More men smoke Camel than women smoke Luckies.

The number of men who smoke Camel exceeds the number of women who smoke Luckies.

More men smoke Camel than women smoke Luckies.

15 men × 2.5 packs of Camel/day > 10 women × 1/2 pack of Luckies/day

Is your conceptually OK?
any indistinct Chinese

in App C sense.

Explained by Where Def

and Modifier Shift
I think this paper says that the only place where $I$ variables go through the action of the cycle.

What about $S_{NN}$? Same-say?

11/27/71

Furthermore, what about $L$'s like Japanese, where $D$ complementizers, so that the whole absurd calculus will fail?
Sifting

Wont he here, dont you think? (do)

Was he here, {do} you think? (do)

Wont he here, {do} you think? (do)
The corp, which was attempted,

The attempted corp by the guards..

Maybe this answer by a rule of

by-phrase pronunciation
what do you think you're doing?
where do you think you're going?

= Why are you doing that stupid thing?
Why are you going to that stupid place

Cf. also
what do you think I meant?

= Of course I meant what I said.
1. *There was among a cloud* - I think they probably disagree. I'll have to check.

*There were three students arrested*

*Generalization: old lady follows highest.

2. There seems to have arisen a dispute.

I believe there to exist no dispute.

So I Racing.
Variation

* Somebody built the fort *(in 1773)*

* Fort was built (by somebody) *(in 1773)*

* a built house
True events in German too

NB

\( \text{Supp}(n) \) ordering

\[ \text{Then we have just to step } [Ae] \] sequences from among...
Dicke's fact:

In pronounceable words, retraction pays attention to whether preceding syllable is strong or not.

And — before — ale

(not before other affixes — cf.束缚 (w) 约 (w))

This shows that there is one RR,

and that, since retraction from non-affixes as well as from -to-, given by the ASK, is not so significant in:

\[ V \rightarrow [-\text{ASK}] / \text{#C'V} \]

\[ C' \rightarrow C \]
?? I was here since Christmas < worse

I {ate it} already

{have eaten it}

but

I {saw him} yesterday

*have seen him*

The asymmetry of these facts would be accounted for

by a rule of Perfect Relation
Dick's rec.

(From Ted Tuck)

"Let's all be a 'shrink', in our own words.

Because here, he said, "I know a shrink."

But what does worse?

Let's shrink, or are you in the fact?

"Blah, blah, blah."

Much better.

This may be a pick that they refer...

to..."
Fact from Gary Milsark:

Epistemic models don't allow `not Hitting`.

It may be broken AMBIG

I don't think `P` may be broken MONOG

Only not sense

This parallels this fact:

* It might not be that he'll leave until tomorrow

NB: He might not leave until tomorrow

The OK-ness here suggests that `it hasn't` been moved up.
Accordian constraint

Crossover is a sub-case
Shallow structure

Maybe this level is just the output of the last cycle.
Agreement

No language has SV Agreement before any rule which forms cyclical subjects.

Can this be used to prove that "Wtt" can't cycle?

cf.

Important are the claim 5, and the claim $5_i$.

Thus can't be embedded.

→ Backward agreement is never in evidence except as a result of non-cyclical rules
Weather * never deletes : * Gestern hat geregen

Object * sometimes in

OBL:G - bestehen daran

OPT - müssen, sagen

OUT - müssen

Non-initial subject es is

NB → Always possible

Rarely OPT möglich

Largely OBL:G wahr

Gott lässt regnen –but

Ich fand* (es) unwahrscheinlich ← suggest

* Relation fact: are cyclic
The horse be killed!
Kill the horse!

That can obviously only be done by splitting the rule of You —

SD You Deletion
Passive
SC You Deletion

11/15/21
The novels {which the men read} {that the men read}

?? Which the men read, The American, WIP, The Great Gatsby C22
There seem to be only 2 kinds of or that can show up in a factual environment:

a) With either, conditioned by models

The fact that either boy

{ either Max or Fritz } could be the villain

do disturbing

b) From and / Neg

The fact that he doesn't like peas or carrots is disturbing

But not:

* The fact that either Max or Fritz or we can live with

is disturbing

The fact that he lives either in Rome or in Paris

is disturbing (of importance) This works -- Why?
The 1st S of S:5 allows rapping out of - at
the end

* It was Max who Ann bought me something nice: a picture of

No.

It was Ann who bought me something nice: a picture of Max.

I bet 5:5 obeys the constraints: 

Fred and someone silly — my sister — would make a good couple.

* We're going to buy Ann a dog and something for the baby.

We're going to buy her [a dog] and a bottle.

? The minister compared Ann and someone from Kansas — TJ Kelly.

? * I have Ann's picture of someone from Kansas. I have her picture of TJ Kelly.
Beautiful fact pointed out by Allan Prince for class yesterday:

The specification clauses must be swooping in because if they were swooping out, they'd be violating the right roof constraint.

Who slept where is fantastic: Max upstairs and Ted downstairs.
picture - N. reflexive pronoun. Use 0°7 m/ clause.

male antecedents, opposed across clauses.
NB: But not here

* Was he so kind as to X?

* I may be so kind as to X

etc.

Normally, as to us only after diagnostic Q's.
Requests

11/11/71

Have some rum (* or else)

This V is only good in requests.
1. Dan now has clause-internal reflexivization, w/o having by *I* myself (actually, he has NP like me).

2. I bet kids have who VP clauses before they have who NP V O.

3. I'm sure they have subject P's before non-subject P's.

4. I'm sure they have Equi w/ subject controller before Equi w/ object controller.

5. One wrt raising

6. Also, I bet NP Clipping from subjects precedes the same rule from non-subjects.
and C varied.

The end is never reached.

Check for addressing issues and deleted.

11/16/16

Leveraged + High Interest
Clefts and V-V selection

Much worse with condescend and manage. Why?

I'm trying for P to be on Tuesdays.

That I swim.

I'm trying for P to be {photograph} assemble.

The ones where a non-adverbial constituent are clefted seem much worse, for some reason.

?? I forced P to be on Tuesdays that we go out.

?? I bribed Max for P to be with the Maxwells that we start a daisy chain.

Beat: I'm going to make it be tomorrow that he cut up.
Paris is an 

\begin{itemize}
  \item easy
  \item idiotic
\end{itemize}

city for living in.

\textit{NB (of Central's $5$)}

So the problem isn't unique to Tough Movement, at least.

Note also that here, $E$ only an abbreviatory variable.

Paris is an idiotic city to try (to imagine Sea consenting)

to live in.
All (or maybe only (some) disjunctions) Q's exclude some kinds of negation:

[Blank]

who did nobody fumble

[Blank]

who nobody saw vs. [Blank]

[Blank]

a mystery
NP's like 'tabs', 'advantage', 'weather' it and there
don't undergo

Tough movement (why don't raised subjects?)

Left or Right Dislocation

Pronounization

Pseudo - cleft formation

Double raising (fact from George)

By phrase formation - *There say me by being a god
Possessing complementation
Passivization of objects I prevent

N8: a little something

Can sometimes be pseudo - clefted

What I want to buy is a little something* (on drugs for Kelly)

N8
11/9/71

NB: This restriction must be stated on rules when, up
[found out] when [it may have been that he]
[he may have]

I wonder

Nice little parallelism:
It seems to obtain also for
it is necessary
it must be

NB: with good, there appear to be no restrictions

should he have gone?
would it be good for him to have gone?
should it be that he left?
Nouns allow up to 2 syllables

- mono-syllable
- multi-syllable

But affixes have to be mono-syllabic

characterize
characterization
Red piping and suspicion

Observation of Ken:
The fact that their hierarchy obtains

strength of &dmdash; self-formation
suffers &dmdash; leads to deft

should explain why
a picture of them is only
good in red els.

And in general, the more one pied piper, the worse things are.
5 from Bill Cantrell:

Tough Movement + lexicalism + flip

This is an easy滨州 on which to play Bach

No (for pm)

(*which for you) to play Bach on

for playing Bach on

Intuitively, easy to coming out of this clause.

But how can P?

Fact from George: Such NPs never occur in subject position

11/9/71 [except as derived subjects: too bad for lexicalism

easy problems to solve are in great demand

Notes: Hello flip

* concern the US
* have 5 parts
There is a difference between being easy S's and plain ones — only the latter ones allow infinite ripping:

Max is being hand (* for me to imagine Sarah trying) to get along with

Arlene's notes:

Only the being easy — type embeds after try, etc — so Dave's contention is OK.

Max tried to be hand (*for me to imagine Sarah trying) to get along with

NS: If Campbell is right as to the source of these, then there is a beautiful global condition on what it is deletion: the WH-word can't have crossed more than one S boundary.
Are you ready to have some cheese?

Where would you like to have some cheese?

I was wondering when the cheese will be ready.

Do you have some cheese?

Can you have some cheese?

How do you like the cheese?

I wonder if I sound like I am speaking in French.

How does it sound in French?

How is the cheese?

Is it better?

How do you like the cheese?
The question as to which V please precedes is non-trivial.

Could the bars please stay open till 8 tonight? (Please)
I want the bars to please stay open till Tuesday.

\[11/7/71\]

Note that there also sneaks by: \[11/11/71\]

(plea) Are you too inconsiderate to bring me a chair?
Are you nice enough to please bring me a chair?

(\[9\]. Would you be so kind as to please bring me a chair?)

Why do Are you so kind \[\{\text{as to bring}\}\] me a chair hopelessly as a request?
From 5/28/68 discussion w/ Paul Broth

* The hats, any of which, I doubt that he wore.

11/9/71

* I wonder {any of which milk be drank.} [any of which hats be wore]

Hum — even when conditioned by P. its rotten

And why is this wretched?

* Who are any of which hats?

NB

I didn't find any wine {which I'd be willing to serve any of to my guests}

*any of which I'd be willing to serve to my guests

Why?
OC on any

the problems, any of which I couldn't solve, really. I know that you couldn't solve any of them.

F*ck, this means that the check has to be done pre-OF.
That - Pronoun

I don't
{find
feet
think
reconsider
* judge
}
{That
*
}

Maybe I
some argument
here that
that →
it

These take so

Bob feared that he might lose, and his wife

Fearing {That → you

but his wife didn't

didn't fear {That

* I'd

* that

→ so
4/17/67 5: Max is being easy to get along with.

It is being easy to get along with Max.

So this is probably from Central's source.

Max is being one who is easy to get along with.

Problem: are there 2 sources for easy S's?

*(Practicing getting himself into a college is tough, etc.)*

It will be easy to talk to Sheila about guys who take it seriously.

Guys to take to Bermuda with her will be easy to tell Sheila about.

* are being
I don't think I could agree more.

*I didn't realize that I could agree more.

Flash! This suggests 2 things:

1. **I don't agree**
2. I think → Ø

But: *Tom said he thought he couldn't agree more.*

Why bad?
Tendency and lexicalism

11/2/71

The fact that

of 9/13/67

* its tendency to be muggy

* there's tendency to be fine

* advantage's tendency to be taken/failed

* headway's tendency to be made on easy problems

poser no problems, because there take NPs, just can't processing

1/3 being muggy depresses me

no headway (x's) being made depresses me

advantage (x's) being been taken/failed argues
We have \{ our chance(s) \} from different ways.

They have \{ a screw loose \}.

We talked to turkey.
11/7/71

**Do you want to please wash up**

(*please) [you] to please help me

*I want [you] to please help me*

[you] *Fred*

So the rule must say: please

modifies the verb of the request, not just the word in it

interrogates a request

? Would you mind please coming back later?

**How about please leaving your name?**

?* Would you have a chance of please reading this?

**Is there a way that you could please read this?**

?* Would you be willing to please sign that?

Why are these out?
Let's let bygones be bygones

here's an embedded I which can't occur alone

Also:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{We've let} & \quad \text{I'm letting} \\
\text{Don't let} & \quad \text{Try to let}
\end{align*}
\]

let bygone be bygone (for else)

(So it's out below command)
Thorne's condition

1/6/71

go home and I promise X

must be from P.S. than S, because of Thorne's condition

How can I use this fact
He reads even LIFE → He even reads LIFE

were easily than

Even Ted went → Ted even went

And how do we get

Max read not even LIFE

↓ OBL ←

Max didn't read even LIFE

↓

Max didn't even read LIFE

And is it still good here? Not even did even he didn't

Uh oh—here it's OPT, but here OBC—help help.
I had anticipated a nice party.

This doesn't presuppose so strongly that the party was a bust.
My wine and a little something *(for you)* are on the table

but

a little something for you is on the table
A floating of each other.

I talked to the boys about each other.

This can't come via normal floating, because:

a) each only comes off of subject.

b) Nothing comes off of non-subject non-pronouns.
Reflection down with clauses

diffs within clauses

NB: this says that picture N
  refl gives its existence to regular
  refl

Hum

With own

11/6/71

11/7/71
Complex NP Containment

* who did you give picture of which you had taken since May

This shows that that is also an island NP

NP 3
Pragmatic analysis

Steve Dano's fear (not Bruce)
probably 5 = not a promise

* Man promised that he would probably leave
Performatives as highest So  
(and declaration + superhyponym)

0/5/74

What I hereby do is pledge myself to the continuing development of

Thus, if a rel. cl. at all, is certainly restrictive.

John said that what \{I hereby \{do\}\} was X

{he thereby did}
Steve Davis's fact:

2 sentences, same force

I promise to meet you at

The Empire State Building

in NYC
Three kinds of promises

X promises Y Z

i) Z is future act of X

ii) Y wants Z
   (X believes Y wants Z)

iii) X promises X will do Z

iv) X intends to do Z

v) X promises himself under obligation to do Z

maybe syntactic: 12/29/71

What do I promise you? what he will do[for] you = [examine you]
[cook for you]

The reason that promises can be taken as threats is a consequence of

the semantic rule which lets the positive
end of the scale be used as the unmarked term

(If. How tall is he?)
(Thoma's Condition)

\[ \langle I \text{ confess} \rangle S_1 \text{ and } \langle I \text{ promise} \rangle S_2 \]

But NB:

I will help Max, whose (I confess) I can't stand.

Thus Turing's condition must be an OC.
A man who there was a picture of [on the table] which to fetch again, that suggests a 2-cycle passive.

4/3/71
For Max to have been upset for a raise before Christmas would have upset Fred.

Why?
Frankly, get out of here. I'm sick.

What the fuck is going on?
*S from Elke:

*I'm a blind eater*

(cf. foreign spellers

polyglottic

* jigsaw solver

(∃ crossword solver just because

∃ crossword NP

This means that the CNPC has
to look up to surface str.
English vowels

autistic

/ɪəʊ/
Clipping from the ads across the board

4/2/71

It is Max who a picture of (Sally) would be cheaper than a portrait of

* It is Max who I believe more strongly that she dislikes than that she is fond of
There was gotten to be an investigation

Why 4 passive? He was gotten to sign

That must be related to the fact that

got to some kind of fly.
That Del and Extrap from NP

\[ \text{the man} \{\text{(that) I saw}\} \text{ came home} \]
\[ \{\text{(that) saw me}\} \]

\[ \text{I saw} \{\text{I saw me}\} \]

\[ \text{That Del Extrap} \]

\[ \text{Can't be done semantically, because rulers aren't constituents of NP's there} \]
\[ \text{Can't be done properly, because if} \]

\[ \text{Evidence will be presented be remembered} \]
The accordion constraint says that in a schematic tree like this:

```
  5
 / \
1   2
   / \n  3   4
```

no ancestor can be shifted down the hierarchy.

* Bill was convinced by me to examine me (1 → 2)

?? I told Jack that we could be examined by him (3 → 4)
Cyclical subject + 55C

That's what could be said:

Nothing can be made out of anything
which was a cyclical subject.

The man who I believe [a picture of face here];

This contrast shows the 55C not to
to be any useless rule.

So the notion of cyclical subject

A man who there was a picture of
in the table;
given to part

So Z cycle pressure is crucial.
Facts gotten with Dave:

\* The bank personnel told him he was stranded by the bank

This fact suggests they seem to see him as international?
Closer tabs \( \ast \text{toke} \) kept on Fritz

I'd get closer tabs \( \ast \text{toke} \) kept on Fritz.

Thus, if \( \exists \) one rule of raising,

we have a unified statement:

\[
\text{get (Raising \( \rightarrow \) To Be Del)}
\]

W/o raising, \( \exists \) disjunction.

\[
\text{NB: As long as it's against Event: (1945-47)}
\]

There got to be a lot of people there.

\[
\text{That \( \ast \) \text{toke}\)}
\]

\[
\text{DNA \( \rightarrow \) NP}
\]

Cf. also they go \( \ast \text{toke} \) doctors.
This world fucking V occurs in 4 PSB!

I a. There is to be a lot of people in my course.

II a. I got the doctor to examine Max ≠

I b. The doctor got to examine Max ≠

II b. I got the doctor to examine Max ≠

Beautiful pair: how the fuck can we explain the non-synonym V occurrence

1919 (almost 38 years later)

Why didn’t get to hit the fan

10/31/21
The difference here precisely in whether the next V down is low or not.

FLASH! 8:15 EST

I got John to come home.

This can be accurate or not.

Thus the natural thing to say is that

firm requires that the next lower V in do

believe requires that the next lower V be (stated)

get doesn’t give a shit.

FLASH 2! 8:25 AM Holy shit!

There is some weird kind of transparency here.

Revised: All V which require lower do’s require higher don’t too!
Thus NB the following contract

\[ (?) \text{ very weakly} \frac{\text{a sense}}{\text{John to be killed off by chance}} \]

I got him to come here — AMBIG.

get John to come home! — MBNO6 (I think)

but: what if I

\[ \text{get some hearing made in that?} \]

\[ \text{better,} \text{hur to seem to have been a fair trial} \]

\[ \text{May: that would explain why I 2 expects} \]

\[ \text{and why the no one takes of NP or from NP} \]

\[ (\text{I expect reference from May}) \]

\[ \text{(of I expect reference from May)} \]

\[ \text{Namely, from is agential, and what happened} \]

\[ \text{is that the subject of the lower do has been} \]

\[ \text{raised (or something), keeping the repetition somehow} \]
Cf. what I expect from Nams is that he will leave quietly.

May: This is all connected somehow with the facts of Enqi with went - namely, its OB16 with lower agents.

This must be the same as the fact that:

$\text{Eqi subj} \geq \text{OBL16, Enqi (absolute exception)}$

for all $i$.

That is, if some $X$ requests //DO, then of course Enqi must apply.

Note: Enqi only deletes the subj of $W$.

(Safe for citations and forref, but note...)}
The primary requirement is done by requiring a lower do - its subject are animals.

Hrm - what about clause-mate stuff?

No problem w/ inclusion stuff - it is exactly the facts w/ want.

Ok oh - what about the difference between if forced (myself) or expected (myself)
That will do. Just say that NPS V

and get started. Bed.

Also, get really on top of it.
Why # 5 fail?

because

kin — is this all connected w/ the fact that aren't etc. seem to exclude Pa?

I have 

- for Pa 4.6

- another fact about because respect before
**Blocking environments for that obligatory and derivational constraints**

?? He thinks tomorrow it may rain >

**know**

?* He thinks this problem we won't get to >

**know**

* He thinks under no circumstances should we go

---

**Facts for Home:**

It was *(that)* he was sick that I had forgotten.

Is what Jack said *(that)* he was hungry?

For what we claim to be *(that)* we were raising would be silly.

He said $S_1$ and I *(that) $S_2$ *

*(That) was left {I didn't realize}

{too easy to figure out}

I believe that $S_4$ more strongly than *(that) $S_2$ *

Shows that

He has *(that)* we can see through him to keep in mind

It must be
general: clauses w/ that must immediately follow their V
Double clause initiators

Susan's idea:

This it is out

Who expects (that) who will run

because no clause can have 2 introducers, essentially.

This might also explain why $\$

a razor with which (for you) to shave and

and

a razor which to shave with

I feel strongly that this is related to the constraint that subjects can't move unless clause-initial.
1. Chipping: we should elect president a man who is fair

we will order steak, and they fish

2. "Sugie," said Carlo, "may be, and Sandra definitely is intelligent."
Why these differences?

I wonder [who drank beer and who ran
whose father drank beer and whose mother ran]

The man whose father drank beer and
whose father ran
They must have been sick all.

This is automatically done by plotting, under Aux as MV.

coupled w/ OC:

* be — Two

Vng Ady?
NP?
PP?

Adjeced

They must be all adjectives

They may have been, all, I fail to be.

They may have been all examined by Fritz.

Necessary anyway: cf.

They are all likely to go.

They seem (to be) all likely to go.

Why: They may not all go.

NB
Larry's (passed on) fact:

We regret to inform you that your policy is hereby cancelled.
help yourself (*or else)

... and Tom obeyed me
Inversions in Hifta's

Away from Max

By Leibniz was discovered X

William

Be discovered at a surface V!
Max will be here, as is possible, Tim hopes.

Max will, Tim hopes, be here, as is possible.

Maybe I argument for Shifting.
It's and but.

I don't think... don't.

*I'm surprised* that there were any IATBs.

Strong neg polarity item.
This must be an NP, because

NP undergoes

I cooked her a little something
I'll whip a little something up
I baked for her a little something
Is there or is there not any

* Is there or not any

* Is or not there any

Has he given, or hasn't he given, books to read?

{} has he not given
10/27/71

That's a big [whether]
[if in case]

I don't think this embeds well:

? The proposition which was a big y

later proved true
I have a protein key.

explained, because NP Shift

best to drag pep's along with it.
a (much) talked about man

This must be a V in der

?? an (often) made use of excuse

?? a *frequently* [honed in on] [beacon]
   [tuned in on program]

These too must become V.

?? a *much* taken advantage of trophic
Facts from a phone call w/ Bruce:

1. More than food, drink + presents:
   - I need a little something [for my cough]
     to put in my stocking
   - I [said] a little something after the trip
   - Why are these out? [photographed]
     [exaggerated]
   - I polished a little something to give to Henry

2. No rule can make it clause-initial:
   - Typicalization, passive, tough movement, of
   - There was a little something with food
     [This was a little something given to us]
     [This was a little something given to us]

3. Because I *I knew a little something to be in the fridge
   we can say *I — I mean
   — [I mean]
Paul Postal suggests:

Generalization: to wit, for other reasons — namely, indifferently (of some mysterious kind) don't speculate.

* Each problem he studied with care
  
  * Every

* All the
  
  * Any problems he didn't look at
    
    * Some

* Many
  
  * Several problems he didn't look at
    
    * Five

* A problem he didn't consider
  
  * Five problem he didn't consider

10/25/71
A little something

- A hat I don't need
- Somebody from home you should marry

NB: any = just any works:

Any problems he [would have told] us about

* is telling

Good test for that kind of any
As far as I know, all idioms are either declaratives, fuckatives, deistics, or exclamations. (I'll be hornswoggled!)

That is, there are no questions, imperatives, or futurs.

Exc. Off with her head!
Down with the king!

Maybe without an idiom.

With friends like him, who needs enemies?

So what?
10/23/20

Wallace Passed of Mike.

* They appear to have seemed to be something.

I believe there to have seemed to be something.

This has to have undergone.
10/22/71

I don't think there are any idiosyncratic
which occur only embedded, though the
converse is true.

This argues for the presumptive analysis,
for only in such an analysis would the
be unattainable to achieve (in a natural way)
for everything that occurs and I have
seen chance to lose it just by 2/3/71

Fact learned while talking with Bruce: 10/24/71

The fact that I unembeddable S's like like father like son
does not argue that O E connection between such phrases and
some glitch making Peri Del OBUG - for E Jerry Meyer's S's,
like father, like son (I guess Wax believes) these just have

I can't be superficially embedded.
introduce ≤ cause to be acquainted with

This would explain absence of role here.

I introduced myself to him.

*I introduced her to myself.

And thus

*I introduced her to *her.

To presume acquaintance be acquainted with
Amphora & Islands

10/22/71

Then realizes that Ann's finding him drunk are connected

* When he came in, I left Mary & Ann.

OK [Ann's sister.]

Sort of [John read the book [D]] which I gave him?

Sort of like nobody he.

But OK: John said that he was tired and that we should leave.

Why? [Ann's picture?]

and
Fake relative formation

The shambles that the boat was in!

↑

(from 6/8/67)

What a shambles the boat was in!

because shambles occurs nowhere else.
Fact: midwifed by Henry Kucera.

When she got back, I called [up Mary]

So the problem of particles really does have
to do with stress, somehow.

Let’s see if the same facts hold about

Nature:

No, they don’t.

When she comes in, I’m going to give [some books to Mary]

Weaker, maybe, but OK.
Nobody bought a picture of her father.

Of which will you make use?

you must make use of all of these.
Unless I miss my guess, I

Jack said that unless he missed his guess, I
No matter whether he comes (or not)

But (also from Emily)

it doesn't matter whether you leave, I'm going

from Emily

10/20/??
Why is this bad?

* Ann was, everybody felt, being unfair to him.
And this good?
The food was, everybody felt, worse that his.
And I think relative clauses are ok.

The proposal would, everybody felt, influence the results of the experiment which they had been doing.

NB: It's dancing in part at least to the same tune.
Fact from Dave:

I slept in, said Jack.

Some of the best orchestras have played in this hall.

Many people have laughed in this hall.

I have a picture of Frits from Dave.

I did away with Max.

I had discussed an opportunity to go to Rome.
Nobody will bite because he's tired.

Why?

Jack will buy a car because he went.

How come we get this:

When did Tom give you a picture of Max:

OK  OK  OK

And this, weird!
Alex as MV

You need (him) to go

*not him (to) go

...directed by universal definition of any
I feel that unless I miss my guess, 5 seems to be very high. Bill felt that unless he missed his guess, 5

Bill said that he felt that unless he missed his guess, 5
Your guess is as good as mine.

He told her that her guess was as good as his.
Adv Prep and ISonds

Originally from PM (and Howard Casiaki?)

It's these patients that I think that

\[
\{ \text{you should talk to everyday} \} \\
* \text{every day you should talk to}
\]

It's Max that I think that \( \{ \text{he always} \} \) talks to

* always he
A further proof of the correctness of this rule is the fact that it extends in British to -ory and -ary (e.g., classificatory)
Thinking

Why OK?

He was proud of his home, we realized.

My father was, we realized, proud of his home

Why?

Q: Who did you see?

Yes!

Q: What did he say?
A: He would be late.

Can we argue that thinking happens before success? This can only be out because this came from thinking.
He was examined, and she was too

He will be examined, and she will be too

He has been examined, and she has been too

He is being examined, and she is being too

He may have been examined, and she may have been too

He may be being examined, and she may be being too

Generalization: Things after -ing don't delete
They said that he may have been being tickled.

1. and I think that he (may have been (being)))

2. and { ?? being tickled he may have been

    * * tickled he may have been being

3. He might have been being tickled, mightn't he (have been (being)))?

4. Insertability (Aha! Insertion is like deletion)

   He wanted to try to begin of writing /> on the wall

   /beginning to write

   /beginning to write

   /to write

   /to write
Rhetorical Q's or why else

why else is only in rhetorical Q's

(I think)
There is a hierarchy

1. Decl + Q is OK
   * Q + Decl

2. Imp + {Decl}
   [Q]
   *[Q] + Imp

3. Q and Q

   He will be here, and how can we get him there
   
   Go home and I want you to bring a knife
   Would you bring a knife

   ?? I want to know how he got there
   how I want to know how he got there

   So conj Q's must both look like Q's.
Multiple speech acts

10/15/71

Terry's fact (?)

I promise you that I and [I ask you to] please buy it.

Do exactly

which I ask you to please buy

Thus: Form check (only things that look like declaratives can be combined with them).

Swooply
There seems to be a hierarchy of types:

1. If one 5 looks like a declarative, all must
2. Where were he and (tell us) how did he look.
   If one is a 9, all must be * have a chain
   Jimmy Thomas fact: It's only possible to delete one time if all delete

NB: we can't conjoin real + rhetorical Qs.

3. If one is an imperative, all must be
   * nothing: come here, and will you bring a glass
4. * Keep off and don't come back
   * Run up
5. If one is a jocular, all must be * Dam it, and forget it
Very fell and across the board

10/15/71

I will, I confess, be there, and I promise that I'll be quiet.

He is, I promise, qualified, and I swear that I will obey him.

Jimmy Thorns' fact provides an argument that shifting has happened here.
"I talked to Tom," said Jack, "and Bill (yesterday)."

Fred sent to Fred a picture of Ted.

Why good?

NB: one can't argue that it can unwillingly be stuffed in before the last constituent.

"I'll keep Mary," said Tom, "company."

"I'll hear that," said Tom, "in mind."
I didn't have the impression that he would leave until tomorrow.

Why not?

I didn't make the claim that he would leave until tomorrow.

Maybe it's just where we go?
1. Fact 1: \{ \text{me} + \text{sich} \} \text{ wurde geschmeichelt}

   (for whatever reason [maybe this has no subject],
   Equi won't delete a dative subject)

3. Fact 3: Ich liebe \{ \text{me} + \text{von ihr} \} \text{ geschmeichelt.}

This must be raised, because Equi
couldn't have applied

[NB: Case marking is not deep, because if
  the subject, geschmeichelt worden zu sein]

So there must be a rule that takes that
to Fact
The preceding is very suspect, because of the following fact.

* Ich fülle dich krank  (füllen is a reflexive V)

And V which allow other objects don't allow the construction

\[
\begin{align*}
{\text{Ich helfe ihm für besoffen}} \\
{\text{ihn für geschmeichelt}}
\end{align*}
\]

{\text{Ich fand dich geschmeichelt}}

\[? \\
\text{gelört}\]
have + VP Del + Aux as MV

He has left, but we haven't

* cats

He doesn't have cats, but we have

* has no

Why?

Aha - it's not suprising.

We have cats, but

I doubt that they do

I'm surprised that they do

and I imagine that they do too.
Questions

Requests
Negatives (rhetorics)
Suggestions
Counterfactuals (Had I but known)
Oblivious

Imperatives
If - Then
Commands
Requests
Permission
Shilling
Suggestions (also Let's)
Advice

Asyntactic constructions
Up yours
Off with her head!
To the arsenal!

Asyntactic way of
asking questions

Like father, like son
Fact from

Steve: smoke anything you like

Dario:

I permit you (you smoke anything you like)

New suggestion:

Imperative S = S whose deepest V

de semantically close to command

(e.g. request, insist, advise, suggest, rule,

decree, proclaim, etc.)

and whose surface S is in the ballpark
An analysis arrived at with Dorothy Siegel

In English, these things control irreversibility

1. Prepositions can split constituents

   * very, said Jack, much
   * on, said Jack, the bed
   * think, said Jack, up a counterexample
   * for Tom, said Jack, to come here would be horrible for me

2. But they can, if before an S

   everybody, said Jack, who I slept with,

   I realized said Jack, that S

   [ NB interaction of parsing:
   found a book, said Jack (which was
   about cattle )]

3. Thus they only intervene between constituents
directly dominated by S.
Inertibility

Now NB the inertibility is

I don't understand why he is so good

This is OK only because of NP Shift

I gave a picture of my father to Max

I gave a picture to Max or of my father
There is a difference between aux and infinitives.

\[ I \text{ want to try to begin to fry the eggs. } \]

\[ \text{All OK.} \]

\[ \text{I want to try beginning to fry the eggs.} \]

NB: \( \exists \) difference between infinitives and gerunds.

This may be what explains the difference between aux and V.

There is a difference in structure between S, which \( S_2 \) and \( S_1 \) \{because although \( S_2 \), etc.

She was talking and Jack to Mike forever she liked him \( \text{which is too bad} \).
Or not Zapping

NP Aux Del (produces or not)

Whether Deletion

Or Not Zapping (only to whether)
keep and predicate raising

he has his wish about him

he kept his wish about him

keep < have - continue
Slunce and friends

He bought something - (I think a picture of Mox)

*It's new that I think a picture*

So Slunce around a term seems to have it on island.

This would also explain

he said something fantastic: *beams that Bill likes*
I begged John to go  —  John was begged to go

I begged John to be allowed to go  —  * John was begged (of) to be allowed to go

I promised John to go  —  * John was promised by me to go

I promised John to be allowed to go  —  * John was promised by me to be allowed to go

[Handwritten notes:]

[* begged]
I [demanded] John to see her

What V here?

NB  I begged (of John) to go

Paled?  Crazy became

If NP Tol

[Misreadings and redactions]
I went to the [the] joint.

I went to the john with the bucket.
The fact that I don't think, etc., can only follow /- (except hardly ever) from a semantically highest negative given a great test for why there are:

He (*probably) never reads his mail, I don't think (probably no higher than never).

He (*cleverly) didn't go, I don't think.

Bad problem: ? He doesn't feel that Tom should have written back until tomorrow, I don't think.


How come this is OK? He almost never read. I don't think.

Because almost no higher than never.
Facts pointed out by Brophy:

how come? John's there

I couldn't determine how come to left.

Liz has come to only reading only.
Edwin's fact: only one subject no thing

Hiding/everything/something strange

My conclusion: what you describe happened to me too

He came from the thing that
The fact that just those speech acts which can't be embedded (decide, shillings, etc...) can't be questioned means that questions must come from embedded structures.
a little something

Original observations: only stuff to eat, drink, or presents
due to

Mary Louise Generalization: can't ever be subject at the end of a cycle.

Sigh —

can't be localized, either.

So try a global rule: putting it from being moved to clause-initial position I think that's right — if

There was a little something [in the fridge] [given to me]
Imp and Roy

10/1/71

Frankly

John's sick

*go home

I tell you frankly

*command you frankly
I promise you.

*I am promising you.*

but

They realize that.

*I promise you.*

*I am promising you.*
Fact from Avery:

* If he comes in, I'll ask Max or Tom

Max or Tom said that he was sick

So he can personalize a deficient
1. Nobody said that disclosing his bad habits.

So it's privacy.

2. It stays out of true facts.

Nobody mentioned (the fact) that he felt oppressed.

3. Prepositional in this type of relative clauses:

Nobody kissed the girl he was with.
The job was, everybody felt, now he had
he would have to get all the time.

* Everybody didn't like to watch you.

The room was always so full.
* Nobody slept, in his bed

* Nobody slept and he slept in his bed

That is, supposing we say that all pronouns impossible we conjured at one time.

* Nobody gave nuts to Ann and received from it to be brought and receive to his sick.
Nobody's paper was treated unfairly.

What about the food, everybody said, was worse than what they would have made.

Any stuff set off by commas can't have a pronoun in it.

Everybody ate, because he was polite.

And what is the context of the presupposed fact in?

Everybody realized that he had problems.

*god!"