Most give idioms occur only in the V N N P. firm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NP₂</th>
<th>NP₁</th>
<th>Only NP₂ NP₁</th>
<th>Better NP₂ NP₁ than NP₁ NP₂</th>
<th>Both equally</th>
<th>Better NP₁ NP₂ than NP₂ NP₁</th>
<th>Only NP₂ NP₁</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>give</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a whirl</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chance</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>free</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>love</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>way</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a time</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>courage</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rise</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chance</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: "gave to the way" and "order" are written in a different handwriting style.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Can front</th>
<th>Check portable</th>
<th>Right</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Check off</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go off (if alarms)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go up (if price)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go out (if light)</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break out (minutes)</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break out (rash)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calm down</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall in (4 formations)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed up</td>
<td>✗ ✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow up</td>
<td>✗ ✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sink out</td>
<td>✗ ✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suck up</td>
<td>✗ ✗ ✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
He kept chanting something—
I think (he kept chanting) that it would rain.

Good argument for suicide.

He ascended something else (then)—
I think (that) her shoes were snare.

This is bad because (ascension) or — (that) Delton.
I said by Bill Labor:

The Revolt was a closed and unfortunate book.
In fact, tone is almost predictable on the basis of N to V.

Since it's not entirely predictable, Harris & Weinsten made it phonemically, and would probably have a morphophonemic rule like this:

In general, N has initial high tone (or whatever)

V has initial low tone (or whatever)

There would be exceptions to this rule.

Thus the Yaronmonos paused exceptions aside, into an area where formal rigor — morphophonemic.

The parallel to syntax is stonky. Whatever is partially irregular, not productive, lexically marked is defined out of syntax, and pushed into an understanding area — the lexical rules of analogy, rules of semantic interpretation.

What I don't now say is this: what is the connection between this branching of irreducible, and the willingness to encode irregularities into no-man's land, as was done in stonks "prediction" in SPE? Both practices strike me as refusal to face reality as preconstructions.
If $\emptyset$

Even were he sick

Why?
S from Michael Chen's 23.751 final:

\[
\{ \text{It, Tom's book} \} \text{ I mean, is a huge sensation} \\
\text{NB also: I mean Tom's book}
\]

This obviously must come from

\[
\{ \text{It is a huge sensation} \text{ - I mean (that) Tom's book is a huge sensation} \} \\
\text{I mean Tom's book}
\]

So: this couldn't work if the alternative clause were inside an RS, so we have an argument for swooping. Also, we know that swooping makes stuff backwards.
Hey — MB

The new { working [7 seek] * fat }

When is Modifier Shift? OBL 7

12/20/72
S from Jim Sloan's 23.75. Page 2:

for him, it's not too bad
John ate rice and drank milk, 4 slices pizza
and drank water. (Jim points out that it only works well w/ eat-drink + closely related products)

For me, it's pretty bad, but how about w/ only one drink?

John ate rice and drank milk, 4 slices pizza and water (respectively)

Good god.
These are counterexamples, though.
If any are good, they argue strongly
for a transformational source, because otherwise
adjectives can't end in particle.
My old observation to the effect that

The body of \{ * \}

The \{ statue \} that I examined the body of

argues tellingly that RRCs are faced with embedded coreferential pronouns, not like Navajo may appear to be.
Dick (or maybe Ken?) pointed out that it can't be the I*SNPC, because the Ss are still rotten when the after- clause is final.

Jurgen Leroy has suggested (in quiz 2 of 23.75)

\[ \text{that the badness of the } \]

\[ \text{leg was } \textit{free}, \]

\[ \text{after} \{ ?? \text{leg being } \textit{free} \} \]

\[ \text{N3} \]

\[ \text{Jack mentioned} \]

\[ \text{that I read} \]

\[ \text{my being } \textit{free} \]

\[ \text{my identity} \]

as because \[ *[P \ S] \]

\[ \text{a rotten SS} \]

constituent. He pointed out that this would allow us to take the condition of \[ \text{of } \textit{religion} \]

\[ \text{of OBL before that and for} \]

I would have \( *[\text{to Rome with }) \)

\[ \text{of Casanova} \]

\[ \text{OK?} \]

So maybe a generalization, arguing prepositions and

complements.

This recalls Susan's hunch \( *[\text{with which to go}] \)

is bad because it's tightly introduced.
There's more here than meets the eye.

* A small amount of deception just met my eye.

12/30/72

x bit off more than (? I think (? that))

x could chew

* could

x will bite off more than x

{Can [with 16 teeth] chew}

x has bitten off more than x

{has been able to chew}

* was able to
This made \( \{ \text{Manny weep} \) likely that we'd lose.\)

So apparently we can't survive after so gone.

Is this how I found him (to be) fathoms?

I found him to be fathoms:

\[ \text{OPT} \]

\[ \emptyset \]

\[ \text{OBL} \]

I found him --- fathoms.

But if so, we have to stop \( I \to \emptyset \) from applying.
category square

syncpe >> synapsed > to syncpe

So when a denominal V enters
the L, it is first adjectival, then

Iny verbal
Margot Pelkey's judgement:

ein von vielen {gelobter} Mann

? {geschmeichelt}

Now: constant.

Er kam an, wurde von vielen {gelobt}

{geschmeichelt}

und verschwand.
One → ∅ + Flip
+ downgrading

The only place where deleted NPs have
the interpretation of one is in things that
are or were subject.

Tests are in
Bill so admired

It is obvious

Betsy is famous

He is ready to shut on

To leave would be to admit defeat

So this provides a great argument

Alan Prince's fact: The chicken is ready to go to market.

It only seems possible to delete one of E same kind of downgrading.
The more RS as compressed, the easier

d) derived forces are produced

\{
\text{Can you}\n\text{please stop?}
\}

\text{Are you able}\text{?}

b) something can serve as a leader

\{
\text{I can}
\text{promise you that I}
\text{am able to inform you that I}
\text{have to}
\}

I'm sorry

\text{to}

\text{that I have to inform you that I}

\text{am able to offer you a raise}

\text{Why OK?}
N- Incorporation

12/9/72

to fart-light = to light a fart

Obviously productive
These things can incorporate:

DO
Inst: ex-murderer
Loc: city-dweller, street-walker

Dir: party-goer, church-goer, 

Man: car-burglar

What is switch-killer from?

And name-caller?
Thoughts while waiting for Apollo 17 to take off:

- We are go.
- We have a go.
- We have a go system.

Is this the source of the go-go go-go?

\{ ingress \}, the spacecraft

a workaround - another way of doing something

Space talk is a perfect illustration of John Brunvand’s point about the absence of context.
it can’t be because English is
subject agreeing that subjects don’t delete,
because even Spanish etc. don’t have

habla Español

meaning, someone speaks.
Sometimes it's OK to use the same word again, other times we search for a reformulation. What decide.

And when can we not use a phrase (or a line)? When must the full NP be repeated?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equi</th>
<th>ev</th>
<th>iam</th>
<th>senor</th>
<th>PP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other rules which need subject (or maybe only unmarked NP?)

Agreement

Tag Formation (?)

C. 12/14/72
As to {Max going there tonight}

I don't like {her impatience}

As to the answer to the question {whether to go there tonight} or whether she's important.
Maybe the fact that it's the past participle that agrees with a preceding (why D for DO to precede?) Obj in French is related to the fact that in Pashto (facts from Mary Lou Wallch's syntax general paper), the perfect stem tenses use an active case system, while the present and past participle tenses are non-acc.

It's common for LS to agree the PP but not the present participle. Why?
Fact provided by Bruce:

(about don't inform you?)

ask him.
PP = NP and fake passives

in German

Auf seinem Bett scheint sich gut schafen zu lassen

Passives are, for some reason,
systematically worse

* Auf solchen Betten scheint wenig geschlafen zu werden

But this is far better:

? Ihn scheint wenig geholfen worden zu sein

So Passive in German does affect

non-accusative NPs
hope = wish

I wish that he had won.

I had hoped that he would win.

12/4/72

Not quite synonymous: George points out that had hoped sort of presumes earlier wanting, while wish is neutral on this point.

Bob Frey points out that this counterfactual had occurs elsewhere; I had thought that he was sick.

1/3/73 Humm — No, I had realized that you were here — maybe V had info.
I realize I am surprised

that there are no fucking books in the library
Japanese and English agree in placing the raised predicate to the left of the matrix predicate.

take-begwood and sweet-en

Is there any L which is so VO as to keep the upper predicate to the left? There may not be, which would indicate that verb-freecing never gets strong enough to invade anaphoric islands.
Thank for

We thanked him for her generosity, patience, kindness, obesity, knowledge, and worthiness.

* The way he stayed late

So here, we can have any derived nominal whose predicate is controllable.

Note the contrast with begin, etc:

He began his [kindness, patience]
If Jack \{ \underline{knew} \underline{realised} \underline{*were surprised} \} that he were fat, he'd undertake

So subroutines also won't go downstairs through strong facts.
How interesting that he left!

But

** How dry (that) the dog!

How interesting:
- *(that) he left*
- ?? for him to leave
- ** his leaving
- * his leaving
The only adverbs I know that have $R_D$ are

- independently
- unfortunately
- happily

and so

* unaccountably for

But then the adverbial rule has to wipe out for, unless this is good, i.e., this release is unaccountable.
11/27/72 NB: *I would be surprised if which I don't know

If which is unlikely, you win. I'll quit.

Unless
In case
In the event

*After, which was surprising, he won, I quit.

So which-clause can only post to the front if which-clause or anything semantically synonymous.

?? Anyone who cares who understands great will help is without
II

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{Not any } \Rightarrow \text{ no} \\
&\text{S Neg}
\end{align*}
\]

He \{ never, seldom \} surrey = not \{ upstairs with me on Tuesdays anymore \} \\
*always\ (anyway)\)

He didn't eat many beans - \{ not any \} while one \( \text{(anyway)} \)

\( \text{The 6 is another test frame for} \) \\
\( \text{S Negation} \)
Selma Terry Langendoen,

syntomes = classes.

So: rules which only skip syllables should be rare — in general, there must be a principle.

\[
x \to y / \frac{\forall \alpha}{\forall \alpha \left[ V \right]} \\
x \to y / \frac{\forall \alpha}{\exists \alpha \left[ V \right]}
\]
1

\( \text{say - want} \Rightarrow \text{ask} \)
\( + \text{were} \)

\( \text{asked} > \)
\( \text{wondered} > \)
\( \text{wanted (*Ann) to know} > \)
\( \text{told them she wanted to know} \)

\( \wedge \)

\( \text{I asked} \)
\( \text{wondered} \)
\( \text{wanted to know} \)
\( \text{told them I wanted to know} \)

\( \text{I asked Sally} \)
\( \text{could} \)
\( \text{was able to} \)

\( \text{whether he were willing to go} \)

\( \text{if he were available} \)
Conj Qo > Neg Qb

Dick's *

*I don't know who he up and hit*

But NB

It's surprising who he up and hit
1. Fact unearthed with John Goldsmith:

who P was [was Peter]

*limped

//S

I don't know who it was

2. Facts from me:

what he has} 2 brothers + 4 sisters.

the ones who he has

So this [alienable] reading

is only in P0,
I doubt that he knows whether S

But

That he knows whether S I doubt
### Better Triggers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>anyone 5 would you wish - if you 5</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>left</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔ (X) □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knew</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>were sick</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>left tomorrow</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knew tomorrow</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>were sick tomorrow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>played tomorrow</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>won tomorrow</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Bruce: I (failed) wanted (to pass) to know 3 if he were a spy
I hope/wish

{ he is sick
  he will come
  he was OK
  he has been it

I wish/hope he were sick

11/16/72
Conjunctive and disjunctive
Q's and that-clauses.

There is no question? (but) [that]

Whether

There is a question? (as to) [whether]

[that]
The complementizer condition

IM scorches weakly, a fact which Noam can't account for by saying that there's no comp available, because what's IM ed doesn't end up in a complementizer.

So it's another rule that is not bounded, but which doesn't move the ripper to 5-initial position.

Others are: {I have} some tests to try to get them to decide whether to grade
This is 3 feet long

but

A 3-foot-long beach

? A 72-people-wide couch

9 4/10/72

a close\(^{(ed)}\)-minded man

11/16/72

A 3-way\(^{(s)}\) ambiguous sentence

4/16/74 From Dave Perry: a 3-way\(^{(s)}\) ambiguous
In we peaked it up.

Particle Movement must apply.

I don't like * you up.

So a wild fact: Particle Movement seems to have to apply where we would expect foreignness, otherwise.
TM and come by

Marga Reis: astounding fact: come by it only below tough, easy

etc:

Impossible generalization of the week
come by only will occur in clauses from which some constituent could be

Med

Great Zed!

*(The solution was so strange that I would not have been able to come by it myself)
This problem is more complex than you would be likely to come by in a month of Sundays

help help
Existential 5's

11/12/22

The school has girls in 7th period, which I didn't use to have.

Which there didn't use to be.

*(in 4th)*

There are boys in the school, which there didn't use to be.* *(in 4th)*

It didn't use to have 7th period.

Contract this with:

*I* examined a lot of boys in the school, which there didn't use to be.* *(there)*

and

*There* are a lot of *boys* there, which I tickled.
He slept deeply. The sleep of the just.

He went to sleep deeply. The sleep of the just.

The V. sleep is even less there in sleep.
Category against

He has a closed mind

He is a closed (adult) minded man

c. 11/16/72

* a 3-feet by 4-cush

Cat a bird is hearted man

4/16/74
Where the hell does moshapen come from?
1. This provides a cool test: *miscarry
   Exception: The plan miscarried
   I fired the gun
   Are there others like this?

2. It only goes with V that take NP objects
   * mislook at, mishear
   * mishear V
   Maybe this is not merely superficial - of *miscalculation
   * miscalculation

3. V-Pt combinations are generally weak at best:
   * mislook up
   * mislay down
   (miss print out)
   It was meant to be gotten?

4. Double-object V vary mysteriously
   * misgive a book to him
   * misattribute it to Picasso
5. It usually means "wrongly", or in the wrong manner.
   So Ε * misrepense, * miscon

Problem: Why Ε misunderstand, mishear * miss?

6. V creation: ? medly, misform, misshape, misfind
   V uncreation: * material, * misdrunk

7. "Empty" V are poor: * miskill < ?? massacre

   ? mistriangle

8. Sentential objects are out, maybe spurious except for
   that I was here, which?
   misreport { how long I stayed } ? her being willing
   underestimate { 3 that } ? her willingness
   ? him to like speech

9. V which have undergone incorporation are weak:
   ?? misprint, * mishap, * mistake
10. ḳ some weird kind of combinatorial algebra w/ other prefixes:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{mis-} & \quad \text{crossclassify} \\
\text{misde} & \quad \{\text{classify}\} \\
\text{misdo} & \quad \{\text{frost}\}
\end{align*}
\]

remisfile \(\gg\) \(\ast\) misrefile

11. Won't work with negatives: \(\ast\) misforget \(\ast\) modern

\(\ast\) misrefine \(\ast\) merun
Fake NP question

11/9/26
Max doing okay?  
*Nobody doing coming?

What's this Jack doing being taken on amnesty?

*Headway doing being made on decision?
*These doing being a bat in my ear
That [Ann: held] [their] play everybody knew at once.

*That he was doomed nobody knew
Hey — so there ever any NP whose lead or way, extent etc which occurs where a Q couldn't?

Yes — exceed

\[ \Rightarrow \begin{cases} \text{The act of farting} & \text{was efficient} \\ \text{How he farted} \\ \text{When he farted} \end{cases} \]

Hum — This might suggest that some relative clauses can turn into Q's.

Hum²
The extreme difficulty of (vital) this task on anxiety in stress.
How the hell, by the way, do I and out get incorporated into side? 

Max dashed to the inside of P 

Hum — maybe there are really two rules.

The beam was one but the inside of P needed work.

Maybe would happen as like this:

I let them 

Holy shit! Maybe to the in of P becomes in to P in PR!
Nobody... he

??What nobody thought was that he was unpopular.
Phrasal and summing up

It's 3 feet long

A 3 - \{ feet \} long snake

It's 3 \{ way \} ambiguous

A 3 - \{ way \} ambiguous sentence

4/6/74 A 3-way (sic) ambiguously

From Dave Henry:
It is only if, in

\[ NP_1 \times NP_2 \uplus NP_3 \times 2 \]

\[ NP_2 \text{ and } NP_3 \text{ are separated by a fairly } \]

\[ \text{strong clause boundary that } NP_2 \text{ is } \]

\[ \text{a monkey-wrench.} \]
I remember that he will be working
I²-SNPC

From student

Cathy Stone's proof:

It is clear that the fact? Inference by
make ourselves on
From John Bransford, Nancy McCanell

Page 19

Walk on able ( = behable )
There being $\rightarrow \emptyset$

\[
\begin{cases}
\text{No milk?!?} \\
\text{Too many cooks would be a catastrophe.}
\end{cases}
\]

So maybe it's not that 280 and

Being $\rightarrow \emptyset$ aren't blocked after fakes

maybe it's an OC.
Are there any clause which have cliches but which don't either criticize or delete subject pronouns?

If there are some, I guess they're exceptions to privacy.

But why should deleting the subject of a clause be connected to whether it's possible to criticize the object?
Maybe all flip V are asymmetric NP*

predicates

[ from your advice to me ] benefit

[ from your hostility to me ] anger
This one won't embed.

* Dan {said} to search him.
I don't think

Michael Turvey's S:

Some of my most knowledgeable colleagues will not argue this, I doubt.

10/22/72
Who (*else*) do what?
Barbara's suggestion:

Some rules can require clause-nature,
but no rule can refer non-clause-nature.

She also suggested something like this:

Rules can specify that some term be kept un-
but no rule can specify that a term be rightmost.

Better: This is a possible condition, but not this:

\[
\begin{align*}
Q & \text{Postponing} \\
X & \{ \text{both} \} \ NP \ Y \\
\{ \text{each} \} & \{ 2 \ 5 \ 4 \} \\
1 & \{ 0 \ 3 + 2 \ 4 \}
\end{align*}
\]

Condition: \( X \) contains no NP.
Are there any L's w/cliics for which pron. subjects are neither deleted nor criticized?
Fake NPs and Conjunction Reduction

* It was warm and maybe foggy >
* It was rain and well now >

* There was a fight last night and will be another tomorrow

?? Taba were kept on her and will be kept on him

? Considerable leading on this problem are made by our team, and will be made by yours.

So glad doesn't like to.
Wordizing and rule weakening

10/19/72

Probably this

Jack Resang

is due to the fact that re- has worked onto

any, thus wiping out the potentiality for

the weak rule of Unmarked NP Deletion to apply.
-en pp never follows C₂.

But: 

sunken ships (≠ sunk ships)  
drunken sailors (≠ drunk students)

The only words which show this alternation end in -nk.

so en → Ø /nk/ in order to preserve the constraint (?)

But that rule is too weak to work presominantly.
Jack (re) entered

\{ walked off
  went in
  climbed on \}

etc.

Hum. Maybe any directional can go?

No:

Jack \{ darted
  ran (wrong sense)
  dashed
  cluttered \}

Hot stuff! I think this is only possible after a directional particle (is it always possible?)

This suggests strongly that enter \(\leq\) go in.
Next Q: To ADD the same rule as

ACD?

Cf. I continued (= went on)

I began (= went at it)

I stopped (= ?)

I knew (= ??)

Problems:

He agreed (to it)

He refused (??)
Bill Cooper's point: He ended that drive (461)<ref>

He gave a heavy talk - The lessons of history - Use of

90/31/12

Draft, revision and freezing up
Paul Postal pointed out yesterday that E rules whose SD requires them only to work embeddedly, e.g.,

Subjunctivization

SOT

Raising

So my question is this:

What stops one from formulating a rule like so:

\[ X \left[ \left[ \begin{array}{c} Y \ni V \n \end{array} \right] V \right] \]

This will produce Anti-German help help
Monosyllabicity

(cf. also 9/16/72) 10/19/72

-en pp < -en caus/inst

Very restricted:

only in

CV C'en
no has

sunken ship

drunken sailor

On the level

woman

heavy


28O won't work after fakes.

I consider:
- Headway likely to be made
- tabs likely to be kept
- Menu likely to be a hit
I was just going to address the question of how we.

On a summer night, nothing to remember.

So she left with nothing to remember.

I'm glad that he gave me peace and the last thing.

I'm proud of my parents.

It's hard when I consider.

That a piece of wood can be so extraordinary.

12/17/12
Central and peripheral tags

Pos - Neg
Neg - Pos
Pos - Pos
Neg - Neg

改革
表达

He must not have been there. Must he?
He must have been there. Mustn't he?

Neither Tom nor Bill left, did he?
I'll thank you to vote.

* He thanked us to stay home.

* He told us that he would thank us to vote.

I'll thank you not to vote. (Scott-Thank)
There may be some speakers who don't extend \( \text{Will} \rightarrow \emptyset \) into relative clauses.

I insist that anyone he kiss be washed.

But noone will do this w/o doing this.

Pitts wlt here and here

I wish that anyone he were dating were clean.

Hey! Flash! 10:30 PM

This crazy parallels this one:

I wish that anyone he were dating \\
\((\text{that}) \) were dating him \\
\((\text{that}) \) were dating him
Fact from Jay

angry old man >> half angry man

but

angry old administration > old angry administration

So old women are more than angry

My idea:

\[
\begin{align*}
\{ \text{angry} \} & \quad \{ \text{disappointed} \} \\
\{ \text{risky} \} & \quad \{ \text{merely hurt} \}
\end{align*}
\]
Who else remembers where John bought which books?

This makes the long bond impossible.