The fact that

he had to have the valet polish his shoes

is out to be explained w/ all

def B [with] and have as

MV, accident by Noah.
Will point out that buying anything will be easy to avoid can be shown out by a branch of George's rule if we make this and this predicates of the right kind.
Max is working and Tom seems to be too. (Believe Jan to be)
What I \{ want \} insist on desire \\
so that I \{ be elected \} be ridden

Generalization:

Abjective subjects of tenseless clauses

can't overlap with their controllers

What I demanded of him was that I leave
Entwurf einer Dichtung, Buch 2, 2.3

* Ein großer Gott, dem das Buch gegeben
9/24/71

Picks up ring in a discussion with Ellen Kaufman:

1. The relevant circle is defined by the next highest seat by saying:

   "I said to Mrs. Norwood, that is:
   "Kicked Mrs. Norwood"
   "Talked to Mrs. Norwood"

   N/3

   The difference here is that she is not reminded
   with the high shelf.

2. *Richard 1.12.21 = Mr. Brown
   "Dad" = Mr. Brown
   "Neb" = Mr. Brown
   "Rex" = Mr. Brown
   "Frank" = Mr. Brown

3. 2nd: "Your bull's in the air". 1st: 7 - 1 w s distance

   "Pretty" < you < "No" 2nd: no sound, greater than = distance from you
   1st: "No" after < not sure
   2nd: you can hear a little

   "Given"
4. Puts to: Vler (about her hand): "him"

6:30 to Morris (male dog): "Professor Keynes"

Calling Prof. Eden "Murray" in speaking to Morris would be like calling John Morris
probable can't be in future

* It {will \quad could \quad might \quad should} be probable that S

I * I expect {that he will probably die

* I expect {it to be probable that S that he will probably go

\text{Oh oh}
Bob
Frazier's
Fact
Equity

Bill could win more games than Jack. [Amatex]

[Jack could only bet]

Bill may have had cancer longer than Tom. [had]

[May have been]

There are no equations in
Then - clauses - they must come

from upstairs

9/22/71 Flash: The extent to which he may have

Thus w/ this source overdrawn his account exceeded X
Particles

Pet Move
Passive

Arlene's
Dorothy's
argument
July

because of

I picked out

\{ a tie for John \}
\{ to John a tie \}

Can't be sure - of

* Which tie did you pick out John?
This goes on logical objects:

Max as

- popular
- famous
- notorious
- tall
- strong

* surprised

For

- Hub's defense by Tom
- Hub's speeches
- Ann's
- being elected
- drunk

NB: Derived subjects go

Max > get a medal for fighting

Are any of them good?

He was famous because of

?? - having lost 100 lb

[Ann's] having been elected
What I saw was him riding

I saw there being a riot

Why doesn't this delete?
Almost every kind of speech act

[except [devis[e: cf. *Maxine, who there's a picture of] dumping on of *Maxine, who the hell with it etc.]

can be in appositive clauses.

Therefore, if these come from presupposition space, that space also has speech acts.

**NB:** These seem to be permutations in RRC, too - cf. everything which I am (hence) promising you to build that is naturally rotten will be functional.

Flash: that is just the kind of speech act that can be requested in O's
I move that your can be empowered to speak.

If the seven in 5, there can't be any higher.
Some NP has 1st person force just in case I can't appear in the 5:

The court hereby proclaims that all decisions reached by [ome] will be published.
1. A NP has 2nd person force just in case

   You in 5

2. All those present are warned that

   You will be found

---

Just those NP which can't be vocatives
can't have 1st or 2nd person force

[The court finds]

That

Some of those present are warned
Across the board

Facts discovered with PMP:

1. Mel, who I like, and a picture of whom I bought.

This shows that the chipping goes on transformally.

2. But apparent double chipping must arise by

   (No Shift)
   Node raising

   (Single chipping)

   because of

   Mel, who I like, and who I think is fat.

This is explained by the fact that things can't be...
Mel, who I bought from Tom, sold to Mel

a picture of and Sheila dislikes

2/1/72

Why so thin out?

NB also:

?? This car, which I bought from Tom and Bill sells to Terry, and Ted worked on, so a decent
I carefully walked along the rail.
and Max carelessly walked along it.
OK w/o Adv My Shift.
so conduit stress might freeze stuff up.
I invited Joan and she was really thrilled.

[Hum... not for all预案]
that 5a works well. But it works well that other day.
Facts, conferred with Paul Post:

1. Only left-handed ships make islands.

Which villages did you give to Wax?

(finely detailed and indisputable) picture of?

Just as, NP shift doesn’t make islands, unless the shift is short.

2. Talk with Nell Czernin.

I know by which villages you signed from Tom.

and "Wax and Sally" (finally detailed and
undisputably indisputable) picture.
Thus it would seem that only A

is an island.

But this J shows that what is

really involved is (understood?) left clipping;

* which pictures do you think there is getting

Max has

Go worry about?

This shows, incidentally, that these S's

involve NI a clipping rule

So maybe the

Maybe of which care do you think that the kinds

would be easy? To imagine something like?
It is not the case that all choppies must move to the front of a higher clause.
There is getting himself together for you to try to get Ted to stop thinking about.

This is, I believe, contrary to what Norman's condition will allow.
Facts from Bruce (my influence):

1. Don't come over. [I promise that I'll leave]
   
   I'll leave.
   
   I can only be there. I promise interpretation which should exist; doesn't.
   
   Which is explained if this can optionally delete.

2. If you will do P, I [promise that I will know you]
   
   + warn you
   
   I'll love you

   Similarly, this is out with warning interpretation,

   also protected by Pen/Pol
He's here vs I hereby declare that he's here
has TV has none (?)

I'll be in Rome (needn't promise) vs I hereby promise that I'll be in Rome
may have some TV has no TV

Generalization: audibility of performative becomes TV/particularity
This word seems to have built into it some notion of the line of vision from observer to observed object.

E.g.

The wall is concave, from where I sit, looking from the north.
Facts triggered by reading Bill Vandem's paper:

They say that he went, which he * must have
* is
* must be
* must have been

Hypothesis: This rule is only * when the
modified I and the modifier agree in
Kase (or aspect?)

8/4/71

Is this the same fact as

I went home, * which was difficult for me
* will be difficult for you

I decided to go home, which will be difficult here,
else...?
What is the relationship between the class Os which allows anti-cyclic any

\{ every
    the only
    the last
    first
    second
\}

\{ the only
    the last
\}

any

and the class which figures in domain

I didn't tell \{ many people
    anybody
    ten people
    *several people
    everybody
    *all my friends
\}

that anyone was sick
What kind of horse - a [fat] one

What kind of milk - {chocolate} milk

Thus seems to ask for only inherent properties
Are there rules which could refer both to V and to N but which only affect N?

I know of none.

The fact that by-phrases are only agentive for N, but are extended for V, is probably a primary fact.

How is Evans's fact that only agentive by-phrases are possible w/ weak personal related here? (Cf. The mountain was rolled down by a [the man] [the pebble].)

Maybe this is some kind of freezing up phenomenon.
He said, "I will help, but that he would help."

Promise was soon forgotten.

So this makes it appear that this comes from

He said that he thereby promised that he would help.

AHAA! The rule of Pet Del
so just like the rule of Ad Del—
both get deleted when contemporaneous with the next higher V.
Object Incorporation and the LBC

peel the banana

↑

how is this obliterated?

Maybe it's only stuffed in

skin- remove (or) the banana by a very late rule.

↑

Incorporation

remove the skin of the banana

How come this is possible? Maybe it's because violations of the LBC are made totally grammatical by inaudibility.

What we will do is that $\exists V$ which could take $N_2$ out of $V[N_1, of N_2]$, which is what we would expect.

アー "what about? e.g. First I unplugged the car, then I plugged it"
7/26/21

The fact that promises, etc. can make it into opposite does it a great argument for swooping, because otherwise there’s no good general characterization of where performatives occur.

Hey! Both of these convey two speech acts.

Max, who:

- I promise to visit
- I will visit
No — only good at home if
not long can express clearly.

John wasn't sure that you were where
you were to find it that you were where
you were.
A 3-placer:

X brought Y home to Z
It must be gapping which gets

I talked to Bob yesterday, and [bald]

because the preposition must stay
Lexicalism

7/4/71

Maybe I'm only imagining Jim's refusal to go... but maybe he did.

But

* Jim's election is likely, but maybe he won't be.

? Maybe I'm only imagining Jim's election to the Senate, but I really think he may have been.

LSD OK
I guess that Tom, and I know that Mike, were then... I know that Tom was, and I think that Harry is, dressing himself. Thus its audibility linked.
Sentence discovered while phoning Terry:

I discovered that Tom was that Harry.

Dick all were drunk

What can all be helping

If so? It must be the agreed NP.

Norm's "idea": that NP is
a) a constituent
b) a PP (P = for)

I prefer for Tom and for Harry for Dick all to be watched.

But NB - I looked for Tom
* Hopefully, he \{ \text{may} \ \text{will} \ \text{must} \ \text{should} \} \text{ have left} \leftarrow \text{epistemic}

//

* I \{ \text{hope} \ \text{hopeful} \} \text{ that he } \{ \text{will} \ \text{must} \ \text{may} \} \text{ have left}
Fact noted in conversation with Paul Foot:

The gorillas all left

I agree with them.

Thus, if floating is restricted only in object position.
I [agree with you]

agree with Ted

Max told Ann that $S + S$ she agreed with him

[read]
He's sick, I think. I have no interest in the outcome (or am afraid that they will say)

So what gives?

Is this because parentheticals are only presupposed, and appended, asserted? Or what?
I don't think Sweeping can be pre-cyclic, because apps. can't modify me (in some dialects).

He shot at me, who was his best friend.
He 0 difficult to be very -

Help help         it is in need

We be the one to come and

To be behave to love

why is to break to become
to break to apply to hit

does to be dominant

6123/17
Our proposed solution.

Proof?
If he or she [reproaches] [him or herself] 

/ so [holds his or her] breath too long 

[her or him] 

Note that this is a respectively construction with or (which is usually forbidden — cf. *Tom or Sam live in Topeka or Wichita) 

Thus this or comes from and
NB: He thought I was confusing him.

I cleaned his room today.

Interestingly, I cleaned the floor.

So, I think it was because of the cleaning.

But, I cleaned the floor.

From Bruce

You're welcome.

Theresa

6/24/17
If Dave is right about *D* deletion rules unless *E* pro-forms in SS for the deleted thingy, then "VP Del must really be a form of *S* Del (or *NP Del*)"
Can you think of a way of slicing these eggs?

Why so that a request?
The reason mysteries are so important is the same as the reason that negative experimental results are important. The theory predicts \( x \) we find not \( x \). E.g., some construction fails to pass you where it should. Or a plausible \( D \) falls down.
I maintain both that Tom and that Mike are spies

(*6oth*)

? I maintain that Tom and that Mike are twins

Mi God!

At the very least, this would appear to shot

down the claim that Chad must precede agreement

* It is Arnette who I maintain both that Tom and that Mike

are proud of

Another case for the IJP

NB: ... that Tom and that Mike seem to have been believed to have been seen

They must be working like Greek Case Agreement, which means OJ plural NP.
Maybe there is a way to explain all this. If Agreement is by Pronoun-Copying, then we could have a derivation like so:

[Diagram of a tree structure with labeled nodes and phrases.]

Big bad problem: How can NR work on this structure? This really looks like an argument for VP.

Hmm—maybe this is really respectively formation. This might explain why himself etc. are out.

[continued diagram with additional annotations and structures.]
Conjunction Reduction and Agreement

Conj Reduction

S-1

S₀

S₁

That Mike

S₂

That Tom

VP

V

NP

S

[NP₂][NP₆]

+ Pro

be

laughing at me

V

V

V

NP₉

+ Plural

be

plural agreement
That probably /s Respectively Formation:
cf. I know that Tom and that Mike like her and dislike her.

Derrivation:
Ale - I'm fucked - this won't lead automatically to us getting a conjunct pronoun on $V_a$ and $V_f$. It looks like some convention will still be necessary.

Ale - there's a prop that $D \in [NP]$ in the str - of.

Tom and Mike are believed to be:

- a funk and a hero, resp.
- finds and heroes, resp.

Prop failed
He replied to my letter last year.

He reply to my letter [last year] was brief.

He's departure (*of) yesterday.

Some V don't allow these J's. What class of V does?

The gift last year of $10.

He's actual (*of) last year to go.

{ He's attitude (*of) last year, He's eagerness, He's sincerity (*of) last year, Knowledge } What the fuck goes on?
To the extent that you (*will) support, we will succeed.

By the way, we (*will) solve that, you may judge our ability.

At the time that we (*will) arrive, no one will be there.

So delegation seems to be in the

done

any 5 modifying an adverbial N.
The following constructions also count as coordinate

\[ S_1 : S_2 \]

sometimes \( S_1 \), sometimes \( S_2 \)

The ver X, the yer Z

This means that in order to get stuff out of

\[ S_2 \text{ in } S_0 \]

\[ \text{if } S_3 \]

either

(a) CSC mentions second clause (yeah)

(b) \( S_2 \) was in \( S_1 \) (better - they were subject +
    object of some higher verb)
Caspar, and him I'm sure you'll like, has a 10" dick

Hum — either Swooping too late, or Hysteria! Islands have to be defined demographically.

What does this say about Jerry's 5's

What I [believed] [was surprised at] was that Bill she hated

Nothing — I'm still fucked here.
It seems to come from du + X, rather than from Sue + X, where speaker

draft X
(although this is often used as a first step to dinging)
than I thought (that) was necessary
* There {be} no beer in the fridge?!?

How is the $b$ out?

Also:

IP {\*be} muggy in Cleveland?!?

\{{\* be} \}

\\{{\* it} \{possible\} that she loves me?!?

\{{\* seem} \}

Hey—maybe that is evidence that the $P$ is only inserted around tense.
Exclamations + Modals + Aux = V

Φ explanation for be may be here

Because modals require tense in 55

Then follows naturally with Terry's analysis of Can't Yanking.

Actually, it shows that which OC is independently D.
Unless [I missed my guess]
[he misses his guess], we're safe

If doubted, I was surprised
Bill said that unless [he missed his guess]
[I missed my guess]
[thought]

We'd win

To him.

NB, though:
The fact that Bill will, unless I miss my guess, worry Clara

Harvey Ted

This has to swoop down with a CNP.
They have to be ordered like that because...

* The man who I ascertained was bald is a crook
I had an offer to VP

OK

There was an offer to VP

OK

and

I gave him an offer to VP (Dave Vetters noted team)

OK
Only and  
& or

all students, more

\{ any, no student, male [ or ] female \}

\{ every \}

\{ ? each \}

The workers, 1/2 of decided

\{ several \}

\{ \}
Maybe the source for middle is able 5's.

1. Able → Ø exists independently - in Hungarian and Turkish

2. This play is translatable for sophomores

This play translates readily for seniors

3. Bill is \{photographable, *printable\} \(\frac{1}{2}\) Bill \{photograph, *print\} well

4. Bill is \{readily, *easily\} \{*red, *important, photographable\} - right kind of Adv.

\{easily, *readily\} six feet tall
5/12/71

Why he left is not clear to me.
I'm not clear as to why he left.

Whether or not he likes you, will be clear.
You will be clear as to whether or not he likes you.

That he left is clear to me.
I am clear that he left.

? I am clear how long a sentence he'll get - either 20 or 30 years.
? I am clear who he murdered - Betty Toms.
Thus clear must flip with that clause.
and is a little odd with unflipped conj.

This is a great argument for flip -
whether or not a V undergoes it depends on
higher info.
When going to OJU, I remembered that 3 people had given me messages for Arnold.

First, I remembered who they were, then what I had to tell Arnold. The opposite seems to me to be unlikely.

Is this a fact which is deducible from the structure of $X$ says $Y$?

Is this related to this?

Somebody mentioned something — I forget who.

But Paul mentioned something — I forget what.

Something was mentioned by someone — I forget what.

(by whom)
Not a thing was eaten by anyone from Kankakee.

What the fuck.

Recalls.

No one was seen at shortly after 4.
Acquisition of Phonology

Where does the [p] in "yep" come from?

Ask Dave

7/12/21
at home school
in bed school

on board ship

sea part

11/17

ship to ship
across the board deletions
5/10/71

Kevin to bed
back to camp
(base, company, + base)
earth, sea

To go 1/2 hour

To go 15 km

Ground school
bed

Head bed - with firm

Foot end must keep firmly

In position face heart

On edge heart beating
Arguments for V2 Target

1. V Scrambling blocked
2. Topicization (maybe universal)
3. es insertion
4. The ordering \( \text{TOP} \xrightarrow{\theta} \text{es} \)

(otherwise, we'd get "Im Walkte schliefen es die Kinder")
08/16, → 6. V Scrambling ceases.

German → 1. Target cases — fake subject pronouns appear, only in initial position.

2. Since true subjects often follow V, the fake pronouns get reanalyzed as subjects, and then start appearing post-verbally, only being deleted optionally.

French → 3. No pronouns can delete.

4. Subject formation splits off from topicalization.

   subjects get formed first, then topicalized constituents precede them.

5. Some subjects get formed cyclically and get number (there insertion).

   Bill I like
Sentence from Bruce:

You are not allowed to kiss Doris, Eva, or Sandra, and vice versa.

?? You are allowed to kiss Doris, Eva, or Sandra, and vice versa.

4/22/71
Pronominalization and Propositional Functions

4/24/71

Nobody is taller than [he thinks he is]
[She thinks Sarah is]
Sarah thinks he is.

My god — what's happening here?
than seems necessary
than it may begin to seem

These show that the rule has to happen after raising. Yet it remains sensitive to the lower verb.

Ta daa!

Revolutional constraint

Or, it could be handled by making cyclical

Extrap OBL for seem

No — that would yield than (35) was necessary

Hey — how about if whatever rule does seem is not Extrap? That would solve a lot of problems.
Whether he eats cheese (or pizza), I like him.
Facts noted at OSU Seminar:

Verbs are syntactically freer than N and A.

So:

1. P relation is major for V, minor for others.
2. V can take NP, VP, S

obj raising
(N and Adj cannot)
Hey!

Look - $\mathcal{A} \times \text{Adj} \left\{ \text{NP} \left( \text{Adv} \right) \text{VP} \right\}$

So what's the big deal about $N$?

$V$ is finer than the other two categories put all.
Examples from Norm:

Our election of John* (to be) president
(to the presidency)

This follows the same general patterns
noted about how everything must have a certain
degree of reassurance.

But that one is really puzzling.
Presumably, the undeleted form is out like
My expectation of John to leave
(persuasion)

But then this is a constraint not imposed
by audibility.
This weakness in his legs

but

* John's back's weakness

(in the sense of John's back is weak from the climb)

Thus this is basic.