I came here by/on the bus/plane/train/cab.

Come by/on the first train.

We traveled by/on BOAC.
Maybe the source of instrumentals, which can go with all actives, is that:

\[ S_0 \]

\[ V \quad \text{and} \quad \text{cause} \quad \text{NP} \]

\[ x_1 \quad \text{use} \quad x_2 \]

\[ x_1 \quad \text{be able} \quad S_3 \]

\[ x_4 \quad V \]
We paired \{ \text{the} \} \text{ways} \).

vs.

Our pairing of \{ \text{the} \text{ways} \} * \text{company}.

It would seem that \text{The} \rightarrow \text{NP}

increases the fakeness of the betroffener NP.
We departed [friends] {arrived [a friend]}

Why aren't these OK?

We were [friends] when we parted.

NB: Their parting (of) friends

* Their departure happy

NB: These also suggest that this is not basic
Causality squash + instrumentals

7/6/72

Maybe the source of instrumentals is causatives

7/7/72

Hey! This fits in well with by/with alternating. Goes with many causes.

Thus Max killed me with a knife

Max's using a knife caused me to die

(Cf. Max took knife killed me)

Maybe the fact that the subjects of feature are more agentive than in five, higher up in the hierarchy is due to the fact that in the S, S must be an action, because only actions can cause changes of location.
7/6/72

Maybe first, stuff can float past V, then afterwards (i.e., in lower stages), the rest can freed for V2 or for scrambling.
Maybe Will's got a point. But the point seems a little...characteristic after the advent of the code before, we used to say, they communicate and understand rules and obligations after, we had a thing to do in the execution.
want (to have) a bagel

VS

begin (to cook, to eat, to delay) supper

And NB also

I missed (seeing) War 
and Peace
* The rapid running (of) headway

* To taking of that book

Taking of chances

* Keeping to house

* This making of headway is encouraging

Much better than this
Maybe all 5's are based on be or do

**be**

- be en
- happen = be with
- will = do in
- shall = do to

**do**

- know = possible
- do = possible
- need = do

**may**

- be possible
- be permitted

**should**

- be good

**must**

- be necessary

Maybe there are freely deletable: V are based on be

(Wig, 2BD, Being Del, Have->D) or do (Know, certain)
2/16/22

I exposed Greg for the quack. [Martha was he]

He pretended not to be a quack, but I showed

that he was one.

7/6/22  PG 2.93

I took him to live at the house that [he pretended to live at]

To have the honesty that [he pretended to have]

NB the = conditions here.
I exposed Greg to live in the [ghetto]
[as part of town]

I took him to have built the tent in the pen
he [pretended] he had [cooked it in]
said [cooked it first in]
claimed

How is all this related to:
I took him at his word
SOV and Case-marking

I think all SOV language must case-mark.

WHY?
The book was on the table, and the table *(on) the floor.
A. *what bothered him was my kissing him."

//d (for who know what reason)

B. The answer to the question as to what bothered him is that my kissing him bothered him.

O.r. B → A
Futurity speech and pseudo-cliffs

7/3/72

? What I hope to be right over <

I hope to be right over

So distance, perspicuousness, etc. play a big role.
Punctual squash

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>burst</th>
<th>leave</th>
<th>reach the summit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>has been</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>²[Np]</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7/3/72
Polarity and pseudo-delfts

1:25 pm

What I didn't think was

that anybody knew for sure

that he'd left a supper

to help an American

that he couldn't help anyone

that he had a red coat

that he had left until you

that he was exactly

a leader

Yay! Squishes solve this honor.
"Indecents" and precedent

2/3/72

Goffman "Fun in Games"

Booth-Walsh

Encounters (1st half)

Free Press

Behavior in Public Places

Papertack

Interaction Ritual

Who goes through a door first?

Goffman has studied this

Principles
1. Guest first
2. Women first
3. Elders first
4. Children first
Obviously, we know about degree of foreign accent...
Nouns do it more than adjectives than verbs.

OK, but why?
Said by an ugly girl, we think, he didn't
feel obliged to wait on to praise.)
"Why don't you put the leg - it's got
tells me?"

5 from Larry's hand
"...throw the baby of [...] out with the
bathwater of [...]"
The chickens were cooking, and that in the kitchen. 
Arnold points out that the SDU and the condition that subjects can't judge are counterexamples to privacy.
It wants to rain.

It's trying to rain.

It was [kind of] dark and not so rain.

Bill got soaked on by it.
Jack believes

That a picture of him (self) is here

A picture of him (self) to be here

Jack examined a picture of him (self)
Jim terrified me with

\{ web intransigence \\
\{ his leaving of Mike while he was \\
discouraged \\
\} his being able to say in Greek \\
\}
derived structures in announcs
and primary

My [Sister of John / to stay home]

[removal of John from staying home] was tedious

No. My [promise?] to John to stay home was rejected

I don't know why, but I looked as if

I wished he to stay home, but more info

in the derivation than

I advised John to stay home

Maybe the rule at the 3rd box brings in debe

from a by-phrases
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restrictiveness of distribution</th>
<th>Plenty squash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6/27/72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>must</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA-like RNA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA-like molecule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA-like molecule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA-like molecule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA-like molecule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows a comparison of different DNA-like molecules and their properties.
The difficulty of choosing a tie

John's difficulty in choosing a tie.

What accounts for this horror?
Carl Nichols suggests such \( \rightarrow \) in object position.

Arnaud pointed out: 3 rule relative 50 and such anyway.

My fact: Both are out w/ facts.

such was \{ known \}

\[ \text{acknowledged} \]

Arnaud points out: Generalization and Unique NPRef both violate privacy.
Janice was heart-broken.

Janice's heart was broken.

X broke Janice's heart.
Both be and began (and is other V)
appear to be able to dictate at before 8p.m.
As predicted by the CS, the 9p.m. does
Show up after having enough realizations

He is a beginner at living

We made a beginning at finding out
I think that it's possible to order the environments for NP as follows:

\[
\begin{aligned}
\text{Incorporation} & \quad \text{(requires bare N;)} \\
\text{Right and Left Restriction} & \quad \leftarrow \text{no fake NPs}
\end{aligned}
\]

\[\text{TM} \quad \text{(only a few cases)}\]

\[\text{Typicalization} \quad \text{(possibly a few more - close track)} \quad \text{maybe}\]

\[\text{Tag Formation} \quad \text{(all cases except tab and maybe hood)}\]

\[\text{Passive}\]

\[\text{Cleft}\]

\[\text{Pseudo-Cleft}\]
2/21/73

No; this cowardly but beautiful love will anger them.

6/22/72

Visiting of the prison killed

Not and words containing it (few, little, seldom, etc.) require lots of sententiality.

I admired Mikes solutions to few problems.

The belief of few people in god upset me.

Facts from Howard Lasnik's Ch 1.

Not everyone's passing the exam surprised me and

For not everyone to pass the exam would be

unprecedented (but of the OK for him not to pass it)

would be tragic.

Fact from me: I told him which books not everyone liked.

So this starts pretty far up. Neg requires lots of sententiality.
Clever use of Zbigiew's Lemma was made.

The contract suggests that
PP left at OSJ when the idiomatic N
is only weakly an NP.

Actually, how about a rule like incorporation?

Then maybe *It was made clear use of will be hard for
the same reasons that *pronouns-world-copy 117.9.154.102
WTU do a better block of VSI

than do Neg

However (horror), Neg goes down into
nounic complements than WTU does.

To shoot nobody

? bothered him

? did he plan

Bill, to shoot whom

?? would bother me

*I never planned

? a Papist
Category squad and racing

It's no accident that I help with the racing, isn't it? I only really
begin, continue, stop, etc.

What about this?

John's tendency of scoring

Can it be argued that tendency is transitive here?

9. John's tendency of being examined by grooms

*being rumored to be a thug
I don't think any V of the class of claim (i.e., the class which allows stative infinitives below) must undergo Ego, in any language: always, there is a possibility of a that-clause.

Q: Why then are there V (i.e., may, have etc.) which require Raising?
Jean Casagrande suggests, as a way of getting around the badness of

*I want there a new trial for them

(the output of 280)

a rule which deletes there. [NB: I had a mental to have a

new trial for them]

This is a good idea, but how will we block these 52 which are even rotten w/o there?

? Enough milk for us all is a wild thought

or

?? I consider there likely to be reprisals

9/6/72. Block has So. like this unstated

in his Report in.
Arnold's observation:

seem > believe w.r.t. Rising

Probably also:

expect > believe > acknowledge

seem likely > seem to be likely
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nom. No.</th>
<th>down</th>
<th>before</th>
<th>PV-4</th>
<th>PV-3</th>
<th>PV-2</th>
<th>PV-1</th>
<th>PV-0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Pl.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art N.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Der Nom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/walls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Check marks indicate correctness or relevance.
- Question marks indicate uncertainty or lack of information.
- Crosses indicate a specific annotation or note.
Nouniness: + possessives

The subject restriction

NB: NP - Vng 0 > NP - N

? Visiting New York's goes only after nouns phrases

being replaced

's goes only after nouns phrases

{ The bomb explosion's illuminance vs the illuminance of the bomb

explosion

The bombs

The bomb

Villas with the plural morpheme

Hurm—this seems like a reflection of the fact that only nouns conjoined NP have plural agreement.
NP Squash

Dealocation <
Tough Movement <
Tag Formation <

Passive

Type classification <
Clap <
Pseudo Clap Formation

unshabbie
Some things pass
But don't appreciate
Wait they don't do:

1. Passives
2. TV
3. Double passive expected to be taken
4. Passive w/ from
5. Show up as agent
6. Number agreement (there)
7. Work at subject of using complements
8. Passives
9. Now 28° to apply after them
10. There are milk in the bad
11. Factory * there confused me by being a riot
12. Rigid and left dislocate
13. Typical
14. Form tags * no need was paid to you, was it?

?? Careful tabs were sure kept on Martha, weren't they?

In class, it came out that tack and your leg can't be ordered. I can't remember why (if friend knows why)
Degree of attachment between clauses

1. Weakest — NB $ even SDT
   though / since / unless / etc
   factors / that
   Extraposed clauses

2. Weak — $ SDT
   Non-factor / that

3. Marginal — $ SDT, will $ bi, OBL at of / that
   Telescopic / that — else

4. Close — $ Equal — OPT
   infinitive

5. Closer — $ OBL = Equal + [ = Equal only]

6. Closest — Berends w/o subjects
Closeness and valency of deletion

The closer the attachment, the less deletion to OBL

\[ \text{OPT Equr}(i) \]

IV - Edwin's term

OBL Equr

for

Ahah!

This makes it sound like in Lio where \( \text{obj-controlled Equr clauses would be more loosely attached.} \)
HIP and N system

Since Mary's Dodge was on the fritz, Max had been asking to use our VW

1

Since his Dodge was on the fritz

?? 4 3 5 2

Mary's Dodge being on the fritz, Max had been asking to use our VW

1

His Dodge being on the fritz

?? 3 4 5 2

Mary's Dodge on the fritz, Max had been asking to use our VW

1

Her Dodge on the fritz

?? 3 4 5 2

Worried about the war

OK ?* ?* ??
If there is going to be any progress, we are going to have to use gas.

Why bad?

NB: any in the D-clause throws out the "no you are right in saying X" interpretation.

Neg polarized items also throw out indignations: I don't have a red cent.

?? If you plan to be in Rome, take a hat.

?? If you expect to be there, call me.
It doesn't matter if we whether (or not) you shave your head.

Whether (or not) the boy is right back.

Whether (or not) you shave your head.
I can feel it easily

I can be quiet easily

Roses can be big & easy
The only fact in which can be subjected to
able requires a pretty positive subject

I was able to get some

The device was able to sound light

Your story might be able to sway them

From a N.B. that be able to do it by force
I threatened them, I was able to deal with them by bribing the guards.

So maybe be able only for him & not you...
be given ⇒ have
be shown ⇒ see
be told ⇒ know

4/13/72

I demand to have my Teddy
see her
know her address
be examined

* go home. (OK when I mean)
be sent

** hip up and down

May I please
have some salt, thin... (this can be improper)
see my Teddy, Tullie
know where you live, Serena

* hip up and down, Serena, out where it near

Tell you please have someone allow us to
yourself down.
Max must return by 9, but I won't require him if you ask.

My son may feel better, but my daughter wouldn't be permitted that.
May be permitted

4/23/12

You may go ← I permit you [you go]

You are permitted to go

There may be a rebuttal ← I permit [there is a rebuttal]

There is surely more
It should be:
I permit someone [someone permitted]

May I leave? ← Do you permit me [I leave]? ±

Am I permitted to leave.

May be permitted
I have a strong hunch that all arguments using this term are wrong.

Note that it always appears in 5's books.

Y's analyses on a notational variant of mine (or X's and Y's analyses are identical variants [and both cut X]).

So I think I should try to lay off using that term.
From now on, I will try to remember to read

\[ A > B \]

as

"B is not better than A"

That's what the claim is.
Squishiness and explanatory power

4/23/72

In a way, I guess, squishiness weakens explanatory power— it would be sheer if things were discrete, happened all at once.

But they appear not to. Squishiness appears necessary.

In a way, there's a parallel w/ abstractness. It would be nice (I guess) if every I manifested its relationship to the universal base very directly. But they don't. So we need abstract structure to get rid of apparent anomalies, like the SAP's of that.

In the same way, squishiness gives a lot more. Being power to universal theories which otherwise would be doomed by lots of counterexamples fairly quickly.

Reader's note: what the author is saying here is that he is willing to work within a theory that is so strong as to be almost unbelievable. He is, however, perfectly willing to add on other hard things.
4/23/72

4/22/72

There are many facts, from Romance, Serbo-Croatian, and Hungarian.

1. Quantifier Float

Ils ont tous voulu y aller tous

* Ils ont tous voulu y aller tous

(10 facts in que-clauses)

B. Quantifier sneak

J'ai tous voulu les voir

* J'ai tous des les avoir vus

C. Infinitive agreement in Portuguese

D. Hungarian agreement of some form (what are the facts?)

E. Richie Kayne's stuff:

Je les ai fait manger à Jean.

* Je les ai fait manger à Jean

* Les faire manger à Jean

Dave argues that this co-transitional - various stuff
is backing up as if it were still in a que.

But I wonder if this is not sort of a recent form of
backing up...
 Predicate Raising Squash

= Auxillary Squash

So maybe what happened is this:

1. A certain kind of Equal (not the optional kind with claim and like, the one that cares about the identity of lower agents) applies, making the lower J just look like one too much.

2. "Semi-auxiliary Stage"
   - Quantifier sneak
   - Clitic climbing
   - Postagragmatic agreement

3. "Auxiliary Stage"
   - Strange behavior (JVI, Neg Pl. in Eng)
   - Gapping treats as a clause
   - Codefication of the VP V is possible

4. Predicate raising (visible, as in Crow vs. Japanese)

5. Predicate raising (invisible, as in English)
This stuff also seems to relate to verb clauses - i.e., that this is OK.

But not this:

Unless this came from a tensed clause via anaphora.

That is, tensed clauses start a new ballgame.
Relative clauses, presuppositions, and negation

Fact emerging in talking to Avery

4/21/72

He didn't bite the girl he was fucking, and by the way it was an ocelot.

* The girl he was fucking wasn't bitten by him, and by the way it wasn't a cat.

* He will loan the book he is reading to no one, and

by the way, it's a magazine.

So, if a relative clause precedes the negative, the speaker presupposes it.
I forced it to be on Tuesday that he comes.
although NOT CAUSE NOT

This is Dolores Harris's idea

Brown Univ student older
dark hair w/glasses, working on for
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>TakeTurn</th>
<th>TakeTurn</th>
<th>TakeTurn</th>
<th>TakeTurn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The "Verbs" Square

The way to resolve all the questions about whether Mike is afraid of heights or not is to give each of the premises to criteria.
\[ \text{PP = NP} \]

4/20/72

Fabulous argument for this equality:

In the tub seems to be where they do it?

This undergoes raising!

Oh oh

In the bathroom looks like

\{ it\} where I'll be sleeping

\{ there\} where I'll have to sleep

Where does this one come from?
Extremely important do *(the fact) that Maxwell says.

This reminds me of Paul's 5.

That he left 4 more important things than that 5 is

{*15 That 5*}
Andy's rule of funny raising (CLS 7(2))
also takes almost any NP

It looks like it's raining

There looks like there's enough

?? Tabs look like they'll be kept on him

Headway looks like it'll be made soon

?? There having looked like there was enough is funny
Dan said "bannister" for "guard rail" (up) [stair]

Q: Which is the right derivation?

(1) guard rail $\leftarrow$ road-bannister

or

(2) bannister $\leftarrow$ stair - guard rail

Somehow, (2), though it is historically wrong, seems intuitively right.

How could we find evidence to bear on this?
When \([\text{on} + \text{Bal}]\) is a murine (as in \textit{ricevini} or \textit{chevreni})

or when it can't (\textit{spumati})

\(\hat{1}\) retention
Fact noticed from Lyle's CLS handout:
He'll be able to help you if he *will be* right back.
I will help, if \[ \text{it will do} \] you any good.

You can keep the sweater, if \[ \text{it will do} \] in it.

Well! Well can only stay in an 'if' clause if I think around which requires it.
Fact from Arnold:

-ing → in

more in V than in A than in N
The dog did a roll down the hill.
By-phrases and manner
Causality Squash

S

surprise
kill (metaphoric)

kill, break
melt

fasten

These can be from any V.

NB

Mary surprised me \{ by \{ ? being detached \} with her detachment \} her refusal to bow

They were fastened down by pressure

This is from a V act
Quantified NPs are fake.

? What I read was each box.

What I read was all "(the) smutty books."
Of strength

?? The examination of every woman bothered her.

[?? Many children's dancing on the roof.

with upper

many

?? Mary's examination of many patients.

[?? Wilded Jack]
Tom told \{ Anthony \} \{ everybody \} about the sexual conquests which that bastard had been making in his aptment.

So the condition on epithets is

\[ \sim (\text{Anaphor} \rightarrow \text{Epithets}) \]

and restrictive relative clauses in non-generic sentences come from upstairs.
Fact from Barbara:

Deleted NPs always have narrowest scope.

\[ \text{Everybody was bitten} \neq (\exists x)(\exists y) (x \text{ bit } y) \]
Learning is aspiring to higher forms of ignorance.
\[ l = \text{Suish} \]

4/7/72

He climbed Mt. Foothill faster than I have ever seen it done.

Before questioning Granny Gramps was.

The floor was waxed by the man who usually does so.
Variable strength

Jenny Kaye's hypothesis:

Weird rules are weak

Adverb Prepositional use too weak, and is a
counterexample.
"It's cold in here. The fish are shivering.

Let's close the window," said Betty.

So the generalization about where the niches are goes through, if the 5's or a paragraph are conjoint.
A man and a woman such that he lives (married) her

So this does require some things of the open I that goes with it.
Here, mother knows that \{ Sue \} hates John. \{ ?\?everybody \}
Wells' S:

Who did you mention looking at it to her mother.

This shows that what's out is any privacy shift.
The NP Quish

4/31/72

facts from discussion w/ Gary

Weak NPs

Strong NPs

Pseudo-deletion < Equational Deletion < Generalization < Become < TM

Gary points out that doubling is in order too.

Also: Max surprised me by knowing her.

There is NP \rightarrow VP

not so new...

take a tack > make headway > take advantage

Keep track

keep tabs on

keep watch on
4/3/72
the application of fire
will take them down

Sentential subject and by-phrase
Causative
squish

Facts arrived at in discussion w/gary:

surprise -> kill
metaphor -> kill
literal -> melt
> > faster

Free by-phrases

That's.

Restricted by-phrase
1. No negatives
2. No statives
3. X passive

Putting them in

The fire was hot
But it melted them

* Putting them in melted them
One good way is to try to find some question to work on together.
Weak Equi

(Visited) from text of Tom's House, Ohio.

Before adopting this, an alternative will be considered.
Need I say more?
The word-formation strength stuff shows that there are degrees of binding.

Flash 10:46am Why must the binding be the same in both directions? This is what's implicit in notations like +, #, etc.

Thus suppose it's really like this:

```
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{3 (z#)} \\
\text{cranberry} \\
\end{array}
\]
```

\(=\text{half-morph}\)

```
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{1} \\
\text{flash} \\
\end{array}
\]
```

Obviously, 3 degrees of morphemehood:

\{P1\}: dogs > pants > cats > the shoes (NB: singular agreement)

\{t\}: assault > fault > the trials \[4/6/74\] (NB after the trial)
\[ \# \rightarrow + / - \bar{y} \]

3/30/72

*ordinarily

*obligatorily

*evidently

(*apparently)

NB: θ *perfunctorily

*advisorily

Because this is a rare word type, and we wouldn’t know what to do with this syllable.
Lynn Dens paved out

Max said I, and I added 50

3/30/72
HIP and Krispy Kluerves

Everett Leder's fact:

He mumbled that these points he would cover later.
Idea is talking with Dick.

The interpreter wants to know you a question.

I think I just have some questions that relates.

Well, example.

Her would like become president.

How come would so used here?
Word-formation: squa

un- \rightarrow \text{-ly} \rightarrow \text{-er}

independently of the others.

but \# *He beamed at us proudly of his kids

luckily for me

Fact from Wayles: clearly to \{ *Bill
\hspace{1cm} \hspace{1cm} \hspace{1cm} \hspace{1cm} \hspace{1cm} anyone who's smoked \}

\{ *of Sally
\hspace{1cm} \hspace{1cm} \hspace{1cm} \hspace{1cm} \hspace{1cm} for a Japanese \}
Max observed my behavior and did that of the other inside.

Both OK → the other member's...

Max observed the behavior of the judge, and also that of the lawyer's...
be + with and have

Jack with a Caddy! ?!!  <<
The man with a Caddy sang

So:  Why Deletion  >  Incredulity Deletion
Transformational relatedness

3/29/72

This is probably a squish, too.
What's necessary is an investigation of what types of rules preserve less.

1. Cooccurrence
2. Strict subcategorization
3. Structure

---

take a walk + walk are weakly related

do studying + study are more strongly related

Maybe revised refusal + refuse are even more strongly related

V Prt NP + V NP Prt are most strongly related

maybe
Fact from Edwin:

I think that he will probably be on time.

I think that he will evidently be unexpected.

I think that I know am glad.

I am surprised.
Agents with adjectives

pregnant by X
He is a man who only people who know him can appreciate him.
Facts from Niam:

people who have seen {them} know that {the belly of a turtle} can be white
NP flush

This was made reluctant use of

- no
- extension
- occasional
- clever
There are \{ \text{another} \} class of counterexamples.
Facts from Emily:

* A man <
?? A certain man <
A certain man I know
This guy <
This guy I know

so tell

Indefiniteness speech

3/28/72
Equis Hierarchy

3/27/72

Eqm — superficial subjects only

NonEqm — deep types & superficials
Facts from talking w/ Edwin:

probably  >  \{\text{luckily, fortunately}\} (for NP)  >  \{\text{cleverly, kindly}\} (on the part of NP)

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\text{Act} & \text{Physician's view} & \text{Hurtful} & \text{Assorted adjectives} & \text{Adverbs negating} & \text{NP actual} \\
\hline
\text{probably} & \checkmark & \text{No} & \checkmark & \text{No} & \checkmark & \times \\
\text{luckily} & \checkmark & \text{No} & ? & \checkmark & \checkmark & \times \\
\text{cleverly} & \times & \text{Half} & ? & \checkmark & \checkmark \\
\text{reluctantly} & \times & \text{Yes} & \checkmark & \text{Yes} & \xmark & \xmark \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lucky to</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>XX</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Neg</th>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>Almost?</th>
<th>Heavily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clever to</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>OK in a sense</td>
<td>(P, almost)</td>
<td>No - presence is only material</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reluctant to</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This was a cluster of ?? unrelated to

It was lucky for me that 5

Very loose connection - essentially, topic-comment, or even lower (cf. it was lucky for me that 2.)

It was clever of me that 5

Almost obligatory for a pronoun to appear on 5:

Apparent exception (via TDC)

It was clever of Lyden that they

With it was clever of Max that Salty threw the ball to him, there's a strong feeling that Max had had been declared
With reluctant, no flip form: as the subj of the adjective, gets more and more responsible for the complement, then on the top.

Clever involves a judgment by the next highest seer or thinker. That the relationship between some animate NP and a non-accidental event was a (good) result of the NP's intellect.

Reluctant involves an appraisal, an assessment, or a report, not a judgment.

Max was clever to go there reluctantly.

Max was reluctant to beat me cleverly.
It was intentional if NP

$\{ \text{That } S \}
\text{ for NP to NP}

\text{If } \neq, \text{ I strong feeling I have } \rightarrow S

S was accidental if NP

\text{Seems to essentially deny that I any possible agent connected with an event.}
Selection as a variable process

1. Selection into that-clauses < selection into non-finites < selection with modals

2. Selection with contiguous elements > selection w/ linked elements (can't seem to < seem to can't)

3. Selection from within a word is weaker than selection outside

Larry: 

- unless < if not
- unnoticed by a soul < without being noticed by a soul
- kill < cause to die
- doubt < think not
- deny << say not
Hopping and selection

3/24/72

It seems that he can't help farting

He can't seem to help farting

Principle: hopped things have less influence than non-hopped.
If Sorge is right, that ask = say-want
only by virtue of a TDC, then they must apply to
their own outputs, because the TDC which
which makes requests in the object of say must
be able to work here.
Fact pointed out in class by Emily:

If underlying elements don't make it to the surface because something is missing, there is more freedom than there would have been if they had been present [Unlike Mary >*Mary dead]*

If underlying elements get incorporated with others, squished together, deagglutinated, there is less freedom than there would have been had they been present [Bill < current-year dead]

4/23/72

This is something about becoming a word which allows all kinds of meaning to arise. Once a word has formed, especially an indecomposable one, it acquires a life and direction of its own.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>tell apart</th>
<th>tell the difference</th>
<th>tell that</th>
<th>afford</th>
<th>help Vip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>possible that</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how do you present</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tough</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>too / enough</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>possible for</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be able / can't seem to</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>can</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ability < able
know how to manage
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4/25/72</th>
<th>I expect tomorrow to break at 5 for lunch</th>
<th>It will do A you</th>
<th>need some good right do</th>
<th>have to do</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>expect that</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hope that / if assume that's</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>? ✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expect to</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hope to</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be going to</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>? x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5/1/72

Pro as Future: We are breaking for lunch tomorrow.

5/1/72

Will hoping: I want hope that I am right back.

I really like for Sally to be right away.
act → instrumental acts → changes → achievements

instantaneous events → states → adjectives

Thus: no language will have do above this

without also having done above all verbs which have

privacy over it.
Directional squint (Y) and close to Y?  

\[
\begin{aligned}
\text{put } & \times \quad \{ \\
\frac{\text{in (to) Y}}{\text{on (to) Y}} \\
\text{at Y's feet} \\
* \text{at my house} \\
\text{with Y} \\
\} \quad \text{what's the difference here?} \\
* \text{to } Y
\end{aligned}
\]

\[
\text{violently} \quad \overline{\text{rifle}} \quad \left( \text{in (to)} \right) \quad \left[ \begin{array}{c} \\
\text{foot} \\
\text{check} \\
\text{Y's} \\
\end{array} \right] \quad \text{put (in (to))} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{place (into)} \\
\text{keep} \\
\text{case} \\
\end{array} + D \text{ loc}
\]

Yuk Stop! 3/31/72

Bruce sounds out: whisper \[ \frac{\text{to}}{* \text{to}} \] the way but short for all
230 is cyclic!

I consider there insufficient evidence to proceed

There is considered insufficient evidence to proceed
If you say, like Ray does, that the VP scope rule is blocked for sentence-initial adverb, how do you get the generalization that closely bound to V don't prevage?
Paul Botel suggests that these mean

The answer to your question is as stupidly obvious as the answer to the question as to whether a grizzly bear sleeps in the winter.

(They aren’t quite good enough - the answers to both must be “yes.”)

But there does seem to be DEG involved here somewhere:

Q: Do you like pizza?
A: Do horses like pizza? (from Emily)

A: * Is Wieder opposite from Schoenfeld?
Consider interrogate. It must come from interrogate (i.e., xerox, perspective, xerox).

\[ \#_N \]

\[ \text{Degeneration} \quad \text{Formation} \]

\[ \text{parade } [\ldots x\ldots] \text{ is ok} \]

\[ \text{except when } E \# \text{ here} \]

\[ \text{passing etc.} \]

\[ \text{O} \# \text{ in referral} \]

\[ 1. \quad \text{O is best guess of } \#_N \]

\[ 2. \quad \text{O} \; \text{OC on } \#_N \]

\[ 3. \quad \text{[novel]} \#_N \# \text{ ice} \quad \text{apply MSR w/ # to the left} \]

4. This structure must be preserved to the output so that this OC can work.
V# Destress

* potato

\[1 \div \text{potato}^3\]

What would happen to /potato/?

/ potætə /

1, 2, M3R, A3R

20X
Subjunctive Lowering

3/20/72

I wish that the girls who [were] planning to come would write to any girl who were going to be there would help each girl.

If everybody who were coming had written, we would have a successful event.

It's (?) where any goes to del cl.
Ich wusste, daß das Ruhm *schwer war, zu lösen*

schwer zu lösen war

So: TM hardly (but why E? the cliff?)

occurs except in top 5's.
OBL - inversion - Any wh-word, even one marked

Anna's pictures of whom [did he throw away]

Both, neither

Anna's selecting whom did you resent

OBL - inversion in as and in and so too

Pretty OBL - inversion w/ prefixed Neg

(but cf. None of them we could invite)

OIT - inversion after than, as
REF-Questions

3/19/72

NB. Maybe even this work.

Anna’s meeting with whom?

Did you meet him? There are the Qs that Emily describes:

He left. Who left?

Here’s a proof that it’s not exactly the same rule that forms them:

Anna’s pictures of whom?

[?? you took back]

[? did you take back?]

NB — here the WH word triggers SVI, where a negative wouldn’t.

Cf. *Anna’s pictures of nobody did we buy

Actually, both of these are rotten, a very interesting fact.

Obviously, it would be unsightful to merely block her who in proposed constituents [NB that Anna’s pictures of WHM came out well & OK], because that would raise the generalization that this proposed rule, which came
Facts from Larry:
pro or anti-Cassidy
in or exterior decorating
Fact from Larry

unbearable /s can't bear

3/17/22
Fact from Emily

Max is more sad than he is desperate.

NB: OBL pronoun
I'd help you > promise

Just let me know if you need any help