Maybe the idea of language is understood.

how to open it:

I know that i

[Handwritten diagram or equation]
1. Helped by generic oil: depth of (*the) water indicator
   [NB: an indicator of the depth of (*the) water]
2. Less incorporated phonologically than elsewhere

   - I love
     - people
     - children
     - women
     - mice
     - bugs

   - I'm a
     - people
     - children
     - alumni
     - mice

3. I'm a
   - cups of (*hot) tea
     - bottle of (*German) wine
     - food

4. a surfing (*without clothes) lover
   - a *without clothes surfing lover

- a Stark-fishing enthusiast
- a?* fishing for Stark

1/10/76
>> "an easy to make pie"
1/10/76
>> "an easy to bake pie"

1/10/76
>> "weekend fishing"
These seem to be ≠ to regular imperatives - of

* Nobody kiss off

Cf. also *Somebody kiss off

This might be bad because of negation: *Don't kiss off
I told you to kiss off.

Why?
A. Define

b. Affine

1. k

3. 1

5. 0

7. G

K

The homomorphic van X of the 
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Nicely and analogously

Liza Cooper's fact

Thank god only will go into factue

complements

We [realize] that there are, thank god, volunteers.

Works w/ I [Suppose guess] [Issues]
You ate the bread (up) on me.

He withheld some of the beer on me.

*much
Garden paths

I adapted this one in Mike Oaks's general's paper.

The posteriori of the data used involved consideration, extraneous to the identity of the derived concepts.

The procedure used involved logical concepts.
Echo PQo + pro V'o

He is WHAT *(TING) + Jack ?!? ( = biting)

He WHAT (to) Jack ?!? ( = bite)

He has WHAT *(TED)

He has WHAT *(TED)

He is WHAT *(TING) to Jack ?!? ( = infesting)

He is WHAT Jack ?!? ( = on)

He is WHAT Jack ?!? ( = under)

He is WHAT Jack ?!? ( = far)

He is WHAT Jack ?!? ( = etc.)
Thought in gang's talk

There were several ships believed to have been lost

There were believed to have been several ships lost

* I wonder how many ships there were believed to have been lost in the storm

This seems wrong from either source—Why?
Happen has the global filler, 

In SS, its subject cannot be realized as an clause. (overly sentence)

Seem has the opposite restriction.

Paul Postal suggests:

Seem must meet the cycle-final condition: $I V (III) Chome I$
German passive? I think.

*Ihr wurde geholfen*

can't come from an *er*-infinitive

because of

*Es wurde *ihm* geholfen*

This being so, how come
double object V have no dative passive?

Cf. *Ihn wurde *ihnen* Bücher geschickt*

12/24 I'm sorry the job is OK.
What was the belief was that he was brilliant.

I feel

That he was brilliant was the belief.

I feel
Maybe S's like

It was felt by Tom that S

aren't from Passwa but rather from

the I → t rule of Sinhalese

It was kicked Tom by Jerry

It was fired to help her
10:30 am to 12:00 pm

How can they arrange for a meeting?!
I

(10) nb

\[ \text{nb} + \frac{\text{nb}}{\text{verb, verb}} \]

and

(11) + some capable verb, and

(11) + some capable verb, and

(11) + some capable verb, and

I think so possibly because of the delimiter, not only that in the shaded area from a horizontal, vertical, or both.

Predicate: (11') let you recommend so to
Fact discovered while talking with Bill Cooper

I consider that it is more OBL to be sad than to be sad.

Raising is more OBL than a deletion.

Welche Frau liest die Mutte.

Of no OBL, focalization is not
Sally did not assume that Sally knew.

Bill warned Sally.

Bill told Sally that he was in love with her.

Sally heard from Bill.

Bill explained to Sally.

Bill yelled at Sally.

Bill threatened Sally.

That he was fond of her.

and Sam told Gretchen.
1. Theme + S/O

2. $V_4$, in which only the subject is thematic. carry]

3. $V_4$, in which both subject and object are thematic. (are they?)

If so, how do we state it?
de to - V C happen to V

CJ. What happened to Mike is that he stumbled.
What I'm driving at is I'm driving at that S

If this really has to be postulated then what's the condition on drive at?
A Rule for Poop Detention

I'm going
He went

He has gone

He {?

He {?

* Go (into the cash tray)

I wonder if go = urinate only when go pee could occur.

Thus: *He went pee but Did he go pee?

I fail
No won't
Did he go?

It's a low-falutin word: ?I'll recommend it to you!
Do I take it that you've read The Kapital?

great lil' distribution

(0) - First person sun mask. no person.

Yuck.
I idoms that are restricted to

than - clauses  (meet the eye, shake a stick at)

unless - clauses  (was one's guess)

I - clauses  (it were not for)

O - clauses  (drive at)

But I have found no idiom that only occurs in relative clauses.
Anti-generic oil

John is claimed to have bitten a sophomore.
The wife one

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{One's cats} & \quad \text{love one} \\
\times \text{you} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

\{ *I \}
\[
\text{The grebe} \quad \text{mates with the owl}
\]

But NB:

He hunts the owl

I admire the beaver

Why good?
Responsibility and plausibility

The plain NP must not be in an island

John began to find that the girl that people liked was eating a red leg.

John began to find that people were credulous.
Maybe this explains why $\Phi$ has been tackling.

i.e., why $\exists \text{Proj Pass but } \Phi \text{ Pass Proj}$ or it might be whatever blocks $\exists$ like keep from being passmaged.

*Running was kept by Harry*

[As contrast?]*
?? He is known to have used to be a witch

9. *He has used to go riding
From Jim McCawley:

I know what the score is.

This idiom violates the otherwise general law that no idiom contains as a complement a fixed [i.e., variable-less] clause.

Andy Anderson can say *What's the score?* in the appropriate sense, but that's not very good form.
Jim Simpson, NBC sports commentator:

None of these scores may hold up.

This has the intended reading: $\Diamond \not\Diamond$.

Why can't $\not\Diamond$ have another reading? $\not\Diamond \Diamond$?
(No other interesting fact is that the number of presuppositions a sentence can have is finite. That is, there are detachment rules for presuppositions, they are not new ones.

If presuppositions start out in logical representation and can have various effects on derivations, as LS assumes, this fact is explained.

However, if there are detachment rules, there is no logical reason why they shouldn't be removed. Of course, various formal constraints can be imposed on them which will have that effect, but I see no natural explanation of the finiteness of the set of presuppositions.)
Category squash 230

It only works (after) when

He seems (to be) sick

He is likely (to be) sick
yet

I am going to fool you yet.

I want

I should

10/18/74
He is driving at what? What else are you driving at?

What do you think he's driving at?

I wonder what he's driving at. I'm surprised.

I'm not sure what he's driving at.

What do he driving at, do you think?
Ms.: what did he drive at?

What I'm driving at is his lulleness.

It's his lulleness that I'm driving at.

Why isn't he lulleness you can't be driving at.

I'm driving at, and Tom too so quite concerned with Bill's lulleness.
Tom is, will we read if {themselves}?

The Tom and that ball may be good.

If {herself}
Fact from Richie Kayne

They all died

They were in ___ Communists ___ when they did ___ Communists ___
1 2 kinds of epithets

George P. 

that wondrous man!

the 57 senator

Cf. also "Jurgen" paper on

"Ausflammen: p. 31" for 2

Ihn schlagen die zu Himmel der Attentäter

den Haken

Also: Sir, ich der Halunke für 2, ein ergebner Wunschnichte
Ill bring their her them for Tuesday.

So on depends on whether object has criticized.
Preposition deletion and the category squish.

10/9/74

All this, by the way, was spurred by Sympsonicity: talking to Ben Borman after reading his paper about P & X in Indonesia. I came upon the fact in the other P & X squadron 11/9.

While reading my Entropian, which had happened to come in the mail in Kritken.

I knew I was mad. too strong: I knew I was mad.

This must be the same fact as

It surprised (to) me. 

\[ \text{was surprised} \] *(to) me*
I drove (the Olds) weeks.

The Olds was driven weeks. Thus the rule is stupid—

* Weeks were driven

The bed was slept

The bed was slept in bed

The bed was slept in the bed

Maybe the reason that for IO's won't

passage is that they's not quite full

That they're further from X than X from IO:
Squash of right-rippling strength in German

Facts unearthed with Jürgen

Stronger rippers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extrasp.</th>
<th>NPShift</th>
<th>Extrasp. from NP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VP Split</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ich habe das vers. zu tun]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strength of restriction

[Ich habe Inf - venusst]
I have no desire to write. Except (to Jack) about the Center.

He did nothing. Except: (to go home) at home.

He has done nothing. Except (to go home) at home.

So let's assume this comes from this by rhymin or slicin.

Where's this come from? Maybe from

I have no desire to write. Except that I have a desire to write about the Center.
5 from Len Berman's paper (on dates, etc. in Russian): (p.18)

"One could handle these dates by claiming all kinds of highly restricted orderings to be necessary."

We are claiming:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{Tax to be made} \\
&\text{these truths to be self-evident} \\
&\text{some difficulties to be unavoidable}
\end{align*}
\]

What is going on?
I'd better say for

\{ damn

*gesessen zu haben

Same in French and Russian and I think

Russian Italian

So be is an easier V to obliterate

Than contention ones. Maybe always true?

Whenever Vf be debts, be even too?
If you want P to be sunny, may P*(be sunny).

Why?
Fact noticed in Mike Cohen's talk.

Everything was developing even faster than the subjects had before.
If \{he\} protected, every \{body\} was jailed.

If \{he\} protected, the sheriff jailed every \{body\}. 

9/23/74
I almost believe that whales are mammals. Betty is always late.

Help help:

They

I almost know

Who did it,

whether he left? (or not)

That he's sick

I (almost) realize when he was there

They (? almost) realize

I'm (almost) surprised
be ramp

+ Tom raced to go

only after being

people ramp to help could pick up

If good, I staffing
\( i \rightarrow \epsilon i \)
\( e \rightarrow \epsilon e \)
\( \epsilon \rightarrow \epsilon \epsilon \)
\( x \rightarrow x y \)

\( [\cdot] \rightarrow i \)
\( [\wedge] \rightarrow I \)
\( [\exists] \rightarrow \omega \)
\( ? \rightarrow ? \)

\( \epsilon i \rightarrow x(\epsilon) \)
\( \epsilon y \rightarrow \epsilon y \)
\( \epsilon y \rightarrow x \epsilon y \)
\( m w \rightarrow x \epsilon w \)
\( w m \rightarrow w \epsilon w \)
\( o w \rightarrow e w \)
Chances are... hacking.

He will, chances are, kick us out.

Since this is rusty, I'm hacking.
8/8/74

If you don’t mind,

- John is a bore, please.
- Stand up, please.
- What is your name, please.

Clearly, this is from...and telling me...
Squibs

8/10/74

Dear Bierce,

Jesus Christ!

Sean

Benedict! Russell

I am to be a Daniel

Love,

 mimetype

Captured by readers. I eagerly await Oct

Cummings

Bartley [last

debt...?

Thank you.

"What's this all about?" he yells.

[Is this code?]
\[ C_p = V \]

Because otherwise, why don't we find \[ \{ V, 0 \} \] or \[ \{ 0, C_p \} \]?

??
Types of Idioms

Determiners show up as idioms:

one or another

many a
I spent {my} true
*your*

My time has been spent in lifting precedents.

Thus this must have arisen via some rule which deleted by me

Note that it’s not performative related!

\[ \text{NB} \]

Max’s time was spent (? by him) *in running*
But and If-Infersion

\[
\text{If we but knew}
\]

\[
\text{If we but had known}
\]

Thus that structure is selectable by an illusion.
{the \{my\} \{?\}} \rightarrow \emptyset \quad / \quad \text{A count}

only if that describes an event

\[ 8/3/74 \text{ They have in hospital in Canada (and England?)} \]

\[ \text{Not right, but something like that.} \]

\[ \text{at/ in 4o} \quad \{ \text{bed} \} \]

\[ \text{church} \]

\[ \text{school} \]

\[ \text{university} \]

\[ \text{temple} \]

\[ \text{go in bed} \]

\[ \text{The pillon} \]

\[ \text{This road goes to church} \]

\[ \text{But why? My books are at school} \]

\[ \text{When? My books are in church} \]

\[ \text{M3} \quad \{ \text{Church?} \quad \{ \text{starts} \text{ at} 5 \} \]

\[ \text{School} \quad \{ \text{* is on 10th St.} \]

\[ \text{* Bed} \]
Why?

This needs your approval (of).

Why that?

This fund needs contributing (money) to.

This needs talking (to people) about.
1. The subject is [VStake]
   * This task needs repeated checking.

2. The number the C in V+C+P
   the worse thing one being wrong
   * This needs
     ?? telling go to
     ?? making sure
     ?? paying [clos] attention
   * Make sure for new ad

3. This needs
   ?? some
   ?? much
   ?? little
   ?? a lot
   ?? a bunch of
   * Look at

4. These need several worst
   * NB
This needs both at + pronoun + en + plurality

So the verbier the pre-form, the less pluralizable thing an.
(Cf. p. 2 #4)

5. Negatives aren't too cool:

This doesn't need 

\{?

a good looking at

?even a cursory looking at\}.
Independence of Topic-Comment and Focus-Resumption

1. $T = F, C \text{ unique}, P \text{ unique}$
2. $T = F, C = P$
3. $T = P, C \text{ unique}, F \text{ unique}$
4. $T = P, C = F$
5. $T \text{ unique}, C \text{ unique}, P \text{ unique}, F \text{ unique}$
6. $T \text{ unique}, F \text{ unique}, C = P$
7. $T \text{ unique}, P \text{ unique}, C = F$

As for birds, they sing

As for Tom, who likes even
In \{ \text{reading} \}
\begin{align*}
\text{by reading the letter } K &\text{ I tend to dream} \\
\end{align*}

Thus \underline{\text{on}} \underline{\text{within}} \underline{\text{by}} = \underline{\text{End}}
\underline{\text{in}} \underline{\text{for}} \underline{\text{since}} = \underline{\text{Begin}}

His reading (*the letter K) began outside

His reading \{ \text{the letter } K \}
\begin{align*}
\text{ended at 5} \\
\text{*some novels}
\end{align*}

\underline{\text{I turned the page > I turned seven > I turned pages}}

\underline{\text{Yeams for}}
\underline{\text{I'm passing with a swamps for charge}}
\underline{\text{I'm taking a kiss for charge}}
7/19/74

Climbing in Italian

sembro averlo visto
Q: Vuoi farlo?
A: Sì - voglio

Q: Hai dormito?
A: Sì - ho

Q: Stai dormendo?
A: Sì - sto
cut sur

Q: Hai fatto tagliare un abito?
A: Sì - ho fatto
Climbing in Italian: facts from Donna Amanti.

Facts from Donna Amanti:

- All dialects allow climbing:
  - stare per bene (to be well)
  - stare bene
  - stare a bene

- Usare (di) (used to)
  - stare benedetto (used to stay well)

- Saper (di) (know how to)
  - stare benedetto (used to stay well)

- Volere (di) (desire)
  - stare benedetto (used to stay well)

- Perdere (di) (lose)
  - stare benedetto (used to stay well)

- Provar (di) (try)
  - stare benedetto (used to stay well)

- Cominciare a (begin to)
  - stare benedetto (used to stay well)

- Continuare a (continue to)
  - stare benedetto (used to stay well)

- Diavolezza (dialect variation)
  - Souteniers do worse than Northerners

- Quisere (di) (will want)
  - preferire (di) (prefer)
  - desiderare (di) (desire)
  - amare (di) (love)
  - odiare (di) (hate)
  - depurare (di) (purify)

- Se (di) (if)
  - dubitare (di) (doubt)
  - detestare (di) (detest)

- No en NP a S
  - allow climbing
  - area of Voice or deletion

- As in

- Amanti,dia

- Non can climb

- Americano di

- Suggestion:
  - No one can climb.
Old French

vent wanger le

1 Verb

New French

vent wanger le

2 Verbs

What happened here?
Connections:
1. Aliens will exist. States.
2. ↑ Fake → [↑ Near, ↑ S]
   {↑ Hot, ↑ Many}
3. ↓ Treasure → [↑ Near]
   {↓ Fake}

Presupposed
↓ S
Heard at Paul's Mall, from one waitress

do you want to keep a tab?

7/16/74

Also:

Put that on my tab.

7/18/74

So keep tabs on, so really just

Keep records on

where \( \text{tab} = \text{bill} \Rightarrow \text{tab} = \text{track} \)
Inwardly is a function of \( \{ \text{outwardosity} \} \) \( \cap \) \( \text{nearness to Vee} \) \( \cap \) \( \text{assertiveness} \) \( \cap \) \( \text{immediacy} \).

\[ \uparrow \text{Support} \quad \downarrow \text{Computed} \quad \uparrow \text{Cost} \quad \downarrow \text{Validity} \quad \uparrow \text{Dependence} \Rightarrow \]

\[ \uparrow \text{Dependibility} \]

\[ \text{Centrality} \Rightarrow \text{Dependibility} \]

\[ \downarrow \text{Nearness to Vee} \]

\[ \text{Center} \]

\[ \downarrow \text{Wiggliness} \]

\[ \downarrow S \]
I

\frac{\text{slept months}}{\text{could sleep months}} \quad \text{(}\ast \text{ eat}\text{)} \quad \text{could}\ \text{sleep}\ \text{(}\ast \text{ eat}\text{)} \quad \text{Thursday}

\frac{\text{shaking} \quad \text{(a sinister laugh)} \quad \text{but heart out}}{\text{drank (beer) his ass off}}
Sources of prepositions

Fact: (from Ed Keenan): prepositions come from verbs.

John took the book to Bob.

John took the book to Bill, Joe.

My addition: Note we have a sequence of V + NPs.

? *I'll take him to go (right judgement)
Here's one of the form

V + C + P

where the C looks adverbed in source.
S — assertion

N — presupposition

Semantics (past)
7/11/74

Fact from Evelyn Parson:

before Ving < requires event third

Before

\{\text{*being surpised at me} \}
\{\text{fell} \}
\{\text{being taken by surprise} \}
\text{reddening}

\text{John was perturbed}
## Nearest to Vee

7/9/74

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jo</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Un</th>
<th>Tot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pla-a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trv-a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-14</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Fraction | 2 1/2 | 2 1/2 | 8 1/2 | 8 1/2 | 3 1/2 |

This spread is a double-ender

7/10/74

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Res</th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>VP Front</th>
<th>VP Back</th>
<th>Left</th>
<th>Follow</th>
<th>Follow</th>
<th>Follow</th>
<th>Follow</th>
<th>Follow</th>
<th>Follow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$*$</td>
<td>$*$</td>
<td>$*$</td>
<td>$*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$?$</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(In terms and idioms)

Fact from Paul Kepner:

* The [engine] killed the bucket

The [spider] died.

But NB: the engine but the dust

spider

death of the bucket = die

So: in general, the more idiomatic a phrase is, the more central its arguments will be.

Hypothesis: no idiom will be formed which will have a range of meanings that does not contain the central meaning
It's no accident that there are no laws like brute force that allow Not Hoping. They also make rebels for some rules.
we've never had company kept on us

we've had tools made out of us
Backwards pronoun make, Apple Age, IO Switch, etc.

6/28/74

They made fools out of \{ \}

Obviously must have a special source.

? I’ve never had a foot made out of me.

?* I’ve never had company to fix me
Phonological identity for deletion (?)

{Does he} like her or she hate her?
{Do you}

{Am I crazy or you save?}
Tell me the exact chair that you sat in

exactly which chair you sat in

So exact is only a possible modifier of chair in cases where chair is the head NP of an NP that is occurring where a Ω could.

Hey! New {exact, present, presumed, known} whereabouts

We know independently that whereabouts only occurs where Ω can, so this ties in well with this.
Hey - do synonymous idioms ever behave differently? If not, this is a clear case of semantics calling the shots.

** The bucket was kicked
* the duck was bitten
** messes are being pushed up
* one was [stuffed] by Ted
  [caught]
* Ted's last was breathed (by him)

But:

The cat was let out of the bag by Sally
* the beans were spilled by Sally

So maybe idioms do have their own syntactic properties.
There is every intention type text plan

I have every indication reason proposal demonstration to X
There was a lot of headway (that was) made.

This argues against a WAZ - deletion source.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Sequence of Verbs</th>
<th>Semantic Sense</th>
<th>to</th>
<th>Imparting Infinitive</th>
<th>-en</th>
<th>gaps w/o Complement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>be</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>w/agent</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be-prog</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>w/time</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be going to</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Advice: Don't always play up</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>need</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>I don't like it anymore and play more</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>can be to</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?* Is it to make something as it?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will, may</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?* Is it to make something as it?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>must</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- "V" indicates a verb.
- "√" indicates a checkmark.
- "×" indicates a cross.
- "?" indicates a question mark.
- "?*" indicates a note or comment.
- "-en" indicates the -en ending.
- "w/" indicates with.
- "Infinitive" refers to the infinitive form of the verb.
- "gaps w/o Complement" indicates gaps without a complement.

**Date:** 6/17/74
He left so that I could write

\[
\emptyset
\]

I was so pissed off that I took a taxi

\[
\emptyset
\]

So hypostasis → pantanask

Are there cases of the reverse?

Note also: He is taller than Pete is

Thus: Inverted order is roosty, and I predict (1:56 pm) that these 5s won't embed where roosty types want.

That he is taller than { Pete is \* is Pete } is too bad.

Yay! Prediction confirmed.
This means that the conversion of \(\text{than NP Aux} \to \text{than Aux NP}\) is a step towards the tree top for the \(\text{than}-\text{clause}\).

I don't know why, but this seems to go along with that increased coarseness:

\[
\text{Nobody is taller than}\{\text{his mother is}\} \quad \text{v.}\quad \{\text{his mother}\}.
\]

And remember Paul Boas's S:

That he erased is more incriminating than

\[
\{\text{that he erased is}\} \\
\{\text{*is that he erased}\}
\]

This may be out for the same reason that this is:

\[
\text{*I consider reprehensible that he might keep suspension}
\]
Squashes of syntactic fun

More fun

Clearance  Nounness  Faded NPs  Category  Spatial
That S  S  NP  V  Inner
       Adjuncts  Subjects  V  say

Think

Canonical
V + object

Less fun

\[ \downarrow \text{Seasonal} \downarrow V_{1} \downarrow V_{2} \downarrow N \downarrow \text{Adverbs} \downarrow N \downarrow \text{outer Adjuncts} \]
Sandra is a demon *(of 14th St.)*

[Temporarily requires an object]
This problem is too trivial for there to be people working on it.

What's this?

It reminds me of:

Two readiness

\( \{ \text{to go} \} \)

is for us to look at

He is ready for there to be an investigation of it.

So when object deletion applies, the complaint

must be evidently?

endowed?
I begin by phrases

From a letter to Roman:

I began the letter by describing the coincidences.

My describing the coincidences began the letter.

He—or here, begin in an existential causative—

That's why I hid it of a by-phrase with it.
What kind of constituents can idiomatic expressions stand for?

V - { eke out, hear't han', let go of, keep company }

Adj - { at large, bananas }

VP - { take gas, screw around }

S - Like father, like son

Tenseless S - Il y avair du monde au balcon (does this raise?)

Direction - to and fro

Manner - car f the life, bit by bit, like a bit of pill

Selective - by and large

Degree - X's ass off

Duration - for hours, some, now, sleep to (?)

Comparatives - by far

Time - today, tonight, after all, ago

to-phrases (enough ... to choke a horse)

as clauses

unless - clauses (unless I miss my guess)

if - clauses (if you please, if not for you)

than - clauses (Shake a stick at, meet the eye)
Certainly D anyway, because I prove $S_2$

I prove $S_2$ to Jack

but

There proved (to me) to be no milk

It also threatened

He threatened that $S$

He threatened we will jail

There threatened to be a walkout

Ditto also not sure. I'm sure of that

There is sure to be a storm
We agonized over \{ * that S \}
\{ * Poo Inv \}
\{ Act Nom \}
\{ Der Nom \}

\{ ? Q \}
\{ Poo Inv \}
\{ Act Nom \}
\{ Der Nom \}

\{ was agonizing (to us) \}
\{ * agonized (us) \}

Why \# agonize like surprise?
(A) I want Jeff to begin to run, and I want you to do so too.

(B) * I want headway to begin to be made on this, but Sam wants a bit of headway to do so.

This seems terribly wrong.
We can't maintain that \underline{make headway always} occurs under \underline{do}, because \underline{what would stop (B) ? So what do we send?}

\underline{make headway requires the fat \underline{V up} to be either be or do? Yeeceeh.}
Note that if \text{CAUSE} can ever have agential subjects at all (dubious) then they can't be coreferential with the agential subject of the object of \text{CAUSE}

What Jacki caused was that he \{ \text{was nominated} \}

And \text{DO} is equi-subject.

Very suspicious.

And if \text{CAUSE} \neq \text{DO}, we'll have to postulate a feature \{-\text{Equi Subj}\}, which is otherwise \text{no}.
Idioms + as-clauses

As luck would have it, S

This one only occurs in as-clauses.

5/30/74
I never remember \( \exists x \) saying like this.

This argues for there being

\( \exists x \)

\( \exists y \)

\( \exists z \)
D = {1, 4, 7, 10, 13, 16, 19}  
A = {2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20}  
B = {1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21}  
C = {2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20}  
D = {1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21}  

8/24/74
Wording up

This bill was indicative to me of that.

NB: of inserted
Why do we never say that subjects agree with verbs? Or objects, etc.?
Vomitory idioms

- throw up
- upchuck
- puke
- barf
- York
- Flash

- blow (one's) { lunch, chow, cookies }
- keep { (one's) { lunch, chow, cookies } }
- toss { (one's) lunch, one's cookies }

- cast one's ballot
NB: when a 3-ary is mapped onto an adjective, it \( \neq \exists \text{ agent} \)

\[ \{ \text{This} \{ \# \text{Bill} \} \} \text{ is indicative to me of that.} \]
Directionality of agreement

Why don't we say that subjects agree with their verbs?
When words for acts (or events, even) are coined, they are primarily transitive. 

- pass
- buy
- flash
- vote
- york
- cast one's ballot
- chuck one's lunch
- toss one's cookies
- flip hash
- blow one's lunch
- fade
- red out
- pass out
- put the rack
- some Z's
There can't be a verb to dawn
which is unrelated to the noun dawn
Thus this must be part of some pattern

That's V P NP
s
experencer

Subj V S P NP to Predicate
exp

Why should seem + appear work here,
but not this derived V to dawn?
Ans: base V have more fun.
The reason lexicalism's structure-dependent way of saying "derived sentences don't nominalize" is that:

1. V's derived a don't undergo all T-rules that the source V could undergo:
   - No verb put the hands and read.

2. Idiomatic V don't acquire new senses:
   - [Presumably, the less prototypical, the more canonical it will be.

3. New V don't either: *Rehearse votes's class!

4. Position: with an V-izer, they are predominantly of the canonical form: waste, zap, blow (V to L).

5. Fantastic Fact: This means that idiomatic frozen focus shape something w/ nice forms!
Facts from dep w/ Bob May

V intransitive - There has yet to be a good party

NEG

* John hasn't yet to arrive

* Has J

? Wh, has

* M

John must have yet to pay

? Neg P: 

* Hasn't John

+ Has John not

+ Yet + leave?

Not embedded:

* That John has yet to pay is unlikely
This is a fairly weak polarity item (generalization made by Dave Perlwitz) 

I (don't) know it offhand.

Original bad S was due to Elke.
No wonder (*that*) he left
Reduced DIR

I left that out of it.

How come that moves? Isn't really a directional.
I bought Tom \{a car \over the car \over your car\}.
To get these at all, we'll have to change the rules.

At all

\[ \text{we changed} \]
Left Dislocation

5/20/74

{# Hm.}

{# Jackson}

I told that bastard where to go off.

\[\text{That bastard, I told Jackson to be on time.}\]

\[\text{** Jackson, you told who to be on time? }\]
5/19/74

He {doesn't write
never
seldom
hardly
?? infrequently
} doesn't or never write — not on Thursdays.

{Nobody
not many
few
} arrived — not on time.

He gave books to no one —

{not to friends? (anyway)
not for friends? (?? anyway)
not novels
not Ted
} that he'll go — not willingly.

I {don't believe
?? don't
} that he'll go — not willingly.

? It's unimportant that you eat these — not the chocolate ones.
Job was tested by God \[\text{by being visited w/ book}\]
\[\text{by visiting him w/ book}\]

Job was tested in order to \{be admitted to college\}
\{admit him to college\}

Double passive restriction
with by-phrases and IOT's
That - 30

My guess is:

- The reason is: "he couldn't"
- That the reason is: "he couldn't"

Seems to show an interdependence between these 2 applications - it's only OK downstream if it's been done upstairs.
Let's that presuppose the existence of a:

- excommunicate $\rightarrow$ church
- play hockey $\rightarrow$ school
- castle $\rightarrow$ chess
- fan, stuff $\rightarrow$ baseball
- fence $\rightarrow$ sword

But are there any reverse cases?

- event $\rightarrow$ happen
- act $\rightarrow$ do

might be, but I know of no L w/o these
Y's N have it over Y's N

My {proposal} has it over {your {proposal}} {suggestion}

Washing it had it all over keeping them

Anna's washing it had it all over your {fuming that?}

{refined}
Facts from Edward Thesis:

- Tell (io) {a story}
- Tell *(io) that S

Maybe Tell Q is only OK w/ conj Ph?

Now NB:

I told *(him) the way to do it

This argues that this clause is not deeply a NP, but has rather arisen via FRCF.

NP S
Gapping and closures

Gapping requires stress from that S to Acc Imp.

Would work w/ Poss Imp.

No.

* For Bill to go to NYC +

* For Ann to LA is too bad.

* For Ann, going to NYC +

* For Sandra to LA depresses me.

* Your
Since it can't be a possessive noun

its having been shot

This must be pretty wrong
There Insertion w/ correspond

Barbara

... to each such syntactic rule there must correspond a semantic rule

There must correspond

* a syntactic rule to each such syntactic rule
For Paul:

These adjectives are not comparable.

It's not an accident that this is the one you get, not this one.

This suggests that there's one basic rule for -able words, and then an optional fancy pants one.
I'm 36.

A fundamental difference stems from different beliefs about the answers to the question: "Is the world messy or neat?"

I tend not to believe that it's very neat. Noam, I think, believes the opposite.
on account of he don't talk so good
Comparatives (Ven + the Category Hierarchy)

tireder (? of that)

?? boredomer (* with my job)

?? posseder off >> ?* possed off

?* turneder on

?? fuckeder up

** hopeder for

** showered off
I'll give you a dime for every quarter you can stand on edge.

In the non-standard interpretation, this really means:

For every time you stand every quarter on its edge at...

When does this rule work?
Thoughts on DMR's talk:

1. If any rule that feeds agreement is cyclic, then \( \checkmark \)

The people that went haven't been determined.

2. \( \checkmark \) etc. feed PP Agreement in French.
Yet

?* He will yet solve it

It is {possible, conceivable, thinkable, imaginable} that he will yet solve it
We gotta go, don’t we? >

Do we gotta go? >

We don’t gotta go.

*I’m tired! gotta go*
gotta

5/1/74

We’re gotta go, {don’t we} {haven’t we}?

He’s gotta go, {doesn’t he} {hasn’t he}?

I don’t think we’ve gotta go, {do we} {have we}?

I don’t think he’s gotta go, {does he} {has he}?

I think he’s gotta do it, but they think he {doesn’t} {hasn’t}.

I don’t think he’s gotta do it, but they think he {does} {has}.

{Have} they got any reason for refusal?
hasta saber... just like a free V.

get must be deleted [V]

or inserted before Neg Pl., USI etc.

to get

He hasn't got egg

has n't got eggs
Don't be too stubborn to go to be nominated for us to nominate you.

Be ready to go to be looked at for me to look at you.

Subjecting + stability

4/30/74
Richard and the interpretation
of derived subjects

That they are being exploited so what they want to say

It looks like

That they are being exploited looks like it's what they want to say

Somehow, this one is "about" the context of the proposition, not about the wording.
The inspiration has to come from within themselves.

(If so, why?)

What made you change?
4/26/74

S from John Lawler (at CLS X)

It goes (to me) like S

These goes to me like there are a lot of
good vibes happening
Getting and you $20

give $10 to Mike, and you to Sam

So I you here.
Hooray! Finally an argument!
Hans H. K. suggests that personal modifiers in German may be adverbially more restricted than they would be in full clauses.

* Trotzdem *(noch) betrunkener Herr.
Are there any non-idiomatic activity that won't passivize?

Yes, I have NP 5. But by and large, the only exceptions to passive are statute V.
   1. Increased: Tissue becomes less volatile.

2. * The idea is to have good-looking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Good-looking</th>
<th>Good-listening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brinling</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hot soup</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cold drink</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cold drink warm can</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>salad</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fruit</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Core: Not mentioned.
fly \{on\} \{with\} \text{BoAC}

\downarrow \emptyset

ski Mt. Venus

\hline

walked for 10 \{miles\}

\downarrow \emptyset

go into the house

\downarrow \text{enter}

\hline

Are there ever reverse cases?

It seems that V+NP is the Vr-kombination, so processes shut at it, but not at the reverse [i.e. V NP \rightarrow VP NP]

\hline

NB: enters into an agreement

[so it looks like go \rightarrow enter/ into NP]
Idioms and CH

There are many V+NP idioms:
keep tabs on etc

no (I don't think) Adj+PP

Idioms, nor N+PP idioms.
Exception:

Incoherent

Unanswerable

Doubtful

This is unlikely anyway...

*Subtract

2+5

No ()

Section V fake profiles

Refills and stability
Simplesness, table
and nominalization

Cf. 10/4/73
and especially 3/11/73

* Its accountability for so wild

* writability down
* clear expressibility
* simpler wordability
Scraplessness + wording up

a 3 foot long couch

a 3 way ambiguous

a 3-way ambiguity

This drive toward stemhood, while incorporating, is the same as the drive toward scraplessness.
Strandung in der Mann

S from Klaus:

da könnt ihr kein Bild von machen

Also:

da könnt ihr nicht und machen

4/14/74
Nearing

Rosenblith called the President "Dr. Werner"
in replying to a hostile & from Bob Shannon,
where he had previously been letting us in by
using his nickname "Jerry"
1. No cyclic rule moves things rightwards (e.g., a / e / r. o.)
   (Just Insertion: First determine the subject; how, why, does
   the old subject end up where P does?)

2. Thus all cyclic rules move things up the hierarchy

3. Maybe not: Why might moving something freeze it
   (i.e., moving something down the hierarchy =
   freezing $\phi$)

   charming $\phi$ $\equiv$ freezing

Problem: Conjoint Movement

To find an ascension rule. If so, how come

the revised conjunct can freeze $\phi$?

She was $egin{cases} \text{argued not red} \quad \text{with} \\ \text{sum} \end{cases}$
Mom, no and one.

4/11/74

Jack's pattern *(1)* I mystified me, but Ann's didn't.
Like Dorothy Siegel's example, the similarity was noticed in 1586.
Why bad? Cf. The red wine and the white.  

The striking resemblance to a corked +  

*her partial (one) to a grapefruit got to me 

hers 

Her knowledge that $S_1$ + hers that $S_2$  

DE Stuff deletion, because otherwise  

we can't relate this to that  

Her striking claim that $S_1$, and her fascinating  

*(one) that $S$
Nobody said that they had each eaten two apples.

Suggests that this comes from he.
I. If we call, Tony shuts on one.

* Bill doubts that one has a chance.

4/9/74

Here shuts on Mary. <= Shuts on Mary

Why?
Gestern fing einen Fisch seine Schwester

Gestern

??? fuhr Rad seine Schwester

Gestern wachte auf seine Schwester
The floor will be polished by the woman who always does it.

The woman who does it has always been done by someone to keep polishing the floor.

The maid will polish the floor on every day when the sink is
"Mention" direct quote.

4/1/74

For that right out of my own freshness,

use grease-o.

NB - not speaker

I deplore that "get off my lawn" attitude.
The bear's will be to send a group to are also chained to their objects.

* There are pumpkins to stay under water

* There are pumpkins going to explode
Mein Bruder weiß, wo Hans wohnt, und meine Schwester, die Anschrift seiner Familie.

Und mein Bruder weiß, wo Hans wohnt, und meine Schwester die Anschrift seiner Familie.

Morgen wird die Sonne morgen.

Weil
Contractions: stress on 'be'

There may be oven? There may be oven.

He may be similar to you. He may be similar to you.

? He may resemble you. He may resemble you.

They said that there may be a storm, and

there may be? a storm may be.

What do you think?
The Quiet Charm of Being

4/1/74

Suckling a pint and her being by me.

Here, the only thing that Be Shift can say to that is w/ Brown.

But I was still a will so and expect.

He's being a part and her Q sign.
If; ...

The more away a verb like be is, the less it likes to have anything come between it and its object. arranged > attempt > try > begin > keep > be

* There are being guys tickled?

* Police he so being

Tom was being rude, and Fred was being too

has been rude and Fred has been too

Tom is being worse so to be (*being)?

There is police, and I'm going to try to be (*being)

India lost weight, and I'm going to try to begin (*beginning)?
The Great Chain of Being

He must \{\text{have been}\}, consequently, examined by Tarl.

He began reluctantly, \{\text{to write}\} things down.

??writing
Teach and future?

\{ That \} \{ *Joe *It \}
\{ *can *must \}
\{ Should *will \}
\{ *is *taught \}
\{ Has taught \}
\{ May have taught \}

\{ to talk back \}
\{ ?? for there to be no beer \}

I \{ hope *expect \} that this teaches you to talk back.

? *If this teaches him to talk back, I'll be glad

* This is going to teach him to talk back.

* \{ That won't *Nothing will \} teach him to talk back
If it were (not) for X, Y

This idiom only occurs in counterfactual conditionals, maybe not even in past ones, in the form

\[
\text{If it hadn't been for you, we would have won}
\]

\[
\text{Had it not been for you}
\]

NB: § in wish-clauses or in other subjective environments.

* I wish that it were (not) for you.

* Supposing that it were (not) for you, Y

Thus this idiom provides evidence for the existence of a T-rule which performs this inversion.
No JSC

There seem to be four or five spots for
outlets of the drain for
the

That you know Ann's father is well. We're not sure

Bill and Ann's father are well. We

Were you for her

Ann's father

so bad up the bar

who she is sick

3/27/74
p. 2
\[ \frac{p}{2} v - \frac{2}{3} vv' + 3 \sqrt{13} h_4 \]
Among a large number of
* an amorphous mass of

cookies

Collection

Great number

bunch pill heap

done bundle

cluster

bag

box

receptacle container

Doesn't require much plurality

Requires more

? We counted a cluster of species
When I do there-Claiming, there's more islanding than when non- I do.

* It's the bill that there's John for us to talk to about

* Reversed with Take-Claiming

* It's the bill that John took 5 hours to talk to us about

* It's the fact that we took 5 hours for John to talk to us about
3/25/74

I gave John them all (out because of [illegible]).

3/26/74

?? John was given them all ← Indicates that he has probably become a cheater.

?? These pills were given them all
? Swimming nude pays (?? for me).

It pays for me to swim nude.

What pays for me is to swim nude.
It's not too important. It's a point.

\[ \emptyset \rightarrow \phi \]

3/20/74
Susan Martin:
There arose no problems

Drew Kahn:
Problem: { never arose > }

Serious problems couldn't arise >

? There couldn't arise serious problems
5 from Susan Martin:

You remember that there's the train to Chicago.

From Evi:

Do you remember {that \*whether} there's the train to Chicago?

Is there *(still) the train to Chicago?
Fact from Mark Lieberman:

It was this table that there stood on — a rose

It was this table that there was on — a picture of Ted

So both are out because of NP stuff

It was that table that there [was] a picture of Jack on

[not much]

No worse than

?? Then lay a picture of Jack on the table
S from Susan Martin

There'd be the devil to pay
Fact from Nick Clements:

Where does he think (?? that) he gets off?
Objects of action now do.

1. Excludes highly sentential objects:
   - Her constant mentioning of the fact that he knew de Gaulle
   - Her rash attempting to climb

2. Excludes highly sentential stuff in the subject:
   - Her driving of them into bankruptcy
   - My classic proving of her... (unclear)

3. Tolerated, barely. PP
   - Her... glancing at her watch

From conversation with Paul Postle: 3/25/74

4. $ (lot) Ing's. His constant mentioning of Bill (is) being paid
   - His rash attempting of going out alone
for -> y / except - p

He drinks:
- except for Tuesdays
- except on Tuesdays
- except on Tuesdays

He ate everything:
- except (?) for the peas
- except ?? for the peas

We talked a bit:
- except for about sex
- except about sex
- except for sex

He did away with everyone except:
- for (** with) Sandy
- with
- Sandy

He stays home except:
- for during storms
- storms
Presumably, this also happened with new...

Does the reverse ever happen? If not, why?
We should not forget that $S_1$.

\[
\begin{cases}
\text{And (the fact) that } S_2 \\
\text{Or (the fact) that } S_2
\end{cases}
\]
* A man came in and I shot a woman who were similar

//'

* A man who I know and likes me buried
It sounds as if that is so

That sounds (to be) so
Wird du das bald in Erfahrung bringen können?

Also 1/21/74
Henk cited this fact from Nicholas Ray:

A qui as tu fait donner les valises à Jean (old I)

Only true statues move - III - Seemers

don't
There's your to play tennis with.

Thos can't be from a RC

The fact that I saw's like

There are papers to grade

Show that papers must have been the
subject once (because of the plural agreement).

Thus the source must be

by an ascension

into subject position

It's hard what there's
The fact that 3 RQs for 1 day show the need for a decentralized source

* Who left, didn't he?
Refereence Qs and antecedents

Cf. also (2b) of Ch. 3 of Peter.

In a field of co-referential pronouns, only the one that is the antecedent can be wh-ed.

Realizing that who was euphemistic, worried him? When [he] got up, {[he] was tired} was tired.

NB: only the antecedent can be wh-ed + multiple wh-word reference Qs.
* Who said that who was tired? ?? Who have I whose castle? ? They're talking to us about elsewhere?

This means that in certain cases, e.g., optional personification, there will be no reference questioning.

John, will enter, and John will win. *Who will enter, and {**Who?} will win?}
that he left proved that who was guilty?

> ?? That who left proved that he was guilty?

It was { * whose dog } that { who i } bit?

1 1

* He left, didn't who?

Take it with { * who's the i } will?

1 1

* The man who took a pistol with who left?
Reference Q's and antecedents

I may say Q's

1. You shouldn't have told him about it then because of the law.

2. I shouldn't have told WHO about what when ?? because of the law.

Note also that Q's seem bad in a number of cases. (and coordination ones)

* She doesn't like WHO, does she ?

* WHO's sick but the game will be played.

* LA, where WHO lives, is snappy?

* You want to go now so that WHO can get some sleep ?

* For WHO's fired ?

* WHO left, you don't doubt ?

* He goes there more often than WHO stays there ?
With two rel els, the first seems to have primacy.

? The girl who loved tickled the caterpillar that repelled him.

? The girl that he loved tickled the caterpillar that repelled who?

Both are pretty lurch.

* Because who looked sad she told you that he was dead?

? Because he looked sad she told you that who was dead?

Their invitation to whom preceded her invitation to whom?
At least one of the following is suggested by what?

* unlikely

What, not altogether
Extrinsic Ordering
+ BPC in Q' \\

Facts from Cole's Thesis, p.107

Wen, hätte der Glaube überrascht,

lAß er gestern Abend geheiratet hat?


Thes would appear to necessitate
the following extrinsic ordering

Exposition from NP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronominalization Check</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help, help</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Viciously
This is

language-

particularly

because

parallel 5's in

Hebrew are still out.

Ch. 5.6 vs Ch. 4 in Cole
Indefiniteness and
Word-words in pseudo-cliffs
+ Endings

Fast from Laskowski (1972) SLS Univ Ill
quoted in Cole's Thead

There's [* a ] President himself

"That"

The man [* who ] himself was sick left

* Who himself is sick?

{ The cooks } what itself needs sterilizing

{ * I know }

He told me the house [ * which ] itself was falling down

What itself needed sterilizing in the pimplscope.

So it looks as if this is from an RC.
Deletion analyses of that-clauses

as (A)

How can such S's be made via the deletion analysis?

(A) There's the book that the cover of, I designed.

NB that *(B) shows that typologization is in general barred from RC's.

* There's the guy that the cover of the book I will send to tomorrow.

Thus this must be being fronted by the rule from my RC's, which is impossible under the deletion analyses.

3/9/74
NB. When have goes, a new II ↓

made, because of

(A) Bagels are wanted

But apparently, \text{Eat-Deletion}
doesn't produce new I's in S's like (B)

(B) A little something \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{would be nice} \\ \text{was} \end{array} \right. \text{Why?}

because that won't raise

(C) * A little something would be likely to be nice
1. The verb for which Equi is only w/ non-agents.

2. Prevent makes only agentive raisees into derived subjects via Passive.

   Obviously, there will be no rule which passivizes only non-agentive derived objects.

3. Note that the top of the fake NP hierarchy has agentive NPs — and no rule works only on the fake NPs.

4. The no blocked for intervening agent subject, but no rule will be blocked only for intervening non-agents.

   \[ I \subseteq \text{Agent} \]
Since I's are normally agents, when non-agentive I's get annihilated, they don't get banished so far. Thus in (A)

(A) His rage surprised me.

old I

the old experience I is maybe a new I.

His rage surprised us both.

He surprised us both with his rage.

No difference, only maybe one can be found in another language.
Non-Terms

A. Don't control deletions
B. Don't antecedes reflexives
C. Don't agree V's
D. Don't host ascensions
E. Don't get replaced by dummies
(Non-terms aren't controllers)

But some get

(A) Sophia Loren was seen by them while shaving themselves

Prediction: all districts which get these will also get (B) [and hopefully (C) ?]

(B) They saw Sophia Loren while shaving themselves

(C) They saw Sophia Loren while shaving herself
Prediction: # which, when carrying
    a non-nominative subject, will
    up to its nominativeness. Well enough
    will be left alone (*).

gött läßt [mir friert]

↓

gött läßt mich frieren
There should be no rule which would climb things into II but not into a I that is derived from I.

(A) They decreased IBM in price.

(B) IBM was decreased in price.

Any rule which will do (A) should also be able to do (B).

Problem: 

$\alpha \rightarrow$ Raising in Japanese.

Responders. Help if $\alpha$ really aren't losing Raising, then maybe $\alpha$ just cannot occur in subject position.
Note that I dialects in which ∃ j's
like

(A) These were given John

i.e., in which Native produces a double II

But: I bet it will be showable that

even in those dialects that get (A), so like (B)

(B) John was given these

are more numerous and stronger, and

there will be no dialect which gets only (A).
want has OBL. Argument at I

E2 will have OBL. 


generalization: Subjects are unique:

1. Subject perseveres.
2. Subject is not doubled in combining.
3. Subject function is really annihilated.

4. There is a unique case for subjects, but I can show up in a variety of functions.

5. I is more accessible + prominent+

Proof that inference really has

\{g\} \rightarrow \theta/ - un

6. Cf. 4E of outline of relational grammar

7. Perm is blocked for a specified agentive subject

I get counter-examples when it ascends, if

when a non-subject ascends, if

They will be primary to lead - that is, any L which involves a rule in which non-subjects climb to non-subject position will also need a rule in which non-subjects climb into subject position,

but not the converse.

3/9/74
Reflexivization is a clause-locater - being a refl, you expect that the antecedent will stay within the clause fact from PMP:

* to Melvin I talked about himself. <

Melvin I talked to about himself

3/9/74: NB: When you move a subject where ambiguity can arise, it's better. Who did you believe { had shared himself }?
Who did you { want } to share himself?

3/9/74: Paul's idea: non-subject antecedents
Reason: If reflex don't move
move, you know they're gone - best if a tense V follow the deletion site, but even of a non-tensed one does.

It was Bob who I believed

NB: To whom do you think we should talk to about { himself }?

PMP: This is ok because he isn't
Tail End Land

Would explain why benentential

never raise into subject position

3/8/74
3/8/74

Old higher-functioning ones decry
more than lower-functioning ones.

?? Which knee is he weak on??

?? Which knee did you punch him on??

?? He is weak on them both ??

I kicked him on them all.
? It's time to be expensive for this to happen.

?? He would be expensive for accurate tel to be taken.

? This would be expensive for this take on.

So it's greatly that block this.
A little something would be nice.

To eat ⇒ by here

[or maybe it by have deletion —]

cf. I want a little something
What’s up? >> *What’s up?

What isn’t up?

{What
  {What has been up?
  {What will be up?
    {What may be up?
      {What must be up?
        {What can be up?
          {Anything could have been up

What’s gonna be up?

?? It

What seems to be up?

{What
  {What is believed
  {What is

Something may be up

Nothing’s been up

Something must be up
wine and beer wise

? either wine or beer wise

?? swimming wise

?? swimming underwater wise

* To swim wise
I. Grammaticalization by rule loss (or "source loss")
   (→ ∅) # leads to reanalysis of Māori passive

II. "Spontaneous" grammaticalization

   In Uto-Khitan, doq nên from the word noun (e.g., "and"). After CV, it can act like (CV) still, making preceding clause subordinate.
   Grammaticalization of a variable rule (id stolen from [having clause])

II. Grammaticalization of a Harrisian transformational relation

III. Grammaticalization of impications

IV. Grammaticalization of phonological victims

Sources for conjunction

1. Subordinators – doq in Navajo
   – niq in Hñuñi, which was the abbreviate conjunction

2. Preposition Saiman Xhosa
   ma
   na

3. Number
   my čžen, I
   my wife
   Wallyn: [ma] na [čžen] (man) 2 woman – where "2" is an old number

23.754

grammaticalization / effects

3/4/74
He left \{ \text{because} \} \text{he was tired} \quad \text{cuz} \quad \text{but}

?? Cuz he was tired, he left
by you → 0

She should be taken

under your wing

by you under your wing

3/3/74
From $\{S_1\}$, I would expect that $S_2$.

I would expect $S_0$.

With (?) wrt know

From $S_1$, we know $S_2$. Why $\exists$? From $X$, I don't know.
If $S_i, S_i$

If he comes, he comes

If he's coming, \{ he's coming \}
\{ he comes \}

If they win tomorrow, they win tomorrow

[cf. *They win tomorrow*]

If he must have known it, \{ he [must have known it] \}
\{ he [may have known it] \}
\{ he knew it \}

*If he knew it, he may have known it*

*NB: identity w/ \{ If he comes, he's here \}*
Norway for perfection

Others: ima tya uyna krtam

My thing done

Mother: kada in = simple past

This is not (of) my doing

* Tom was not of my examining

Very limited

may be do as the only W which enters
It was the six-pack that he ran into the liquor store and his flunkeys ran off with.
Wend RC-ords

All of these types of RC-ords share
the inner island feature:

(1) a. He's not the doctor that he was.
   b. He doesn't have the legs I had.

(2) The longest that we had to wait was 3 hours.

(3) He stayed God knows how long

(4) A man [woke up] and a woman [didn't wake up]
    who were similar.

(5) The headway that we made was fabulous.

(6) He talked what seems to have been ruthless advantage.
Quotes from guy sitting between us in the jazz workshop:

[Boston] is basically a student town anymore.

Other words that have gone the anymore route.

Anyway, anyhow.

Why do I P's here? At any rate in any case event.
There's a frequent advantage taken of Betsy.

There were careful tabs kept on Nader.
Why is that good?
If shifting point of view, and open
sealed.

S/s from Tangy.

only
contradictory

Dick is taller than he is, Tom thinks.

The same is true of

Nobody doubts that Mary loves \( \frac{m}{x} \) \( x \).

Mary loves \( \frac{m}{x} \), nobody doubts.
Their heart \{ \_\_ \} bled

Her heart \{ \_\_ \} bled

So this rule works on this item
Can such things be?

If sue(-1) the no cannot be.

Are some things?

You even are.

They also the ask if it may be? Their

(+)
If he is helpful, as he can (be)
The AN graveyard - chief

This crazy adjective only occurs in this weird type.

Chief among X is Y

? * Y is chief among X

2/11/24
Fact underlined by Bob Sacks:

\[ N > V \] with borrowability

2/11/74

\[ N \] are more easily borrowed than \[ V \] because

\[ 3 L's \] which inflect only \[ V \], but some which

inflect only \[ N \], so borrowing \[ N \] will make

fewer waves.
The demonstration that \([\text{he is}] \rightarrow \text{the + Egal}\) was willing was hard for \(\text{John + Egal}\) to see.

In those the worst have been produced by Egal.
Thought while reading Gary, Ch. I

The only locative pronoun that appears in
corres to the distant one, these

Cf. Boston he often goes [there],

NB also: Thus N only takes adverbials but

same in German.

This would explain why there is aSanta

isn't an existential S, given Kuno's copying

analysis.

I bet this is related to the fact

that * these who S, but * there who

and that which, but * this which
What we found {was} some marbles

What we found {seems} to have been some marbles

A/B: What he promised were that I'll would win
and that he'd give up

What {is} some mosquitoes

Are {are} some mosquitoes

Are {are} some mosquitoes
There Insertion and be going to [and bet?]

Maybe the reason for the badness of

I'm sure guys (group) to be in jail

(?) because 862 results interruption

But, Bill is [not sure] going to leave now...

To become a vacuum cleaner

Bill is [not sure] going to wash

etc.

NB also that 862 had the willies

exc in question [to me] [I was though]

*I know a man going to resemble a snowflake

Also B giving up going to ski, she just listen

\( \frac{1}{2} \) decline in Maine, Chelsea

& I'm going to catch more birds than she is. To be fine, go

I am to pretend more here or otherwise.

(?) to do that
2/17/74

Sam asked

- Whether Bill or Tom had left, either of which could have happened
- Whether Bill had left, or (whether) Tom had left, either of which...
- Who had left - Bill or Tom - either of which could have happened.

* We were surprised at who he had shot at - Bill and Tom - both of which had seemed unlikely.

So it seems that any Po should be from NP

5
It is as though he were sick.

It couldn't be as though he were sick.
* Why is there SV order in how come clauses?

NB also:

\{
  I wonder
  Tell me
  [Ed]
  I (don't) want to know
\}

* How come she's late isn't known

NB Suggests an OC for this star, doesn't
I'm [glad] to see [I'm sorry]

We regretted

you leaving

Bill sick

? There be such a small turnout

? I saw there be a sellout

? I'm sorry to see [X] necessary to turn the hood down

2/2/74
Idiom - X in sub.

\{ X's protest \}
\{ the protest (by X) \}
\{ fell on deaf ears \}

Hum - this one means "was ignored"

Are there X's in subjects of idioms which have no passive paraphrase?
 guerra compound V and wording up

weil er oft Karten spielen müssten

weil er oft Karten (hat) zählen müssen
What the hell are these? How do they relate to idioms?

Some examples:

- S
- May concern
- For all our kith
- And x lived happily ever after
- Once upon a time
- Thank you in advance for your consideration
- I think that I may safely say
- The more i x met
- The first thing x knew
- As soon as possible
- As far as I knew
- I command to your attention
- With an eye to
- At first sight

Note: 2 clauses

Idiom?
Idiom?
If-clause idioms

If

\[
\begin{cases}
\text{my memory serves} & \text{me right} \\
\text{memory serves} & \text{me right}
\end{cases}
\]

* I wonder if memory serves
  - don't know

* Unless memory
  - does not serve
    - serves

* * * Hah! Memory is serving again!
This paper is about its own style describes or influenced by

But: (fact from Jean-Loren)

This paper reveals its (own) style (own) lines

Has to do with something like

agency
In the note on the transcription, it is noted that the transcription was edited.

The analysis between head of NP and rest (i.e., when anaphora, the construction must be "...".

* a picture of one by Rembrandt

* a petition for us to initiate one

But J-R is right only for N Comps — w/ rel cl, it's OK.

The best way is to put the boy seeking one

Then...
Why don't you love me like you used to do?

He loves me, but he didn't use to (+do)

He will go, but I won't (**do)
Elevated (Subway) $\rightarrow$ \{Ed, *Elo, *Elev\}

Chevrole \rightarrow\begin{array}{l}Chev / * Chevr \\
Cherry / * Cherry \\
Chevto / * Chevelle\end{array}

Why? Chev isn't really a possible English word, words m [... end]

Note:
Cadillac $\rightarrow$ Cad / Caddy
Pontiac $\rightarrow$ * Pont
Jaques $\rightarrow$ Jag / * Jaggy

Rolls Royce $\rightarrow$ Rolls / * Royce

Aston Martin $\rightarrow$ Aston / * Martin

So it seems to take the the 1st [1Stress] syllable (or word)

Volvo $\rightarrow$ Volv

But of also Rev

This shifting has to take place very late — after some sequential rules have applied. Thus of "Har" and "Edw/[...er]", which is an impossible final sequence.

No Amelie $\rightarrow$ * Amel
Edith $\rightarrow$ Edy / Ed

Sandra $\rightarrow$ *Sand

Why? Why?
Abbreviations

Horton → Hor (m)
Olivia → Oli (f)
Samuel → Sam (m)
Stanley → Stan (m)
Moses → Mos (m)
Ursula → Urs (f)

Elizabeth → (E) Liz
Eloise → (E) Liz (f)
Elysa → Eli (f)
Ezekiel → Zek (m)

Vivian → Vin (f)
Patricia → Tricia (f)

Columba → Lumb (m)

Renée → Ren

Joelyn → Jess
Jessica → Jess (f)

Alice → No short form

Reuben → Rube (m)
Rudolph → Rudy (m)

Bryan → Bry (m)

Always = never follows a V?
False = Joey

Yale

Daisy

Harry

Brownie

Corny

Texie
Abbreviations

Mathilda → Tel (tie)
Amanda → Mand (*u)

Philip → Phil (ly)
Thomas → Tom (uy)
Sibs → Sir (*ly)

Horro → Hor
Jerry → Jer

Dorothy → Dor (ay)
Denise → Dan (uy)

Jeffrey → Jeff (*y)
Charles → Charlie

Heaton → Heats
Whittlesey → Whit
McGee → McGee
It's from Bruce's "Hedged performatives" paper (p.17)

"Occurring with nearly as many performatives verbs (all classes except that of requesting) as the modal can"

N3. *Can as occurring with X

? Seeing that S were X Y

? * Knowing that S was X
Blends

keyailer

Ice Caplettes ⇐ * Capalettes

↑

Why so this bad?

Cf. ok Hurricanettes — Cyclonettes

Is it because — ade is felt to be a morphone?
For some of the text, I will note my thoughts in parentheses. I find this helps with my understanding.

Where I have an asterisk, I have written it for emphasis.

Hello. Text for what a leader!

I would like to ask you if you would like to be a leader.
Thus since \( \text{can you} \equiv X \), we expect

Can you believe \( X \equiv I \text{ assert } X \)

True: \( \{ \text{Can you}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Are you able to}
\end{array}
\} \text{ please Clear now?} \)

\[ / / \]

Fred said: \( \{ \text{Can you}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Are you able to}
\end{array}
\} \text{ believe that } S \} ? \text{ which was a lie.} \)

Would you be willing to believe \( X \equiv I \text{ tell you } X \)
Maybe the way to get all this A
I want [I ask you, you X]

I want ∅ you to X

I tell you — you believe me
= order you — you obey me
= agree on — you agree with my request

Can you obey — when I order you to X
≠ X

Why?
Negligence, n- and universal q's

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{never} & > \text{seldom} \\
\text{no} & > \text{few}
\end{align*}
\]

contain universals — hum.
The text on the image is not legible due to the quality of the image. It appears to be a handwritten page with various symbols and notes. Without clearer visibility, it's challenging to transcribe accurately.
NB: The Codge is really trying to say:

Wording the primary stressed syllable, and an optional following unstressed syllable.

12/29/73
Fact from Jean Roger: 12/26/73

?? Few men, who I knew, were invited by the committee. <<

* The committee invited few men, and I knew.

/ / / 0

?? Few came, did they? >

He invited few, did he?

/ / 0

?? He was pleased when Jack got back <

?? I praised him, of when Jack got back
Coordination and species identity of phase 4 type of engulfment model.

- $C_1$ as well as $C_2$
- $C_1$ and $C_2$

12/26/73
Will they? and when do

two members of a dynasty

The Harrisons, when

of they were to die

were to die only a minute apart.

Why is there no tense here?
I don't know why.

N3: I'm glad I saw you.

OK, partly because it was so easy.

Partly because I was no longer afraid.

I remembered.

That Tom was right.

Was it my fault? not yours.

So stupid.

I lost my job.

12/22/72

12/14/72

Jack 3/17/74

Pericles and Hermione
Squashy restructuring.

Why shouldn't such a thing exist?

With respect to squashy restructuring.
It was taken *(? frequent)* advantage of

//

It was made *(? greatly)* sure of
Case Marking

Consider:

ein schwer zu losendes Problem

How is lesson found by CM? Problem was not its cycle subject, was it?
English stress

The reason that e → ë in Elizabethan
so that otherwise we'd get either Elizabethan (and because ë is too different (compared?))

12/6/73

Hamlet ( = Hamel-#13a )

12/7/73

If a noun is the modifier of another noun, then is another piece of evidence that # X is left end of MSR
Fact emerging from conversation with Nick Clements, who tells me that in Ewe, these facts also hold:

\[
\begin{cases}
  (*) \text{ Only} & \text{I'm sick} \\
  (? \text{ Even}) & \text{I'm sick}
\end{cases}
\]
Double Top 5's

12/3/73

$ from Avery

Bill gave guess what to me

This is a 9

$ from us:

Bill gave guess what to I forget how many

kids
He asked if he should leave.

"He'd be a monkey's uncle, Ted said."
If he were sick and she \( \boxed{\text{were}} \) well

\[ \text{was} \]

If he was sick, and she \( \boxed{\text{were}} \) well

\[ \text{was} \]

If he were not tall, but rather \( \boxed{\text{were}} \) short

\[ \text{was} \]

If he was not tall, but rather \( \boxed{\text{were}} \) short

\[ \text{was} \]

I wish he were not tall, but rather \( \boxed{\text{had rather been}} \) short

NB \[ \boxed{\text{So were is the toughest thing for this rule to produce: NB I wish they were at tall but were rather short}} \]
\[ N \to \text{one} \]
\[ \text{the one} \to \text{that} \]

11/30/73

The trip from X to Y and that from Y to Z

The conversion of X to Y, and that of Y to Z

The plan for us to leave, and that for us to stay

The claim that I know and that that I don't

[no one]

The picture of me swimming and that of me sinking

An argument that \( \exists \) a rule:

\[ \exists \left[ \text{that NP X} \right] \quad \text{only} \quad \left[ \text{that of NP X} \right] \]

Thus, Insertion has to have applied

Another: \( \exists \) that fact of there being no milk

\[ \text{that of there being no milk} \]
Many of

\[
\text{\textit{Thick of Name:}}
\]

\[
\frac{3}{4}
\]

\[
\text{can be attributed to blindness}
\]

\[
\text{Nick of}
\]

\[
\text{Much of}
\]

\[
\text{Not be left early, for him to leave early.}
\]

\[
\text{For him to leave early by the left.}
\]

\[
\text{by being early.}
\]

\[
\text{his being early.}
\]

\[
\text{From being early.}
\]

\[
\text{early departure}
\]

\[
11/30/73
\]
In this section of an embedded clause, if there is more than one constituent, then place an arrow one level above.

These boxes I don't know where to put DO

8. In double wh-questions, move the 6th most wh-word.

What did you put there? Where did you put it?

Who did you talk to mixer? >> What are you talking about?

NC: This keeps the order in surface structure.

Bill is how to talk: To admit war

Bill is how to talk: About war

Want to fly? No but...
It is fun that cold to fun to read in about {about}

*about 1 to

It's cold that warm to fun to talk \textcolor{red}{? to about} about to

Obj₁ Obj₂ NB

* It's cold that snowballs are cold. Yes, it

* It's snowing. Why didn't we call you there at

\textcolor{red}{DO} \textcolor{red}{DIR}

How it's to bad that both are fun to give
[Actually, $c_1 S \Rightarrow \text{there}$.]

This is a proof, as we see it.

Otherwise, we would have won $\Leftarrow$ there is a contradiction.

Since $\exists_0$ can never have been triggered by something.

$\therefore \exists_0$.

Otherwise, $\{\exists_0 \\exists_0 \} \Rightarrow \text{that he would have won}.$

So everyone will have to migrate under the same conditions as everyone else.

We now:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\{ \exists_0 \exists_0 \} \Rightarrow \text{that he would have won}.
\end{align*}
\]
What can be done?

Consequences, predictions, forecasts, warnings

(They always have to do with the future)

And done now occur in predicate position.

Why?

N3: consequences so due that I peed in my pants

This means that just predicting due pronounally won't save the day. What's 3 is that due be I

[+JD (?W2)]
What happens when one magnetizes a Möbius strip?
These types of NPs have the same (?) distribution:

1. John's case: An Adj a N as 5
   (Adj w/ more Adj enough, etc.)

2. A parent

3. A man to VX
   He is the man to do it?
   The man to do it must VX
   Is a man to do it should apply, 5
John is heavier than Alice

by more than Sandra is overweight (*by)

He had a bigger head start than Jack by more than I estimated.

Obviously, I was process swalloed up by some by's (though not for most people I asked this S to in the workshop).

Why are only some by's deletable?
If -able Adj were basic, we couldn't keep the generalization that Adj + DR is.

Cf. Translatable into German

Cf. 11/18/73
What could explain the fact that Adj can't have directionals in a theory in which all directionals are derived from causatives.

Since adjectives don't lexicalize acts, there are no causative adjectives, and thus none with directionals.

Is this true, I wonder? How about

maddening corrosive efficient

Ann - NB It is corrosive \( \frac{\text{reptile}}{10} \) retel

This doesn't seem like a real theme, because only generics are OK.
Formulation of the constraint arrived at with Tim Austin:

He is being examined, and she is (*being) too

\{ which I am not (*being) \}

He has been examined

\{ and she has (been) too \}

\{ which I have not (been) \}

He

\{ wants to be examined, but she does not want to (be) \}

\{ *likes being examined, but she does not like being \}

Restriction: the object of ing-ed be Pass cannot be deleted.
New thinks that Mary didn't kiss the boy she kissed, but they were the same "(boys)"

They wanted to have a bagel but they didn't have one already.

So inadvisable V in surface Str. can't be the antecedent for contrastive stress.
Particules and Stative
Directionals + CH

Non-statives don't take particles. }

Also, as Judy Kegl, a Brown student in Linguistics 131, points out, there are no directional with be

Also, # DIR / Adj
# PRN / Adj

Hmm

Dr. now 11/8/73
not-have ⇒ without

without

{ any clothes on him to play with
  a top to it
  getting into college to worry about
}

all typical objects I have
I'll give it to you to read

This must come from
the embedded have - 5

11/7/73
Maybe this is a squishy property

A verb is really ergative

and does CRED on absolutes

11/6/73
Facts w/ Avery

1. Neg D: I (don't) know how many peanuts
2. No Q's or Imperatives etc.; don't forget
3. Thank God OK

10/31/73

4. Only 2 deg meanings -- I've the bravery of Tom?
Nore: \( S \) be \( S \) population.

Resistance \( X/Y \) to

- ?? giving up \( X \)
- ?? the decision of \( X \)

To answer \( Y \):

- ?? giving up \( Y \)
- ?? the decision of \( Y \)
Bill would rather leave now, & I think that Sam might too.

But if this is firm, might well rather

He who sits down... should... could...

Mrs. D. & Sam [writes]

How & Lois are of this is good

because [writes]
Sensation hierarchy

Facts emerging in talk with Bill Cooper:

see > feel (>) hear > \{taste, smell\} in terms of syntactic activity

1. I \{see, feel, hear\}
   ?smell
   *taste

    that

    \(\uparrow\)

    counterexample

2. It was \{seem, felt, heard\}
   *smelled
   *tasted

    that

    \(\uparrow\)

3. I \{saw John drunk
   *felt John scared
   *heard John gurggy

4. Mike was \{seen to like cheese
   felt to have shown it
   *heard to have left
   (but: to be leaving)

5. Sam was \{seen writing
   *felt trembling
   ?heard singing

He looks to me (to be) sick
He feels to me (?to be) feverish
He sounds to me (?to be) interesting
The cabbage smells too (to be) sour (to be) tasty
My favorite teacher was Mr. Fantasia.

Except for this, and I have
definitely preferred

NB. The orders "the" twice.

Bella's favorite wine(s) are

I was selected by [any] students.

10/13/15
Counterexample:

Negative prefixes only affect lower clause some's.
Syllables // Clauses
and primary

Are there any processes that work only across syllable boundaries?

Yes—Morris points out things like alternative stress
And he thinks words // clauses
So maybe we're dealing with variables here.

In phonology, variables can be constrained to stay within #6, but not to start outside #6.

And maybe in rapid speech rules, syllable's // clauses.
Condition 1: \( V C_i \cdot C_j V, \alpha < \beta \Rightarrow V C_i \cdot C_j V \)

where \( C_j \) is the maximal string of word-initial consonants.

Condition 2: \( \beta = 0 \Rightarrow V C_i \cdot C_j V \rightarrow V C_i \cdot C_j V \)

\( n \rightarrow n-1 \)

May be:
1. \( V C_i \cdot C_j V \rightarrow V C_i \cdot C_j V \), where \( C_j = \text{maximum} \)
2. \( V_1 [+]o [+]o [+]o \beta \)

\( 1 \ 2 \ 3 \ 4 \ \Rightarrow 1324 \) where \( \alpha > \beta \)
2. If $\alpha \geq \beta$ in $\text{VC} V$, the following segments move leftward across the syllable:

a. $s \sim t$

b. $[\text{seq}] / V-V$ (OBL $\alpha$ $\beta = \emptyset$, possible? $\gamma$

$\beta = \text{? ??} \alpha \emptyset \text{?}$)

c. $\{t\} / \{v\}$

mercenary

"mercenary"

foreign
Nickery at extremes

? "I'll pick him", said A., "right up."

Why?

The part of the word on which must be inserted before a final or after an initial constituent of that constituent is attached (contrastively?) but right isn't there..."
Why? 

(ax - win case of the bro -)

* lady - bank with bill ...

N - V-ing 
(by ok)

Non-subj. (passive) see subj. hypotactic
in - (H - lapse -)

Pref #V

relooked at bill, overtrust [ bill

* to luck

uncomparable

with tom.

(by)

I don't think it would be talkable over

[N - V-ing]

adj

[un p -]

(by weak)

[un - V]

[Pren Adj]

But:

his non-election to the club

But: he

pitching to

the club

But: a screwed up answer. >> a thought over answer

big

unexpected by anyone.

? ? division of?
Scrappiness

loosen the sis. p.

[loose-with the sis. p.

But: E

the isoo-mating of

the strap

the date-fastening of the web

[revel]

to my taking

NE

*untalkative {to} people about food

unhappy about receco

Aha! *interaction in the natives

unfamiliar among the natives

out £ unpopular with the natives

Why? unfortunate for us

10/4/23
Fido just scared the mailman.

9/29/73
The reason is that
how angry is an nobody

in our life with reasons.

But don't think of me supposed to be sent to
it all be said that the new job.
Hey kids! Join Dunkin' Donuts Birthday Club and get as many donuts as you are old on your birthday.

(Limited to kids under 12)

9/23/73
AA and Action Nominals

This masterful finding of a solution independently

This kind (? are there others?) of adverb doesn't seem to have to undergo AA, or even to be able to, in action nominals.
Amnesia & Equations

9/16/73

?? He wants something quite impossible: that Sheila be followed all night
What I didn't say was that anybody was following.

Maybe the only Vs that are good here are V which in some language allow Not Happening.

That would be eine saftige Tatowche.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Negressess</th>
<th>Not sure. I don't think it was.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>few/V</td>
<td>?*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>few/V-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no/V</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>?*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rarely</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hardly</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Ordinary men camp, and will, did many worse.
- Few men came, and neither did many worse.
- He said few men.
Few / \V > Neg Few / \V

?? Few men knew do they? >>

?? He seen few trains, did he?

Few were invited at all >

?? He much few at all

Nobody ate either >>

?? He ate nothing either >

?? I gave milk to none either >

?? I will force you to marry none either
It was not clear precisely when he left.

He told me precisely the length of the board.

Precisely who shot Bill was unclear.
German Verb Hitting

\[\text{wicht} \]

\[\text{Sie werden ihn haben sehen können} \]

\[\text{?? sehen gekonnt haben} \]

\[\text{Manfred's judgment} \]

\[\text{Weil sie ihn nicht \times \text{sehen können haben werden}} \]

\[\text{* werden sehen können haben} \]

\[\text{Manfred's suggestion: } \exists \text{OC which reflects this:} \]

\[\text{\times \left[ \begin{array}{c} \text{Inf} \end{array} \right]} \left[ \begin{array}{c} \text{Modal} \\ \text{PP} \end{array} \right] \text{Y} \]

\[\text{Mine: when haben moves left of [Modal], by whatever rule this is infinitivized.} \]

\[\text{But why is this bad?} \]
as you hinted (? at)
as I had hoped (? for)
as we planned (? on)

Yes (?)

that he would lose they may well have hinted (?) to me

that you would write some more I had always hoped (?) for

I don't see any way of accounting for the fact that these types of SS and Shaw 2 variants which are both pretty good.

Certainly, it would seem that only a global rule has a chance of working.

Better example thought (?) of

as was hinted (?) for
(from presence

- like some PM

on 8am (10:10) 7-

c/ lid

near adventure 3/18 76
departure 5:00 am + post post
"... and even though out of sight would not necessarily be out of mind the absence of that mutilated body could hardly fail to improve morale."

Alastair McLean, Bear Island p.188 Fawcett, Greenwich Conn (1971)

Out of sight seems to have been out of mind

So I rule of Its Deletion

Maybe it's responsible for other senseless idioms like

Easy come, easy go

Like father, like son

Nothing ventured, nothing gained

NB that this rule obeys the Bathtime Principle

I think that out of sight (is) out of mind
\[ T = \{ \text{do not} \} \text{ for the after midnight.} \]

\[ = \text{and} \{ \text{say} \} \text{ that we will meet midnight.} \]

This p.o. is evidence for

\[ \text{be here} \rightarrow \text{do it} \]

and any not.
If I think that under any circumstances it'll go...

It looks as though this must have been so, and the Nag must have helped without direct help from this position.

To do this, we had a global set of NOT hinges, whose environment would be set early, and which would subsequently help in my own written position. I had already...
He said that he departed...

\[ \Rightarrow \]

In fact of his departure

\[ \Rightarrow \]

\[ \sim \]

The whole process is sort of like

\[ \text{VNC} \Rightarrow \text{\sim VNC} \rightarrow \sim C \]
This raining on game days has got to stop.

Can't come from

This raining \( \{ \text{on the part of } P \} \) by \( P \).

Hmnn — NB:

\[ \text{This being possible that we're being duped} \]

\[ \text{as a down} \]

\[ \text{if stats being kept on everybody is terrible} \]
Q. Does virtue apply to nominals?

A: No, if N which do not correspond to sentences (are not nominalizations) in [S-6, p. 159].

[Ex. no escape [hope to the prisoners]]

If the rule applied to them, then it's motivated to be independently of nominalizations, so it should apply to nominalizations too.

Actually, we have a syntactic example, with [failure], [because of weather].

So lexicon is claiming that there will be N where no cases in which N which are morphologically complex will exhibit syntactic behavior that is morphologically different from that of morphologically simple N.

But it obviously provides no explanation for the fact that Equi does "generalize" [cf. his efforts to defend himself, his habit of shamming himself] where # *He efforts to x *the job? VngX]

but object deletion does not.

That is, why should this exist, but not this:

*He went 4 words back (off 4)
Since 1957, many S's that were called ill-formed have become "syntactically well-formed, but semantically deviant."  

[Example: Chomsky S^2 E^2 p.157 fn.]

Any beaver with teeth is building a dam.

Have there been any cases which went in the other direction?
Conversation with Dan:

Dan: Fred Firststone was a Scoutmaster, and was trying to show the kids how to light a fire by rubbing sticks but couldn't. Then the kid started one with a cigarette lighter.

Me: They outnumbered him
It's sort of like cheese

Approach for

1. Sort of ⇒ Sorta only in some dialect. The same term will go here or elsewhere.

2. ? Standing

3. ? Nobody knows, sorta

There are fewer problems, sorta

Weird
Sure...

\text{exp} Y

\text{very} \quad \text{that} \quad \text{is a baby girl.}

To do it with only one entry - a list is not possible in R in

and gets a \text{false} if

m.
I guess the only way to do both

a) Stopping / fronting
b) Stopping / leaking

is by an OC, no?
The 2 seem only functionally related.
A. The issue was to lie about himself.

B. There's something you've got to do, and it's to wash yourself.

?? There's something I don't believe, and it's that he has any $.
Pre- and post-nominal modifiers + non-ness

No (.) L has full clauses pre-nominally and reduced clauses post-nominally, unless it also has full clauses post-nominally.

Thus: Reduced post-nominal clause $\rightarrow$ full post-nominal clause

But Reduced pre-nominal clause $\rightarrow$ full pre-nominal clause

Thus reducing a clause =

gong towards non-ness.

Probably no L has compounding w/ more than 2 elements — why?

This is why it’s hard to get things like

* lady-killer with axes * an lady-killer
*The same thing doesn't apply here*
What I know is that S. and what I require

What I know is that S. and I expect to find in

What I neglect is being and I

5/29/73
Observation from Ken:

Sam and Jane want compromising pictures of

his or herself

This shows that I rule like them.
John Lawler's crazy so show that there is such a rule.

Not and stay sane

\{?

I think he can't

I don't think he can\}

5/23/73
Topicalization + ~ Danny

5 emerging in Judy Kisson's talk

Hans Hess and Maria Kissen

| Subj       | Obj       | Only possible interpretation |

In Kuhn

Handbook

Copyright

Horrible fact:

Topicalization is ok if the top isn't interpreted as lower on the case hierarchy than something you pass on the way to its deletion site.
Maybe the badness of (1) due to the same badness of (2)

(1) Important is *(the fact) that he wince*.
- he having wince

(2) I consider important *(the fact) that he wince*.
- he having wince

There would be a global constraint forbidding *that*-clauses from moving rightward.

But what about right dislocation?

Hum — maybe it's only clause-internal moves that are out.
Idioms

Keep mum

Little Lulu: "Black Monday"

Title
3 tests: 

a) feasibility
b) ? count restriction
c) modifiability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V approx.</th>
<th>V Avg.</th>
<th>N_{max} = N_{2}</th>
<th>N _modifiable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>list of ( N_{2} )</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heap of ( N_{2} )</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quick of ( N_{2} )</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of ( N_{2} )</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: only modifiable if \( N_{2} > N_{\text{count}} \)
or > and / vice versa

John left + Susan stayed, (and) / or / vice versa.
ACD 1/77
+ Participation

5/15/78

A: * Tom said
Did you hear

I

* know
* want
* forget
* lend
* promise

B: What's

Can't

So there is a test for participatives... the thing must have deontic force.
It is your fault for being so sure of yourself.

Once going too late to your fault

NB:

* The disaster was your fault for being crazy
Un-typicalzable constituents in german

* Nicht* seh ich dich.
[Q. Nie seh ich dich]

Maybe its V which dont go w/ jun. That

wasnt typicalize.

out by Elke

* Gewesen ist er schön, aber nicht wahr

* gehabt hat er ein Kätz

* habelt hat er seinen Vater

* gewusst hat er, dass er krank war

OK, zapp Elke
Only many complements can shift:

I consider fantastic.

\[
\{ \\
\text{that he left} \\
\text{for him to have won} \\
\text{who saw who} \\
\text{him winning the race} \\
\text{has having won} \\
\text{has handling of the details} \\
\} 
\]

I wonder if that is because Exposition.
Jorge S: we must topically focus

The boss said E E E. I don't know. I'm not sure.

report accuracy

which

The boss: the reason if I think that the... n

they can help? Then do you want another

are basically
So the JFR didn't mind 2 5's on the new side of the bar. Have a good

From Y X follows. ➢

?? Y X follows from:
1. Maybe the same side filler w. what makes bi-potentialed V
   Japanese impossible.

2. How is this? according to Elke
   Wenn die Tatprobe, das S1 (*es) bewiesen, das S2,
   würde ich meine Schuld zugeben

3. Die Tatprobe, das S1 (*es) bewiesen, das S2
   Both OK with Hans bestie.
   The SSSF seems to be sensitive to verboiness

4. It's a SSS linked filler.
   OK: ... which that he left proves

5. Thus S *That S2 is tough for me to imagine you believing the
   fact that S to prove
   provides evidence for TM, not TD. Because we can't say the
That $S_2$ to the controller, and by button-passing triggers the S5F, because otherwise this would be bad.

Though not indicating that $S_2$, that $S_1$ is suspicious.

Why don't they trigger the S5F?

And because which the fact that $S$ proves is OK, we can't say anyway that corresponding nodes trigger the violation.
That she is guilty is too unlikely for me to be able to imagine the fact that her knife was bent demonstrating conclusively.
From a comparison n/16 is.

1. "The circle has a radius r."

2. "I can draw (\ldots)\)."
Who do you think (*that*) who invited?
I *(don't)* know Tom's whereabouts

Tom's whereabouts are odd

*I criticized Tom for his whereabouts.*
Fact developed by Carol Reesent, Karen Jordan, + Mike Kilburn 5/2/73

What seems to be necessary to the following

Strip
Braced
Forbidden rule

Affected element - that element which is moved or influenced

The converse of a chopping or shearing rule =

the island of the affected element

No wall proceeding from the affected element may cross the island boundary of that element.

John (Lee) (Kilburn)

What Karen, Carol + Mike worked out is that the flag can cross its island boundary (downward) on getting to the ride itself going to enter.
1. Fact discovered with Bob Fergo + Dick:
   Spatial count N [aperture, driveway, path, etc]
   can't be measured: *sm aperture
   But: this curve seems to have an \( \{ \text{cataca, parabola, spiral, circle, ellipse} \} \) in it.

2. Statues don't have perfectives

3. Statues don't take directions (?)

//

Mass N don't have spatial orientation

But: Its alignment towards Moscow makes it unsafe

? * How descent into madness is eternal

? * How attribution of the fresco to Ritter is misguided
Tell and Nature + Range NP formation

I told the story to the boy

??the length of the course to the boy

* how long the course was

This contrast suggests that this is not basic
The moon may move.

* Mirzod! Salar, ko moving.
a song of the going home type

I told you that I would talk to you (p.s. I look)

?? a book of the I told you that he did in your type
Bill was better to go than.

It was with Bill that I decided to stay.

\begin{array}{|c|c|}
\hline
\text{was} & \text{to stay} \\
\hline
1 & 1 \\
\hline
\end{array}
Is there the correct generalization?

N to the effect that S; = machine + life.
I want to talk to you about a matter.

There is a matter that I want to talk to you about.
I'd like to have the opportunity to have a say, if I might have one.

C.

I'd like to

(If I might, I might have a say.)
Factivity quest.

knew > realize > be surprised

Putting these V in quotes

suspends factivity here, maybe here.

but not here.
Answers to Qs +?

Why is this funny?

Q: What king wore the biggest shoes?

A: The king with the longest feet.

(from *Alice in Wonderland*)

This would seem to give more info. But I guess it doesn't. Why not?

Because the world where foot length = shoe size is so humdrum?
The key is opening the door.

So instruments will work.

2. Understand me.
   ?? be understood by people

3. For 5 minutes to eat lunch
   * for bell to sit on...
He looked up the number.

He gave Sally photos.

He gave photos to Sally.
That or any arbitrary anything

As we've seen, we have no way to say a reason (except)

No need to: no reason

So maybe we have no way to specify that if + knn?
"In my work in both France and Italy, much looking, much simple being there preceded any photography.

Only that you are lying is obvious

But ?? It is obvious only that you are lying

Why?
S from Mike Kilburn of JUNYAR.

That he ordered beans is obvious

and that Tom has had it even more so.

But

I knew that Tom ordered beans and

I also know that Fred has.

Why?
Can V which required animate object

even middles?

Yeah, I guess so, half-heartedly

? He doesn't teach (*greek) easily

? They don't deceive/fool/cheat easily

* Bill doesn't confuse easily

So proviso 1b: The only rule that can convert into a derived subject an NP that was optionally restricted to be human.
wicked to = Fronting

Felt that he had been wicked to do that.

That he had been wicked to do that was felt.

Is this maybe because the source of all these

wicked to guys is that

For John to go there

John was going there was wicked (of him)

Promotion / off

John was wicked { to go there }

{ ? going there }

Note I found // to these

? I was amazed that he had disguised you with his specimen
Near to Vee and agents.

3/20/73

? good baker of cookies <

good hitter to left-field <

big spenders on weekends
3/19/72

Str. manipulation to break a TDC:
1. Other TDC's - Those from Oligar in Cliton, Merger's rule (because he's not talking) [not legible]

Postal:
2. Suppose things as usual, if that describes in PS? (not visible)

Emonds < Lakeff + Naikami

Harsh - Some Y and D - Wise

[Signature: Emonds]

[Signature: Harsh]
Such's source

3/17/73

He made one claim \( \text{about } x \) \( \text{that } \), and I

made another such claim.

He made an attempt to leave — another such attempt was made last week.

He gave a proof (to the effect) that God exists.

But I know of such a proof in 2 steps.

His refusal to surrender was met with gunfire, which makes me fear that such requests will be rare in the future.

*They* the Armenians built a house. I hate such houses.
do and pseudo-clefts and complementizers

We did more than \{?	ext{to help him}
\}
\{help him
\}
\{?? helping him
\}

We have done more than \{?	ext{*to help him}
\}
\{helped him
\}
\{?? helping him
\}

We are doing more than \{?	ext{*to help him}
\}
\{help him
\}
\{helping him
\}

This is exactly the array of facts we find in pseudo-clefts which start with what we \{have done\} etc.

Hum
Epithets and command

From the Globe:

Dr. Cheng Y Ting came to the United States from Taiwan in 1930. He began teaching on acupuncture, a subject on which the Chinese doctor is well trained.

NB

* ... He felt for the Chinese doctors... In a time for advancement were limited... Why on them first?
3/14/73

This coming home late of Janet's has to stop.

3/15/73

No more telling people lies on the part of [official] will be tolerated.

*I can't imagine any more believing the part of joining citizens.

/* This belief on the part of the officials, that's...
Variables + penetration = Jorge's universal

Jorge:

Rules which delete variables are tresty.

Me: (a) Rules w/ long variables are tresty.

(b) In general, if you scramble, you have weak variables.

(c) In general, if you care much a lot, you have weak variables.

Generalization: Don't mess up your head too much.
Bill: {stepped \hspace{1cm} attempted \hspace{1cm} kept} \hspace{1cm} running to work

Susan: staying home

So we want to be by first of all:

Certain V don't like to let anything happen to their complements.

1. Pronominalization: *Tom kept
2. Passiverization: *Running was kept by Tom
3. (L)osand: *What Tom kept was running
4. Transitive: *Running Tom kept
5. ACD: *Tom did keep
There's more here than meets the eye.

* Hey! A counterexample just met my eye.

NB — meet the eye can only occur when its subject has been paid with

I also shake a stick at
Necessity, determinism, and loss of complements

[Cf. also:
This being easy to reduce has got to stop.

So B E Equi here, to get rid of the embedded subject.

Thus being told not to even of himself has begun wanting to free himself
to it, and Melch.
What happened to me was that I got *happened by me was (that) I left*

I did
I'm going to temple

Josephine Wedding. My son goes to university.

Us: I was late for group.
### Determiners and Nounness

#### 3/9/73

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NP's</th>
<th>no little</th>
<th>careful etc</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>other</th>
<th>6/14/73</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>that 5</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for to</td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>any</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes:

- being thought unkind
Determiners and Poss by
and Nonniveness

Further proof that these are Poss Ings, not
Act Novm.

They having been followed for years
This being waked up early is terrible
Thus having paid early to avoid fines

By the way, since \{ \text{little} \} seem much
weaker here, it seems that

\{ \text{the} \} \{ \text{that} \} > \{ \text{no} \} \{ \text{little} \} \{ \text{etc.} \}
Beans I like, but yecno I don't

Beans I eat, but today I won't eat

So you have to know where a VP came from before you know whether it can be deleted.
3/9/73

Topicalization, getting +
Nearer to Vee

Basically, the more closely bound the topicalizee was to the
V, the worse! post-topicalization getting is

Beans I ate and was *(I)* Tom

?? These points I'll cover, and those points be

?* Him I send money to, and then she

Tomorrow, I'm going, and the next day, Harry

<<? To him I send money, and to them, she

I send money to him, and she *(them)*

?? Him, I looked at + them, she

?+ A martini I don't need, nor a 4th beer Peter
Types of rules which only occur downstairs

1. Complementizer placement
2. Subordinate forms of V
   a. subjunctives
   b. relative clause marker
3. Participle

Query:

We find "unembedded" subjunctives in Latin, etc.

We find "unembedded" that-clauses in German, etc.

We find "unembedded" gerunds + infinitives in English, etc.

We find "unembedded" nominalizations in English (e.g.,)

Are there any of these downstairs-only rules which never show up in main clauses?
No one participating in the meeting will be allowed:

This is a {'Poss'} Ing complement, as in:

shown by:

\{?
  No sucking thumbs
\}
\{?
  No looking names up will be permitted
\}
\{?
  No giving people handjobs
\}

The determiners that work like no are:

\{?
  subsequent
\}
\{?
  prior
\}
\{?
  frequent
\}
\{?
  occasional
\}
\{?
  careful
\}
Keep and Print Norm

\[ \begin{array}{l}
\times \text{ keeps them} \{ \vspace{1cm} \text{happy} \vspace{1cm} \text{ rich } \vspace{1cm} \text{'slave'} \vspace{1cm} \text{ doctors} \} \\
\end{array} \]

3/8/73

So why is this bad?

This may tie in with the nature of

*There are men slave.
Evidence for a difference between conversationally implicating and deriving from R5

Dude: It’s cold in here.

Butler: *When do you want me to (do X)?

So conversationally implicating stuff can’t antecedes in anaphoric processes.

Contact this with:

They say that he made a drink he,

which is

\[ \begin{align*}
  & \text{are} \\
  & \text{not real} \\
  & \text{does not} \rightarrow \text{is} \\
  & \text{terrace, outside} \\
\end{align*} \]
When confronted by such data, the only way to \textit{X} is to \textit{Y}.

What is the controller here?

Note that such S's as

When drunk, going home is fun.

argue strongly (pace examples like this) that there was a for one, after fun, which has been deleted, for otherwise, how could the general rule for deleting this be applied?
Idiom inversion

3/6/73

My bow not to Avery (on a brave attempt to demonstrate quasi-clausehood via the Right Hand Constraint)

The theoretical spirit is willing but the intuitive flesh is weak.
* be made it snappy

(I told him to) make it snappy
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Will} \rightarrow \emptyset \text{ and similar rules}
\end{array}
\]

\[
S_1: \quad \text{I hope that he}\{\begin{array}{c}
\text{Comes} \\
\text{Shows up} \\
\text{Knows A}
\end{array}\}
\]

\[
S_2: \quad \text{He}\{\begin{array}{c}
\{\text{Will}\} \\
\{\text{Will}\} \\
\{\text{Will}\} \\
\{\text{Will}\} \\
\{\text{Will}\}
\end{array}\}
\]
All hell broke loose.

Sentence idioms.

3/1/23
Idioms with non-subject variables

Time (seems to have) hung heavy on K's hands

So I will split up
1. NB that raising only requires activity, not activity when making new subjects.

   * Be likely to go

   claim him [{? to be} as] your friend.

2. Most subject formation rules only work on active inputs

   cf. passive & manner adverbs

   Middles won't operate on stative (fix results)

   Locative subjects only are made from activity predicates (swimming)

   Instrumental subject predicates can only arise from predicates which take instrumentals, i.e. activities.
Why only...?

Because they can't be asked.

Not by real thinkers.

The thing is

accountable for

?Pr: unrepeatable down, unrepeatable up, unrepeatable.

?Why: This is unrepeatable strongly.

expression clearly.

exceedingly obtuse.

unrepeatable thoroughly.

This is unrepeatable strongly.

unrepeatable clearly.

expression

unrepeatable thoroughly.

unrepeatable down, unrepeatable up, unrepeatable.

unrepeatable clearly.

expression

unrepeatable thoroughly.

unrepeatable down, unrepeatable up, unrepeatable.

unrepeatable clearly.

expression

unrepeatable thoroughly.

unrepeatable down, unrepeatable up, unrepeatable.

unrepeatable clearly.

expression

unrepeatable thoroughly.

unrepeatable down, unrepeatable up, unrepeatable.

unrepeatable clearly.

expression

unrepeatable thoroughly.

unrepeatable down, unrepeatable up, unrepeatable.

unrepeatable clearly.

expression

unrepeatable thoroughly.

unrepeatable down, unrepeatable up, unrepeatable.

unrepeatable clearly.

expression

unrepeatable thoroughly.
I believe and $\phi$'s

Just where believe can take $\phi$'s $\exists \phi$ is tautic and $\exists \phi$ takes conj. $\phi$'s

I (can't) believe $\exists \phi$ [that $\exists$ who left when]
They are confident that he \( \{ \text{will} \} \) \( \{ \text{*must} \} \) win.

They are hopeful that he \( \{ \text{will} \} \) \( \{ \text{*must} \} \) win.

I expect that he \( \{ \text{will} \} \) \( \{ \text{*must} \} \) leave.

\text{sort of British}

I regret that you \( \{ \text{will} \} \) \( \{ \text{*must} \} \) (have to) struggle

Why?
?? There deserves to be a fair trial of this group

not totaled salad
Fact from Donna Farrow:

The book is \( \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{impossible} \\ \text{possible} \end{array} \right\} \) (to read)

Hey! This provides the argument that was needed that I rule which deletes invalid after easy etc.

Then I now have an argument which I can use in the demonstration that the bad version of this would be impossible (to spell) so only only because of some AC.
Paul Kiparsky's suggestion: übr = /übr/
and only stem vowels can be unstressed.

Problems: 1. Why is Tate OK, but not Tetä?
   2. Why is europäish OK, but not Europä?
1. That $S > E$ for $NP \rightarrow VX$
   a. That for $\rightarrow$ for that
   6. That faithful is what he will become $\rightarrow$? for faithful to be what he becomes

2. For $NP \rightarrow VX > \varnothing$
   a. it $S$
   b. $P$ relation

3. $\varnothing > Acc$ Inf
   a. Extraction
   b. $P$ tel
   c. SMC - small difference
   d. Some fake $NP$s won't go $\rightarrow$ Acc Inf
   e. Not $\varnothing$ in subject position so weak with Acc Inf

4. $\text{Acc} \rightarrow \text{Poss Inf}$
   a. SMC
   b. Fewer fake occur in subj of Poss Inf complements
   c. Extraction from NP

5. For $NP \rightarrow VX > \{\text{Acc}\}$
   a. Replacing
   b. Recomposition
   c. $\text{Tel}$
   d. Promotion is $\varnothing$ only for $\{\text{Poss}\}$ Inf or lower.
5. Pass Inf > Act Nom
   a. S5C
   b. Plural agreement
   c. Preverbal "it"
   d. Act Noms w/ take NP objects
   e. No x as subjects becomes impossible

6. Act Nom > Par Nom
   a. Pre-verbal "it"
   b. Seldom
   c. -$
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>not</th>
<th>never</th>
<th>nev in subj</th>
<th>sit Q in subj</th>
<th>few in subj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That S</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for to Q</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc Tp</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prep Inv</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act Npr? ??</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Den Npr ? x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

heu visits to nyc
[?*seldom]
[?*never]
[heu premedication: ?*seldom]
[?*never]

?* heu handling of the mice: never

* heu never handling of the snakes
Neatness and fake NP subjects of copula switched pseudo-cleft S

Facts that emerged in class (Ling 524 - SUNYAB)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Poss Nom</th>
<th>Poss Inf</th>
<th>Acc Inf</th>
<th>for NP</th>
<th>to VX</th>
<th>that's</th>
<th>to VX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc Inf</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poss Inf</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would be fine but for the constraint on possessives

Maybe: For that you left {} to surprise Tom
	{} to be what they object

No puzzling
Subject creation + activity

All rules which make new subjects leave behind a statutorily V (e.g., $ progressive form):

Passive
Flip Middle
The key opens that door

The room swarmed with flies

1943 found Adolf in Ewa

Thus, the brothel accommodates 500 mammon/day

(5 from Postal)

Bill bored me with his sappiness

Rainy

[4/15/74 - yes it does, when A-Rainy]

IM

[Doesn't really make a new I]

* Take Bill 5 minutes to photograph
Is the following too strong a structure?

In a squash, no restriction may be stated which does not include the entire range from one end of the squash to the threshold point.

That is, we couldn't say

"Rule X works only for Poss Inf complements."

Instead, we'd have to say either

"Rule X works from That1 — Poss Inf"

or

"Rule X works from N to Poss Inf"

If this is true, it strikes me as being a very good argument for the existence of the special...
Like phrases and predication.

They eat like \{ \text{birds} \}

He eats like \{ \text{birds} \}

He is like a bird \text{ when he eats}

Which one?
Subject-filled idioms

Jack thinks the world's his oyster

? The world's Jack's oyster

(Actually heard: Linda ... The world's her oyster)

NB: The world seems to be her oyster

*Linda's oyster I doubt that (She thinks)

the world will ever be

*What she thinks the world is is her oyster
1. [He would prove [if]]
   + [I needed one, I give us a test]

2. * He * Mod be wicked to VP

3. \[
\begin{align*}
\text{[I think]} \quad & \text{[they know that he was wicked to VP]} \\
\text{[they] - [he]}
\end{align*}
\]

4. ? Call [see] to have been wicked to A
   But Bill might want to be wicked to someone

5. He bought a house that he was limited to use

6. * He was good to one and wicked to another

7. * He was wicked to go to CA, not to LA

What the hell is going on?

5. ? You [were] [in] [As] and [in] [Dall]
(Double Writing)

First noticed by Robert Jacks, next by Henry.

? The reports, which the covers of the lettering on the height of the government prescribed, are dull.

A crime which the perpetrator of a complete description of we will furnish you later was because
Non-numeric and all of them

They all of them like it

* I drove them all of them crazy

* For them all of them to go

* Them all of them being sick is too bad

Their all of them showing up was too bad

But:

(Williams) \[ \begin{align*}
\text{Their all of them handling (s) of it} & \text{ was wretched} \\
\ast \ast \ast \text{Their all of them sincerity was touching}
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
\begin{cases}
\text{He} + \frac{2}{3} \\
? \text{ Him + me}
\end{cases}
\end{align*} \] have both of us worked on this.

2/15/73

2/21/73

4/26/73
John Schumann said something like this:

What's ever good for you

But NB (I feel)

†? Gallery fallen out of the ground

* whatever's right good for you

?? what'll ever be good for you

** What's ever be cooking on the stove

* who's ever ready, we're going

George, who speaks a little of this dialect, agrees, except that he would rank this one as good as, or better than, this one.
These mothers are out with

1. Negation
   a. not
   b. no
   c. few

2. Question - though a weaker restriction

3. If - * If Tom were wicked to leave...

Also,

He is fortunate in her *ability to think
*height
*strength
*his refusal to leave
Universal category hierarchy
+ CS

A → N → V

A. Why ain't I see that before?

B. And, they teach the CS, doesn't it?
2/11/73

Bombshell question from Terry Nelmes (asked uncoolly):

Who introduced the notion of syntactic evidence?

In my wrecked state, this caused a brain-snap.

The answer is not far to seek: I think it was Nom.

Though what about Harris's metapho-utterance stuff? What traditionally counted as syntactic senses were items which were intersubstitutable in the same frames.
Texas agreement will happen

What is happening is that people { are } smoking
{ may be }

What may be happening { no } that people { are } smoking
{ may be }

What will happen { so } that they { will be }
{ may be }

What may happen { may be } that they { will be } write

What is going to happen { is going to be } that they { will be }
{ may be }

What's happening is that they { are going to fly to Texas }
{ will be }

2/2/73
Incorporation and -like

of SUNYAB

Mike Kiburn pointed out how productive N-like words are.

Now note:

He is child-like in \[\text{his} \}\{\star \text{way}\} \text{simplicity}\]

//'

He is like a child in \[\text{the} \}\{\star \text{way}\} \text{simplicity}\]
Factes from a French woman at Rochester:

* Elle t'a vu et donné un livre
* Elle t'a vu et parlé
* Elle t'a vu et entendu

Elle t'a parlé et donné un livre
* Elle t'a vu et parlé de son accident
* Elle est blonde et lui aussi
* Il est intelligent et elle aussi
* Il n'est pas bête, et elle non plus

* Elle est triste que Jean a vu
* Sa sœur qu'est-ce que tu penses
* Tu sais

* Il a mangé et bu du bon vin
* Il a mangé des pommes et bu du bon vin
* Il a mangé et bu.
Slippery identity: disregardable features

These features can be disregarded:

1. Gender: Elle est plus intelligente qu'il ne l'est

2. Plural: They are members but I'm not > ?? I'm a member, but they're not

3. Tense: Ted thinks that he is right, and I did think so, but now I'm not sure

4. "Affixes": He wrote, but Tom may have

Mary may have written, and I know you did.

Tom is writing, and Sam may have [?! yesterday]

Tom will write, and Sam may be

* Tom has written, and many interesting papers have been too

5. Complementizers: I avoided passing, even though Bill wanted me to try

So when there's a choice, deletion is not
Feet from Raina Dolapchieva (Buffalo graduate student):

The harp \{ sounds good \}
\{ is good sounding \}

But

That idea \{ sounds good \}
\{ is good sounding \}

That \{ check approach \} looks good

That \{ check approach \} is a good-looking

So: for metaphorical senses, only volatile categories are used.
He let things slide
to things
{will \ way \ etc
have slid
had}
A. Why do they say
B. He read the
C. He naturally...
D. We need help
E. We were listening
F. We have had our
G. We had a party
H. We had a perfect
I. We had fun
J. We had a great

- say your name
- say your name
He suspected us of lying

He suspected that we were lying

Why is it a [criticize, approve] for praise?

but a [brag, boast] about?

pooh-pooh = say "pooh" to
There goes in No accent

S1: There goes Mike!

S2: * No — here { goes } Mike!

Also bad:

S1: Here comes Mike!

S2: * No — there goes Mike!

Why are these bad?

Maybe it's because the only element of choice — direction toward or direction away — is put into 2 items?
\[ V(\text{life}) > N(\text{death}) \]

Tired, fell many: > tenebrous, deformed (like with up or top)
Option upstairs: limited disasters 5.

So maybe if a language has a normalizing process
(e.g., Japanese [though it does have a few]), it will have
strong variance (why should this be?)

Dutch = Danish 2, and German have about the
same weight [flying equipment]. So Dutch, if you do, get
Danish > English > German

I can't yet clearly see what I want to say.
I'm scared! Jack's thoughts:
- Thought
- *behaved
Dan says \[ \text{[pæθæz]} \]

He's right — somehow, \[ [θs] \] is a tough cluster — tougher than \[ [fz] \].

How do I know that? How is that fact reflected in English grammar?

* thick \( \text{th} \) \( \rightarrow \) thickness

\text{sixths} \( \rightarrow \) \text{[sikz]} \)

\text{months} \( \rightarrow \) \text{[mons]}
Force rules upstairs > force rules downstairs

Do you think you could (please) close the door? >

Bill asked Ann whether she thought she could (please) close the door

NB also: Do Bert Bob after say etc., because of

Bill said that he [would go], which promise he broke

? Bill said how big all the stars were <

How big all the stars are!
CH and the sense of surprise

1/28/73

Here's a thought which is trying to emerge:

hand-working \succ \textit{hand-worked}

cold-running \succ \textit{fast-driven}

NB: Maybe predicate problem regards use numerous? Change 'has'

in 'hard,' 'plenty' 'hand' \rightarrow \textit{?--working}

in 'hard worked' \rightarrow \textit{?--worked}

Bold are far better than fast-driven

Way in there?

1. working \succ worked

2. \therefore \textit{working} can incorporate more stuff.

3. \textit{hard} \succ \textit{beer}, \therefore \textit{only} a more volatile element can incorporate?
It's not an accident that upstairs is where all the rules that make speech acts hard to sort out happen.

If the rules which give extra forces and which account for hereby cannot occur, only in treaties are regular To, we have a ready-made explanation of why these processes are all limited to treaties.

If they're all some kind of other beast, extra stuff has to be said.
Afflicted passes and Andy's rule

The bed looks like Fred slept in it

(*thought)

So is this a general property of rules which subjectivize things? Or what?

1/28/73

?? Under the bed looks like he read some books there
S from Howard Lasnik: 1/26/73

Under the bed is a nice place to be.

So there, undergo even TM.
Fact from Tony Kroeh:

* * *

The bed is believed under to be where he slept.

And Postal pointed out that.

This is no problem — we also don't find that.

* She was believed advantage of to have been taken.

The reason is that the second constituent becomes a derived object, which is what passives...
1/20 73

Long TV's... is it much farther N/S

In aren't.

Rain, economical beds... need a... 1 2 3

? How do I do the kept

Anyone been... or kept on...? a

Anyone... kind of

_________________________
It's not only exposition that went work on \( S_1 \) in

\[
\sqrt{2} \left( \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{1}{i^2} \right) S_2
\]

I struck the \( \frac{1}{i} \) and took \( \sqrt{2} S_2 \).

That is \( \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{1}{i^2} \) with my fingerprint being on the page.

\( \text{So there's an AC (weblett, but not!)} \)

Bisentential \( V \) can't be in \( S_2 \) w/ both complements on the same side of 400.
I. Bisentential V and movement rules

Actually, the condition seems to be that:

With bisentential V, the arguments can’t cross each other.

Q: [That he’s guilty], \( P_i \) proves \( P_j \), [that there were some fingerprints on his snake].

Q: Is this part of a more general condition?

Red green clashes with ??([?, P])

* It clashes with red, green

* Red, \( P_i \) clashes with \( P_j \), green
That they might lose was never obtained. (of)

We never dreamed of that they might lose.

But why is it so hard to stand
P in typified 5½ than in pseudo

clefs?

Arm - wild care.

That Jack is sick was talked about in church.

They talked about that Jack is sick in hopes.
What goes on?

I help them.

So I helped them.
Case bi a.1 pyramidal

pyramidal [Seems wrong fact —
Tibetan Morris showed no pyramidal
in K2]

I don't think I ever Case f syllable
which can count as the W in Case bi.

So. How do we do this?

Tibetan + an

1 1

Or what?
Path - nominal

Ceteris paribus statements of V <br>
by diff
What about SOT? There are places where it stops one clause down.

But if SOT', which only starts changing phrases 2 clauses down.

I: I thought you

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{I: I thought you} \\
&\text{know \textit{we} \{were\}} \\
&\text{are \textit{we} \{were\}} \\
&\text{are \textit{we} \{are\}} \\
&\text{were surprised that we \{are\}} \\
\end{align*}
\]
Thoughts while listening to Les Noces:

Start the revised version of my book with a footnote about the ecological self-sufficiency of islands: the core of the whole synthesis.

Also have footnotes, meta-footnotes (with Greek letter superscripts)

Meta-meta-footnotes 1: some undercurrents.

If island ecology = island system

what corresponds to the hierarchy of spherical islands?

Could psychological entities be found for island boundaries?

Design covers for books. Draw me like this: [Sketch image]
a would-be { assassin, charmer, thief, butcher }
Is under the bed where you left it?

Was there anyone before?

So: PP's do these NP-y things:

1. Cleft + Pseudo Cleft
2. Cleft Switch
3. Raise
4. Passive
5. Tag Formation
6. VSI (weakly)
All physical projects require VNP
VP deletion and than clauses

Going home was necessary, but he ran home faster than was.
I know that under the bed is where he keeps it.

I hate P or under the bed to be where he keeps it.

Why → ?? I know under the bed to be where he keeps it

We all tried to imagine under the bed being where he keeps it.

Under the bed's being where he keeps it is distressing.

Oh oh: Under the bed is known to be where he keeps it.

Why? 8

2/21/73

Same is true if Tacit is a condition.

\[ N > \text{Tickets} > \text{for} > PP > AP \]
Max surprised me with

1. Hub refusal to return
2. Hub surliness
3. Hero height
4. Hub execution by the Russians

What's going on here?
* Die Bücher habem ihm zu gefallen geschienen.

* Es hat geschienen, dafß S

Maybe thinkable

Wenn es geschienen hätte, dafß S

Or pluperfect? Elke scarts out very quickly.
\[
\text{re-} V \text{ and Nearer to } V
\]

\[?
\text{I re-read } \{ \text{for my boss} \} \]
\[?? \text{ to my boss}\]

? I re-contributed to the fund.

This parallels (somewhat)

* I relisted at my watch.
I want you?? (to be) easy to talk to

Since Ω global condition on Z80 after want to the effect that the rule want delete a to be that has been raised across, that badness suggests that \( IM = \text{Raising} \)

Cf. I want it? (to be) easy to talk to you

But how come it's not as bad as that?

I want him?* (to be) certain to finish

Ship.
Privacy and Acc-Ing

Everybody likes them better in object position.

Help help
Best →

I'll {call} {see} you

I'm {calling} {seeing} you

I {call} {see} you

I've {called} {seen} you

I {called} {saw} you
Action Nominal ≠ Derived Nominal

he good {solution to} the problem

well and good can’t appear in action nominals

Same with bad
Causality and the activity hierarchy

Suppose cause has the following analysis:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
S_0 \\
V \quad NP \\
\quad \text{go} \quad \text{and} \quad NP \\
\quad \quad S_1 \\
\quad \quad \text{Anything} \\
\quad S_2 \\
\quad \text{I was surprised} \\
S_3 \\
V \quad NP \quad Causally \\
\quad \text{go} \quad \text{and} \quad NP \\
\quad \quad S_1 \\
\quad \quad \text{Act} \\
\quad S_2 \\
\quad \text{he died} \\
\quad S_3 \\
\quad \text{Act} \\
\quad S_4 \\
\quad \text{horse gallops} \\
\end{array}
\]

State \downarrow \quad Events \downarrow \quad Act \quad Threw it just what we find will do
Causality and fake NPs

\[
\text{That } S \quad \frac{\text{for } NP \rightarrow V \ X}{\text{Acc ing}} \quad \frac{\text{Pos ing}}{\text{Act Nm}} \quad \frac{\text{Der Nm}}{\text{NP}} < Q
\]

- express

\[
\{ \text{Agents} \quad \text{Concrete} \quad \text{Events: some?} \quad \text{Abstracts: ??John's unorthodoxy surprised me by being unusually ordered} \}
\]

- *jack
- *headway
- *(be muddy)
- *(i)
- *(nan)

\[
\text{?? it (name)} \quad \text{?? it (name)} \quad \text{?? it (name)} \quad \text{?? it (name)} \quad \text{?? it (name)} \quad \text{?? it (name)}
\]

\[
\text{They knew that I had卓入ted into the house, and that it had killed Lord}
\]

- * that $S \rightarrow$ ok?

\[
\{ \text{for } NP \rightarrow V \ X \quad \frac{\text{Acc ing}}{\text{Pos ing}} \quad \frac{\text{Act Nm}}{\text{Der Nm}} \quad \text{fake NPs} \}
\]

\[
\text{for } NP \rightarrow V \ X \quad \frac{\text{Acc ing}}{\text{Pos ing}} \quad \frac{\text{Act Nm}}{\text{Der Nm}} \quad \text{fake NPs}
\]
Causality and fake NPs

They knew that I had put the candles in the store and what I had melted them in.

The room's high temperature melted the wax.

The rock melted the ice by pressing down with a force of 20,000 lb/in².

The high temperature fastened the rocks together.
German TM, des + Case Spreading

1/9/73

How the hell does the case spread to the embedded V in ein schwer zu lesendes Buch
Long & binding

Who remembered where Jack bought which books?

?? Who remembered where which box were bought by Jack
I'm doubtful that we'll win.

That we'll win is doubtful.

So what rule relates these?

It's like the Serbo-Croatian passive—no experiences are possible.
How modifiable are \( NP_2 \)'s?

There are many more modifiers possible for headway than for head.
The reason that breast causatives don't allow
how more time ahead. c.e. in 1964 they're lost
their clause.

Clauses with indicators.
Possible N's

Are there any N's which are synonymous to N's with relative clauses in which the relativized NP couldn't have been a derived subject?

So

Twelfth house = house people are supposed to have frequented.

So words may have the relative clause twice. If Malagasy, effectively.
It seems that suddenness is critical.

Off *drifted* the cops.

\[ \text{(Dashed)} \]
Slattery and Avery's S's

1/2/73

The swallowed (don't forget) (few people)

*that

*many

Why?

argue its from Slattery

know how many goldfish before she was stilled.