Adverbs have the same hierarchy: this explains John's criticisms of the book before I left.

The hierarchy is:

Nominate absolutes
Although J

(for NP) to V
O
P + NP
P + Vn + Vp
P + Vn

1/19/72

This really suggests that Action Nominals are more restricted than derived nominals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>P+N</th>
<th>P+Der Nom</th>
<th>P+Vn</th>
<th>P+Vn + Vp</th>
<th>P+NP + Vn + Vp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominals</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Der Nom, ungramm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null, no article</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vn, no article</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vn, have slept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vn, have slept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vn, have slept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vn, have slept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OK
I don't know when \{ to go to Rome \\
  * going to Rome \\
  * to have left \}

1/19/72

Seems to require [-Stat]

5/23/73

And clsq [John Lawler's observation]
1/1/71

Deontic Desiderata
Deletion + Q's + Any P's

Two seem totally out, even w/o Q's

Ed knows what he ate + Bob knows $\{\ast \}$

$\{\text{how long he slept}\}$

$\{\text{where to sleep}\}$

I found out who he was with, and Sally found (at) out too.

1/1/72

Who he invited was fantastic, but it wasn't unexpected

Wild! Cf. * Who he invited wasn't unexpected

This it means: That he invited who he invited
1. Maybe the reason I told Max about himself
   because Max is a semantic subject. The approximate paraphrase is

   \[\text{I (tried to) cause } [\text{Max } \begin{cases} \text{learn about} \\
   \text{hear about} \\
   \text{understand about} \end{cases} \text{ himself}]\]

   I gave Max a picture of himself.

   \[\text{I cause } [\text{Max have a picture of himself}]\]

2. Maybe the reason for *I talked about Max & himself

   (a) Accrual constraint

   (b) From searching - object antecedent reflexivization
   will be a very weak rule anyway.
Fact from Dave Dewty:

Historical present: He is realizing that he's been betrayed.
*Knowing that he's doomed.

NB - even this is out:

? I was realizing that I'd have to quit.
*(when he walked in and fired me)
Fact from Andy Rogers:
He looks (like he's) tired

She looks like she's nice ≠ She looks nice

My fact: This is the only place where nice = beautiful

(same with {smells tasty, sound feels nice})

{nice looking tasty, smaller, good listener}
Requests and generics

12/29/71

Bruce's fact:

"Smoke [the some] grass, please"

/

"Would you smoke [the some] grass"

This is only because the only interpretation is one of requesting.

Request don't contain generics

Hum

then what the fuck kind of S-type is

Smoke grass (with anyone)!

An admonition? Advice?

Who knows

MB
When can you see me?

It's more demanding than

can you see me sometime?

Why?
This should be reformulated as follows:

If pred_{i} has primacy over pred_{j} in semantics,
the same is true of shallow structure.
Possessive Deletion

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a hat of } & \{ \text{Bill's / * Bill} \\
& \text{the man's / * the man} \\
& \text{the man we were talking to (ks)} \}
\end{align*}
\]

This can't be out for some TOC, because

the man we were talking to's hat
This rule is OCH26 for subjects, weak for objects, blocked for that-clauses, reluctant for ti-phrases.
All V which allow $NP \to [\{V\} + \text{Stat}]$ objects allow passives

[except present etc. don't w/ fake]

NP's. (and I don't really think they allow
statives - in I prevented him from knowing Tom
it's really from an inchoative deletion)
Presumably, this will float

To be deletive when second

But not this:

* To deletive, she is stava lavorando

Thus, Pronoun Deletion can't apply below a case where it could have but didn't. I bet the same is true in Japanese:

I told him that she was stupid

* That he was stupid
S from Fergy at Exec Comm meeting:

"... a linguistics and something program..."

This should be a violation of the CSC, as far as I can see.
Nuclear stress in compounds

Dashed line:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{kitchen table} \quad \text{polisher} \\
1 \quad 3 \quad N \quad 2
\end{array}
\]

Not:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{kitchen table} \\
3 \quad 1 \quad 2
\end{array}
\]

This must be out for the same reason that it is so:

* indistinguishable letter writer

Namely, only unmodified \( N \) can incorporate. This is also why this is written:

\[
\text{international societal programs}
\]
Types of adjectives

Tired though *she was* he was happy, Max went home.
I² SNPC

12/24/11

Did him being alone.

Did there being no milk bother you?

* Did you have to read

Maybe these facts are the same even w/o I² SNI.
I can't tell you why,

but I might later

right can

get that the answer is straightforward

4.5%
There is a productive compound formation rule which however produces compounds w/ phrasal stress.

kitchen bulletin board

bulletin board in the kitchen

I think that phrasal stress is (in general) associated with productivity.

NB: Nouns have left-er stress than other categories, and they're the frozenst too.
I mentioned having any $40 for people.

Why?
Pronominalization and privacy

A. Stress loss
B. Re-form
C. Deletion

1. Forward w/ command (properly)
2. Forward w/o command (indirect)
3. Backward w/ command
   any
4. Backward w/o command
   Eng. pronoun
5. Backward w/o conjunction
   Samoan pronoun

So we expect Japanese pronominalization
will have to be stronger than w/ deletion;
never the converse.
3. places where subjects are more restricted.

1. or not deletion (maybe)
2. P depression in OF
3. 550
1. Clause-wise reflexivization, subj antecedent

2. 
   a. Non-subject antecedent
   b. Across clauses

Japanese seems to do this first
1. Inf w/ subj > Inf w/o subj

2. Case hierarchy: ablative > dative = \{ genitive, accative \} > nominative

3. Privacy

4. Variable strength (includes pied piping, strength, and strength of individual)

5. Strength of stressing

6. Color word hierarchy

7. Kinship and affiliation

8. Kind/quantified status

9. Strength of pronoun-ization

Also:

a. Reduced stress
b. pro-form
c. deletion

a. Forward w/ command (everybody)
b. Forward w/o command (somebody)
c. Backward w/ command

10. Strength of across-the-board condition

a. Nothing out of either S or S2
b. Start out of left
c. Back over the board

11. Strength of incursion rule

12. Hierarchy of triggers and priority items

13. Noun

Note: I can wash the pan
Fronting and deletions

? You never said anything more stupid than that. These two we can't handle.

? I said that Bill they should fire and Tom that Ed they should keep.

12/24/71

Fritz said that there'd been a fight, and Tom that no criminals had [the police] surrounded.

?? Dana said that her father they'd been bugging him, and I that my mother she'd be all right.

Crazy. So when you front, you block.

That Tehran,
Gaffney above,
stuff from nching out, searching and paragraphing.
It's almost as if the lower S becomes detached from the tree.
He claimed that I had stolen another car.

Than truly

Bounded downward
The man who Bill and Sue talked to about war + peace, respectively.

The stuff that Bill and Sue talked to George + Mike respectively about.

Respectively won't go down into that - cls.
Max claimed that Sally ate pizza but
Max didn't claim that Sally ate a hero

Max claimed that Sally ate pizza but not a hero
I think this rule will cross infinitive boundaries:

I tried to buy pizza but not grinders

= I tried to buy pizzas but I didn't try to buy grinders

≠ , but I tried not to buy grinders

? Who did you try to buy pizzas but not grinders for?
1. (b) 

- Conjunctions which don't allow anything out for

2. Some which allow only across the boxed rule & work

   - and, or, but

3. Some which allow stuff out of $S_1$

   - or $S_1$ and $S_2$ in $S_1$

   - but not out of $S_2$

   - alone, than, than with

   - www.xlibery.com

   - cry

4. Conjunctions which only allow stuff out of $S_2$

   - This should be a fact about privacy.
Fact from Paul Kepesky:

It's not only epistemic models that stay out of if-clauses — so does have to.

* If he has to have gone, S

[Why then can't be possible? OK?]

Note also

It is possible that he [left

It will be possible that he [will leave]

If it is possible that he [will leave]

Only OK in the "If you are right in saying X" reading
If the faster he runs, the more we'll have to pay, let's go.

* If the faster he had run, the more it would have cost us, I wouldn't have gone.
It is possible that he \( \left\{ \frac{\text{will leave}}{\text{left}} \right\} \)

It will be possible that he \( \left\{ \frac{\text{will leave}}{\text{left}} \right\} \)

\(\text{NB: They will think that he left - possible as the only V I know of which has this sequence of tense condition or future tenses.}\)

\(\text{If it is possible that he}\ \left\{ \frac{\text{left}}{\text{will leave}} \right\} \)
If you're so smart

The rule which deletes (?) as below

\[\text{If you are right in saying } x \neq 5\]

\[\text{If } x = 5\]

it's a clever little rule

* If there's Wax, I'm going to hide

* If who said anything about being, why do everybody putting on his coat?

* order me to leave

If you guarantee that we'll be back tomorrow, why

did you cancel your reservations?

* If like father like son, I'm not going to marry

So there's at least 3 places where these guys show up.

A. Only certain kind of performances are OK

B. Not in adapted classes

C. Not sufficient with that to control
I made a pie, which he ate.

Then

the pie, which I made, was made by me.

There is only possible in following appositive clauses whose time follows main clause time.

Thus: *I kissed every girl who I then photographed.*

Problem:

He lives in that house, which I built but $j < i$. 
Maybe the reason that the rule of RCF won't relativize \( N^a \) in

\[
NP_0 \xrightarrow{2} NP_a \xrightarrow{3} NP_6
\]

which of can mess with is just that this structure is not

because \( NP_0' = NP_a \), and \( NP_0' \circ NP_6 = NP_a \), so \( NP_a' \)

which is not independently (?)
Nick pointed out that it's not an accident that its object pronouns that allow floating — for this rule will allow them to snuggle up to the V.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{deal} \\
\{ \begin{array}{c}
\text{out} \\
\{ \begin{array}{c}
\{ \begin{array}{c}
\text{the men} \\
\text{us} \\
\text{us} \\
\text{the men} \\
\text{out} \\
\text{hands} \\
\text{out hands} \\
\text{out hands} \\
\end{array} \\
\end{array} \\
\end{array} \\
\end{array}
\end{array}
\]

Hey! *Deal us out them!*

Since the ordering is *Active*, this must be thrown out elsewhere *Passive*. 

12/14/71

12/15/71
Ruminations with Dick:

Maybe "slot" is a variable action
too - cf.

They

* each

\{ often \}

\{ seldom \}

? each individually

\{ often \}

\{ seldom \}

So, what goes in NP? This

depends on the identities and properties
of the successive markers.
Pseudo-passives and quarantining

NB also: There were a lot of beds slept in. This bed seems *(to be) likely to be slept in.*

This bed seems *(to be)* likely to be photographed. It doesn’t seem to have been taken seriously.

So pseudo-passives really are different from real ones—presumably because the passivized NP has to travel farther.

It seems to be likely to be written {to + for} or talked {to + about}.
Fake NPs

These really are fakes—they always do only a subset, never a superset, of what real NPs can.
* Of my students, I'm surprised that Jack's the tallest.

This last, I'm surprised that he wore.

* Tomorrow I remember that he will be in Cairo.

Of my students, I remember that he was the tallest.

So:

(and Clefts)

Not all clefted things can be questioned:

* How good is it that it tastes?

But:

How long was it that he held her breath?

What the fuck grade?
12/12/71

S from Josephine Welden:

He's going to university.

So the rule is governed.
Arkene's dynamite fact

I = \{ ??found \} as pretty a girl as Mary.

This construction is only good in non-referential environments.
Slurried and variable strength

Principle: Slurrying around a constituent
isolandizes it.

Cases:

1. Pseudo clitics

   * Who was \( \{ \) my gift to her \( \} \) a picture of?

2. Slurrying after think, etc.

   Who do you think of a portrait of?

3. In that clauses (and other than clauses, after clauses before clauses)

   * Who would that resemble more expensive than a portrait of?

4. but (not) and except

   * It's Helen who I bought everything (today) but a picture

   * It's Max who I bought flowers (today) but not a picture
5. instead of

*Who did you buy marbles (yesterday) instead of a present for?*

These facts of course argue that but (not), except, instead of etc constructions are derived via deletion.

6. Equatives

*It was Max who I found something wonderful — a picture of...*
* who was your gift to her a picture of?

But E

Who was P a picture of?

so this isn't a general restriction on picture of X as a predicate where that P isn't a pro-form for my gift to her
Crazy pseudo-clefts

My desire is for tea

My surprise was at Jeff

They are pseudo-clefts, because

I slicing past

* It's Max who my desire is for a picture of
The following processes make islands:

1. Chomsky-adjunction
2. Scorching
3. Quantifying
4. Slurping around

for the following types of rules:

A. Choppers
B. Feature-changers
C. Slurcers
D. Frontiers
Raising and N

* the habit of being examined by Dr. O.
* Dr. O.'s habit of examining him

* the frequency of his visits to us
* her frequency of visiting us
* our frequency of being visited by him
Privacy and Equi (5?)

Though after before etc?

These only allow their subjects to be deleted.

While allows subject and object deletion.

Bad counter example: For VHS
go only delete.

Prediction: no construction will allow only objects to delete.

This is stronger than the prediction about languages.

Problem: What about? I avoided his grasp etc.
So why should an increase in inertness enhance deletion possibilities?
Mark's idea:

When that has gone, nothing intervenes or rips out — the sequence **v (to) j** is fixed

Evidence for it:

To whom did it seem *(that)* he was tired?

*(Weak) counterevidence* I was told he was tired
This would explain the real bitch in better than difficult.

1. Subject branch doesn't allow non-semantic NPs to double raise; object branch doesn't move them at all. He's easy to want to die.

2. Both branches improve if to crops; when the subject is being raised.

3. (from Larry Horn) No predicate governs both.

4. It was cheap for me to buy.

5. It seems to be considered easy to fix.

6. *These would be easy to judge difficult to play.

But why? Why are there so many Ns that allow the former, but none that allow the latter?
them all is possible roughly where checking is possible

I have a picture of them all

And! A picture of them all would be nice

So the correct generalization is not exactly about checking but rather about capability

But I [picked them all up {kept them all company}]

Why?
1. Edwin's point:
   Now come Polite and Art Movement
   aren't counterexamples to the claim that
   no rules refer only to objects?

2. Wild point. Take Agreement. It's not that
   Hungarian Definiteness Agreement is an impossible
   rule—it's just that its existence presupposes
   the existence of some SV Agreement rule
   that is a trans-grammar rule
   or something.

3. Gary's point:
   Finnish: acc → partitive / {v} — 
   \{nep\} —
   Not in subjects
Let NP be

This whom seems somewhat restricted

He\{ may let us be
    let them be
want to let them be \}

Why don't you let them be?

? Is he letting you be?

He seems to have let them be

Maybe it's fairly free though.
Expletives and princi

This can be saved by Proo> Dee. This can't 12/10/71.

\[ S > P \]  
weather

* it raining depresses me

but it being possible that S depresses me

//

le (*l') entend pluvoir

vs. le (le) c'est possible que S

These seem to run counter to German, where we find es > Wetth. must always stay,
while es(f) can drop non-virtually (sometimes)
Poss condition

A man's being here who I love upsets me.

A cordial relationship (5) existing between us is D

Why that difference?

Because this is sent further?

Or what?

NB: This can yank out.

Who did cordial relationships exist between?
Passive of Indirect Object < Passive of Direct Object

* Who was there given an apple? <

?? What was there given to Bob??
Fact from PMP:

I difference in shifting over stative infinitives, where \( \Phi \) is roughly possible, and over future infinitives, where \( \Phi \) is rotten.

\[
* I \left\{ \frac{\text{wanted}}{\text{expected}} \right\}_{\text{to sleep NP}}
\]

? I moved to have slept NP
Dave tells me that Macedonian has no raising.

I let raising = Equal

Larry tells me that agreement in OBL16 in Swahili, except for inanimates objects, for which it's OPT.
Primary and Emphatic Reflexives

I talk to him about \( P \) \{ myself \} \{ himself \}

?? by me

He was talked to about \( P \) himself

So the rule only splits them off superficial subjects
Strange Equi in Japanese

Tovone One points out that this rule, which can also go backwards, essentially works with subject controllers, works also into NP's with toki (time) etc.
Presumably a primary fact

ground

hardest to find

None are formed from lower clause elements

What I believe = my belief

What remains = the remainder

The manner in which he arrived

The time at which he arrived

The extent to which he is aware

The extent of his sincerity

The fact that the statement is false

The fact of the statement's falsity

The interval during which he was imprisoned

The duration of his imprisonment

The frequency with which he visited

The frequency plus twenty times doubled

The path along which we traveled

The place where he resides

The destination of the train

The source of the train
the question as to whether or not the statement is true or false.

\[ \Rightarrow \text{the question as to} \]

\[ \text{a} \]

\[ \text{the statement is true or false} \]

(is indeterminate)
1. There is one By-phrase Postposing rule but is more restricted in N than in V. With not Obj Preposing.

2. It's not only that N has less Raising than V – it's that the case of Raising that is missing is just what would be predicted by primacy — Raising into Obj position.

So whether a rule applies is a function of at least these 6 things:

- Context hierarchy
- Strength of rule
- Strength of variables in the language
- Category of governing item
- Speaker awkwardness
- Distance from highest island (cf. *What it concerns* I don't know)

or *I don't know* *What does it concern I'd like to know?*
There are lots of V like tend, continue, may etc. which require raising, but there are almost no A that do.

apt
about
supposed
Privacy + person

e.g. Refl.

If a process works for 1st/2nd person
then for 3rd also, but not the converse.

Interestingly, I bet that these 2
can't be separated by any process

Examples:

1. 1st/2nd person reflexives \( \rightarrow \) 3rd person reflexives

2. \text{svo} \text{ in Russian is OBL16 for 3rd, OPT for others}

3. \text{picture} \frac{gX}{(for next)} \rightarrow \text{Refl} \rightarrow \text{OPT (for some)} \text{ with 1st/2nd, OBL16 (for next) for 3rd}

12/10/71
I some idioms which can only be used in adverbial clauses and after *say*

But are there any that occur only in *that*-clauses? I doubt it.

What can this mean?
Nothing in French goes here NP → VO
Nothing in English goes here JV → NP

Except both constraints can be violated with commas.
1. Red puffy 3 N cb only possible w/ RCF

2. \{ ? Mary \}
\{ ? the girl \}

who Max resents our kis-up
Pied Piping and embedded Qs

Fact from Bernie that pied piping is limited in embedded Q's

I can only pied pipe in Q3

It can't be stranded

Transderivational constraint - PMP

12/11/71

Also, pied piping is worse in subject clauses than in non-subject clauses

?? At whom she will throw it hasn't been determined

<

? It hasn't been determined at whom she will throw it

So subject clauses are just more restricted, period.
Mark's hypothesis

1. All 1st/2nd person reflexives will be morphologically
   my/your & N

2. No language will have such reflexives except via NP copying
No of's which follow V can be deleted in derived nominals.
These are all out followed by poor
Two verbs begin

1. damn only w/ transitive

2. case-finish

3. tons

4. it weather will begin
Primary & O'Regan

12/10/71

They are all of them working.

* I gave them all of them before.

Only off of subjects.

But: 12/24/71

I bribed the workers— all of them— to strike.

So I guess it's always OK w/ commas.
Ordering must be

Passive

Particle Movement

Passive

* The

he was handed a book

over
Pseudo Cleft S.'s
and sequence of tenses

our belief
{what we have believed
*what we believed

has always been that 5
where's this come from?

Note this insanity — it suggests that
the only tenses here are copies of here

what we believed
{v
{was

what we have believed
{v
{has been

what he may have believed
{may
{have been
{was

Pseudo-cleft S's and sequence of tenses

That phenomenon must be at the back of this.

What I'm doing is [saying]...

That is...

...what he may have known...

Note all these differences from the last 5 on p. 1.

12/9/71
variables

and

if Castell is right, TV is merely a rule

Tough Movement and Government

12/17/71
This rule depends on preceding segments:

- The huge gyrella... while Hugh was in poor health.
- From Hugh to me in student's case.
- That might ces stop student grab Hugh.
- If Hugh shows up?
- *Wasn't student?
- *Both Hugh and I.
- That might paws student off.
- ?? park Hugh's car.
- ?? burn Hugh's house.
- ?? hurt Hugh's feelings.

rc < lc

And maybe on phase? Of w/ humanity.
1. *Never was our belief that 5
   (so it's more general than just Q's)

2. *was what you thought was possible that 5?
   *was what was necessary to go home.
   So *(*D) your belief that 5?

   was what you ate a peach

All these argue that P is not
merely some stupid perceptual strategy.
Facts from Jean Roque:

L'air tous voulu les voir [+aux]

+?

?commence

?essayé de
+coordonnées

[-aux]

It only allows transitive models—epistemic ones are out.

Furthermore, this sequence must be defined in part by the universal definition of aux.

I bet a hierarchy, such that if for any one speaker, one V works, all V higher in the hierarchy also do.
One man who *he doesn't know anything
*I don't think he knows anything
* *I don't think you know him

So returners are

a. worse in top clause than in lower ones
b. worse in non-only of lower clause than in subj

e. the more returner pronouns are bad,
the lesser it is to relativize, etc.
Double Raising + Non-semantic NP

There may seem to be problems

It's

There seem (not to be) likely to be problems

Double Raising is only of an
infinitive marker to in SS.

So models etc. aren't argued
against by this phenomenon.
Bill knows who he photographed,
and Sam knows (? it) too.
OF and Squeezed Earth

Who! This province (soil?!) an explanation for why it's easier to get stuff out of when $q_0 > \text{when } q_0 > \text{when } q_0 > T_0 q_0 > 70 q_0$. The first are being made by Adelle - the rule.

Bill told me (that a picture of Jec we could send to Martha)}

What picture of Jec we could send to Martha

(a) It was Martha that Bill told me... What a picture we could send to

(b) What picture we could send to

(a) << (b)

Another way that OF is weaker than Topic-aligation
Scorched earth and islands

12/6/71

What is scorched is everything dominated by the note the superego is attached to.

This is the right formulation because of the facts with even.

Amm — what happens when even no moved rightward?
OK We added to membership even these men.

?? It was Mom who I talked to everything was

?? It was war which I talked about
Right suppress and searching

12/6/71

The reason why $A \wedge A$ makes only a weak island is because Node Racing and NP Shift are such weak rules.

How bout "quarantining" for the name of the principle that freezes up a supper?

By the way: attacking even does scorch. So Postal must be wrong about
Red Ripping and S-ness

12/6/71

What I solved which I never knew

*to read which I've always tried

*to ask which I've never succeeded in

The thing I won't be easy

thing which want to today

a problem

So whether or not it moves play and

How the clock do I get there?

Two kinds of wind and I restriction on

Finding an approach, an investigation on supply.

NO: To speed up. So are prepared and go there now.

it is other means cannot send and had nothing be worthwhile
Fact from Mrs. H72:

Maybe the 5SC is because the 5 is so close to the beginning of the 5.

My thought: it's been moved there by Subject Formation.
* That's just \{ the right way to do it \}
\{ the best way to do it \}
REC<ARCF

2. The rules of which there are many are hard to learn.

12/4/71
Pseudo Clefts + Yo 110 0, + Lexicalization

```
what de it a peach?
Was { * was he said that ? }
* his claim that ?
```

This is an argument that this is a pseudo cleft, thus that I rule.

```
what he claims \rightarrow his claim.
```

It's not the E5 NPC constant because if * was what you vote it having as ?

So it's only pseudo clefts which are construction.

NB: the going come.
```
\text{May\,\,\,}\text{pad\,\,\,}\\\text{Haven't\,\,\,}\\\text{our\,\,\,}\\\text{back\,\,\,}\\\text{pay?}
```

Would you come to it's betray her? It's believing that?
Some nobby would be nice right now.

That... no, here here.
Deaumenting

12/2/21

Weaker suffers deaumenting less than stronger ones.

* The town I bought a picture of was ugly, but it's not for sale.

[Handwritten note: The process only seems to work for definite pronominalization]

* Boston, I did buy a picture of, but it's frame fell off.

* Men were fun to take pictures of, but they were out of focus.

Boston they said we'd like, but my wife didn't think so.
Variable strength and slippiness

As ripping strength increases, slippiness gets harder.
Max thinks he's hard to get along with, but Joe doesn't think so.

Max thinks he'll be hard for us to imagine Sam trying to defend in debate, and Bill thinks so too.

No happiness.

Max believes that these points he'll get, but Tom doesn't think so.

Max believes that tomorrow he'll win, but they don't think so.

? Knows

? Knows it

? Admits

? Admits it
Idioms and phrases

Facts from Wayles

1. You can X = I'll do Y

You put a lot of mean on Brooklyn.

Is this not an idiom?

2. 2d clause

X looks like Hitler would (ad)

met on X’s tongue.
regouger
remainder

ergative suffix
More people smoke more Camels than animals smoke luckier
Lexical inversion

some know { low } * when
Privacy and Fact

No V governs this rule in subject position.

Cf. I considered (the fact 5) ≠ 5

I considered (the fact) 5 was considered

Cf. I considered

This statement

Marks observation

How do you judge consider?
8th bad so lets do this may not be involved

* by your plan if you're alone

I² SNEC
II. There are several types of universals:

A. If believe-clauses are islands for any rule, know-clauses will be.
   (This for whole languages)

B. No language can have a stronger rule of OF than the rule of RCF

C. No language will allow topicalization to penetrate to a place
   where the hypocrisy could not

III. How can I see that some languages are free than
others in their ripping strength

   Danish
   English
   French
   German
   Russian
   Italian

Certainly, it would be crazy if any Danish has a
differently formulated rule of RCF than English.
Maybe it would be sufficient to say that a language
provides variables from strength a to strength b. Then it would be
automatic that the highest strength ones would show up in
the strongest rule.
The fact that $QF$ can rap out the subject of a "there is" while $RCF$ can't is probably to be handled by saying that the latter rule works only on definites.

Maybe the idea about variable $a$ - variable $b$ is not good enough - some language might have a range of variables yet still supply $QF$ and $RCF$ with the same type.

If this is really ever the case (let's hope it isn't), then we'll have no choice but to mark every rule in every $L$ for its rapping strength.

IV. So whether a particular rule can apply in any given case is a function of 3 things:

a. The inherent strength of the rule
b. The inherent freedom of the context
c. The variable strength which is provided by the language
It was Mary who there stood on the table a picture.
Sentence said by Gary:

a man (drunk) is a man (happy)

OPT

OPT

11/30/71
George Williams

Strong ripples, deantecedentype, S's:

The hat, which Bill said that Sally wore, was cheap, but the clerk didn't believe it.

Weak ones don't:

Tomorrow many of them think I'll be in Rome, but many don't believe it.

She was tough to seduce, but he attempted it.
Constantly amicable relations between nations existed

OPT

The nations which amicable relations existed between

Seems OK - so PP Shift
doesn't make island.
The facts about oy, aw, and oo are:

1. They can only occur finally or penultimately (and only if followed by [V]C, # in the latter case)
   
   [cf. * oogone etc]

2. They all alternate with an unrounded [w]
   
   [oy] \sim [\wedge]
   [aw] \sim [\wedge]
   [u] \sim [\wedge]

3. Q: Can oo be followed by [+ gw] segments?
   
   A: Yes.

   storage, porch, hoop, tomb, more, proof, roof, sniper, room, storage, [uog] (except [uoger] maybe this in [you] anyway [hought, how pronounced?]}
As far as I know, this word only occurs as a *DMAN* (or as an adjective modifying abstract N which derive from V which can have *DMAN* - no other citations in W3)

(1) Their resolution of the conflict was amicable.

(2) An amicable resolution of the conflict.

(3) They resolved the conflict amicably.

(4) ?? The way they resolved the conflict was amicable.

If all these exist, the preferred route of derivation would be

(4) $\rightarrow$ (4) $\rightarrow$ (3) $\rightarrow$ (2) is a possible offshoot

Thus this helpful word would provide evidence for the correctness of these rules.

But soft...

(5) * The boulders rolled down the hill amicably

This word requires animacy, and probably NP*
(6) \{ *Jack \}
\{ The boys \}
left amicably

(7) They were amicable \{ in \} resolving the conflict
\{ while \}

It seems to me that (7) is OK, but only
when this phrase is there.

Wild fact

(8) ?? Their way of resolving the conflict was amicable

This may not work with amicable, but possibly
does with clever, etc. It suggests that may be unfortunate.
amicably and man

\{ Max's \}
\* The Boulder's

way of squashing the tulip

Thus, way itself requires a human subject. Hmm
Another proof that they are Q's, not free relatives:

What happened that we didn't expect was fantastic.

but

?? I ate what she cooked. That was nourishing.

Hrm - maybe theb is ok
Fact noted by some UMass student
(via Bruce):

\[
\text{even Bill and Max} \begin{cases}
\text{are similar} \\
\text{are erudite} \\
\text{embraced } \ast \text{ Fruit}
\end{cases}
\]

Thus $N_P$ and $N_P$ from Conjoin doesn't allow modification of $N_P$ by even.

My fact: $\ast$ Bill and even Max are similar.

There's something here about first NP's.
Q: Are you sick?
A: Does a grizzly bear shit in the woods?

Q: How long have you disliked the US?
A: How long has Nixon been president?

These "answers" presuppose that the hearer knows the answer to the second Q.
Infered requests:

Do you think you might want to tell me whether you think you should go please?

Do you think you might want to tell me when you think you might want to please leave?

Do you think you could leave? 46 more polite than

Why are only yes-no Qs interpretable as requests?

Could you leave?

Just as

I think you are wrong is more polite than

You are wrong

What shall I wear?

What do you think I should wear?

Why bad?
I believe all V's in presupposition have to be possible V's in the language.

This will be a nut-crusher to prove, though.
1. New constructions
   a. Regular
   b. Irregular
   c. Passive
   d. Comparative
   e. Superlative
   f. Negative

2. Result-constructors
   a. Only
   b. Never
   c. Usually
   d. Often
   e. Generally
   f. Typically

3. Posers
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. Maybe
   d. Don't know
   e. Don't care
   f. Don't understand

4. Relative clauses
   a. Noun phrases
   b. Adjective phrases
   c. Prepositional phrases
   d. Infinitive phrases
   e. Gerund phrases

5. Adverb
   a. Time
   b. Place
   c. Manner
   d. Reason
   e. Cause
   f. Purpose

6. es-
   a. Subject
   b. Verb
   c. Object
   d. Adverb
   e. Adjective
   f. Preposition

7. Infinitives
   a. To + infinitive
   b. Infinitive + to
   c. Infinitive + preposition
   d. Infinitive + adjective
   e. Infinitive + adverb
   f. Infinitive + conjunction

8. Nouns
   a. Common
   b. Proper
   c. Collective
   d. Mass
   e. Concrete
   f. Abstract

9. Verbs
   a. Regular
   b. Irregular
   c. Transitive
   d. Intransitive
   e. Declarative
   f. Interrogative

10. Prepositions
    a. Preposition + noun
    b. Preposition + verb
    c. Preposition + adjective
    d. Preposition + adverb
    e. Preposition + conjunction
    f. Preposition + infinitive
Facts discovered w/ Gary:

There are (at least) 6 constructions w/ \( \text{there} \):

1. There is NP (No double Raising)

2. There are a problem w/ Raising, \( \overset{?}{\text{SVI}}, ? \) Tag
   Embedding OK, Neg?

3. There stood on the table a boy from Calcutta
   Embedding OK, Raising (?), No pl. Ag- (?), Neg?

4. getting into college: No check about

5. Tights: \text{The problem about citizenship} \leftarrow \text{maybe it's always}\n
6. There's England (PP) \leftarrow \text{This is all that can follow}

No embedding
No Raising
No SVI
No Tag
No Neg
No Complex aux
Fact discovered w/ gary:

There's a man from Kansas

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{who wants to see you} \\
* 
\end{array} \]
(1) The price of bananas is low.

(2) Bananas are low in price.

(3) Bananas are cheap.

(1) → (3) might be a case of Predicate Parsing.

However, since \( X \) is what \( X \) costs.
There is a guy on the table, working + drunk.

Generalization: After death, there is only PP. This is a PP.
She is more content as a naturalist than Martha, a more content naturalist.
Postnominal Modifiers

* somebody tall interesting just came in

OK. *Somebody tall from Kansas

* examined by Dr. Petrocelli

Something red near the end of the shelf caught my eye.

Cheap with a chrome handle
This house was built

But

The winter of 1873 was terrible.

Few of the houses which were built then had plumbing.

Heh heh heh.
2(3) \text{design} (at) \text{ee} \\
Why?
Medical V

- t - tomlite
- e - Mononguela
- ee - Kolaen  a - Chicago
- sy - Sheboygan

Yuu - Petula 11/23/71
- u - Lola
- o - Oklahoma
- s - Winnipesaukee

aw - dowdy
(dowdy are w/ #)

Medical V

- i - ballistic
- e - manifesto
- ae - Alaska  a &

- u - bullet 2 syllables
- o -
- o - harmonize

ye - scriptura
George's anti-cyclic

Finding {Bill's} drunk seemed to {him} to be bothering Mary.

Mine

{His} having found {finding} {Bill's} drunk seemed to {Bill} to be bothering her.

OK {Web's} having found {finding} her drunk seemed to {Bill} to be bothering her.

very weak 1 1
(*Exactly) what I ate was a tomato

She cooked (exactly) what I wanted

{(*exactly) what I ate

11/24/71
Rippability

So ripability with

The only nature

Who's I think

That didn't part of

I was crazy