q's don't.
Fake Q's

The fake Q's that go in the subject of
old etc. aren't disjunctions
they're conjunctions

Who he's been going out with-Marcus, Ann, Kelly

is fantastic.

The class of V which takes these
conjunctive Q's (e.g. odd among etc.)
is the same as the class that excludes whether
in object position I [will try to determine] whether to let

If P isn't odd who's been sleeping with whom
Questions & any

6/23/70

Some any's anyway seem to go by

speaker request:

I want (*Sue) to know when anybody leaves

but = it when

I want (*Sue) to know what anyone eats

= it if
I want (?Bob) to know wherever you see
Please come back = leave
Call before you come back or presupposition of another
When can you call before coming back

The police don't know 5 1 Preppy
Why don't the police know 5 2
The police don't know 5 for what reason 3
Where is what?
I know that one often feels lonely.

*one often to feel lonely*
1. Know how to regard (ESTAR)

2. I know how to persuade Max to eat [whisk]

3. Maybe (Bob Ware's suggestion)
    He knows how to minimize [mark]
    How one should minimize [mark]

That would require for 5's like
He knows how to protect himself
A rule oneself [mark]
Supportedly he knows how to [mark]
Flash in talk with George:

What abnormal is the lack of modification
in Hunt's sleeping

We can allow for this to occur if we postulate a rule of Now+Then Deletion.

So the reason that this is bad

They tried to be working them

So that the rule has misapplied

This means that be my + how is always active - maybe be J Pierpont?

Why then do he seems to be sleeping now?

OK?
everyone who hasn't drunk in the past few d
S From Emmen

* he's saying that Mary who I hadn't seen recently

was in NYC proved that he was an idiot
He ate before 

Obvious deletion

'll's (?), then

He left
The *ness of *Werde untersucht! can't be called a semantic one, because the 3rd good in English. It must be bad because of a syntactic fact about German.
5/27/70

Some \rightarrow any

* Writing anything inflammatory will be easy for me to avoid

Show \rightarrow everybody got enough why I (*ever) talked to
clothing-adj. I regret it, that he (*ever) showed up

* That he ever left is what I didn't say

But how come

That he ever showed up is doubted by many

That he ever left is surprising I are OK?

What's the difference between these rules?

Can that output fact be what's relevant?

I will say to nobody who has access to a phone that there is anything
1. Bill begins to come home at 5
   tends to begin

2. commence to [-start]

   It also excludes nomic reading for its complement

3. will be ing (exc for
   be beginning
   to like me
   to eat turkey, etc)
He begins to leave at noon

He is beginning

NB - P is OK in past tense

Why is progressive aspect necessary for nominity here?

NB - this is only true when I adv in the embedded S.

He begins to cry

What's the difference in my between

He began / was beginning to get home by 5
Do I take it that they gather?

Why?
Extraction for Pseudocraft

what I realized was that he is insane

*what were telling?

*I ate what were on the table

But

what were considered to be good plays were in fact trash

what were thought to be counterexamples have since proved to be good ones
Neg Attraction

Anybody could have gone

* anybody couldn't have gone

Doesn't the contrast argue for Negcorp?
the/a warmth

5/10/70

half the doctor that [They (*don't*) think]
*
[They deny]

I was(out)
be and shaving rules

picture of Paris that this is

picture of Paris that this is

hero's claim to that she stole pans

what he claims

suggests not here, not here
Another plan for No Delition

5/3/70

* Mix avoided swimming + Bell to go

The lexical item must be reconstructed

But what if

I like drinking + she (smoking)

{to smoke}
Thoughts with Paul:

1. Deletion of a nonfinite object marker command constrains murdered and raped to be in same town.

2. Deletion of a nonfinite object marker command constrains murdered and raped to be in same town.

3. Deletion of a nonfinite object marker command constrains murdered and raped to be in same town.

4. Montague's idea about the one I mentioned — maybe?

5. How to make 1. the same fact as John + Paul's stuff about VP Deletion? That seems to be the same fact.

6. Paul's proof that not all pronoun facts can be stated at one place:
   a. Who did he say was coming? (OUT FOR ALL)
   b. They said who was coming. (IN FOR SOME + OTHER)

   Paul says a must be out because he said who was coming to bad, i.e., one constraint before wh-more.

   But since which of the men the Bolivian dealt with was very, we need a check after too.
The supposedly tall man really wasn't allegedly.
Dislocation and Scrambling and Moving

4/22/70

How can it possibly have been disturbing to as many people as she claims? This finding is correct. This constituent can now be reordered to any of these places.

So maybe there is only one rule of Dislocation.

(What about pronoun differences, though? Why can't a pronoun follow, while it can precede?)
Maybe Jay is roughly right — that in a \( \Delta \) like

\[
\begin{array}{c}
5 \\
\downarrow \\
3 \\
\downarrow \\
1 \\
\end{array}
\]

the top clause this constituent can go anywhere in of \( S_1 \) (what about with nominally complex NP?)

all of the ten boys who he saw must have been playing with toy trucks for at least 10 years, I think

This goes where the ink shows. Your friend.
Is crossover an OC?

4/21/70

? May be believed to have been examined by Mary

but he isn't

Yes—this is much better than

it would be if there were (believed to have been)

examined by himself

This seems to ruin Bay

A— he agrees [VP Del]

Then he has to say

3 DC to the effect that

his semantic rule if

refl antecedence is

dependent on later

deletions

B— he says [VP Del]

Then he has to do his rule of reflex antecedence

on the output of VP reconstruction

which must yield syntactic forms, not semantic ones.
An outstanding counterexample to the claim that all T's which attack things to S can only be in the highest 5 to 5 Clitics Placement.

If in particular, da mi je čita,

where even Emonds may be reluctant to claim that the structure is da

da mi je
Semantics vs Syntax

Paul used to characterize semantic violations as those involving modifiers.

Since there aren't any semantically, how about saying that semantics is all only violations of the form

\[ p \& \neg p \]

where either or both can be presupposed
SR provides a terrific argument for this rule, because negative parentheticals are in general impossible!

(Why didn't I see this before?)
Declaratives and Stumpy Identity

4/12/70

[Handwritten text]

I'm Stumpy, and Bill thinks so too.

They're... Can this conceivably mean Bill thinks he's Stumpy?

This surely can't
What class of V takes this model?

\[
give \begin{cases} 
\text{a yell} \\
\text{a short} \\
\text{a cry} \\
\? a yawn \\
\? a breeze \\
\? a cough \\
\end{cases}
\]

\[
\text{need to} \\
\text{push, clap, shout, boost, breeze, hard, bang} \\
\text{Take objects}
\]
great argument for Questions

I want (*Bill) to know

{I wonder
{They wonder

tell me

Let be there

What's the use for SVI?

Obviously, object of a request by speaker for info from leader

With writ commands

go home; I will tell you // go home
Cognate Objects

Maybe they don't all perfectize

Make steady progress

Take frequent walk

Halt—maybe these mean (presuppose?) a sequence of perfective actions ??
Do you have change for \( \frac{50}{2} \) cents?

Real world. (put 5)

Is this out because he has change for \( \frac{1}{1.5} \) but not for \( \frac{1}{1.05} \)

one concept of dollar includes the concepts of dimes, quarters etc and the notion of addition? Or do not out linguistically?

1. I don't know, but I'd say it's out because if he has change for \( \frac{1}{1.5} \) it is entailed than he has change for \( \frac{1}{1.05} \). So the "out sentence" expresses a contradiction, one of form p \( \land \lnot q \), where p entails the contradictory of q (ie q).

Whether mathematics is a part of grammar, I have no idea. Paul Ziff, eg, thinks it isn't. He gives examples (I think in "What a Grammar Can't Do") such as:

The person who used to be John & has since changed sex:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\text{sex} & \text{female} \\
\hline
\text{once} & \text{male} \\
\text{twice} & \\
\text {3x} & \\
\text {4x} & \\
\text {5x} & \\
\end{array}
\]

Nor is elementary biology & surgical theory part of grammar, I. Very strange, I don't know how to deal with these as on which grounds to hold them "unacceptable".

Mitchell

Gensberg
* he's, I think, unsure
Perfectivity and Unspecified COPES

Fact noticed with awe on reading Millbrook's squib:

It took her 25 days to write [{X}]

4/70
As clauses

as it possible

This clause can follow

a) if-clauses
b) either-clauses
c) objects of hope doubtclaimmaintain

Why can't it follow may/might?

can't follow factive clauses
of say maintain premise

seems to have a speaker uncertainty group

Problem: as I had hoped (*for) why?

as you are aware which I had hoped (*for)
Argument for a manner adverb:

1. *He died a death

2. *He died a valid death / *in a valid manner

3. *He grinned an engaging grin, and she grinned (an encouraging) one too

4. Only mannerable V take cognate object

5. Argument for them being derived:

* He's sleep of the sleep of the damned
* His death of 1000 deaths

Etc.
*Hans fährt nicht nach Rom, und Peter nicht nach Paris*

* OK weil Hans nicht nach Rom, und Peter nicht nach Paris fährt*

* Backwards ≠ forwards*

* Uh oh — how come at least 2 differences are Δ?*

* Weil Hans Wein, und [Peter Wein] trinkt*

[Hans Beer]

This looks like real gapping
Cf. Katsunaka

In Japanese backwards Refl 2d only from old flip subjects. Also, otherwise refl only comes from subjects.
Neg in Than Clause  
+ Being Deletion

\[ \frac{1}{2} \text{ half a loaf is better than none} \]

looks like an exception, but it disappears when you add having here+here

Argument that Poss big S's are S's

Another argument is that SSC obtains for Poss big clauses

I'm more afraid of going than I am of not winning

doesn't command compared to men only if Poss big guys are S's
Japanese gaps NPs forwards:

John ham on Saturday to Bill on Fridays eats

but V only backwards

(and the Vs from top down, as in English)

[facts from Nakan]
[ɔ] must be a palatal in English

push  [u]  pull

bush  bunch  bull

mush  [ʌ]  wall

Note: 3 contrast - dental

pus - press
put - put
plu - pudding
Linked Q's

3/26/70

What did you eat -

\begin{cases}
    \text{a bagel} \\
    \text{only} \\
    \text{even} \\
    \text{nothing} \\
    \text{all the hotdogs}
\end{cases}

What didn't you eat -

\begin{cases}
    \text{a bagel} \\
    \text{the bagel} \\
    \text{my sandwich} \\
    \text{my bread} \\
    \text{only the bread} \\
    \text{even the bread}
\end{cases}

Can these derive from?

What did you eat - did you eat a bagel

What did you buy a picture of -

Who are you counting on -

To whom did you give it -

\begin{cases}
    \text{gail} \\
    \text{of gail}
\end{cases}
Double Passes

3/23/70

We have been made fools of by this.

This shows at least some productivity for this construction.

But NB:

fools of us have been made.
Specificity and Success

No success V makes an opaque context.

Jack succeeded in finding Max

forced Bill to find

managed

Also, why do this bad?

* Max succeeded in looking for a pencil

trying to find

(Assertion: weak) that there is a derivation from pattern to
If

They were arguing about nothing

It really to be interpreted as agreeing with

nothing which was kept

then the latter must be mapped onto

something with a radically different from

nothing which was {wrong, heavy, exposure} etc

What justified this asymmetry?
If DF really worked clause by clause, how come NP shift doesn't? This suggests that DF can't clause by clause.
Double Os

3/23/70

Why is this bad?

* I asked when it was when that wasn't?