Bill, who therefore didn't know, hadn't read the paper.

Bill, who doesn't, however, like Greeks, like Turks.

So these guys also obey pronoun-inflation constraints.
Yarın oraya gidecek misin?
Tomorrow you'll go there tomorrow?
W'll you go there tomorrow?
Yarın oraya gideceğin biliyor musun?
Tomorrow, you'll go there, future tense, know, prep. I
* oraya gideceğin yarın biliyorum.
The most complex and sophisticated / the narrowest
Where do we find old V2?

1. In many environments:
   a. \([V]_N\) — martial, aggression
   b. \([V]_N\) — martial, aggressive
   c. \([V + \text{er}]_N\) — martial, aggressive

2. In passive participles:
   - claven hooves, sudden fields

3. With particles: eke out, bandy about

4. With negative: budge
A good sharp * can be assured by putting a nobody... he took into a because.

* Nobody did so because her brother had gone home.
Pop with Nancy Stenson.

Maybe all these *P*'s are arising from a rule of \( \text{Case} \rightarrow \emptyset \) which "OBL" in some places.

\[
\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\text{ought to} \\
\text{way could} \\
\text{can't have to} \\
\text{must} \\
? \text{should} \\
? \text{ought to}
\end{array} \right. \]

be (the case) that \( \emptyset \)"

"Is \( P \) (the case) that \( \emptyset \)?

Who is \( P \) (the case)?

\[
\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
(\ast \ast) \text{ saw you} \\
\text{that you saw}
\end{array} \right. \]
Bill was written by Florence.

* Florence wrote Bill.
I doubt [that S (\text{**ast**}) whether S (\text{**or**})]

They doubt S — [that S (\text{**or**}) whether S (\text{**or**})]

I'm doubtful — [that he'll win (\text{**or**}) whether he'll win (\text{**or**})]

as to whether he'll win (\text{**or**})

about [that (\text{**or**}) as to whether]

* I'm not doubtful S

NB - Can there ever be P as to S? I don't think so. So does that mean that as to S

so more sentential than S? Or what...
doubt (ful) + as to

That he'll win.

? Whether he'll win. I doubt/ful to me.

It is doubtful to me. (? as to) whether he'll win/ not.

* about 5

Why is this so rotten?

NB

I have my doubts

* about his

? (as to) whether (?) or not he'll win.

* what he'll win.

I don't have any doubt. (as to) about him.

* about his sincerity.

[Read to about whether he'll win or not. NB]
John was uneasy.

* 8

Of course, uneasy ≠ easy, but in general, I believe it to be true that


This is false for impossible and TMs.

Of course.

But could that be typical? Or something?
Backwards squash

Can P be shown that there is a squash-like that?

Complements
easier to pronounalize backwards (there I'm very doubtful about)

Adverbal clauses (there are probably many kinds of these facts are taken from that)

Restrictive relatives in "shifting"

Appositive

\[
S \xrightarrow{NP \, NP}
\]

\[
S \downarrow S_1 \ \ \ \ \ \ \ S_2
\]
This contract suggests that $s_0$ has different pronominal relations than $s_1, s_2$.

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c}
I'll & go & \{ & ? & \} & , \\
\text{if you go} & \{ & \text{too} & \} & \} & 1 \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c}
\text{If you go} & \{ & \text{too} & \} & , \\
I'll & go & \{ & ? & \} & 1 \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c}
\text{WHY?} & \text{A little weaker than the others} & \text{so also behaves like a pro-form.} & \text{WHY?} & \text{But: that Jim entangled } & \text{suggests that Mike may have } \\
\end{array}
\]

So it's more stringently restricted than pronouns.

?? That the bastard got reelected means that Nixon will have no fears about escalating.
Two is "transformationally constrained" (like even; there's only one per S) (but cf. p. 4)

Bill left and Jane left (*to) and Sandy left (*to)

If you go \{too\}, I'll go \{too\}
\[
\begin{array}{cc}
1 & 1 \\
\times_{100} & 100 \\
\end{array}
\]

This suggests a transformational source

There's nothing corresponding directly to too in derived nominals:

Bill's death, and Harris's death (in addition)

Bill is unlucky and he's unhappy too

Here, too does not refer to Bill is an X but rather to Bill is X
They [think, don't think, realized, were surprised] that Marge left, and they [think, don't think, realize, were surprised] that Fritz did too.

That Marge left surprised them, and that Fritz left too, surprised them too.

Hey! NB

That Fritz will win is likely, and that Ted will too is likely.
It seems harder to get stuff out if prepared
adverbs the more sentential they are.

It was this symphony that [at the end of > ]
I wept. Not after I heard the end of it,
I forgot that Sam had composed the end
Better end of

This is reminiscent of the facts with
typicalization and awareness: the more sentential
an antecedent is, the easier it is to stick an
There are a number of rules that refer to delete under the control of the subject in the next highest clause, but will stretch a point of D.

Super Eque

After Ving X, 5

Ving X, 5

Adj P, 5 (cf. 10/17/72)
This seems to be one of those rare times that
refers to delete against outlets, but will stretch

in Texas for the pitching.

Thinking on a problem of great delicacy

Truly and sincerely, they have found themselves so thoroughly

?? Don was heard by the

?? We were kind by the

She was heard by Sally

?? Don was heard by the

Thought to him the

10/17/22
Nounness = syntactic death = isolationism

Thus

a very (much) aware man

\[\text{Ein auf alle Stimmen (f) Mann}\]

Preposing leads to

nouns

strictest OV environment
Where OV order is preserved, there we find some stranded V:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a sherry-drinking man} \quad & \text{aggressive}\text{\, male}\text{\, sherry}\text{-drinking}\text{\, man}\text{\,}\text{man} \\
\text{a sherry-drinker} \quad & \text{aggressor}\text{\, man-drinker}\text{\,}\text{man} \\
\text{sherry-drinking is fun} \quad & \text{aggression}\text{\,}\text{man}\text{-drinking}\text{\, man} \\
\end{align*}
\]

This suggests that when a new verb enters the lexicon, it spends last to the "inaccessible" OV contexts, and is then relicked there when the word dies out.

This seems true of the new verb gr0k:

? a people-gr0king policeman
?? a real underwear-gr0ker
* a mass bra-gr0k
Bill Cooper's squad:

1. \{ See \} to it that J
   \{ *Hear \}
   \{ *Saw hitler invade greece \}
   \{ *heard hitler claim that J \}
   \{ *smelt hitler take a bath \}

2. 1943
   \{ See, look \}

3. \{ See, look \}
   \{ *Hear, sound \}
   \{ here! \}

4. I \{ See \}
   \{ *Hear \}
   \{ *feel (as to) how J \}

5. He \{ \}
   \{ looks to be sick \}
   \{ ?sound to be to-order \}
   \{ *Feels to be muscular \}
   \{ tastes to be a soap-halter \}
Fact from Richie Kaye:

I am fond of her, and

She (? fond) of me

So the clause boundary between be and Adj is pretty well wiped out.
You can think of her if you want

* I think of Harry

10/5/72

Pointed out by Karen McAmnach (of Brown—an undergrad) Who would have thought it?

(only OK as a rhetorical Q)

10/6/72

* Who thought it?

This idea (?) seems to be something like a cant-polarity item

I never [* would have ? want ? could] could think it
Ken Coleman:

"Audubon Rodriguez [patient] was the only person
in The major whose name contains each vowel"

Woody?

Why?

* Each of Miller's pets swallows mustard
Q: Is the snake in his box?

A: No, but I'll do it (put him in his box)

How do we get there = ?
They believed themselves to hate {themselves}

They believed each other to hate {* themselves

They talked to themselves about {themselves

But:

They talked to each other about {each other

This shows clearly that here, these pro-forms refer only to the
1. *There (*s) appearance of a vehicle
   *The appearance of there of a vehicle
   Why not? There seems to be a general idea:
   "Fake NPs don't show up in wrong places."

2. My surprise (*at it) why I
   Our pairing of *(the) ways
   "P.S. Don't apply this rule under conditions Z in rows."

Other things being equal, such P.S.'s are impossible, if in verbs implies in rows. How does lexicalism automatically preclude such P.S.'s?
If X were Y, Z \{ \text{could not} \} \text{ be } W

If X is Y, Z \{ \text{could not} \} \text{ be } W

Same facts reversed.

Hum
9/28/22

Why do all objects
like but-clauses precede
V in Japanese?
What is the relationship between

John helped me and [? helped me]

Is far from what John did?

Help us pretty a step anyway
The stability squish

Facts from phone call with Ivan Jag: 9/27/72

Know that (proportion w/time variable filled) <

Know that (proportion w/free time variable) <

Resemble Bill <

Controllably resemble whoever you’re dancing with <
The less someone is typified, the more private forward planning and the more CBD will be.

* * John, he didn't say they will invite <
Out: John 10 he;

* John, whether he didn't invite <
Out:

In: he 10 John

Are so John, he didn't receive < out.
Out:

Our nagging: John, he didn't respond.

Read:
Com: he 25 That we nagged when he didn't respond.

George's beautiful insight.

As we go down the list, the primary relationships change less and less. So these facts are explained by binding and squishy primary.
a (*no) pipe carrying rain...

on the back fence, Mann...

I think the reason is that

in German generally there is much lower bound between phrases (no separated whole words) and some.

The light past is the part of English / still existing / among others, but not in itself.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>xelp</th>
<th>self</th>
<th>sel'</th>
<th>sel'</th>
<th>sel'</th>
<th>sel'</th>
<th>sel'</th>
<th>sel'</th>
<th>sel'</th>
<th>sel'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>scalp</td>
<td>elf</td>
<td>altu'm</td>
<td>alto, etc</td>
<td>sel'</td>
<td>alcohol</td>
<td>alcohol</td>
<td>defalcate (?)</td>
<td>sel'</td>
<td>Althen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sympol</td>
<td>elf</td>
<td>Alvan</td>
<td>alvarez</td>
<td>sel'</td>
<td>Algernon</td>
<td>Algernon</td>
<td>Algernon</td>
<td>Algernon</td>
<td>Algernon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sel'</td>
<td>sel'</td>
<td>sel'</td>
<td>sel'</td>
<td>sel'</td>
<td>sel'</td>
<td>sel'</td>
<td>sel'</td>
<td>sel'</td>
<td>sel'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>xelm</th>
<th>xelm</th>
<th>xelm</th>
<th>xelm</th>
<th>xelm</th>
<th>xelm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lam</td>
<td>Lam</td>
<td>Lam</td>
<td>Lam</td>
<td>Lam</td>
<td>Lam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alvin</td>
<td>alvin</td>
<td>alvin</td>
<td>alvin</td>
<td>alvin</td>
<td>alvin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Primacy and non-subject reflexive

Sami told me that there was a picture of himself on the desk.
There are islands

Q: What did Mary help John to do

A: *To advance herself

*Beans I helped him to buy for myself

Thus it's me help for me to say that in

I left and got the house. I don't really
on IOT phase 15735. They're ambidex anyway.

So what the fuck is it?
This seems to eat the people: me praying

Who's who?
Between any two linguistic facts, there's another, grub gesagt.
9/20/72

Word-order Case Marking

Strong SDV

Japanese Turkish Navaho
+CM +CM -CM

But, as Ken points out, Navaho has the animacy hierarchy. So it avoids pernicious ambiguity by its own tricky means.

This means that the animacy hierarchy (or conspiracy) is really functionally identical to Case Marking.
There are more men here than there are women (here).

I saw women.

I saw more heads than there are members.

So it would seem that some // construction etc.

NB: # ... than the women [That] there are more

So this can't come from this by today
There are more men in China who do wear rings than there are \{ men } in Thailand who don't.

NB: here's a \( \emptyset \) antecedent for a following relative clause.
Observations from Furnos paper:

* They prefer not to go, and neither do we. <

?? They must not go, and neither must he.

They prefer not to go, don't they? >

* They must not go, must they?

So here, even though the negative cl ush the

'canr sentence, it looks O. Because the

change from say between went and go has grown

so faint...
I was reading part I of the New Yorker article on Neal Miller and visceral learning. That article had explained how a colleague, Barry Schwartz, had taught Lyndel Belafonte to love her blood pressure.

The second part didn't mention DuBois at all. I'd "Miller and DuBois refer to my attempt to attack a lesion in non-verbal terms as an "Thorpe."" (p. 52)

Then, p. 53:

"For example, Barry DuBois, a surgeon in human babies,"

Obviously sad.

So apparently, we forgot to drop off flame on occurrence of male chivalry.
Thoughts arrived at with Tony Langendoen:

1. - en
   do away with
   let go of
   get wind of
   make sure of

2. - A + P + NP
   - A + P + NP
   - P + NP
   - P + NP

3. - A + P + NP
   - A + P + NP
   - P + NP
   - P + NP

4. Dative V
   de-V
   out-V
   over-V
   over
   pre-V

5. re-V and over-V
   a. *re-looked at it

6. ? re-ran over the snake

7. ? re-cross-hatched

8. ? re-air-conditioned

9. ? re-unbuttoned
Rewrite the letter.

Write a different version of the letter.

Recover the couch.

Make a different cover for the couch.
1. \( V \rightarrow \text{be Adj} \)

2. ? That it is possible he'll come back is true
   \(< \text{ It is true it is possible he'll come back }\)

3. Better after tensed V than after
tensers V
\[ \text{re-V} \{ \frac{P}{P_{rt}} \} NP \]
A down-gliding plane

The input

upset

MB that

this is an idiom

but what about putdown, sendoff, etc.?
Cantor's Double-Cardinality
and Correspondence

Who: 
[AM 36] 

where

wonders [MONOO]

John bought which book?

So the term 'measuring' ambiguity
is used by an arbitrary
conj D. Humb.
Thoughts with Ken:

Why is it that treetopper elements get grammaticalized quicker?

Examples:

Tense
Not
Models
Performatives (is this the same thing?)
One more story about himself, and I'm going to call her.
2:30 PM  FLASH!
But soft! I think regret to

does not take performances, but rather

progressive - if

I regret to have to live near gang

? be able to predict that

? be traveling to Topeka

Uh oh - why
is this good?
9/11/72

Since regret to (and happy to?)

No I am happy to read this

[see you]

Is [say]

It can be used as a test

I regret to [tell you, adapt, disagree, agree]
I can assure you.

I am happy to assure you.

I can warn you.

I regret to have to warn you.

If I can predict, I regret to be able to predict.
Outside leaders

9/11/72

* I will regret to have to warn you

I be happy to promise you

* be able to promise you

So effectively these guys can't

have leaders themselves

I will have to warn you

* be able to promise you


1. There are more infinitival clauses than ones with that-clause complements.

2. I'm sorry [that I have to begin by saying] [That I]

* I begin by saying that's

So begin to like mention
9/11/72

I don't think that he'll come, { which would be nice [ which = he came ]

which is too bad [ which = that he'd]

in parallel sense:

I think that he won't come, { which would be nice

which is too bad

I think that he's not coming, { which would be nice

which is too bad

[ I don't think that he'll come, { which would be nice

which is too bad

Hey! Wild - note that the which refers to

that he won't come, which is impossible in

I don't claim that he'll come, which is too bad

Argument for Not Hitting ]
Thoughts with Bruce:

- Can I be allowed to have to warn more or request more warn assure promise stress
- Concede confess
- Suppose assume guess

I am forced to conclude

1. Ceremonials
   Exc. more
2. Suppositories

I have to begin by saying I am sorry to request sorry to

Reveal. Will be group. I mention add reveal

* periphery would (d)

* to try to
* interested
* hope to
Available off

Adjectives cannot be followed by particle.
Imperative

9/10/22

Stick 'em up

/ / %

I \{ \\
\text{told} \\
\text{ordered} \\
\text{made} \\
\text{left} \}

him stick 'em up
There is probably a graph here like this:

\[
\text{since } S > \\
\text{I}_W, C > \\
\text{NP, V, X >} \\
\text{NP, Adj, X >} \\
\text{NP as X >} \\
\text{NP NP}.
\]
We won't pay for Rembrandt's portraits of ourselves.

They tell the stories about themselves to each other.
If this analysis is kept, having Podolsky's generalization (MS p. 163) that only be-complements source as can be kept.

Melvin Strikeman: \{ as (being) smart as having no bells as knowing too much\}
1. Kissing gorilla just went home by Ted.

2. That was wanted by Ted.

   worked for everyone.

5/30/73

From some earlier quit I passed today:

Not a thing was eaten by anyone.

?? Fritz
The answer to the question as to what he ate:

- That he ate
  - bread too
  - even bread

Not bad enough, but an encouraging parallel.
Jack is presentable. (except to a debonair)

This work has signed us the associated proportion on workable (in) disposable available accountable for.

The only word I know of that dangles a proposition

This house is livable. (? in)

NB

Ma! I standing is a very trait

The facts are accountable for to a larger degree than I had expected.

* These facts are quite accountable for this house is livable in to a large extent

The

?? The table was almost eatable. Off if
1. No L can have words like dependable without being words like cockable

2. No L can have dependable W/O being able to stand P in passives

(Check this)

3. No L can stand P in passives W/O being able to stand P in ruling rules

4. Whether or not a L can stand P by ruling rules depends on variable strength considerations

The rules which tell about possible words [E.g., is this a possible S?]

This an current seems stable (on)

must duplicate transformational restrictions unless they are formed transformationally to begin with.

Q.E.D.
1. Fact from Paul Postal's MS on raising (52) section E
   I called them all > % I talked about that with them all
   Some people can do (Qualifer positioning)
   off of the object of a P.

2. French won't passivize prepositional objects.

3. Only some P can get gobbled with -able words

Obviously \( NP / V \rightarrow NP / V + P \)
No rule can affect only prepositional objects, i.e., also getting direct object.
This is a funny use of \( \rightarrow \), because obviously

It is not possible for a V to take simultaneously NP and PP. anyway.
So it suggests that something structural is necessary, so that "going to" direct objects to be costly (yuck) than going to prepositional objects.
I think Larry noticed this one too, but
shake a stick at only occurs in that-

clauses.
1. If he is being rude, stop him (*from being)

2. If he won't (*be polite), make him
1. My talks to them about *themselves* and each other.

2. Each other as reflexives

This suggests again that it is just general freying up that happens to certain weaker syntactic processes when word-edges have happened. For N3: Our talks to talk about each other.

It's not that the each other rule is too weak to work in derived nominals, (or "can't be generalized to NPs"), but rather that it doesn't have enough zip to overcome the drag put on it by (a) starting from a weak antecedent, (b) being anything at all.

9/1/77
2 bits of sad news:

1) On what Tuesday did Maria seduce Fritz, and on what Wednesday Boris?

Here Boris is only a patient

2) Why in Acc. Ing. impossible for verb in subject position, for none in object position?
On what Tuesday did Babs seduce Fritz
and on what Wednesday Fritz harried.

But OK

... and on what Wednesday Boris

I believe Tony to be capable,
and the incompetent.

?? I believe myself to be attractive
and she unattractive.
The producer forced the director into

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{a corner} \\
\text{submission} \\
\text{submitting}
\end{array}
\]

and the director the script girl into

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{a corner} \\
\text{submission} \\
\text{submitting}
\end{array}
\]
This seems to have the \( IO \) in it? Note the

rightness of this dialogue.

A is shutting in a public crapper. There is a

Knock on the door.

A: ? I'm still in here

\underline{still} (5) seems to presuppose that the

hearer (= IO) expects \( \sim \)

So \( \underline{still} \equiv \) even now.
I'll give him a drink before he gets ugly.

In order to cause not:

I gave him a drink before he could become ugly.

9/2/72

So this one seems to come from Can Delilah

I'll teach him to keep accounts before I go back up.

Usually this cause not(able) before only goes w/ derived (?) subjects
Derived structures don't wordize:
A. 3 derived nouns
B. *able - derwodes

Maybe this explains why idioms (= great words) don't nominalize

*The wildness of the grove-chase
  is apparent
This obeys the CSC:

I doubt that

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{he has studied Greek and does know it} & \quad \checkmark \\
\text{he has studied Greek and does not know it} & \quad \checkmark \\
\text{he has studied Greek and knows it} & \quad \checkmark
\end{align*}
\]
At the Lake:

Hoppys under the (red) car

RRC's carry a presupposion that there is a greater number than one of the relevant NPCs.

The (*Earth's) moon is bright tonight.

Hoppys was under the red car, if indeed there were even 2 cars.

So it might be a real presupposion, not an implicature!

(I wish I understood Larry's stuff better)
Auxiliaries increase in verbiness as they go down the tree, i.e., from left to right.
F*ck you  —  F*ck them

F*ck you and the horse you rode in on

But:

* F*ck them and the horse(s ?) they rode in on

Why is F*ck?
* Tom doubted that Bill did have a cold

* Max is being surprised that Tom does need me is likely

Why?
Ich glaube nicht,

dass er seine Tochter in

Schule lassen wird.

* je von Russen bewohnt
Häusern

? Häusern die je von Russen
bewohnt werden und

Is there a contrast here?
Check with Elke.
I thought

said

knew

realized

*was glad

*was surprised

That man, Max, had been asking to use our VW

Dodge was on the Fritz, had been...
1. will → will / because

2. will → 'll

I won't → ? + I'll not
Even though cloisters are islands, we find

What I was told so that never had I been a

few of wheats

So the possibility of the, [NB it's]

out of surprise etc. proceed can't have

anything to do with the structure of the
If he [no polite] drank it, and I must that [he be]

and that I must that [he be]

... Which I must (for) he [be]

4/6/74
The is fun (*for me) being with

// to (maybe 9/6/72)

Moscow is expensive for me (*for you) to call
These will do for me.

↑?

I will make do with these.
Pseudo-clefts?

(To) Route 95 is 4 miles

It is 4 miles to Route 95
This is the rule that gives

\[ \text{explain} \rightarrow \text{explanation} \]

(142) is reformulated as (143)^1

They distinguish between

\[ \text{explanation and vacation} \]

(142)^1

But there are still lots of exceptions

(143)^1

parental, satanic, tyrannical

I guess that the reason for the difference here

is that an \[ \frac{3}{4} \text{vocation, } \frac{3}{4} \text{vacation, } \frac{3}{4} \text{location, } \frac{3}{4} \text{alida} \]

\[ \frac{3}{4} \text{rotation, etc. the [1 Stress] vowel is tense,} \]

while it's lax here.
Vowel Laxing in $\gamma_1 V$

So the rule is:

reduce if non-initial or if the following vowel is lax.

$$V \Rightarrow \left[ \frac{-\text{Str}}{\text{VC}_a}\right] \Rightarrow \left[\text{VC}_a\right] - C\left[\text{VC}_a\right]$$

either $a$ or $b$. 

6/7/72
The facts of Japanese and Basque suggest a hierarchy of cases:

No. I will be able to relativize from phrases with being able to relativize to-phrase. etc etc
Maybe I squish here.

rapid departure — such departure

sincere belief — such belief

through study — such study

keeps a perfect fool — such fool.

It's a nice child — such children
11:20 P.M.

Wild Reach!

Suppose that the next highest life form after man is the machine.
It would live longer, make fewer mistakes, and be non-questioning.

Good set.

I hope the hell I'm wrong.
\[
\begin{align*}
&\{ \text{Who I invited} \} \quad \text{was the } n^{th} \\
&\{ \text{Who came} \}
\end{align*}
\]

Hence another argument that

This is a Q.
I noticed while reading Foard there's:

\[ I \begin{cases} \text{need} \\ \text{broke} \end{cases} \text{ an instrument for measuring } \]

\[ I \begin{cases} \text{need} \\ \text{broke} \end{cases} \text{ an instrument for measuring with } \]

This suggests that this comes from the same source as this:

\[ I \begin{cases} \text{need} \\ \text{broke} \end{cases} \text{ an instrument with which to measure.} \]

Both seem only to be OK in predicates which contain both (or even).

A room in which to work (is available)

\[ I \begin{cases} \text{find} \\ \text{look} \end{cases} \text{ a room to work in.} \]
Paul Kiparsky's beautiful Q:

Why should upper elements have primary over lower ones?

My answer:

There's a conspiracy to make one clause out of many. Multi-clause structure are used instead of simple clauses.

This is so natural for weak processes to stop upstream — give direction costs energy.
1. JVI: *Never's N¢e commented*

2. Opales Switch: *They've been what we've been all.*

3. Income in (than) classes.

*He's taller than she is.*

4. AP Frontier: *Would you tell DE if you'd heard!*

6/21/72
Vowel Deletion Squad

Facts from talking with Lisa

6/2/72

1. is > has > have > will > he (approximately)

2. Pro > why Pro > what NP

3. Staccato > Moving

4. /V_ > /C_
(cf. Rules for 23.734 - Squish!)  

5 reasons why Pooley is still 5:

1. Backwards pronoun (but this could be because it's a NP)

2. SS6

3. Backwards any

4. Predicates Crossing: And knowing few angered many

5. Double reflexive constraint?

Your {photographing?} of John himself angered John himself
Extrapolation w/ bisectoidal

It would have meant that S p: he had cried

\[ S_1 \]

\[ S_2 \]

Thus it seems that what's wrong here is merely some performance-like thing.
Fact noticed by Lisa:

\[ \text{have} \rightarrow \{ d \} / \_ C \]

I woulda \{ shift helped \} you
\{? injured \}
\{* admitted \}
Another test for #:

[Ix], as in number, never appears before {#}.

\[\text{meaning} = \frac{1}{\text{niy ri}g}\]
I'm mad at Ted.

I'm mad at Ted because of [insert reason].
Can agree

difficult if not impossible
Noun Incorporation

How else is the fact that German
nouns in -heit/-keit, or -ung, are
feminine to be construed than that these
"endings" are themselves feminine nouns,
with the appropriate meaning of quality,
degree etc, into which the first part
of the word has come via incorporation?

Prediction:

No regularities like these will be findable
when a language doesn't exhibit incorporation
(in particular, there should be none in an SOV L)

Is this true? What about -kata and -sa
in Japanese.
Morphological analyzability

1. hotel
2. motor hotel → mot + tel → motel
3. sky + tel, tra + tel etc.

1. Massachusetts
2. Mount Wachusett (Fitchburg company)

1. panorama —— panasonic
2. 
3. Burger + rama → Burgerama
4. Christ + rama
Turnpike, for me, still has a story.

But I don't even know if it's a right one, and for many, it's obviously fading.
VP Frontlogy  5/19/72

If fight en vows forced to
then fight em we must

Call Raya
Larry:

0. [Because] starting himself would be crazy. [Although] he knew himself

1. 1 didn't shut up because he was bored

2. 

   Jack left [Although] it was raining

3. 

   What Jack did was: speak up because he was mad
   speak up although he was mad

4. also covers 3, because 3a, but not 3b although.

5. Because will propose further than although.

{Because: she has lacked} I realize that they danced.

{Although: you don't give a shit}

John is taking an umbrella, (in case) you were wondering

(because) I saw him in the street.

(I know...) although I didn't see him when

because it's raining in case it rains
Privacy and VFinality

VF everywhere. - Japanese.
VF in atomics, VF embedded, German, Japanese.
VF only in nominalized, - e.g.
VF everywhere. Ken's observation:

Object incorporation is linked to
verb finality. Maori, which is the strongest known
type of verb-final, even incorporates objects to the
right:

eats meat John

Perhaps, Ken observes, another phenomena
that is connected with VF to much side
of the world and might bring about the
loss of V's. In Japanese, the verb V-itud-in, Algonquian, etc.
initial?

Reduce, she? makes include, leaves behind old winds, also add in a lexical graveyard (clover hooks, etc).

How come pickpocket in an old form of agent V formation?
Eg in Praving and privacy

Praising Equin, I bet
Initial place > Final place > Internal place
It's only possible for this process to go down into clauses (ditto with Russian and Finnish case change) because it does it one first. Macedonian may only marks for clause-mates objects - no language marks only for non-clausal marks.

Ditto with Chliciation - no Chlicies only persons etc in lower clauses.
No L has OV upstairs and VO downstairs.

This really looks like OV is basic and VO is a perversion which goes down via privacy.
Anonymous by an agent unknown

* anonymous knowledge
The shit looked ready to hit the fan

What the fuck goes on?

Is ready an intransitive?

Or what?
5 Deletion and "free pronoun"

\[
\begin{align*}
\{ \text{That} \} & \quad \text{was} \quad \{ \text{good, nice, kind, clever, silly, etc} \} \\
\{ \text{It} \} & \quad \text{of Max} \\
\end{align*}
\]

The fact that this \( \text{it} \) / \( \text{that} \) can only refer to an activity whose agent was Max suggests to me that it would be wrong to say that such \( S \)'s should be generated "in isolation".

Obviously Max has lost stress because it's an anaphor.
Q: Shall I come?
A: Yes, probably.

A little weak, but maybe OK.

Certainly far closer to grammaticability than reason would lead one to suspect.

It means roughly, "Yes, it would be good for me (?) if you were to come."
As yet and Negative Polarity

This crazy idiom requires a negative,
but it can precede it.

As yet, I’m afraid that they know that we have no case.
Counterfactual worlds are farther away from the speaker than the actual one:

Eddie [would have been] a lost cause in this respect

and Daniel knew

Daniel must have known
The Transitivity Squash

Houses are likely to be built here.

Houses are apt to be built here.

Houses are able to be built cheaply here.

Houses are free to be built here.

Houses are eager to be built here.

Houses are anxious to be built here.

Furthermore, I think that there in terms of "transitivity". That is, with these subjects, these S's get worse more quickly.

Max is likely to go, and Fred is equally likely.
It seems to me that there are many steps along the way to being "a strong (or true) verb-final language" (as is indicated by the bitches). In criteria are:

1. Verb-finality
   a. only in propositional modifications
   b. only embedded
      i. in neither, only in infinitives
         (maybe in Beige too?)
      ii. in German, everywhere embedded
   c. in all clauses
      i. Extrapolations freely permitted (German)
      ii. No or few extrapolations (French, Dutch, Japanese)

2. NP S
   Some languages have both - I don't know which one is basic

3. P NP vs NP P
   a. Only postpositional - Japanese
   b. Mixing postpositions, but some prepositions - (I know 1 no examples)
   c. 50-36 (I know 2 no examples)
   d. Mostly prepositions, but a few postpositions

Furthermore, it seems that German is prepositional except for hard, entgegen, entgegen, entgegen, entgegen, entgegen...

English has only postpositioning as a postposition.
Primary and some rany

It may be possible to find cases where some oer are w/i claims and otf across [ ], but never the opposite.

Cf. 3/3/72 for just such cases
There was a lot of complaining, discussion, that, tears, work, help. Among the people among the deck.
This analysis does 3 things:

1) It gets rid of the weight constraint.

2) It makes it not an accident that only animals, cyclical subjects, may have both the general and the aspect-act-related permission sense (permit only has animate IDs).

3) It explains (via permit being equi-

why it’s I may vote in April or bad in
the permission-giving sense, and why
May you vote in April? is also bad in
this sense. Interpretive rules would make
the person switch an accident.

be permitted ⇒ way
Fake NP and without Del

John could come without (him) being invited.

There could be a storm without *(there)* being a flood.

It could rain without *(it)* raining.

Tubs could be kept under without *(tubs)* being kept under *(them)*.
He isn't too good a lecturer.

That isn't too big a house.

? Don't cut it too large a shoe.

All these are fine in 40-70 structures. Wear's weight indicates a difference in process.

I don't think he's too good a lecturer.

[I don't think he's too good a lecturer]

[don't think]
There are 2 things which suggest that what's involved here is a chipping rule:

1. Avery's crossover facts

2. The rule can stand provisos - Postal's generalization was that deletion rules usually wipe out P.
4/28/72

S from Will:

Because Mary loves [line deleted] better than her [line deleted]

*Because she loves John, he trusts Mary*
No one said I wanted him to write many papers.

4/30/72

Easier S, same point:

Nobody said he wanted Bill to see many others.

What about

Nobody said that Jim wanted to talk to many people about

Setting his job
A good argument for: in German, case must go along with the dislocated NP.

\begin{align*}
\{ \text{Ken} \} & \quad \text{Man} \quad \{ \text{ich möchte ihn umbringen} \} \\
\{ \text{De} \} & \quad \{ \text{ich möchte ihn umbringen} \}
\end{align*}

Deinem Vater, ich möchte ihm meine Meinung sagen.
Future Hierarchy

Fast from Alexa:

We'll break at 5 for lunch.

* We broke for lunch at 5
This book is easily readable

* long
* popular

This book can easily be read