I consider there *(to be)* likely to be another plant. *(to be) likely to be kept*
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Potted gets *(cf. MS)*

I consider there unlikely to be a not
Meat-eaters hate

Meat-eating planner

The bond here is closer than that here.
So, since we've incorporated only very closely
bound ideas, their is worse.
Thought while reading Larry's thesis:

Books are givables to assets

* Acts are givables books

May this be the correct principle:

Derived structures don't overwrite

But:

These walls are sprayable with paint

This kind of paint is not sprayable on vertical surfaces

What is blamable in this account?

This accident is blamable on Red.
Epidemic can and trigger hierarchy

Epidemic can be best in Neg

next best in φ

next best in

So synthetic change proceeds along the trigger hierarchy
I followed her to the station with a suitcase in [my] hand (Stone).

I had (= was with) a suitcase in [my] hand.

This comes from:

I had a suitcase in my hand while I followed her to the station.
NB: the second part of the compound is increasingly verb

N-N < N-Ver < N-Ven < N-Ving

\[ \text{ox (n.)} \text{hard} < \text{ox (n.)-earthy} < \text{ox (n.)-rotted} < \text{ox (n.)-eating} \]

* ox*meat < ox*eaten*meat < ox*covered < ox*laugh*ing

** pig*open ** pig*liver ** pig*eaten*ed ** pig*tanning
Fact from Dick:

The trying xerox b copy don't

Only when that is an old subject

But it's no good as a controller for the deletion of the subjects of participles.
people eater >> ? men-eater >> * boy-eater

(* one's) self pity

(* one's) bridge (* 5) - burning
maturigated

No. The bigger back than just.

Possible. As I can see, if I go further:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{v} & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\
1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\
1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 1 & 1 & 2 \\
2 & 2 & 3 & 1 \\
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
\end{array}
\]
8/3/2

What stops *motive*?

Maybe the best way is to reject the idea of motive for a

Given I

I only disagree: I accept and like

This one is always restricted, and always has

those rejected by its "like", and then always

lose ones...


I have this unique sound: int

expression of words like *spirit*

I can't think of any now, so much the

right
Category against and if-complements

Facts from Edwin:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{I would} & \{ \text{know} \star \text{about } \phi \} \\
& \{ \text{regret} \star \phi \} \\
& \{ \text{be aware} \star \phi \} \\
& \{ \text{be glad} \star \phi \} \\
& \{ \text{be happy} \star \phi \} \\
& \{ \text{be surprised} \star \phi \}
\end{align*}
\]

if I won

So only predicates require \( \phi \). That is just the opposite of what I would predict.
Futility and y. complements

Facts unearthed with Edw.

I would be [happy] if it rained

[? a no go to]

? I expect Sam to be glad if he wins <

?? I like to be glad if I'm drafted

So there thing is only possible with strong future triggers
The facts seem unchanged w/o or w/b VP Rel, so we are again dealing with the Q of how good an antecedent for anaphoric pronominalized clause is.
That the structural condition is D can be seen from

I was depending on that the set coarsened being provable

(This to only bad by virtue of the \( I^2SNPC \))
I find [that you ate that] deplorable.

*for you to eat that*

I would find [that you ate that] deplorable.

*for you to eat that*
I wore

- a hat
- pants
- a belt
- false teeth
- 45's
- shoes
- a wallet
- a crown

8/1/72

I put on

- a hat
- pants
- a belt
- false teeth
- 245's
- shoes
- a wallet
- a crown

I used

- a hat
- pants
- a belt
- false teeth
- 245's
- shoes
- a wallet
- a crown
That → Ø

It is odd? (that) ∃ > (I think)

I find it odd? (that) ∃

and of course

I find* (that) ∃ odd

But why actually?

It is likely (that) he won’t come back

It is believed by them to be likely* (that) he won’t come back
Almost all indelible ink.

1. Hated (did not succeed) smoked

Feel like I have to continue.
Subjects of that-clauses can be less wrong than subjects of for-to-clauses. Than subjects of "for-ing" clauses.

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{If } \{ \text{?for NP to VX} \} \Rightarrow \text{no too bad} \\
&\text{NP} = \text{V} + \text{NP} + \text{Y}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{For } \{ \text{?for NP to VX} \} \Rightarrow \text{to bother you is too bad} \\
&\text{NP} = \text{V} + \text{NP} + \text{X}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{\{\text{That is} \} } \\
&\text{\{\text{For NP to VX} \} \Rightarrow \text{is bothering you is too bad} } \\
&\text{NP} = \text{V} + \text{NP} + \text{X}
\end{align*}
\]
Epistles

That [LBJ] was wrong if the bastard would never act.

No.

\[ \text{[LBJ]} \]

The bastard was wrong.

So the consensus in at least one was wrong.

But then why do they do bad?

If the bastard could go, LBJ would take it.
Two arguments that some if-clauses are complements.

If Jack says he will, Jack will play golf

(OPT pronoun in if-then 5's)

1. If (*Jack) could go, Jack would like it

(he: 1)

(?Jack: 1)

1 1

(OBLG pronoun in complement structures)

2. LBJ would write, if the bastard had any heart

(epithets OK in if-then 5's)

* LBJ would like it if the bastard could scrub the floor

(No epithets in complement structures)

?? If LBJ could scrub the floor, that cockroach would like it

NB That LBJ was unpopular that cockroach never

{?? believed?}

{?? reported?}
The 1968 9th grade cohort =

the set of children in 9th grade in 1968

followed through time.
DATING in lexical items

swell < peachy < here < wild < a gas < far out < out of sight

7/25/72

Jane < dame < doll < broad < check

7/27/72

guy

fellow < guy < cat < dude

lay < { hump } < make it < ball

7/29/72

duck
If selected violations can save a sentence (i.e., are strong enough to override a violated perceptual algorithm), then morphology does, but not conversely.

That is,

?* A man kissed a girl who was rude?

?? A man kissed a girl who was shaving himself.

This parallel linguists' feelings about morphological considerations outweighing "were" selection.

What this means is that "hard-core" syntax.

7/20/72
Wild fact!

If I say that FRONTUP only happens in loose enough environments in English, I have a source for a hard-working man, a sheep-killing man, etc.
I don't think that ever have I seen such crap.

On many occasions will we have a chance to vote?

*Tell people

Wild!

This only works with Not Hopping

Cf. Nott
Why mention in incompatible with T6

A: In general: view in NY

T7 & 78

T8 & 78

Categories are functions, namely semantic categories, but
in explanatory order

1. The necessity of general in the

2. Slow alternative, ending in

(\textit{with respect to)? pop. the 33rd century Sxx (333)})
Fact from Susanne's "Natural Explanations for Some Syntactic Universals" (fn. 21)

Turkish is weakly SOV in main clauses, strongly so in all subordinate clauses.

Fact from me:

German is weakly SOV in subordinate clauses, strongly so pre-nominally.

So the progression seems to go like so:

(for any level)

1. Strongly SOV
2. Weakly SOV (that is, stuff moves past V)
3. V-fronting (OPT)
4. V-fronting (OBL)

I'm not sure that 3 and 4 can be distinguished.
7/10/72

Another observation from Susumu (p. 67)

There are strongly SOV L's, but there are no strongly VSO L's, i.e., L's where nothing can precede V.
The more many a NP, the worse it is an antecedent for if and so after do.
This is a pretty strong positional item.

I won't see the like of it.

I don't think we will see the like of it.

3. I NB:

(The likes) of which I can't believe.

*Any

That we will ever see.

Even though any > ABlon the market.

one can precede and command the trigger.
Complement deletion in than-clauses and non-necessity

She ate more than \( \{ \text{I thought, I realized, I contemplated} \} \) that to me.

Thus, their rule seems only to work with complements of high salience.

d delivers to me complements only.
Thus is impossible

a) After the gap
b) (Pseudo) alefted
c) Topicalized
d) NP Shifted
I think that auxiliaries get verbs (except possibly for *be*-ten) the further down the tree they are. This is surely not an accident.
I don't now see how Edwin's system of I-IV automatically predicts that deviations from the order I-II-III-IV will be bad, and still less do I see how his system captures this fact, namely:

\[ I-I-II-III \ll I-II-III-IV < I-II-IV-III \]

That is, the strength of the bonding seems to increase logarithmically as the V is neared (§).

My Theory (!) of bond-strength won't do it either, but I've got to fix P so that it does.
9/6/72

I quote a scrambled squib:

"Intransitive V just look as if their subject can be far down on the agency squib.

So do we need both agency and transitivity?"

I wonder what I meant?
(chili)  dog  (free)

- burger  (almost free) Cf. Burggrana

- (a) mat  automat, washmat hand[pr.] mat

- term  delikria, uzshakria

- rama  Seen: glamoriana

- tel  motel, iratef, skytel

- oatef  [= ocean hotel] (pieds volants) masquerama

7/9/72
Beautiful Q from Rita Nolan (Knowland?)
Paul Ziff’s wife) at Mana Tsiapera’s last night:

"Don’t the physical sciences (e.g., biology)
find themselves confronted with squishy facts,
yet model these discretely? Then why don’t we
in linguistics?"

Arnold started to answer her to the effect
that notions like “species” in biology have no solid
conceptual bases.

But I wonder if this is a place where linguistics
could lead the way, and could open up a reconceptualization
of the logic used in the other physical sciences (to
say nothing of the social sciences).
Paul Zeff's fact:
prove $\not\,$ is entirely intransitive

There proved to be no controls

It proved to have named $\not\,$ be naming

Talks proved to have been kept on everybody

Ruthless advantage proved to have been taken of such
Problem 133. Sierra Popoluca

1. hesak wi?kpa he?m šiš ko-pho-m
   Then that cow will eat in the meadow.

2. he?m šiš ikup'pa šok ko-pho-m hoyma
   That cow will eat grass in the meadow tomorrow.

3. apoyum ad ka-mho-m
   I rah in the cornfield.

4. okna he?m šwan ipetum tak matak
   Later yesterday that John swept the house.

5. wi?kum dimpa
   The dog ate.

6. ikup'tum
   He ate it.

7. anu?kpa
   I will arrive.

8. hesak ad anuusum tu·m dimpa takho-m
   Then I held a dog in the house.

9. šwan thuyum tu·m ko-pa
   John bought a meadow.

10. miwi?kpa mîc ka-mkaam hoyma
    Tomorrow you will eat at the cornfield.

11. mîc ikup'tpa sak
    You will eat beans.

12. okna he?m dimpa ikup'tum šiš
    Later that dog ate beef.

13. mîc ikup'tpa šwan takkaam
    You will hold John at the house.

14. hesak ad anhuypa tu·m šiš
    Then I will buy a cow.

---

extends: Berta about

Ru=T only with certain prefixes