Q: What did you say about the knife?
A: I said that you used it to stab me (with)

Q: What did you say about yesterday?
A: I said that it was when Jack left

Q: What did you say about him?
A: He was stared at by Hannah

NB: He was the one who Hannah stared at

Q: He was the one who he stared at
   ? Hannah was the one who he stared at
   ? The one who he stared at was Hannah
* Nobody spoke up, but I hated him.

Nobody left

\{(\text{since}) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{although} \quad \text{because} \}

Nobody passed it by studying instead of writing his father.

Nobody wrote me (*) to get his grades.

\{(\text{said that he was sick}) \quad \text{left (*) before he was called before being photographed a Catholic convert etc.)} \}

What about facts?

Nobody \{\text{realized who supposed? reported} \} that he had been photographed.
Nobody went out and got his rifle.

?respected woman and hated her sister

Nobody typed up 

\( \text{a} \) description of his beard

\( \text{Mrs.} \)

Nobody had an opportunity to visit his sister.

?discussed

Nobody believed (??the claim) that he was sick.

But OK: Nobody ate the peanuts that he had bought.

Why?
Cleft 5?

It was John \{Who\} I didn't find congenial

That was John \{That\} I was describing

No \{That was to John that I gave it\}

Think it is pretty not a cleft 5
Berlin is a city which White Del is ecstatic to visit.

→ White Del

a city ecstatic to visit

→ Modifier Shift

an ecstatic city to visit

This rule can work on funny NPs:

Tell me the right [{an ecstatic city} to visit]

Why?
great argument for:

These houses are \{ \begin{align*} & \text{well} \\ & \text{German} \\ & \text{recently} \end{align*} \} \{ \begin{align*} & \text{built} \\ & \text{made} \end{align*} \} \{ \begin{align*} \text{houses} \end{align*} \}
4/23/71

* what he kisses is ass

ass-kisser
ass-kissing <= kiss ass * ass was kissed by the sergeant

Why & bucket kicking?

mind blowing - blow (one's) mind - ? my mind is blown

(*he) blame-taking - this suggests I rule which deletes article
Agent Del

4/23/71

Maybe agents of causatives don't delete:

This hole was dug *(outside)*

* The explosion was triggered

* The rest was [incited]*

caused

This book was

written *(in.

well)*

These are different

no modifiers

can save them

This house was *

built

well

made

of sand

in 1945

But: The student was *

killed

murdered

tortured

The water was boiled

Note: maybe it is agents of causatives that don't delete.
I read up to Ch. 3 and a bit more. 4/1/71

It was up to Ch. 3 that I read in that book.

It was up to Ch. 3 that I read in that book.

Read in book - definite

Read in book - definite
Do you want me to make you a drink? *(slice of toast)*

4/4/21

- Coffee
- Tea
- Glass of wine
- Gin and tonic
So I guess I real variable in the rule.
Branching Adjectives

Aba - of alas  two-gun  stud head

He do very *(heart) - broken

I think that if a rule can be motivated, it'll be done to Lemarchan because of the extra meaning of *(right) - facted

Why oh why wasn't there any branch? This is the only place I know with a restriction like this.

And they can have the \( N \rightarrow G \rightarrow \text{two-faced} \) \( \rightarrow \text{well-mannered} \) as part answers.

are there any two \( ADJ \) - Yes! well-intentioned

(e.g. often etc)

which can't occur in predicate position.
1. This is a well-looked at area (very)

This doesn't argue for a Trk rule, not a lexical rule

2. slept in
   well
   paid for
   thought of
   *Verbed during

Hat! The lack of any such Vdp adjective follows from independently needed constraints on Pied Piping

Thus car is * (German) made
Branching Adjectives

Jack is [?
- hearted?
- hearted man]
- hearted
- faced

OK
- faced
- minded
- handed
- shoudered

N, is Adj N.
N, is Adj N.
N, is Adj N.
N, is Adj N.

Arguments for deriving these transformationally:

1. \( N, \text{ is Adj N.} \)
2. \( \exists \) inalienable have a relationship between \( N \) and \( N, \text{ is Adj N.} \)
3. But: \( \exists \) iteration: *a cherry-nipped breasted virgin
also \rightarrow \text{other}

? I also invited another friend

Slightly redundant

\[ I \text{ have } \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\text{a picture of another Greek} \\
\text{other times}
\end{array} \right. \]

This argues that a rule of nouns here?

maybe this is the reason why or is used here
Beautiful fact of Peter Geach's

John's attempted murder of his queen

Source, please?

Can't come from

Which was planned

Certainly
Clause Deletion

was necessary
I thought
I realized
*I considered
*(it) seemed
*(it) was reported

(NB this)

Why is this hopeless

*which it seemed
MHP

4/13/71

Margaret is blond. It's wrong, because of \( \frac{1}{2} \) and \( \frac{3}{2} \).
I.

4/13/71

Inner island rules split as to which allow words like this to intervene. None allow surprised that

OK 1. Adv Prep: Near me I was surprised to see a snake

?? 2. Though Prepoing: ?? popular though I was surprised to be

* 3. The/a warmth: he greeted me with the warmth that I was surprised to get from him

?? 4. Closer I arrode: It was with rather fork that I was surprised to be able to call the trucks

It was in the garden that I was surprised to see Alex rising her

* 5. Comparatives: * He is colder than I am surprised to see that you are

6. The happiest that I was surprised to find out that you have seen him

OK 7. Slepting I was surprised to discover,

OK 8. Which is as many of us were surprised to learn

9. He is to the doctor that we were surprised to learn that he could be
10. Whatever he was surprised to find was lacking
11. ...the sector I was surprised to become

What V follow?

They were surprised to \{  
\begin{align*}
&\text{have won} \\
&\text{win} \\
&\text{be winning} \\
&\text{discover} \\
&\text{knew} \\
&\text{be known} \\
&\text{be home} \\
&\text{be happier}
\end{align*}
\}
Dave Flamps' fact:

The usual people were fucking in the usual place.

* Surprising people were fucking in the usual place.
Nominalization

He criticized book before (it appeared) getting smashed 1946.

Maybe in lab criticism of the book before (it appeared) getting smashed 1946.

This is out because the whole thing has to nominalize.

This is another case where 's complement, because if

That's NB her description of Bill to get herself into paper.

Maybe this is too much because ing-phrases are more n-like than...
Deletion and Contraction

He gave her something, but what’s not clear.

If this is good, then deletion in lower clauses doesn’t affect contraction.

Ha! \( \{ \text{him} \} \) - \( \checkmark \) deletion

\( \text{herself} \) - \( \checkmark \) deletion

Of which ear do you think my description is accurate?

John said that the picture of him is on the table.

NB: I know something about Soledan & gevora, but the whole story has been told wrong.
* George is tough to take his lollipop away from.

* George's lollipop is hard to take away from him.

This really looks like cyclical pronoun.

? The girl who George married is hard for me to imagine her telling the story that he would tell that these pictures of himself look good. It's hard for me to imagine Tom saying
I gave Bill a nickel & her a dime.

The persons which I read: [to her note to me] [her and she me]

Web argnes

Gaping

Reel & Formation

(but we clause-by-clause analyzed)
Vocatives + implied orders

4/10/71

Dave Stamp's fact:

There's a draft in here, [Mike or Tom]

[* please]

< incredible contrast

NB [two points set]

It's like a beer, please.

(Maybe this is another hint for pre-supposition vs. implication (or inference))

Jeanette Gundel's fact:

I order a woman to *pick it up*

* Pick it up, a woman
the proof is that he ate cheese
Fact from Jeanette Gundel

Whatever he doesn't wear, he will wear the other way.

Only good w/ pockey bag clo.
Modifier: Preparation

4/9/71

Hard-working

Fast-running

The adverts here can't be prepared by

Independently. Do this.
Arnold's fact:

\[ a \times \infty \sim b \times \infty \]

...also

inner-island bound
Ted & Max kissed Sue & Alice, respectively,

and *vice versa*.

My god — maybe this is even good...
Parallel to SSC facts in derived object, we find

* Who did you believe a picture I to have fallen down?

? Who do you expect letters from to come today?

10. what are you expecting a letter from (from boy/today)

What about?? Who did you look into this at any due time

Aha — so maybe what's out is

anything followed by $[\checkmark \times]$

Won't work for SSC — No — this is OK, because

adj $= \checkmark$

?* It was Mary who I found getting along with difficult

Aha! It was Mary who I found difficult getting along with in
About whom do you think our decision was in error?

SSC appears not to care about derived non-clauses.
Facts from OSU

4/6/71

I didn't tickle

\( \{ \text{any girl or any boy} \} \)

\( \text{and} \)

\( \text{any girl for the boys} \)

\( \text{the boy for any girls} \)

\( \frac{\text{Ted}}{\text{or}} \)

\( \frac{\text{Bob}}{\text{or}} \)

What the f*** gives? when \( \rightarrow \) and \( \rightarrow \) or OBLK?

NB: only 3* and changes:

*I didn't mix cement or water*

I didn't clean that saw or Feds

had left (*together*)

Logically,

I didn't tickle Ted or Bob

\( \frac{\text{Neg =}}{\text{and} =} \)

I didn't tickle Ted and Bob

\( \frac{\text{Neg =}}{\text{and} =} \)
I deny that they tickled Ted [and] Bob

This is not, in the intended sense.

But this is just what we'd expect, because

\[
\neg p \lor \neg q = \neg (p \land q) \quad \text{There is no syntactic analog.}
\]

Rather, E DC, which says

\[
(\text{sR} / \text{and}, \text{com, Neg}) \land \\
(\text{SS} / \text{Neg, com and}) \rightarrow (\text{and} \rightarrow \text{or})
\]
Facts from OSV

I didn't know

that anybody had left or that anybody had remained

that anybody had left? or that Paul had remained

that Paul had been used or that anybody had

that I and that I

I knew that he was there and she (was) here

I didn't know that she was cooking any

*and she was eating any

that she had cooked steak or that beef

no * Bill was eating steak or Max fish
I didn't know that $S_1$ and that $S_2$

Here, any $S_1$ of across the board and (weekly), $y$ just in $S_1$, poorly if just in $S_2$. 

I didn't know that $S_1$ or that $S_2$
Hypothesis: only one of these types of coordination (and I'm betting on the one that allows or and any) will allow across-the-board checking.

Wrong, I mean.

Any house that you claim that you have found fleas in {or} that your kids are refused by will be paged.

The house which I didn't know that she had bought {or} that he had fixed up {and}

was spacious.

The man who I couldn't find any stories about or any pictures of seems to eat fish in gibs.
Possible argument source:

I don't want \[\text{any} \] $f$. 

If a $V$ can be found whose object can have $\exists m$ even when it is neglected, then we have two arguments.

10/25/71

No argument — apparently, $\exists \exists \exists \exists \text{uncommanded by Neg.}$
The fact that it is island-internality that is crucial here is shown by the following pair:

\[ I \text{ expected} \{ \begin{array}{l} \text{he going} \end{array} \} \text{ would be noticed} \]

* That I would go

The fact that these do not can't be explained on perceptual grounds (being led down the garden path) because this should then be just as bad.

Thus George must be right in his suggestion.

Can some minimal pair be found?

The facts of * Is to whom known? and that he is here is odder than that he is more do.
Fact pointed out by Greg:

They didn't realize that it had been easy for Mike/him to hire anyone.

These are equivocal, thus this falseness says nothing about whether SSC controls any.

NB: If it's not stepping interacts with whatever's going on here, part of some-any must be cyclic.
Non-semantic nature of constraints

4/6/71

Facts from O.S.U.

I verified (the fact) that he had shoes on

These are, I hope, semantically identical, yet only when the fact is present is an island formed.
A. Arnold’s suggestion: That in a design of John’s this is an island because it’s a reduced RC (fairly)

My argument for: in (1), that door is choppy:

(1) I have [a key to this door] of John’s

(2) No this door which I have a key to of John’s

Thus, Norns’s idea is wrong.

B. Another facet of the ‘For NPC’ which is wrong:

(3) It was Mary who I didn’t approve of Jack’s decision to hire

C. Another possibility: [NP → This is an island}
I let [the cats out + (she) the dogs in]

I will write you + (she) phone Tom

Oly the generalization is stable

in terms of left-branchingnes?
She has big wanted tits

* She is a big wanted titted girl

* big-titted

He goes out with bigger-titted girls than

I do

I guess Hub argues for
not being these underw...
Fred & Tom swim like \( \text{fishes} \)

\( \text{*a fish} \)

This seems to argue that

Fred & Tom are like \( \text{fishes} \)

\( \text{*a fish} \)
This kim chee is hot — *I heated the kim chee.

This coat is warm — *I warmed the coat.

* He flew out to center field.

* A pile of Lives was on the table.

Kyparmy — Paul's e.g.*The strength of this German verb is unknown.

Paul suggests:

No minor rule applies to a derived sense (How come I took advantage of her?)

This is why John read last night.

It's bad in the sense of poker.

ATA! This argues that verb is formed by a rule.
Suppose we say that a person is seen as having a shared sense of the "whole." Can the whole person make up a rule? Could it mean that people are aware of...
Paul points out: E * The warmth of the coat
   F * I warmed the coat

So there must be a hierarchy of majority.

Abc — it must be nonanalogy as a whole that is bad, because of

* the [strengths] of that verb is unknown
   weaknesses

The fact that F * I broke the vase

means that if * some process relating X broke and Y broke X

And come E we broke her spirit

Abc — F * his spirit broke

Don't we predict that they shouldn't happen?

Argument for derivation: If * it acquires new sense, * here may or may not be a new derivative.
Are there minor phonological rules? 
What's the difference between a minor rule + exceptions & a general rule?

Yes — \([\text{\textit{uu}}] \rightarrow [\text{\textit{u}}]\)

No — maybe this is major before \([\text{\textit{s}}]\)

* \(\text{pool}\) \(\text{fill}\)

Are there minor word-formation rules?

Yes — \(V \rightarrow [V + \text{al}]_N\)

Major — Lat. stem \(\rightarrow\) Lat. prefix + Latin stem
1. *Discuss the letter I sent you*

2. $a \rightarrow \text{CDA}$

3. $\text{will} \rightarrow \text{I demand that another author's book* should be read}^\dagger$

4. *Demand Proposal*
Because you really a handful person.

Aunt Jeezer that direction don't count.

It's important to be prepared. You have a hard fork for this beginning.
Tough Movement

3/29/71

...shaving herself under the knee so hard for me to imagine Mary being willing to try...

There really is a way...
3/29/71

The beans + Frank's Tour + Ed will eat *resp

The beans + corn I gave to Ed + them *resp

I talked to Joe + Bill about war + peace *resp

[about war + peace to Joe + Bill *resp]

I talked to Bill + Sue about each other

Why? I told Bill + Sue about e.o.

I talked to her about him + TV.
We've talked too long, haven't we?

Why? (The too long thing)

Because NB

? We have talked too long, haven't we?

Maybe still bad.
Visible

Nobody left. They didn't too.

* Few people left.

That's the same as

I guess not?

I don't think.
Nobody's here, so No
Few people are here, I guess not.

P.E.D.
He gave it to someone -

To whom known?
* It was made to rain
* It was prevented from raining
* Tabs were prevented from being kept on the transaction

* There was prevented from being a rest
Multiple Relatives + NP Shift

3/22/71

Prove that you do NP Shift, not their RELAL Formation.

It was Harry who I bought from. Fred said to a picture of Harry.

Thus, this is a contradiction.

But that could be because this is...
1. Where are these
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{everybody} & \text{ kissed each other} \\
\text{All the men} & \text{?}
\end{align*}
\]
supposed to come from?

2. What blocks
\[
\text{I argued with the men about each other} \\
\text{themselves} \\
\text{with each of the men about the other}
\]

3. Dwight's 5s: They realized that presents for each other
\[
\text{are a sticky basis for a friendship}
\]
While they can't be moved from clauses, they can be, in general, from NP's

[*(in general be from NP's)]

No also *(..they can in general, from NP's)

Thus **VP Del really makes the Aux

** into an island, or something

Hm

Hm

Hm

Hm

How can this fact be used?
Hey! Nothing comes out of though-chases, but though postposing works! Ditto wit as big as he is.

This suggests a structure like:

```
  5
   /\  \\
  5_1 5_2
```

though he is big    I'm tiny
George's fact:

[* Rufus left.]
[
I think that Rufus left.]
[
Rufus may have left.]
[
My wife thinks so too.
]
They said that it {sounded}, {tasted} good (to them), etc.
(also: was obvious)

They thought that it tasted good (to them)

NB: It tastes good (to me)

This argues: It tastes good (to me), doesn't it?

It's obvious (to me), isn't it?

Doesn't it taste good (to me)?

Isn't it obvious (to me)?
If specialization works from the top down, how do we stop?

Ramon, I said that teens I had bought from

Is there some truth about only one application per stretch? Or what?
JERRY'S S'S:

Put it over there, I guess.

My contention is that there is a reduced pseudo-shift
(i.e. where you should put it is over there)

Q. *go to sleep, I guess* (except as an answer to)
   what should I do?

NB also: *please leave, I guess

1. All answers as PC S's
2. Rule of Answer Shifting
3. It follows Shifting
Then we get these facts free,
Inclusion Constraint

3/9/71

This is a DC because if

We began to expect me to [be nominated]

* leap

So: If A and B aren't deep class mates, they can become class mates only if B isn't an agentive.
in *(the) bead next to hers

* If you're going to school, why don't you look at me?

blow freezing up.

Emma
3/7/21

This is weird w/ destruction/creation

* I [ate] each of the cookies

* Each problem arose / each vanished

(But NB: I ate each of the cookies separately)

Each problem

Can there be attempts to make Doug's analysis of each other?

Aha! Each of the men destroyed it

Each other: none of the countries destroyed the others

Maybe each always has 2 comments

This one is un hookup = each laughed at one line

This would explain their contract as well as reach of connection.
A picture of each man was stolen.

* Ann*

The men were willing to see each other.

? The men were surprised to see each other.

Each waited to come (for a different reason).
I demand that anything be touch be sterilized

I demand that anyone be photographed be dressed

what he eat be beans

where he sleep be on my bed

I request that how much be given be unreasonable

what

I demand that anyone be touch be washed

leave early

Seems to work best w/ inanimate

Great evidence for cop switch:

we demand that beans be what he eat
in the house be where he sleep

3/2/71
The SSC is wrong:

we would expect to get

*It was Max who I believe [trying all to be difficult for Belby]

We can't say that I can't get the effect that nothing comes out of a clause which was a SSC, because what about extrap?

[Bad news: This is explained by Noam]

[written idea that this is still a clause]
Subject Requirement

3/1/71

Which man did he demand leave early?

Of which car did he demand that the hood be fixed?
Pronom + CSC

* The story of an agreement between Mary, Sue, and Tony,
* of labi duplicity

* The story tells of the similarities between kissing Mike and fondling girls, and of the length of labi prickle

So: the CSC

But NB: it's OK w/ across the board

Pronom:

The story talks of similarities between Mike's dog & Mike's sister, and of his intercourse with both
Hey look — there must be the same fact:

On Tuesday start a seminar *(on racial equality)*

By Leibng was discovered the fact *(that S)*

I explained to Mort the fact *(that S)*

But how can there be, unless there is some general constraint on right moving NP's *(? ? ?)* that they be "heavy"?
"Do Support" is Analogue Destruction

All these potatoes contain at least 25% DDT, and I request that any you eat do also.

Where from, please?
Hypothetically, no semantic violations are imposed by

\[ \text{Equivalence} \]

*The quick brown fox jumps over the lazy dog.*

\[ \text{Equivalence} \]

It's a question of how distant (dissimilar)

\[ \text{Equivalence} \]

\[ \begin{array}{ccc}
\text{requests} & \text{validation} & \text{censoring} \\
\text{CNPC} & \text{CSC} & \text{crossover} \\
\text{vicious violation} & \text{censorship} & \text{passive constraint} (\text{previous}) \\
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{vicious constraint} \\
\text{get by a kite} \\
\end{array} \]

What about the converse: all synthetic ones are inspired?

Amnesties

If true, then should be a great leap forward. But what about crossover? How can it...
Command

2/24/71

dressing herself is hard for Jill

* herself is hard for Jill to do

↑

Should be out for the same reason

as any snacks are easy to avoid eating
The IC seems to prohibit even deeply different-clausal NPs from getting together if the second is an agent.

Thus

\[
\text{I want us to leave by noon} \quad \text{only OK if it means our train etc.}
\]

\[
\text{I want us to be nominated} \quad \text{not to hop up and down}
\]

Explain: I forced us to leave

But: I saw us shining the shoes

Ugh - They must be the same fact as

Hey! I want (*myself) to win.
It's

\[
\{ \begin{array}{c}
\text{that} \\
\text{the same} \\
\ast \text{a} \\
\ast \text{the} \\
\end{array} \}
\]

\[
\{ \begin{array}{c}
\text{color} \\
\text{size} \\
\text{caliber} \\
\text{etc} \\
\end{array} \}
\]
Greetings!

Hello, {every, body, some}

This is a performative
... aber ich habe wom Vergessen

Ich habe daβ er hier ist vergessen

ist of.

ich habe zu geben versucht
He is the one man whose opinion is more important to me than anyone else's. Of all...
I believe we can get the facts of

Max isn't here, (*they believe*) I don't think

by doing the ordering, with 2 split rules.

1. SD of Shifting
2. SD of Not Copying
3. Some \( \rightarrow \) any
4. SC of Shifting
5. Not Chopping (Not Cracking)
6. OC: on /n-1/ + semantics.

"face" They believe I think Neg Max is here \( \rightarrow \) NCoppying (cyclic)

1. They believe I don't think Max isn't here
2. Can't Shift

Which: If this is good down:

But I think ?? Max isn't here, I don't think that they believe
We only want to delete NEG which has copied so we can get

Uh oh—what about?

They don’t believe he left until Friday, I don’t think

This shows it can’t be a semantic DC.

What are the choices for stating this notion?

On Slipping

On Not Coping

On Neg

Copy a highest

(won’t work if)

negative with a

one—please parenthetical

whose verb is a

not happen.

5D Slipping: don’t do w/ Neg

Not Coping / Cyclic, probably

SC Slipping

Not Cracking
Note that if I rule of Not copying
we need T-rules, because merely inspecting
the trees won't tell you where I came from.

27/16/71
DC on Not Copying + Skitling

DC: If you are negative by virtue of not-cycling, your object can only shift if that effect was right below the performance, and if it shows up as /i/-/i/ in SS.

Said otherwise:

a. Meet SD before not-cycling

b. [handwritten symbols and notes]

ech

Blarg furrk

These blocks. We can't join. I believe they don't think...
From a conversation with George:

Root = object clause of V of saying
thinking
believing
promising

but no V outside their class works

But what about

He wanted to announce that the ground he had already covered = OK I think

What he wanted was to say that never had he been so drunk

OK

to say when

That never had he been so drunk was what he wanted to say

To say that never had he been so drunk was what he wanted

(OK in app. cls, not in REC's. Sigh)
E Quinn

* What I wanted is that we go.

Help help how thrown out?

Hah! Jorge points out

* for us to go
He has bigger claws than are usually found in Saskatchewan. 

NB—argues for deletion
He has *his* work cut out for *her*.

Here's an idiom which occurs (only?) in *than* clauses:

There's more going on than meets the eye

(*I suspect*)

NB

*Bill's swimming* meets the eye
Bill said (*to Mary) that Jack was tall, *vice versa

**what did who think was tall? **

?? what did who shoot
Fact from Avery:

This I can't come from NP Shifting

2. conjuncts:

- The boy who I said was sick
- Bill said was well
Maybe the reason that $\exists V \cdot V \cdot V$

\[ + \text{V-} \text{V-} \text{V} \]

constraints is that items can only [condition]

things in the next lower clause.

E.g.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{will} & \rightarrow \emptyset \\
\text{future} & \rightarrow \emptyset \\
\text{have} & \rightarrow \emptyset \\
\text{be} & \rightarrow \emptyset \\
\text{that} & \rightarrow \emptyset \\
\text{come} & \rightarrow \emptyset \\
\text{go} & \rightarrow \emptyset \\
\text{müssen} & \rightarrow \emptyset
\end{align*}
\]


2/9/71

NB

He doesn't have the lap he needs to be a great cat
striker

He doesn't have the lap I expected (him to have)

lap is a great N, for its only

inherent

NB *The lap that she has makes for great
cat sleeping
where did you get that and please tell me what it cost

It may be that Q's can only be conjoined with requests for speech.
The girls who John dates need people wiser than [myself + himself] to help them. Everybody likes John, but we need wiser people than himself to help solve this one. (So it really does require command.) Yawn — argument #47.
Q: How do you know X?

* real life
* remember
* find out

A: Because Y

Obviously, why do you say you know X?

How do you know X?

What can this be used to shed light on?
He took unfair advantage of me.
(underlined)

He took what appears to be [unfair advantage] *(unfriendly)*
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Another uncatchable generalization:

Only passivable guys work

* He let what seems to have been lost go off
And only modifiable passive.

He lost what seems to have been sight of it.
I don't know where he left it.

It's a mystery.

However, they're OK with them.

Now bent.

* They don't know whether or not he's sick.

Still out.
If way-Bombing not right,
agreement looks tough.

He kept what appear to have been careful notes on sal

This newly plural NP must be DC linked
To this NP, which must then pp/ plurality tree,
Help help — about a 4 level constraint
Adverb → Adj

The rule which makes civil decision
It pretty the same as the one which makes
Take unfair advantage.

PARADOX! If so, it must be cyclic for we have to get unfair advantage was taken.

A: The (unfair) taking advantage of juniors by seniors
Has to stop.

The keeping of careful tabs on his movement has to stop.

This keeping tabs on me by the FBI has to stop.

Suggests NP meaning? Theb would account also for the passive.
Sentence suggested by Minoro's paper

He kept what appeared to be
[quite careful] tabs on X

PM: Paul points out,

This parallels

He kept tabs on X in what
appeared to be a quite careful way.
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It seems that

What Max doesn't believe is that Sue kissed anyone.

* What Max doesn't believe seems to be that Sue kissed anyone.

Arguments for raising:

Tom knows what Max doesn't believe to be that Sue kissed anyone.
Hey— if I difference here between say a pup, maybe rootlessness has to do w/ islandity

John quipped that these deductions he had made up. [said] never would he trust in the bath that Bill had left he hadn't known.
Coy & Co. (7)
+ respectively

Which girls - Jan + Sue - were invited by which men - Ted + Tom (#)

* Which girls - Jan or Sue - were invited by which men -
Tom or Ed - a mystery

NB - As Toughly points out,
or would go with resp.

The men - Tom + Ed - kissed the girls - Jan + Sue, resp.

This suggests that apples are not the source (apples,
because respectively doesn't go across clauses.

* The men, whose names were Tom + Ed ate pepperoni, when the girls -
whose names were Jan + Sue, resp, had made

The men flew to resorts - Fred + Bob to Las Vegas + Bermuda, resp.
Object Incorporation

Arguments for kick ← foot strike

1. Semantically right

2. The process is needed anyway ← ax-murderer

3. kick with the *(left) foot ← 11o Mohawk fact

4. \( I \) ← headed/buttocks
   ← shouldered/kneed
   ← nudged
   ← fingered
   ← footed
   ← fisted

   But why $I$
   ← asess
   ← hipped
   ← ked
   ← ked
   ← fingered
   ← thumb

Stuffarm ✓
Firm ✓

1/6/71