I am tortured by what seems like a paradox

English exists — I speak it

but

My system is different from everyone else's

Or

Stereotypes are fine. vs. Everyone is an individual

Is this like finding ever more pattern as you up the power of the electron microscope?

What looked random indistinguishable becomes unique.
The frequency of use of a law should be usable (?) as an index of the number of votes. Maybe language by language?
He said that he was a gay

Like:

I am Stenpo's henchman

(example from Noam)
Pippi said something to sensitize me to these differences:

That got me happy # That made me happy.

That got Al drunk # That made Al drunk.

Is this somehow more consonant with Al trying for

drunkeness?

[or rather: speaker wants drunkeness]

That'd get them angry # That'd make them angry.

That got death casual? (??-seeiny) # That made death casual? (seeiny)
There's \{ a man's hat \} on the bed.

Is this known?

7.28.81. Army

There couldn't have been the story if \{ an Asian prince \} in any period.
Me is near

Me

old male Samson circa 1805

autumnal domestic presidential orders

This would say that direct objects are

the most essential [if the essence] to the verb's meaning

just like ? German wooden stools

wooden German stools

But: German wooden stool

do wood German

sage that French glass table top

material is more Me than place of origin

more essential
Es → da
darüber

↑
da darüber

Eine Doppelmoppelung
Ich habe ihn erschreckt

Ich bin erschrocken

Ich habe mich erschrecken

ich erschrecke
du erschrückst
er erschreckt

er erschrak

* er hat erschrocken

Berlin

1.7.1988
From TUB lecture
Me
who are industrious

the Chinese

the industrious Chinese

The phonological parallelism is exact — but why do restrictive

part of immediacy?
German agents

- er = animate agent
- el = inanimate agent?
  Instrument

Hobel
Hebel
Kuebel
Knueppel
Idioms + Word-Use Semantics + Metaphors

Like father, like son.

\[=\]

Der Apfel fällt nicht weit vom Stamm.

Just as

slow motion to another route to Zecklyke.

So I wonder if there are points in propositional space, with the compositional rules being driving instructions.

What put me onto this was all of the 24,900 students saying that in the last got his tongue on possession sense of have.

[This is only true of the route, not of the destination. So you with metaphor.]
Negrines, +
+ Nigerian +
+ sending up +
+ Anaphora Islands

Mary will not be eating anything ⊃
{ be eating anything }

Not many will be eating anything ⊃
{ will not be eating anything }

will be eating nothing

So why not? Probably because I wording up
negative can’t have word very well.
4.17.79.
NB: all have initial
stress, none have
> 2 syll./word
have 2 in endyll!

Also: 2nd

syll. ends

with

sonorant:

* guttly

* pruncely

* insectly

Contrast

beastly

p. 2468

N.B. *

* ad + ly

manly *

womanly *

* goodly

* (grand) fatherly

* (grand) motherly

* (beast) friendly

* (beast) striking

* (beast) neighborly

N+ by adj

Are there all relational N?

No →

lambly w ?

childly w ?

illaddly w ?

lovelly

timely

naively

lovely

worldly

heavenly

naively

baddly

timely

baddly

beastly

beautly

Unique? 4.24.79.

come + ly

Unique?

deadly (A + ly)
Rel Pos: #/ - 1st
+ Empty N

2.1679.

The place: {{ to which } to go

the restaurant: {{ to which } to go

The place: {{ where } to live

The time: ?? at which } to go

The thing: {{ where } to build

But, if not: *somebody to give presents

The way: {{ how } to solve it

The reason: {{ for which } to recall
The meaning of vowels:

- [ɪː] - quick, like yellow.
- [ɛː] - quick.
- [ɜː] - hesitation.
- [ə] - hesitation.
- [ɔː] - words, surface.
- [uː] - too.
- [ʌ] - a delicate point.
- [ɪ] - British.
- [ʊ] - British.

- [ɪ] - yes?  
- [ɔ] - pain.
- [ɜ] - yes.

Initial syllable:

- [rɪ] - excels.
- [ɜː] - look.
- [ou] - sound.
- [ʌ] - sound.
- [uː] - sound.
- [ɪ] - sound.
- [ʊ] - sound.
- [ɔ] - sound.
- [ɜ] - sound.
Transtivity + Sportese

12.1.79.

No (?) football V delete anyplace object?

kick
carry
gain/lose
throw

pass
fumble
sweep
punt
defend

recover
intercept
carry

recieve
fakes
score
hold
trap

start
field

holt

ack

hurt

sack

sweep

spike

sweep
ground
drop
catch
dip

have been tackling
Source of what

what can't be \parallel to some

\{ \textit{what} \} \textit{some}

\textit{what} is probably a determiner, but rather an adjective.
Why can't either more than one clause?

She thinks I went is a mystery.
Professor Ascension should clench his arm.

\[
\text{I hit her arm} \quad \downarrow \quad \text{PA} \quad 2
\]

\[
\frac{\text{I hit her on the arm}}{2} \quad 2
\]

NB. also:

\$\text{I hit her on the}\$

\$\text{left \ arms}\$

Argument for:

\$\text{I hit her on them}\$

\$\text{I kicked her in the}\$

\$\text{*(shorter five) tentacles}\$

\$\text{DIFF in French? *Je me les suis levées}\$

German: *Ich habe mir die geschoren*
In Merrill and my class:

Merrill says: preserve[z] presumably proceed [z]

I have proceed [z] but proceed [z]

Maybe some have [z] in both.

Then anyone have [z] and [z] [z]

Probably not, // ing

was were (at)

data procede
Verner's Law

exalt [gz]

exaltation [gz] or [ks]

So: since ññ is unmarked,

1) 2 chances there,

one in the marked ññ.
I (S) - the irony of S =

1. S is false
2. Speaker wishes that S were true.

But

Pick up your darling son

Here's a case where only the precomposition is

Irrelevant

Conf my heart, darling

Why is it easier to say

He's a magnificent dancer than

Exaggeration so big here for I.
Why $\mathcal{J}$?

* Jane pocketed her hand.  * I potted my foot.
* Ted bowed himself.

Why does pocket only allow alienable objects?

Does this mean that notion of alienables is prototypical?
Non-anaphoric it

I've had it.
He's gonna get it / just got it?

I've got it!

give it to 'em!
et it!

you asked for it.

I take it.

Move it. Hop it. Step on it.

Dig it. We can take it.

Make it (2 senses)

Buy it. Catch it. Cut it. In for it.

Goose it.

Get it on. Get on it.
"Soft facts."

"These implications I will mention where relevant, but I will not pursue systematically."

These I will mention (but I will not pursue them)

but will not pursue further

Why this diff?
If clauses are syllables

Then some in syllables we typically have that

Sonority profile

we should expect a clausal analogy.

What would that be?

\[
p \text{ in } T
\]
\[
p \text{ at } T
\]
\[
\text{paynt} \rightarrow \text{less V like}
\]
\[
\text{give blood to people for money}
\]
\[
V \quad NP_1 \quad NP_2 \quad NP_3
\]

V + NP, should be more similar than V + NP. Is this shown by the tendency of NP to incorporate...