Two corner presumes artifact?

?? The left rear corner of the cave was damp.
One corner of the [postcard] was bent.
?? leaf
One corner of the [pebble] was chipped.
Who was in the bath tub?

None (was {there}).

There (was no one). Why?

Who was there in the bath tub?

"None"

"None was (there)"

"There was no one in it"

"Wasn't anyone?" (there)
Dread Andie Talley at the Boundaries

"The mention of fact" between 5 and 10 charts or any handpainted letters had

\[ X \text{ observed that when } 5 \text{ was could } X \]

\[ \text{Total} \]

He observed that with all the facts, he could have

\[ V \]

\[ V \]

\[ V \]

7.26.78
Perforanaces

7.21.70

Frankly S

Frankly only modifies V say

*I sliced it frankly*.
Eindruck → Ø

Er macht einen müden

? guten

*Vampyr

What's this say for good old non-recoverable?
They look

\{ qualified
? separated
* depended on \}

/"/

\{ qualified
? separated
* depended on \} - looking

also: an innocent-seeming he

? These shoes are paid for looking

? There is some sat-on looking bread

All explained, of course, if I rule of incorporation.
End of the Line

That's not even a little funny.

He didn't even Bastow us.

We didn't reach even the halfway point.
The Bible is designed to be easy to manipulate by authorities.

This language is designed to be easy to use by people.

Who knows Fortran?

This work is designed to be easy to burn by youngsters.

So both \( V \) are selected.
fashionable - DV fashion

palatable - DV palatable
Suffice Law (?)

[ent + able] v

[ent + vision] v

[ent + power] v

Counterexamples

beneath

Maybe the law (?) governs only productive offering?
Basically a (Neg) polarity item except that Neg
co somewhat not

I hope I can hack it

think
have an amount that
report

* Hack it!

He has been hacking it for years
In which case

Seh may [have drunk]

[be drinking], in which case

[drink]

we'll celebrate

* we celebrated

* Seh [has drunk]

[drank]

[drinking], in which case X

It rains, we'll stay in, in which case X

* We'll stay at home, in which case X

It could [not]

[was, were] 

[not]

[shall]

[have]

[not]

[has]

rain, in which case X

If you play, help us as possible
I have Jameson in tow

(?? I'm getting Jameson in tow)

\[
\begin{align*}
\{ \text{want} \} & \\
\{ \text{need} \} & \\
\{ \text{expect} \} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

Jameson in tow by noon.
Janice's hatred - (whether for pizza or for cornbread) is irrelevant

* for whether pizza or cornbread

↑ T somehow

That dance - (whether Janice hates pizza or whether she hates cornbread)

(whether it is pizza that she hates) or whether it is cornbread that she hates

whether it is pizza or cornbread

is irrelevant

A handful - whether of grapes or of raisins - would be enough

So I doesn't seem easy to use this as a basis for transformationalism.
2.17.76

When all is modified by almost, it can float, but only
off of subjects.

We have almost all seen that movie.

I kissed them (*almost) all.

I gave melons to them (*almost) all.
Can everything incorporated into "like"?

Child-like

? bookcase-like

?* American history teacher (like)

* works
Reassessing

Skin points out: He was explained to that S
My observation: reassessing is out of a higher-ranking term.

This explains this:

Terri was talked to (about it)

It was talked about (?? to Terri)

This can't be re-assessed from 0 to 2 so will be in the 3 around

2.7.78
Tokyo
talk to = tell

talk about = discuss

look at = inspect

count on = trust

believe in = ? [just believe ?]

3.22.78

live in = inhabit [so why is it bad if object is country? Inhabit allows country object.]

play in = use (very roughly) but clothed in equals nothing.

near's idea: "pseudo passives" are only possible if V1 is a verb, i.e., if the object of I can be interpreted as a 2.

so maybe these facts are relevant:

Hall [think] the problem

the concert hall has been { played in by some great orchestra

*applauded in by some large audiences

the BSO played in halls in europe

* these audiences applauded the halls
A possible counterexample to the Prefix Law (namely, prefixes don't change category) is Arabic

ma ktab

Two possible wrinkles:

1. Is ma prefixed to verbs, or to a stem? If the latter, bits are off — no problem

2. If Arabic has category-changing prefixes, does it have any such suffixes? Maybe languages can change categories from either end of a word, but not from both.

Problems:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[hin + über]} & \quad \text{Pref} \quad p \quad \text{Adv} \\
? & \\
\text{[be + side]} & \quad \text{Pref} \\
N & \\
\text{[be + cause]} & \quad \text{N, V} \\
\text{conj} & \\
? & \quad \text{Pref} \quad \text{Adj}
\end{align*}
\]

Possible wriggle: these are not productive patterns of prefixing.
From Konaruk Reddy  
Sound Of Meaning
Tamil

→ dhimal-dhimal — noise of a stone [or heavy obj] rolling down a hill

adhi atma — Mummy beat me for being so stupid

Anjali

au: aya: = on gie — Hindi
ata jata — Hindi
coming going

akad bakad bamba: boo

əːsəː si nabe pure soo

soo kalote + 'tar moote' ← [fat]
Law: no prefix changes category

\[ \text{Word-building rules} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
V & \rightarrow V & \text{ble, for} + \\
V & \rightarrow A & \{\#\text{able, ing}\} (N) \rightarrow \text{en (heart broken)} \\
V & \rightarrow N & \text{tal, want, ion, ex, ec} \\
A & \rightarrow V & -\text{en} \\
A & \rightarrow A & \text{ish} (longish [g], over, under, in) \\
& & \text{but: donishing [b]} \\
A & \rightarrow N & \text{eth, y, loy, role, ness} \\
N & \rightarrow V & \text{fasten X (down) with Y} \Rightarrow \text{Y X? (down)} \\
& & \text{put X on Y} \Rightarrow \text{X Y} \\
N & \rightarrow A & \#\text{like, worthy, x, fed (worth, feed)} \\
N & \rightarrow N & \text{non, \#\text{truth, hood, ship}} \\
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{Law: x to stem} \\
\text{Stem} & \rightarrow V & \text{ify (crucify), ize (aggrandize, baptize) ate (rotate)} \\
\text{Stem} & \rightarrow A & \text{-ent, ant, -ian, -ed (minimal), -ous, -ese, -ay} \\
\text{Stem} & \rightarrow N & \text{-on, -ion (spatious), -ex} \\
\end{align*} \]
Overkill Passive

Sentence heard from Justice grover, a friend of Uncle Vivx:

This amendment was sought to be made

Since seek does not seem to be a V-Preter (although further checking is necessary here)
this S must have been derived from

X sought to make this amendment

Thus when seek to make it

treated as a {compound} V

{complex} {conjoined}

both seek and make must get

passive morphology

But what kind of rule?

Sue anne says there's something like this in Turkish that she read...
Ref with Jake: 

(to Jim)

They're screaming for it to be possible

? for people to walk at night

? that we'll get back on time

So aaptivity doesn't go by form: it's abstract isn't always equally good.
11.27.77.

Me [meat] / meet Me

Voice? C♯ / cow / beef Q

p / sheep / mutton 1-0

C. V. C♯ / lamb / veal Q 3-1

V. q C♯ / pig / pork 2-0 (or 3-0?)

Cf. also Stern 20.10.77. p. 162-163

Elke Christian Hirsch: "Deutsch für Bessereins: column" "Welscher Tand"

Me / Me

P Mut / Courage

P Reche / Revanche

C♯ C♯ / C. V. C♯ / Ehre / Prestige V. Q 4-2

2 C♯ 5-1

C♯ / Glück / Malheur C♯ 2

Hirschk. proof. Out that the French words all have an ironic connotation.
Helmut Schultz's father, speaking to Helmut and me: "... such..."
[although he doesn't say me] — There is wrong.

On the other hand, speaking to Helmut and to some high tier,

he would have to say, "Them."

What's the rule? Is it because I'm close enough to
being duttjean that it would be more of an insult to Helmut to exclude
him in an "Them" than it is presumptions to exclude me in an "Euch"?
While with the Bundeskrieger, it would be presumptions (like trying to sneak
in — words, often one can enferen before one can duttjean), more
presumptions forwards the OK than distant from Helmut.
Weil Hermann die Ausgaben hätte Selber kaufen können

Weil meine Freunde diese Kirche hätten alle kaufen wollen
Uta Prachtov didn't like Eriierung —

It turns out that it's got to be transitive: *Schlafung

* Taupung

* Singlung

No: Dieter Hartmann points out that Eriierung is transitive but OK

Reason: Die Orangen { *fronen

Werbung

Sitzung

Tagung

U.R: Gettung - $ gotten

Intr. Erscheinung

Offnung
The leaves were shed [leaves thus is a plural]

Probably OK because of *leave

But why then it *cultivate so long?

out-cultivate is better.

But why then because NN is more tightly bound than \( N(p) V^{\frac{1}{1-x}} \)

But scissor (??) gander

headlight (??) adjuster

?? paint mixer
Ich hatte vergessen, dass sich mein Vater diesen Hut gekauft hatte.

12.2.77.

False: Jake and Earl shot it down

So this rule only works in superficial non-relative

Subordinate clauses

NB

1. Why?
2. How? Note that here, RC knot isn't easy to define configurationally.
From a Max David brochure:

Frömmelige Fabeln — Die Frömmeli blendet X

//

Preise gekrönt * Der Preis krönte X
Juwel beschnickt * Die Juwelen beschnickten X
Kriegsverletzt * Der Krieg verletzte X
Wasser beschädigt — Der Wasser beschädigte X
Erst getötet — Der Act tötet X

(Why is?)

What predicts the possibility here?
Place > Time

It was beautiful { there then } { then there }

10.11.77.
Cut it out
Move it / Kiss off
Make it snappy / Shake a leg / Move your ass / Get a move on
Or else

All these occur only in imperative clauses, and all are imperative.

Why so this? Is it because the unmarked imperative is
imperative, and idioms can only penetrate unmarked contexts? Or what?
"Manuals of Sufic practice are not available, whereas ones are for Yoga and Zen."

*... but ones should become available.
Why do it
Mostly dental have graphic versions

\[ \text{[yɔt]} - \text{cat-cit-cit} \quad \text{[ɛxt]} - \text{cat-cat-eight-eight} \quad \text{[aɪt]} - \text{ite-eight-eight} \]

\[ \text{[eɪd]} - \text{ead-eed-eed} \quad \text{[eɪd]} - \text{ade-aid-aid} \quad \text{[aɪd]} - \text{ide-ide} \]

\[ \text{[ɪs]} - \text{ice-ice-case} \quad \text{[ɛis]} - \text{ace-ace-ace} \quad \text{[aɪs]} - \text{ise} \]

\[ \text{[ɛɪz]} - \text{aze-aze} \quad \text{[aɪz]} - \text{ize-ize} \]

\[ \text{[tɛɪn]} - \text{can-cen} \quad \text{[ɛyn]} - \text{ane-an-ee} \quad \text{[aɪn]} - \text{ine} \]

\[ \text{[tɛɪr]} - \text{ear-eeer-eeer} \quad \text{[ɛyr]} - \text{are-air-air} \quad \text{[aɪr]} - \text{ire-yre} \]

\[ \text{[ɛyl]} - \text{ael-ael} \quad \text{[aɪl]} - \text{iel} \]

\[ \text{[eɪ]} - \text{ee-ee} \quad \text{[ɛy]} - \text{ay-ey} \quad \text{[aɪ]} - \text{ie-ye-yo} \]
Robert Frost: Something there is which doesn't like a well.