Clinics:

- second (eye)
- center (field)
- final (exam) oral
- contact (lens)

Shock (absorbers)
- short (film)
- house (dressing)
- house (coffee)

Historically:

A. Schott
Khakis

2.12.83
Berkeley

2.15.83
2.14.83
Began LAX
P.I.T. a mechanical failure
an intermittent
Suppose that the Yankees (will) win.

Dot if they (will) win.
Participle + the category & formal

Talking + Rosélia

My fate

a merinica roanda

so past participles agree, present ones don't

In French, both do, no?

Is there any 1 which has the reverse?

Me: Maybe past participle we also

A more last cause

more composite

longer ticket
3.11.83

How can I have been so stupid? Of course we change the L by working on R.

And we must change the poem too— the true poem, not the written one.
Petrosa, talking to Dave:

Look how the 12 moons show up:

1. 12 Zodiac signs / 12-year cycle in Chinese astrology
2. 24 = 2 x 12 hour day
   - Day = 12 hours
   - Night = 12 hours

3. 4 Seasons (are there any cultures with 3?)
   - Spring
   - Summer
   - Autumn
   - Winter
   - Youth
   - Prime
   - Middle Age
   - Old age
   - Death
   - Morning
   - Midday
   - Evening
   - Night

4. Hour = 60 minutes = $2 \times 30 = 30 \approx$ days in a month
5. Minute = 60 seconds
6. Foot = 12 inches
7. Yard = 36 inches — divider 360

1 Shilling = 12 pence

Stone = 26 pounds (divides 360)
Rock = 15 1/2 feet
No = 4 1/2
Declarative standing for \( q \)
standing for requests.

Sometimes declaratives can act as \( q \):

1. 12.83.
     Ruby

A_1: I'm hungry.
B_1: It's awfully cold.
A_2: Answer the question.
B_2: How all right.

A_1: It's cold in here.
B_1: Bad wind outside.
A_2: *Answer the question.
B_2: Ok, ok.

Why not always?
only + indecisions

There is {only} event
* {also} you.

1983.
Ashley.
Seen as a motion verb

From looking at this, it seems to me that you are right.
(a) student though he is

he is *a* student
1. Listening to Jeff Goodler:

A: Would you like a ride home?

B: (Thank you) — My car's right outside.

(A: OK, see you tomorrow) — What is tomorrow?

2. A: Would you like a ride home?

B: (Thank you) — my car's in the shop.

A: OK — if we go.

{I'll get my coat.}

Why this difference in deletability?

Is this related to the observation (cf. “where to”) that promise can be used to promise or warn [I promise you a good healing] but warn can only be used to warn?
From a talk with Rosalda yesterday:

Why is it that IPE accept non-compositional adjectives
only grammatically?

More, chief, very, utter, etc.

We clearly have some kind of process sending stuff in NPs

Letter
Shorter
More or
Less compositional
Examples from fn. 17 of Joan's

"The pressure on lexical theory"

sleep-in looking, uncared-for appearing

One more turn of the screw:

\[ \text{an easy-to-get along with - seeming man} \]

\[ \text{a difficult to imagine Betty saying that she'd sleep with goat} \]

Also: This goat seems difficult to imagine Betty saying that she'd sleep with

so lay thy

This will mean that Task Movement will have to be made

a lexical rule.

A swaying-like motion

an egg-beating-like rhythm
Was *speaking* in Greek of last night's speech of four hours. The rapid translation of the MS of last night.  

So I'm OK as a preposition for *temporal* only in using complements.

Lori: Last night's decision

Me: *Last night's translating of the MS*

P: Why *Last night's decision*
John Bergstrom, Howard Eskin case in semantics

Done it just went done

Don't do don don
Performatives

After Harvard Extension class on performatives.

You are hereby \[\text{warned}\] \[\text{promised}\] that there will be a strike.

Talking to Mike Reality.
Margaret Freeman: Philip Larkin does this —

All (that) nearly straddling to and fro they find

Nearly straddling to and fro

All they find

(Path: Extended parallel plate)

I know what to talk to Tom about is war

All I talked to him about was communism

All that I doubted that you should talk to him about was vice

So maybe this preparing it sensitive to inner island

Not clean-bound

To him (I know that) communism is what we should talk about

It is to Tom that communism is what we talk about
Log multiple Q's +
However to Vee

who wonders where we bought what?

Log link here better than in

?? who wonders what we bought where?

However, it's not just who-where links that are bad.
Because this is fine:

who wonders where when Galileo lived where?

and who what can be ghostly:

who wonders who ate what?

I think: who... why is my god if I do close to

V then i i
From James's paper:

"But in such an event, knowing the boy as intimately as I do, my anxiety would be entirely for the snake" The Invincible Heroes

It so happens that I'm anxious about

Having eaten

{ The Thing }

I am anxious about no snakes

Snakes in "what? I'm anxious about"

{ The Thing }

So control is possible out of (only fake?) RCS

Having shaved myself early, the only thing I fear

{ It makes }

{ fell on July }

Wow

{ Having shaved myself, these books I really don't want to read }

{ Having shaved themselves, these men I think we should hire }

{ Having grown themselves, no policeman has the bolder threatened }
Having no money, it is unknown where he could have slept.

?? Last night?

Suggest it's not via Adl. Propag

Having no money themselves, it beat me the place that they tried to live.

It is surprising

After being themselves, it surprised me that they could still stand.

I was surprised

But that one does feel like a proposed advert. How the hell is it leaving the scene?
That's how long it took.

Good frame for copy Qs.

Oh oh —

That's how I got oneself elected.

So there must be a rule of deletion of for one subj. — I can't see any controller. And this rule works for Qs & DQs —

d. 9.24.82.
While reading Jane Grumbach paper in LI (10.1)

Disj Qs allow Equal, Conq Qs not:

They don't know how (very) polite to be

Did Ho write concealed Qs:

They told me the houses to let myself into

They don't know the houses to let themselves into - Bills

Is there OK?
Compulsive Co

From reading Jane Ponsford

p. 299

* They were surprised at

- They wondered about

- They told me

The houses to look at this

1/5

Comp's exclusively Equal, there a support

for head raising.

It's going to be very tough to know this difference

w/o fake MP formation.
From a letter to Boswell

a key to an old chest, to a door containing no known treasure, but one became inaccessible.

8.12.82.
Ashley.
"You're fired. / I fire you.
"You're under arrest. / ?? I arrest you. Why?
"You're a bastard. / *# I call you a bastard.

You are sentenced to 5 years in Sing Sing. / ? I sentence you to 5 years in Sing Sing.

This rule is: if the effect of the speech act is bad for the addressee, the sentence is framed with you as subject so that the I doesn't have to be visibly the agent of some bad scene.

NB: the rule that deletes the by me could be a nice one to state, recoverability?
orgasmic

\[ \frac{\text{irresistible}}{\text{morphological harmony}} \]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{orgasmic} \\
\left\{ \frac{\text{irresistible}}{\text{likelihood}} \right\}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{cramp} \\
\left\{ \frac{\text{irresistible}}{\text{likelihood}} \right\}
\end{array}
\]

So with a Latinate root we need a kind of morphological harmony.

\[ A \times \pi \left[ A \times \pi \right]_{N}^{Learned} \]

9. 25. 82.

Ashby
yet = circle

? I'm surprised that Mike has yet to eat.

? If he has yet to eat, feed him.

Zoscy has yet to leave.

* Zoscy might have yet to leave.

Tom do (**yet) to speak.

Why?

Hum: ?? These are yet to be assigned

** Stanley in Exhibit

Is there a rule?

Hum:

have yet to V < have not V ever yet

Condition: not in effective context

Tom may have not eaten yet \Rightarrow ? Tom may have yet to eat

Tom had not yet eaten \Rightarrow Tom had yet to eat

{If I have not yet eaten, I can help you.

?? If I have yet to eat.
have not yet

- been to the beach
- been in church
- been followed

? been working to capacity
been being followed

I have yet to be followed

?* I have yet to be working to capacity
I have yet to be being followed on a regular basis

?* I have yet to be replicating all results

I have as yet [no] idea.
As yet I have [no] idea.
I have [no] idea as yet.

Few people are as yet aware of this.

What kind of cookware rule is that?

Why? OK. All others with be afterwards are blighted.

generalization: OK to do their side as long as person be or a real vis. to the right.

5/26/88
Belo Horizonte
I filled water into the glass  
↓ 082  
I filled the glass with water

A

↑ Cause

1. Theme  Goal  
Water filled the glass

↓ Goal Promoter

The glass filled with water

↓ 1

Why is only this causalization, which looks like a derived one, possible?
She persisted in her stubbornness.

Continued

Ceased

Her stubbornness persisted.

/s

be stubborn

?eager
Sentences discussed with Greg:

a student in Bible + my reward class

If S ≤ S' because S

My thought:

They derive from:

If S ≤ S', S be NP

If we turned left anywhere, our turning left was at First Road.

If we win (in any reason), [NP will be because we have worked well.

If he lives anywhere, the one who he hits will be ten.
With Dave & Pablo, at Merod's:

Pablo: I hereby countersign this order!

Me: I promise to break my word on that promise.

I bet I won't win this bet.

Pablo: From Joko, Eder, Ech: This sentence has three errors.

(If we say it has only 2, then that's the third. ☺️)
Chat with Jane Simpson:

I want to wash the peaches, and I want Sally to wash the peas.

Why [ & how? ] does this N get contrastive stress here?

To invite her would have been expensive for me.

and for Sally to invite
The more the merrier

3.7.82

Boston -> Atlanta
South of D.C.

She worked (all) the harder, the more liberal (that) she got.

Wow — this really looks like a relative clause — note that we even have all, a pronoun.


"In many cases, the doubting game has the opposite effect: I experience it as a strong attack and I dig in my heels the harder."

What has been deleted here? the stronger an attack I experience it as? If so, we should expect to find instead facts.

I met a man whose breath smelled bad, and I reacted all the more.

Why OK? [crossed] Why bad? Your sister looks like a gazelle and I reacted all the more.

Was happened? I was hungry and there was food on the tray, but I reacted all the more.
The ongoing research

The upcoming events

The incoming signals

The outgoing work

only come + go Ø?
only here?

in/out

over/under

S. S. 04:44

off/on

So it looks as if only compostable locative particles can be incorporated.

but - go on com-

postional! ? !
I stabbed
slit
pierced

through
eye
hand
leg
arm
stomach
back

They have a finger
I kissed them on the finger

Stuped
I kissed her on

punched

mouth
head
belly
lap
ear

So I suggested
relationship here

He was blind
They are blind
in one eye

hit

She punched them in the fingers

? I stabbed her in the finger
Suggested by examples from Ken Helle:

I am blind

* Ted's eyes are blind [but: Ted's blind eyes]

Ted is blind in one eye

They are blind in one eye

Ted's blindness in one eye has embittered him

Why OK? Is it a strong rule either?

Or is that supposed to be there?
\[ \text{pro} + \text{N} = (\text{non-predicate) adjective} \]

I am pro-life – OK, but seems elliptical

A pro-Castro demonstration

A pro-nuclear energy demonstration

A pro-arms control experimentation

So pro can precede compound N and non-predicate + N

Note: "a pro long vacation lobbyist"

? a pro shorter work week lobbyist

? a pro green roof voter

In general

pro - Adj. N N

is not too cool
pret & post

pre
pret

post
post

pre (wax)

pre (dram)

post (marble)

pre (industrial)

post (transformational)

pre (cyclic)

post (cereal)

pre (corn)

pre (cheese)

So: only N work that can precede happen: work;


That [wax] happened at 12

by dog

Also:

pre
21.6.82

Andy

I wonder where they all went.

They gone where there books are, will be back.

Why?

"OF > RCF"
Leftwards can leave classes:

I don't even think that Tom likes Celeste pizza.

But rightwards, it obeys the Right-Reflex Principle.

* That Tom likes Celeste pizza is unclear, even
Formulae +
To the extent $S$

1. 13. 82
Ashy → Boston

Tom said it, I hear it.

A. To the extent (that) $S_1$, to that extent $S_2$

Embeddable. We know $A$.

That $A$ is obvious

Double negatives? The people who *to the extent that I understand*

I like
Need

If need be

Change tech

Need we go?

Neg + need

What precaution need be taken?

OK only if measured
The cattle *will be* lowing.

\[ \text{or} \quad \text{were} \]

\[ \text{are} \]

\[ \text{lowed} \quad \text{will low} \]

Requires progressive