Pseudo Clefts

3/19/70

Lovely fact from Bob

What it was that Bill ate was a grape

Argues that this is an embedded CP.

Cf. * I ate what it was that you cooked.
1. There was a man [drunk, mess, up, high, gone, drunk, fat, crazy]

2. What's he doing [drunk, high, gone, mess, fat, round, crazy]? [drunk, mess, up, high, gone, drunk, fat, crazy]

3. [drunk, fat, funny] [drunk, mess, up, high, gone, drunk, fat, crazy]
Thoughts while reading ACLS applications:

We should award

Only good if presupposition that there is a known

award — like

Jack smiles
Why do the S (from Santana) amig?

Before I stop losing you?
Sentence from George Williams, who heard it on the radio

Since 1960 Harvard has placed 1st, 2nd, 3rd... and 8th, resp.
Tag Q's

3/12/70

Mary ordered fish, and Bill steak, didn't they?

Gasp
3/9/70

only w/ 10 can you get mask forms down
ich wünschte (unterricht) zu werden

wünschen = will
Red piping conventions block

* the man that Ed hired whom I didn't know

They also block

* a man who was how fat did you kiss?

If this is the source of

how fat a man did you kiss?

Then we must have the order

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Red CL Reduction} & \\
\text{Red CL Formation} & \\
\text{O Formation} &
\end{align*}
\]
* John didn't like Sue & vice versa

John was willing to meet Sue, and vice versa

John thought that Sue loved Ed, and vice versa
Consider

- **North**
  - east
  - west
  - south

- **South**
  - east
  - west
  - north

- **East**
  - North
  - West
  - South

- **West**
  - South
  - East
  - North
Contrastive stress can't be in DS. It must be transformationally introduced.

He chased her then.

He chased him

He chased her

Then he was chased by her

有时 he was surprised at her.

I talked to her about him and to him about her.

I talked about him to her and then to him about her.
do and non-acts

* Rolling down the hill just isn't done by barrels.

This suggests that

the do in... and the barrel did so too

It's an intransitive

Also

?? Falling asleep at the wheel just isn't done by...
Topicalization in German

2/17/70

One more beer 2/21/70

NB

\{ one more beer \} and I think? I'll leave

\{ if I got more beer \}

*realize*

Shows that it's an if clause

* Ich habe Bücker gekocht

Ich habe Bücher gekocht zu lesen

NB
restrictions between speech act V
that don't show up as selectional constraints
below the corresponding V.

Thus if peek e.g. can't occur
in warning, it can't occur below warn.
Fact with Dave:

- If that is the movement constraints
- Only
  - that 500 people came is likely, if that
  - it's likely that 500 people came, if that

CSC
- He wrote [*many books*] and 3 plays, if that

CNPC
- They reported [??the claim] that he had raped 26 women, if that

Out with negativity etc.
- he will be willing to go to 3 cities, if that
  - *surprised*
1. thing, me  eat mine
2. do her, do it, make it, do the thing
3. do so into the sink
4. it can be dirty, not they
When a rabbit sits on a hill,
{? it} may roll every which way
{*they}
5. Resuspension of neatness

7. She was crying 4. I got into the soup
I streaked her makeup

7*. When I burped, several chunks of spam came up with it
I think this is an argument for deriving all persons from underlying 3rds (and thus for performatives?)

grammatical used as semantic

3rd (your majesty)

3rd (yours truly)

* 2nd

1st

1st

3rd

* 2nd

flog am sick = { 2nd The butcher } to sick
I talked to the milkman, not the snowman.

OK with unt the meatman.

Parallel productive formations work OK, just like pronominalization.
Hilton's the one who did it

*The one who did it's Milton
(y. The one who did it's all done by now)

*In the back where I left it
*Where I left it's in the back

Hmm.
Relative Clause Deletion

Q: How did the headway you've been making on CP please him?
A: The headway pleased him quite a bit.

Better, maybe:

Q: Did the headway 5 or the prospect of one day at home please him?
A: The headway did, but the prospect didn't.
Bill discussed $\{\text{Sue} + \text{ hub}\}$ resemblance

How can this even be stated?
Bill wondered wanted to know, but I didn't know asked, said. If this turns out in some nice way, more evidence for performatives, because if I don't know No you schlep don't know can occur after it can be answered.
Neg + OC

1/9/70

If all polarity violations are OC's, then

what about?

I didn't [believe] that Jack would leave until tomorrow

[underline]pay

Conversaion w/ George:

These facts must be done like so:

if arrive until 5 occurs in surface str.

it must have
Argument that these V come from comparatives.

* John outran himself
Performative

(almost)

The fact that $\delta$ restrictions insist on just 1st person, w/o also being subj-subj constraints, is a great argument for perf.

with wrt 2nd per.
Clept S's

1/5/70

It was John {with Mary} *

{in the hammock} *

{happy} *

{a student} *

What is the rule that makes these? They're not rel. els.

It was him in the hammock that {I heard} *

{disturbed me} *

John containingerson
I insist that any action [not] be taken immediately.

This may be enabled by the missing model.
This guy only goes w/ performative (?)

I do

name

"enjoin you to"

promise

pledge

now

command

demand

build

ask

enquire

require
I demand that any action be taken immediately.

Any action \{\text{would, will, must, should, could, can}\} be taken immediately.
Elkby though I was {willing} to be {surprised}
If he wants to speak, let him

we won't have to make him

*I know he can speak for I've [heard] him

Why?
Fact from Bill Leben

There seem to have been enough

This makes tabs seem to have been kept on me

Tabs be kept on me

Does this mean that make has an

It's object only if seem, appear, etc.

are the next lower? Gasp
What [co] was the pillow doing at our house?

S by Elke:

* What is the pillow supposed to do at our house?

It must be present or past tense of the programme

* What will it be doing here

OK with

must

may

can

could

might

What could it have been doing?

It has it been
watch = for some time look at

We're going to watch the slides implied

they're going to do something, or that something is going to happen to them
* They didn't kiss their respective wives

They were [eager] to see their respective wives
Derived Nominals + Derived Sr.

expectation

* John's belief of Tom to like cheese

knowledge

They can be explained by

motivation

John's persuasion of Bill to go

compulsion

NB: that this can't be an DC

the decision of Max to go - it must

come before the rule by → of

NB: If is relevant. John's reliance on Max to leave

But maybe this is more general: NB ∩

Joseph is eager if Max to go
Probably the same fact:

(a) John tried \{to jump, and I tried too\}
   \*jumping and I tried too

\* John \{avoided\}
   \{kept\}
   jumping and I \{avoided\}
   \{kept\}
   etc.

Maybe a problem: John was working, and I was too.

(b) Gapping is also out

\* John kept running and Bill swimming

NB, however, that you can gap through:

John keeps writing plays and Tom poems
Negatives are out, not only in highest 5:

* John tried not to drop glasses, + Bill claps.
Fact from Pat Brogan:

The prepositions that can undergo Reposition Attachment (let out, elbow off, etc.) are just exactly the subset that can undergo Particle Movement.

Ditto wit the P's that can have their objects deleted after intransitive V (e.g. come in, dash out, etc.)

How the hell do we state this fact?
great argument for

Datives don't work with disyllables,

nor do they work with V-Prf

i.e. *obtain me a book

*buy up me a book

But of for-datives

He'll fix us up some at the mill
Please take me up a layer cake
She called them up some devices
Output condition vs OBL16 Extrap

11/22/67

For OC

1. Bad S's aren't bad—only unacceptable.

2. The OC will be X anyway, prevents like move, follow from, etc.

3. Ordering paradox: if X condition on Extrap, the ordering must be

   [Rel cl]
   \{G
   \{SVI
   Extrap

   But because of SSC, ordering must be

   Extrap
   \{Rel cl
   \{SVI

The OC must be:

1. X NP Y, where X + Y

   are in the same

   S as NP, and

   where complementizers

   are better than lexical items

   (also quibble about coordinate with)

2. A hierarchy of complementizers

   that > for to > Poss by

3. Subject is worse than object
Derivational Constraints in Phonology

study → student

deny humiliate → mutilate → refuse

The rule is:

"Don't apply the tensing rule to what will end up as the prothetic penult of a verb."
Causatives and islands

John hardened the metal.

*galloped the horse
**killed Mary

but it took him 10 minutes to bring it about

These facts are like

Even [*finitists] think it sound written

[*finitists]
It's wrong to say that in

either \( S_1 \) or \( S_2 \) can extrapose first. In fact, \( N_P \) is an island, as can be seen from

* a review which I've been working on it coming out soon

10/22/69 - No, you jerk, that isn't starred - of SPE

notice that it can come from a review if SPE is coming out.
I want you to be polite,
and Ed also wants you to be kind.

I want the driveway to be long
and Ed also wants it to be.

That can be handled if this is act
and the rule order

VP Del
act → be / - Adj
1. *I hate one can't be out by virtue of an OC, because of
   (a) *one's father often hates one, and so do I

2. Therefore, the relative clause on one in (b) doesn't have an underlying one as object
   (b) one who I hate often has trouble passing

3. This seems to argue that relatives are formed on variables

4. Incidentally, it also destroys Mike Carnes's analysis
Only higher presuppositions can influence lexical selection - this is the same as the fact that only elements in the island of a node can influence it.
Fact from Paul:

John ate at midnight. 

At midnight John ate. 

Tense is a verb.
Fact from Ken

John broke the window

The window broke
The treaty broke

Can these be the same fact as?

John read up
Isn't it so that all symmetric predicates can "delete" each other?

Cf. John & Bill \{ kissed \}
{ * hit \}

This would be explained by NP* analysis

(I think?)
How do I get

the car it paid for \( \text{(NB paid \$ for)} \)

from the car has been paid for ?

Stan's counterexample:

The door is open \( \neq \) the door has been opened (it could now be closed here)
Idioms

They were at each other's throats.

This idiom seems to require a reciprocal.
Fact from Bruce: at midnight can't propose in

(A) John has eaten at midnight

My idea: this is the same fact as the fact that
proposing the adverb disambiguates

(3) John promised to leave at midnight

under the assumption that (A) has the
structure has [eat at midnight]

Stan points out that (C) is ambiguous just like

(B),

(C) John had eaten at midnight

Proposing however, gives only sense 6, exactly parallel to
what happens in (B)

Stan also observes that at midnight, I plays chess ≠

John plays chess at midnight — they differ in the order of implication.
It lessness

{*doubted*}

as was {noticed}

as seems likely

{to have been {noticed}}

{*doubted*}

*as seems out of the question*

I guess these facts just show that

P can be deleted after as ???

Oh oh - it's the same rule that gets rid

1 P in than - clauses

than {was noticed

seems to have been noticed}
Either J or B baked the cookies and brownies

\[
\begin{align*}
\{ \text{baked} \} \cup \{ \text{baked} \} & \\
\{ b \} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

The cookies and brownies were baked by either J or B

\[
= \left[ \{ J \ v \ b \ c \} \cup \{ b \ v \ c \} \right] \& \left[ \{ J \ v \ b \ v \ r \} \cup \{ b \ v \ b \ v \ r \} \right]
\]
French Copula Agreement

Jeanne et 
\{ Marie \\ Georges \}
\text{et Pauline sort} \{ blondes \\ blonds \}

Explicable w/o special convention for feature raising

if feminine is a morpheme, like to:

That masculine is the unmarked form is also argued for by the fact that les acteurs can denote a mixed group, but not les actrices.
Present tense + performative

Palmer via
Fact from Jim:

Simple present can be used like so:

Walker winds up. Hergenrother: The runners go. ?

\{? considers bunting
? knows he needs a hit\}

But this is not like progressives + performatives, because if

This Walker winds up \{guarantees 5 right now\}

Note also that these historical presents are strange with atatites - of.
SUPER-Fact from Jim (the most important fact about cleft 5's, I think):

It was [my leg] that Jack pulled.

NB: * good deleted pseudo cleft

The one whose leg Jack pulled was [{? he pulled my leg}]

[? * mine]

[? * me]

Jim points out that this is only possible if the my is semantically a direct object.

* It was my throat that I cleared.
Fact from Traugott Schiess:

Verb Crossing is a derivational constraint linking semantics and shallow structure, but not all intermediate stages.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Alle Lehrer} & \quad \text{luden} \quad \text{einen Studenten} \quad \text{ein} \quad (\forall x)(\exists y)[x \text{ inv } y] \\
\neq \quad \text{Einen Studenten wurde von allen Lehrern eingeladen} \quad (\exists y)(\forall x)[x \text{ inv } y] \\
\neq \quad \text{Von allen Lehrern wurde ein Student eingeladen} \quad (\forall x)(\exists y)[x \text{ inv } y]
\end{align*}
\]
Argument from Trangott Schiebe

Ike wants ham or beef is ambiguous

1. Either Ike wants ham or he wants beef \( \leq \) or above want

2. Ike wants either to have ham or to have beef \( \leq \) embedded or

But Ike eats either ham or beef do not similarly ambiguous - it has only an \( \leq \) reading

Östen Dahl added that while Ike wanted a unicorn is ambiguous, Ike ate a unicorn do not.

Same fact, obviously
Slurry = Jeffing because of

* I don't know whether parallelizing

* I don't know whether John went to Rome or whether to level
I. Types of rules
   A. Gapping
   B. Sticking - extended to cases with post-verbs
   C. Deletion in than-clauses
      Point out that the rule that deletes he kept track of her. I think careful track
      John no taller than (+I think) her
   
   II. Identification of rules
      A. Gapping = Deletion in than-clauses
         1. He looks at girls more often than she [at] men
         2. I was [surprised] to eat pizza, and he back
      B. Gapping = Sticking
         I don't know when Mary [will] know John, and when Mary
      C. Sticking = Deletion in than-clauses
      D. Prepositions can't be stranded when pied piping [he looks at more girls]
         and must be when sticking [he looks at her more than she [at] him]
   
   III. Directionality of deletion
      A. Never upward: For [me] to share [myself] was expensive
      B. Never backward: backwards "gapping"
      C. Uncatchable generalization about deletion and the output condition on pronominalization
IV. Deletion obeys constraints on variables:

Jack eats ham (and eggs) more often than I bacon

Pronominalization in Japanese

He looks at [any] pictures of her more often than she of him

good point - bring [*and cost] up at meeting
Adjectives in middle sentences can be left behind, but not verbs.

John seems to be eager to go, and Jane (to be) reluctant.

John seems to like to go, and Bill to hate.

Wrongly put, you don't. But this is just because complements can be deleted after "be.

I'm eager to go and Bill is reluctant.

Tom was proud of me, and Bill was {afraid, jealous, mad}.

Why?
The reason that is bad

? I was surprised to see John, and he me.

It is because no X can be chosen — the theory of variables won't let the inner island be broken up.

Pith for

I have \( \frac{a}{*bol's} \) picture of Ann, and she of me.

and

The girls \( [\text{try}] \) and play chess and the boys checkers.

P.S., you docs: There is great profit that in fact it is variables which are being deleted.
For him to go to NY and {Ir to go?} to LA

+ {h to go?}

Why?

Related to?

I counted on her to drink wine and {* ?} him been

We planned for me to go to NY, and she to LA

Fine w/s for me here.

Can't be general, because of 1 in 3 Stock and 4 changed
To Harry was given a pick and 6
To John a shovel

The pictures of Jack are here, and the paintings (are) there

Some of the beer is here, and the rest [is] there

He brought photos of Jack and I {I Tom

[u]paintings"},

NB

This suggests a structure like

Believe the claim

Tom said I was a Republican] among] paintings of NP

and she a Senator
Slurting?
Neg from upstairs? 7/16/69

I know when he smiles and when not

I know what he said I planted and what not

unknowingly

It means only

what he didn't say I planted

I know during what months he fucks her frequently
and during what months infrequently
either he often writes, it rain, travel West, or seldom. I get it all.

it he often writes you, Fact, if seldom, prob.

Obviously, it's the same rule.

I wonder when he cooks (indoors) and when outdoors

and when in the oven

I wonder when he gives marble to Jane and

when bags of Sapphire

* who he'll try to give books to and who reads to

to whom he'll try to give books, and to whom novels
I wonder when he'll go to Rome and when (Sarah) to Paris.

I wonder how he forced Paul to go to Rome and how [Peter to Paris]

7/16/69

I wonder when Irene married, and when Ben.

7/17/69

I forget when Irene wanted (* Ann) to marry him, and

when Celestine

Hugh

I forget whether Mike married Lisa, or whether David Lisa

I think Mary loves him, but I (don't think) otherwise.

Mary
I said thought *admitted*

John loved Mary and Tom *(what)* Hey John *admitted*

*I know that John doesn't love Mary and Bill thinks (that) Mary John*

Weld!

Gapping and Shucing are the same rule!

Great argument for performatives

Either John left or Bill left - [I forget which (not him)]

FANTASTIC!
7/10/69

Backwards gapping must be racing:

NB

weil der Mann, der schläft morgen, und der Mann S heute

weil der Mann S morgen, und der Mann S heute konnt

NB weil er Montags, und sie Dienstags Fischen
Who do you promise to kill?

NB that here, promise does not have a habitual meaning - this is asking for a promise.

But it is clearly embedded, because questions come from I request [you tell me] 5

Now note: *he eats the turkey right now

I [do telling me] that he promises to kill 26

I'm thinking about the fact right now he [challenges me to a] match also not habitual

So this provides: 1) further motivation for [+Perf]

NB 2) a life for as for myself, I apologize
Note Maurice's fact:

Q: Who is sick? or Who do you think is sick?

A: {I} {think} Bill's sick.

And:

Q: What do you say we should eat?

A: (I say) you should eat hash

Note, however, that this is not in general possible.

Q: What does Ted say we should eat?

A: Ted says you should eat hash

* You should eat hash
Performatives and answers

Q: What do you order [me to] *Ted* to get? (I order you to)
A: Get a dingleberry.

Q: What do you promise to stamp out?
A: (I promise that) I'll stamp out corruption

NB: Q: What do you hope that he forgot?
A: I hope that he forgot his pipe
* He forgot his pipe
Q: What do you request that I buy?

A: Would you buy a store?
   - Will
   - Should

Buy a store, would you?
   - Could
   - etc.
   - must

* You (goddamn well) buy a store
1. How with a crescent!

2. With [my reasons & suspects] full play, I'm staying here.

3. A man with a cold

4. with your cooperation, I'll win

5. with your pride, I'll win
Can deletion ever take place except under command or precedence?

The putative counterexample with expensive etc

Isn't one:

To shave myself would be expensive for me

For me to shave myself would be expensive

When we say

For John to shave himself would be expensive

It need not cost John anything, so it's not John that's deleting here.
However, what about also the picture of himself that I lost (supports a Bravais analysis).

To enroll himself in night school would increase the chances that John will be promoted.

This is not cool, but maybe such so are possible.

If however, deletions can be constrained to work downward or forward only, then So's like it will be expensive to show myself are great evidence for performatives.

NB: this says that backwards getting must be by raising
By and large, statues have no perfect tense:

* This soup has smacked of Rice Crispex

* John has meant that he's sick

Maybe the perfect gets deleted here, so that these show up as:

This soup smacked of RC's (which)

John meant that he is sick

Why then, is there a contrast between

John was sick \ne John is sick \ne I have been sick

John meant x \ne John means x
Illsentivory Force

7/7/69

Sometimes one performer can double as another:

I promise you that there will be an investigation.

This can be a warning.

But

I warn you that whatever you say may be used as evidence.

This is not a promise.

What the fuck is going on?

And aren't we in bad trouble?
Stress Inversion
+ Niching

Dee is right: (but you need some stress on both sides of the insert)

"Jack, said Ma, "gets beans, and Ed hash."

* "Jack gets, said Ma, "beans, and Ed hash"

NB: * "I buy cars and wash," said Ma, "them"

"Tom, said Ma, "and Dick are similar"

? * "Tom and Dick, said Ma, "and Ed are similar"

Whok — why can we get? "Nobody," said Ma, "goes out."

"I gave a book to Paul," said Ma, "who really needed it,"

(*which was fun to do).

Why? Can we find some argument about VP stress ≠ NP stress?
Stress inversion

* "Shut the" said Ma, "fuck up."

get that gun, and put it," said Ma, "on the dresser.

NB this counts as a word.

"Let the cats," said Ma, "out."

* "Burn the house," said Ma, "down."

NB OK with right here — fuckin'.

* "Some," said Ma, "come it in the fridge."

* He gave me [*a 7*] said Ma; "sausage."

* That it's likely that Bill," said Ma, "will leave depresses me."

It seems to only go down/1 clause? (90%)

7/5/69
Why can we get?

It seems that Bill left, which I can't get Mike to believe.

Bad news – this can't be an NP.
Imperatives

\\[ \{ \text{Don't} \} \]

\[ * \]

be a jerk

\\\[ * \]

I \{ ordered \} Jack \{ not \} to be a jerk

\[ \text{advised} \]

\\\[ \times \]

\[ \times \]

I expected John \( \text{not} \) to be a jerk

\[ \text{wished} \]
other and comparatives

7/11/69

He {will have} pictures of {more} people
  * never had
  * didn't have

Then I ever had pictures of

OK w/o ever here
As it turns out, it seems to appear as if believed thought likely.
They are keeping track of him

I think careful track
John happened to like beer.

For John to have happened to like beer was a miracle.

Two arguments that have fall:

1. NB

2. It was a miracle that John happened to like beer.

Bad problem: If John happens to like beer, we're in C.
One NP different:

1. Emonds noted Y, and Kijensky.

Emonds noted X, and Y.

2. A picture of me was on the table, and [a picture of you]

[you]

*you

Emonds noted X. K noted X.

Emonds noted Y and K.
3 2 /'s as for

1. In than-clauses, NP's beginning with P don't delete:

   I look at more pigs than you look {at\ }\ ]

Similarly with to VP:

   I wanted to eat more chucks than Bob wanted {to\ }\ *

2. Neither to VP nor PP phrase:

   * Into the garage I think he's going to back the trailer

   * To eat even 1 more blunt I don't want

   (However, NB? * eat even 1 more I don't want to)
3. guessing also treats these the same

I looked at girls and she [at boys]
[‡ boys]

I tried to dance and Mary [to sing]
[‡ sing]
1. The following facts about negation follow if this rule is right:

\[ \text{no} \left[ N \right] \text{ other than } NP \]

\[ \Rightarrow \]

\[ \text{only} \]

\[ NP \]

\[ \{ \text{on no other day, than} \} \text{day, when I [ever] called him did I even come} \]

\[ \text{only on} \]

2. Sentences with other than are just like comparatives such as

Mike has pictures of \{ more \} people than \{ Mike \}

\{ taller \}

\{ other \}

\{ our house \}
3. Red piping is identical for other than:

Mike will want to have pictures of \[ \text{more \ taller} \] people than \[ \text{other \ different} \].

NB

\{ \text{(I think) Fred will want} \} \text{ to (have pictures \text{[diff])}} \}

\{ \text{(*I think) Fred} \}

4. So the problem of the source of

I have no other house than a log cabin

is identical to the problem as to the source of

I have no bigger house than a log cabin
5. Great argument that the NP after other than

6. Go from a S: [Bill] [but] [himself]
   no one injected. Ed [other than] [Bill]
   Ed injected no one [other than] [Bill]
   [but] [himself]
   [NB]

6. Carla's example: a red bigger balloon
   shows the following words also to be comparative
   * a costly [preferable] [other] house
   [different] [inferior]
7. The crazy fact that other shows up on either side of integers is paralleled by comparatives.

\[
\text{the 2} \left\{ \frac{\text{other}}{\text{taller}} \right\} \text{boy} - \text{the} \left\{ \frac{\text{other}}{\text{taller}} \right\} \text{two boy}
\]
beware occurs only in semantic things

That are addressed to belief and intent
to elicit behavior from him.

Beware of March!

I told him, "beware of X"

He advised me to say,

You'd better behave if X

I suggest that you beware of X

* I require that you beware of X
NB: exactly the same exception to the To ≠ 0 constraint as is found in regular cases.
Title

The title of the next book after

Abstract Syntax:

Adverbs, Ellipsis, and the Theory of Grammar

It will have chapters on

1. Inner islands
2. Comparatives + other (and only)
3. Superlatives
4. All other degree adverbs
5. Sources of adverbs — Adverb Lowering
6. Theory of ellipses
   a. Stich "A"
   b. Red piping and gapping and ellipses in Wh-clauses.
7. Slippage, identity, and propositional function
Jutting and inner islands

+ I didn't like steak, and Bill liked

1/5

I was [eager] to meet Brigitte,
[surprised]

and Aristotle Jacqueline
It's wrong to say that big, often, many, fast share a feature of constant ratio.

For compare

***NB (also good)***

He ran the miles fast

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Net time} &= 3 \text{ min } 55 \text{ sec} = 225 \\
\text{Average time} &= 4 \text{ min } 10 \text{ sec} = 250
\end{align*}
\]

and

He drove to New Haven fast

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Net time} &= 2 \text{ hrs} = 4 \\
\text{Average} &= 2 \frac{1}{2} \text{ hrs} = 5
\end{align*}
\]

What all these words presuppose is not only an observed instance and an average instance— they presuppose a knowledge of the curve, and they assert that the observed case is more than 1 S.D. out (in the positive direction).
The difference between verbs and adjectives and prepositions is that prepositions can never delete unspecified objects.
Annex as MV + VP Del

Probably the same thing will have to be stated for App + Formation

6/15/69

1. D VP Del because of King's facts

2. D VP Del precedes Aff NP, because of and he did

3. But because of I see too, Noam cannot say the VP that's deleted

4. The rule must look like so:

\[ X - \{ \text{has} \} - Y \] - 2

\[ \{ \text{has} - [V, Y] \} \]

5. But then will only get a: and the \{ a way \} too.

\{ b may have \}

\{ c may have been \}

To get the others, he'd have to say

interesting

little

duplication here

with an interesting ad hoc condition on parentheses

Third branch of the rule duplicates to itself

here - you don't have to fill them if you don't want to
6/15/69

What's the Russian form for this:

I think that Bill was sick and

you think that Tom was

??

Cleverly, the Russians don't have

VP deletion, Dave tells me
I insist that Bill leave, and that Tom do this.

Bill be quiet, and also that Tom be *do*

Maybe that do is the do of do so.
1. From Joe Emonds
   * I don't know why I read  [not, surely]

2. Ela from why

3. No matter why you left, you're in trouble

   * Wherever you left