The place to go.

* street to put it.

What place did you put it?

I go the place.

[scribbles]

And you going.

So it seems to be a phenomenon involving suicide fantasy in RCF or Release Reduction.

But

After that.

Mom: I left the house.

So the closer you, the less deletable the P.
Article Idioms

many a

one or another

Such a

no such
Typicalization vs. Literalisation in memory

Who do you go with?

Jane I went with

* Jane I went with her

Jane it was that I married

It was her that I married

Maybe OK

Mr. Shapard, it was him that complained
Almost + The incomesty of tellest (if thee the right notion)

almost

{ believe
    drank beer
    ?? drank beer on Sundays

* walked from LA

7.30.74.

6/13/84, Greenville

This is no fair, because

Tom walked from LA. It also is good

unless interpreted as (4) here.
Sunday Laws

Coca Cola not * Cola Coca

became

\[ C_i \cdot V_i C_i V_i \] to the unmarked syllable

then

\[ C_i V_i C_i \] a

then

\[ C_i V_i C_i \]

Is that the best monosyllable?

I doubt it

\[ p_i i \] must be much better

\[ p_i i \] is hard, and so often dissimilated against
This MS has been finished being typed

If

I finished the MS being typed

10.17.84

The MS has been finished only being typed

It was gotten (been) here
It's not that S

It's only that S

It's merely that S

It's more that S than (if up) that S

If {must, may, might, could} be that S

* It has been that S

Maybe the rule here is The case follows Which we blocked here, etc.
?? What are you telling to me?

Why had?

I wrote to Jon McCaulby about this fact, looking it to

? I told something to him

NB: What are you telling to me that I don't know?

I told something to him that he didn't know

So O J Rel cl.
I'd be happy to share... (illegible)

Mike said to share [myself, yourselves, yourself, oneself].

5. 28. 84

Foster
Trend you feeling a lot more like you do now than you were when you came in?

Don't you feel a lot more like you are now...

He felt sick \( \begin{cases} * \text{ I am too} \\ * \text{ I was too} \\ * \text{ I have to} \\ * \text{ I might have too} \end{cases} \)

He is feeling sick \( \begin{cases} * \text{ She did too} \\ * \text{ She has too} \\ * \text{ She may} \end{cases} \)
They don't

*It was in spite of the rain that we had our picnic.*
Reading Riché on ECP (from last year, actually)

Chinese can count as an antecedent for an empty category.

Thus, "The Chinese destruction by Russia"

(Though I wonder how usually Arthur did this.)

America's human expedition

Here's a goal:

Here's a "America's human expedition"

Anyway, bringing this forward a quarter, we find

\[ \text{China's likelihood of leaving} \]

which thus argues against Riché's idea that likelihood works via Equal (= control - cf. p. 109, fn. 25).

I think that the real explanation is not movement vs. not:

\[ \text{Chinese} \]
\[ \text{The Chinese} \]

The Chinese is a weak antecedent, if all
Which as sentence, relative + adverbial?

Todd, \{ \underline{as} \} you know, sores.

\*\underline{which}\

So as clauses are adverbs and never islands

If Todd snores, as it possible \{ \underline{you know} \}.

\*\underline{as is true}\

\* This seems bad in all contexts
We can ill afford to lose. + High-falutin'.

? We can ill afford that RV.

** I can ill leave

*** I can ill seem to persuade Joan

So ill only goes with effort?
While reading Noam's "Conditions on Rules of Grammar" (p. 179) — Essays on F+I

They want

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{pictures of} & \left\{ \frac{\text{themselves}}{\text{each other}} \right\} \quad \text{(to be) made} \\
\text{pictures to be made of} & \left\{ \frac{\text{themselves}}{\text{each other}} \right\}
\end{align*}
\]

Serious problem because?

* They want me to think of \left\{ \frac{\text{themselves}}{\text{each other}} \right\}

So it looks as if the rules should go:

1. Reflexive in picture-N
2. PP EXTRACTION

\[\text{What to do in a theory which can only look at SS is not obvious.}\]
size of affix boundary and attachability

\[ \text{+ive} - \text{+ity} - \text{+ible} \]

these attach to news (i.e., word or root)

but are very clumsy — only go with (adjunct stuff)

by contrast, -scope will go on words

and then [by what type?] doesn’t care about lexical class

size of boundary

low \[ \text{low} \]

What explains this tradeoff relationship?

with lexical phonology can one say

only level 1 affixes can have lexical stratum continuums
It's unsteasability.

Ursula K. Le Guin, The Dispossessed

"It was strange to see Tekwee take a leaf in her hand, or even a rock. ... she became an extension of it, and it of her."

OK:
1. She watched it, and it *(watched)* her.

2. *It* and *it*'s predecessor.

3. Not *it* but *it*'s owner were to blame.

*What fell on you? *(It was it)*

2. *I saw it*, but not *him*.

3. *(Can you locate it?)*
The police stopped talking \{ about war \} \{ about them \} on campus.

Why so wretched?
from a letter:

I have far to fly

*I have often to stay up
* I have [three] times to grease the car
* I have [not to think]

I have farther into the woods to fly than you do.

*I have with the woods to fly

? I have far into the woods to fly

?? I have far into the night to work

What does this kind of have require
so to rigge?

Alas! I don't have big to want

↓

I don't have a long time to want (for)
Sexism

wife-swapping

husband-swapping

Thus wives are husbands' property (of course), not vice versa.
Er ist schwer zu sehen.
Him cost schwer zu halten.

ein schwer zu {Selten} {Selten} er Mann

So it must delete only nominative.

Ich wünsche, ge{Selten} zu werden.

Thus * Feme is a deletion, so should Wibiz be.

Which parallels: gimmersbach.
Prone + TH and change passive to Nominative.
1. What is the meaning of the Soviet pilot's words?

2. What is the meaning of the fact that the Russians allow the pilot to talk?

3. What is the meaning of the US saying that a previously "illegal" pilot is now heard as the pilot saying "I have fired warning shots"?

4. What is the meaning of 3 following 2?
LOVFACTER

LARTOIACTUFEH
Freeze Frame

A. Move
B. Someone freezes, all freeze
C. Move by someone, all move
D. Freeze by someone, all freeze
E. Move

A = E?  How \[ A \neq C \]

B = D?
(1) German: Hast Du genug zu essen, dass ich zufrieden realeb
(2) Wärest Du krank, wos (so) müpte ich ween irrealb
(3) English: *Have you enough to eat, I am satisfied
Were you sick, I’d have to cry
(4) This suggests that the prototype inversion is irrealb cases — or could an anti-English exist?
But why oh why should it be preferable to invert in irrealses?

9.16.83
Zo

(2) *Ich müpte ween, wärest Du krank.

The inversion only works in the order: Subordinate – Main
Thus vielleicht ist das die unverbante Wortstellung?
This parallel,
I put on more weight, the more I eat.
Instead of she we, I examined her.

(1) a. Instead of [he] Tom, this will be painted by Martha.

b. This will be painted by Martha instead of [he] Tom.

(2) a. Instead of [??] Tom, this will be given to Martha.

b. This will be given to Martha instead of [??] Tom.

(3) a. Instead of [at] Martha, she was looking at Tom.

b. She was looking at Tom instead of [at] Martha.

(4) a. Instead of [of] figs, I was dreaming of things.

b. I was dreaming of things instead of [of] figs.

Instead of in the box, it was on the box.

Instead *(of) of Ted, it was a picture by Ted.

So the of that goes with instead never together.
First retired in Canada? in August?
or in LD in July?

He might have been working alone, your Dad might have been there.

NB:

He might have been being secretly followed, your Dad might have been there.

How can these facts be made the same as those for Tags, even etc.?

good luck to us all

NB: Some deletion is mandatory.

It's simple, this problem is *simple*.

Right, Pastor: That's drunk, your Dad is, go to bed.
Stressless N.

Sucker

jobby

I could never get used to the sucker jobby.

Both ok with this, that

my??

? I couldn't get my fuckers over
I'm just a person who likes { her \{ my \} house \}.

* who says that I like her

9.4.83.
Ashby

I became a person who could be proud of { himself \? myself \}

write

I became a person who hated { himself \? myself \}

Why?

\(3 > 10\)

I became a person who felt that people loved { him \? me \}

2ax > 3

you became a person who felt that people loved { them \ you \}
Past - Participle → Present - Participle

Reasons:

1. Shorter
2. Irregular
3. Graveyard forms
   - new warm bag
   - eleven leaves
4. Some short forms:
   - wel pego
   - marito < master
   - saltos
5. Agree in # + gender
6. Prepose sometime?

Longer
Regular
No bound form
What of
Campanilla
Etc.
1. Adjective Prefacing

2. WH-fronting

3. Predicate raising

4. Quantifier lowering


* Head noun postposing

* Clause remnant postposing
This book is

☐ characterizable
☐ uncharacterizable
☐ other
☐ another
Is it an accident that only Brashingsian (among
classical Romance L's) prohibits climbing and also hasn't
developed any Be / Have alternatives.

Um. Hmm. Hmm. No.
Rosédia gestures "Further out!"
as I say
se en for

[I correctly rephrased:
se en from]
Rosélia's image:

a web, una tela
of relationships
in center necessary, a very flexible
very general, not linked to language,
as do a poem.

much

The Jewel Web of Rosélia.
Riding downtown, I realized that the license plate game, I realized that for these two,

- *gazebo* (some useless fully things?)
- *zygote* (some biological term, concerned with cell division?)

That was all I knew. It therefore has to be possible to give partial specifications – that a speaker knows only nouns and little else (except registers, levels).
gesture: personal space + negation

From George's talk:

Language:

- X is present vs. X is not present

Gesture:

- Far from body
- Close to body

So negation so close to me?
Factors influencing adjectivality

Rip with Rozalin:

1. Valence — contextually = 1 [Valence of opened \( \downarrow \),
   but as an adjective, we’d better hear it as a property]

2. Verbs tend to follow: \{ * killed, murdered \} 

   built [environment]
   built [house]

   If a context provides a contrast, it goes through.

   Written letters - OK if we give a universe where letters can be tape-recorded

   Why:
   baked beans.
   Why?: baked \{ goods \} \rightarrow Man: goods can come to exist (many ways other than by baking with peas).

   3. ser not estar: \{ falante, * falante \} 

   form \{ child \}

   \{ actor \}
There may be a lack of overall preparedness — is this a problem of preparation or process is the approachgroupId.

It's not what matters. It's who.

That's all there is to it.

Like chicken or fish.

It may not matter who has power over who.

With the president.

Where is the president?

The president is the president.
From The Tao of Psychology, one of the last 5 pages or so,
a quote from the Taoist:

A: A dream unexamined is like an unopened letter.

B: An unexamined dream is like an unopened letter.

C: A dream unexamined is like a letter unopened.

It seems to me that both repeated cases are

OK:

D: ? An unexamined dream is like a letter unopened.

My feeling is that NA do not so much about N, but
rather about the esthics which is logical between N and A;

AN seems as Duhduh shows us, to imply a "missing" Ser

Then suggests that F is better than F

E: ? Ser is like Ser.
F: ? Ser is like esther.

In other words: the semantic center is

NA ≠ AN

7.4.83.
Los Angeles
4:26 AM
Adjectives which only go with ser or only estar

7.4.83.
LA

pingoso

mangose - trash fit

rambente - scally-nosed

favorito

either
favorito
believe

N/A
maconheiro
costureiro - dressmaker

only estar

pensado

enser

a drunk

a scantly-nosed N ++ is satisfied

hard-working [ok / be -]

Why?

Aha! Complaining = sendo

scantly dressed
pipe smoking
There are people
\[
\{\text{hungry} / \text{*finished} \\
\text{drunk} \\
\text{naked} \\
\text{awake}\}
\]

Why \$\$?

There are many {\text{cheered} / \text{mugged}}
\[
\{\text{open} / \text{*opened} \\
\text{closed} \\
\text{painted}\}
\]
Prefix shorter than suffix
Coordinates, Site Construction + Ripping

6.17.83

* Tried

*She went home and try on the

* What did she go home and try on?

Must be from She did go home + try on

* She went home and try on the

Ahem! What has she gone home and taken out of the fridge?

She has [gone home and taken X out of fridge]

↑

↑ Cheryl

S + S
1. Yes
   An + Yes/No

2. I will comply
   An + Yes/No Whispering

3. I see

4. I don’t dispute - I accept your break in the conversational edifice.
While writing about my dream:

The notion of multi-attachment is a holistic notion —
ending it as we always did before by a set of coreferential NPs, which would delete each other under identity —

that was Newtonianly seeing one multi-located entity into a field of particles.
Jack has [never been able] to take this feed on dope.

That feed has {never been able to be taken on dope.}

?? been unable to be taken on dope.
Subject Object Fusion?

From my emerging Equi-Parsing paper:

A Dr. Sincheke - Bally examination is feasible

When is this construction possible?

A Linguist - corpus examination

So it has to look like an NP*

but: A Dr. Sincheke - Bally examination

What V allows N?

The Romeo - Juliet

{Work

Love

Fight

Kick}
Passive Adjectives

Rap with Rosália:

Seen → be, not converse: The door [were] closed

Both OK with Rosália

Rosália: Note from don't agree, also they have no adjectival senses.

In European Portuguese, NP's of the form

\[
(\text{NP: Vndo X})
\]

\[
(\text{a menina \{*Comendo\}})
\]

\[
(\text{a comer})
\]

OK this & OK

Me: And [Ving] not, also have [Ving]

interesting

interested

Why?
Quote from Picasso, mentioned by Viki Wexrook.

*Discover*, June 1983, p. 57

Picasso was asked:

"What good are computers?"

"No good at all. They can only give you answers."
Fact from Mao: there's nothing
(Harvard student from Taiwan/who's taking 24.901
from Jon + me)

In poems, final particles are stressed,
final prepositions aren't:

The bed was \underline{\text{kept in}}
\underline{\text{kept in}}

The cord was \underline{\text{turned in}}
\underline{\text{turned in}}

Mineral pie: \underline{\text{Holly}} \underline{\text{sleep in}}
\underline{\text{sleep in}}

What explains that, I wonder?

Pinto, as she observes, for: Ruggles
It was the bed that I slept in \underline{\text{kept in}}
\underline{\text{kept in}}

It was the cord that I turned in \underline{\text{kept in}}
Call L's + Prepositions

They don't have many

WHY???

After talking with Ken & Mary, I hear that it doesn't seem to correlate with either configurationality or with costness.

Most languages have less than 20, maybe even less than 10.

German doesn't have some processes which make preposition

English, etc.

Russian seems to have quite a few:

2a v & dlya k ot pri na bez pervel do u

And so:

li mir fi
Quantifiers Floating
+ pronouns + prony

I will talk to

The boy

other

all

Why shall quantifiers prefer to float if pronons?

Don’t understand it.

No: better for subjects than objects - prony

The boy

all like pizza

Why do this good? (Is it?)

I gave the boys all

cooked

milk

Why this

horrible
Colors + Names

4/11/83
Keep Tech

Secondary colors which can function as family names:

- Must
  - White
  - Black
  - Brown
  - Gray
  - Green

- Mr.
  - Blue
  - Red
  - Yellow
  - Pink
  - Lavender
  - Rose [ok, but]
  - Orange
  - Purple
  - Black

Why should this be?
4.18.83.
Atlanta

From Rosalie's topic continuity paper

... As if one knew what that phenomenon is or what it entails.

As if we can have been.

As if I knew who he were.

As if I knew that he were happy.

As if I were surprised that he were happy.

I wish you knew that he were happy.

Hum — so it requires a bit of clausemuteness.
sink \neq \{ walk \neq \text{ gallop} \}

Isabelle:

He sunk the ship by turning on the wave generator.

V0.

He walked the dog by X.
Adverb Prepositional clause bound and derivative
in Texas tomorrow I will say.

QF is a riper and once only

* Where did you see?

These can't be unrelated facts.

They feel like the trade-off between inflection and
scrambling.