Michael Murphy "Golf in the Kingdom" p.4 & 5
Full Page back 1972

Did he [Shane, Irons] drive the eighteenth
green, some 320 yards away?

Later on - past p.50
... play Basingstoke...
If one feels ill, taking him to a doctor is easy (for me)
This makes the claim that rules which influence lower items [Finnish Case Change, Russian Case Change] should not be able to work — because cyclically, you move the things before they get changed.

Spanish à
Rap with Paul

Reflexive Action

I washed (myself) / *I rewash

I bathed (? myself) / *I rebathed

I showered (*myself) / I resterowed

But

They armed (*themselves) / rearmed (themselves)

We're rebuilding

The plane is refueling (*itself) / The plane is refueling

NB
Paul speak/talk
Paul doesn't get this at all
French isn't spoken here
 French is fun to *talk
I talked to her in French
I talk French

Why? French was spoken in

But: Why *speak linguistics/ship/etc? *
* He now speaks French
Rep with Paul

Me: Possible test for introspective 1:

the \textit{V} \textit{N} \underline{began}

Paul: Possible test for introspective 1:

\[ \text{-ing} \] \textit{N} \textit{N} \underline{\text{subject}} \underline{\text{object}} \underline{\text{etc.}}

Me: In German \[ \text{Das V ein} \]

Paul: English \underline{N} \underline{A} \underline{gentive}

Exceptions: \underline{summer}, \underline{beginner}
INTRANSITIVE 1 VERBS

work
play
speak, talk
Way of speaking verbs: mumble, shout, scream, whisper, bellow, growl, etc.
smile, grin, grimace, frown, etc.
dance
whistle, hum (voluntary)
skate, ski, swim
kneel down, bow, bend (voluntary)
think, meditate, cogitate
fight
walk, travel (agentive sense)
sleep

INTRANSITIVE 2 VERBS

exist
happen, occur, transpire, take place
arise, ensue
appear, disappear, vanish
Inchoatives: melt, freeze, solidify, crystallize, vaporize, evaporate,
redden, darken, become fat, become thin, become big, become small, etc.
All colors, weights, sizes, shapes, smells
fall, rise
arrive
flourish, multiply, become numerous, become rare or scarce
blush, grow pale
perish, die, be born
sprout, grow, bloom, wilt, wither
dry out, become wet
explode
collapse
slide, slip, seep, trickle, drip, ooze, gush
drown (involuntary), stand (involuntary), sit (involuntary)
stink, smell
rot, decompose
evil, good
light, heavy
increase, decrease, reduce, diminish, dwindle, peter out
dim, brighten, etc. (these are inchoatives)
remain, stay, last
survive, subsist,
begin, continue, stop, start, cease
dissolve
reside, dwell
dangle, hang
sway
burn
disintegrate

Remove
SOME TRICKY CASES AND SOME CASES OF DOUBLETS: INTRNS 2 OR INTRNS 1

VERBS OF MOTION

walk seems to be generally an intransitive 1.
So are, usually, travel, voyage. But these can be intrans 2s too when they are nonAgentive, as in: That letter travelled from Paris to Buenos Aires.
arrive seems to be an intransitive 2.
But most verbs of motion seem to be capable of being either Agentive or not, and hence intrns 1 or intrns 2:
go, come, leave, go out, go up, go down, etc. These should be examined in detail.
Also, run seems to be Agentive in most cases, but there are also nonAgentive uses of run. (The conference ran for 3 weeks, ≠ lasted for 3 weeks.)

What needs to be shown in all tricky cases and all cases of doublets is this: That whether or not you can have an impersonal passive depends on whether or not the semantic relation of the nominal to the verb is that of Agent.

escape is also tricky.
Nonagentive, hence intrns 2: Gas escaped into the next room.
But what is the status of: The convict tried to escape.
This is not so clear.

As an intrnsitive, follow seems to take initial intrnsitive 2s:
Night followed. A party followed.
But it is a 1 in transitive uses of follow.
The same is true of many verbs that are transitive/intransitive doublets, especially the aspectuals such as start, stop, continue, begin, etc.

There may be a contrast between dream (taking an initial 2) and daydream (taking an initial 1).

The thing to remember is this:
In all cases where something seems NOT to behave like it should according to the enclosed list, test to see whether the verb in question is capable of having different semantic relations to its nominal, and see whether the syntactic behavior in question is correlated with these semantic differences.
Rap with Paul (Paul Piper)

12/29/76

Paul asks: in

How serious is it to you that I?

31

Why can the 3 drop along with the I?

*How deceptively presented to the committee.

Me: were these experts?

*How widely reported in the newspapers was sick recognition?

[Why: How quickly freed were the eggs?]

Paul: ?? How widely known that he is a pest? was it to the new members of the committee?
Red Pen!

(by the student)

How well received was Don's talk?

Paul: How [well] often discussed is this problem?

So that I has no good form well.

How afraid that J are you?

How afraid are you that J?
Why is officiating in NFL so bad?

Why angry?

Maybe because of

a) the officiating in the NFL

b) officiating in the NFL is bad for one
Hey! Here's a middle with an NP swap:

Joe takes *(good)* picture *(of)*

[= Joe is easy to photograph]
I know how to find my way.

Otherwise, X's way occurs only after find/lose, and know take S or O.
Phenomena for Joel?

In New York (?) centered speech, sometimes [g] doesn’t drop word-finally:

Long Island

I just heard something like

... anything out...

I’m sure the [g] can’t always stay

1. Across clauses?
   * If you’re not coming, I’m going

2. Easier / less than / - NP?
   Where are you taking us?
   (us)
   Eddie

3. In fixed phrases?
   * Long Island vs? Long envelope
$\$

* Es wurde geregnet

Why not?
From my wife Moira:

12.13.76.

Is it difficult to distinguish, in tree theory, between

* V NP NP when one has later been moved?
French is hard for me to talk in.

The language that he is talking isn't agglutinative enough.

So in talk in French.

French isn't much of a NP w/o P.

But French-speaking people.

Why is French-speaking so fun.
No adverb will compare that is not either Adverbs or a possible prepositional adjective.

He worked more skillfully than I did.

He ran [faster] than I did.

* He has eaten more already than you have.

* He is here stiller than you are.

* He likes Ripple, evener than she.

* He played it even thinner than you did.

* I stayed more there than you did.

Exceptions: often, ?seldom

NB: Ë frequently rarely
He is a man who is fun to talk to.

Presumably because this is a marked TNP.
Seems to be only with future triggers?

John { tried 
* wanted 
* tried 
* would like 
* likes 
* seems 
* may 
* avoided 

I { helped 
* made 
* expected 

John anticipated please

Can the rule ever work after an-ing?
The other is Lee's more cautious female counterpart.

Further on, where normally there was no tension in the natural world, a conflict before demand can fulfill itself.


The public about letters and attacks are.

So ROC and feel more the

Who NP's is the front.

Joan recognizes this type of sentence - she believes there was a squad about them - is there sometimes - possibly by a Japanese linguist?
Knecht
Bach / nach

Wöch

Büche, Fruch, Euch

Ich
ich! Viel vorchen

Pech

* eech

Koch, doch / * och

Küche / # ... ich#

# äch?

/ Reicht
/ auch 3 lot
/ auch Dach
Parallel was it made of

I have

? I hate being written recommendation for

* What kind of recommendation do you hate being written for?
1. who > what / - P

She caught a cold, but I forgot \{who\} from

2. Not all people like being stranded:

She was throwing things, but I couldn't see

\{
\{what out of\}
\{who at\}
\{who with\}
\{what in\}
\{what through\}\}
If \( V \) NP P NP \( \approx \) V NP with NP,

then this will middleg better than this.

But

Truth serum injects easily (* into my patients

Patients inject easily with truth serum.

Better spreads well onto crackers >

Crackers spread well with butter.

Negatives are OUT

* Snow sweeps easily off of the sidewalk

The sidewalk sweeps well (** of snow)

Yankedness: these linoleum [washes, wipes] well
Rap with Rick

Rick: This table wipes clean easily

Usually, Pepsi Cola powder (*out) well

Ext: The shirts dried

\[
\begin{align*}
& (P \quad \text{no agent}) \\
& \quad \text{well} \quad \text{some} \\
& \quad \text{easily} \quad \text{all}
\end{align*}
\]
Why is there? That is, basically? Statues passives for V with P.
11.15.76.

Only unmarked P may go:

(In) The garden swarms with bees

(On) The stage was crawling with termites

Rich

Blood dripped from the knife

The knife [was dripping] with blood

The knife dripped blood

Source Fantasy
Middles

This ax cuts \{ \text{well} \}
\{ \text{steel} \}

\text{Maybe the restriction is that something must follow the V?}

\text{No}

\text{?? This novel translates into Spanish?}

\text{[Better with would (not)]}
बोरा अधिक बड़ा मानक

? जो बोरा है?

लोग जो बोरा है
जो बोरा अधिक है

one who is a big man

jo ... wo
They differ in \{ ?* \text{ names} \\
? \text{ name} \}

Their difference(s) in \{ ?? \text{ their names} \\
* \text{ names} \\
\text{name} \}

\text{NB: Their difference is refusal to weep}

What class of \( N \) allows \( \varphi \) article here?
From 24.9.71: 11.5.76.

All V that undergo *Raising* can't have their components to the left of them.

*only adjectives* can. Why is there no adjective like *seen*?
Rep w/ John Goldsmith:

He: Comitatives often assume passivity.

I drove off with Tex = take Tex.

Me: with -NP's can only modify subjects + direct objects.

* Books were sent to Mike with Sandra.

He: with a third — it is a kind of comitative.

Me: so are instruments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intransitive</th>
<th>Deletable (?)</th>
<th>Non-causative</th>
<th>Maybe non-causative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>agents</td>
<td>objects</td>
<td>agentive transitive</td>
<td>kick, touch, reach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>give, etc.</td>
<td>eat</td>
<td>hit (strike, smash, etc.)</td>
<td>build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>drink</td>
<td>kick, touch, reach</td>
<td>destroy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>read</td>
<td>kick, touch, reach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>drive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>smoke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>write</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>run?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

help = cause contact

bend
lift, drop
* All of each of my friends

* Each of my friends all ate together

But 3 Each of my friends wanted to all eat together

\[ \exists 2 \text{ clauses in DF} \]
Negative Relation

Idea from Koby + Wright:

Bentham phenomenon is explained by taking Johnson's principle that negatives presuppose affirmatives, and by some principle that allows the deletion of presupposed material.
Another case of Benoit's law.

*Need* to say

10-26-76.
Appositives + weird dialect

24.951

Karen Michelson can say

Fred, and to whom I talked, is sick.
Mark Baltes.

They place that I live
*city

Yrs

in church, *baptism
Fact from Mark Baker:

It was Tim

* in behind the door
* heavily
* knowing that S

* the villain

* at large
* up for tenure

Don't reduce unless the predication is contingent. Wrong: 'It was this book about war'

* It was this book about war
* It's this book

* It was this key to that door
* It's this key from Moscow

Me: These are clearly clefts:

It was

* even
* also

only

Tom behind the door
Extrapolation from NP?

From 24.961

Maybe extrapolation of N complements

do done by extrapolation of PP?
Why? Es wurde sich von geholfen.
10-18-76

Rich: only \textit{remained} invest NP & NP

\textit{The problem} \textit{remained} apathy
Apathy \textit{remained} \textit{The problem}

Out for
change:\textit{ A jockie became Clyde}

Me WB: \textit{D Nep}

\textit{The problem doesn't remain apathy}

/5

\textit{The problem doesn't continue to be apathy}

Maybe: \textit{NEG(CONTINUE(STATE))}

Why: He didn't \textit{stay} \textit{improve}
Ciao-to-athens flight

True? Since only 1500e incorporate, this makes as if it is one word:

Journey
From nap with Dominique and Nathalie:

"Povero (X) esser lavato"?

Yes but critics go after infinitives

Luigi: Mi sono dovuto essere lavato

Aux dovete Aux V

Dovete essere lavato

Mi: Devo essere lavato mentre ero sotto ipnosi

(D: he must have washed while we were under hypnosis)

E dovuto

(has a different meaning): he had to wake up

Mi sono dovuto essermi lavato mentre ero

realized

Mi sono dovuto essermi lavato
Rizzi points out that none of the phenomena that he proposes to explain with the restructuring process (e.g., climbing > Aux switch) do not take place in the context of lexical entries.

Aux V Aux V

although they do in:

Aux V V

and

V Aux V
10. 8. 76

* * *

To Joan, these things I said that we'd

bring up later.

NB* in the table the beer I put

some

But I OK S's with 2 classmates

ripped:

To the key, steak I talked about, and to Harry

I talked about fish

*typ

Must repeat

* These files, to the Anm Library

To the Anm Library, these files I would only

turn over if they show me some funny pictures
Titles for paper: "Like - wow!"

Like I can't stand him.

Why is this OK?
I

(They well be able to help you)

{ could, can, might, might

* must
* will
* should }
From 24.9.1:

Who did he give what?

Why is this good, when this isn't

Who did he give a throttle?
Bumper Sticker:

Snoopy: No matter how you slice it, golf is a great game.

\[
\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
?? \text{It doesn't matter how you slice it} \\
??? \text{Regardless}
\end{array} \right\} \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
?? \frac{??}{??} \text{slice it} \\
?? \frac{??}{??} \text{they slice it}
\end{array} \right\}.
\]
Benefactor -> 1

Parking lot attendant:

Would you mind telling me how I look on the roof?

How do I look for me on the roof?
Different tests have different thresholds.

He hasn't any money

Ted pays jokes

He has any fun

Ted polish my shoes
I only saw everything.

I only met all the people.

I only met all the men.
Hey!

I will refer to this as a law [any expression of the form $\log$]

So some $P$ can be stranded.

Hummum.
Observation of Benefit: negative sentences allow more deletions than positive ones.

Example: *(Il y a) besoin de courir.

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Nul} & \text{besoin de courir.} = *(\text{No}) \text{ need to run} \\
\text{Aucun} & \text{besoin de courir.} = *(\text{No}) \text{ need to run} \\
\text{Pas} & \text{besoin de courir.} = *(\text{No}) \text{ need to run}
\end{array}
\]

*(In)utile de courir

*(Ce n'est pas la peine de courir. = *(Not) worth running

Rien ne sert de

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Il ne sert rien de} & \text{cours} = \text{No use} \text{ running} \\
\text{Que lui sert de} & \text{cours} = \text{No use} \text{ running} \text{ (for him)}
\end{array}
\]

NB: *(Il sert quelque chose de courir

Pas question de vous aider

*(Pas) grave = *(Don't) worry? (very after someone has stepped on you)  
*(Il) n'importe que = *It doesn't matter that

Aucune importance = No matter
*(im)possible!
*(im)credible! = *(un)believable!/(im)credible!
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{No} & \quad \text{a} & \quad \text{chance} \\
\text{Not} & \quad \text{a} & \quad \text{chance} \\
\text{Pas de jeu} & = & \text{no fair} \\
\text{No} & \quad \text{kidding} & \quad \text{stuff} \\
\text{No} & \quad \text{telling} & \quad \text{telling} \\
\end{align*}
\]

"Nach dir" keine Sorge = Don't worry
No sweat
No problem
Keine Ele = No hurry
No accounting for tastes.
Needless to say.

NB: In negative (etc.) environments,
need to ⇒ need Modal
1. Benet: This isn't done by stupid old men - if a man were named That, we'd have Mr. That, but fine. So the constraint is: don't process-urize definite which are used as pronouns.

2. Me: This suggests a more general law - don't follow any pronoun with 's.

   * The picture of you's width

   ?? The man who met you *(yesterday)'s hat

3. "Fell" is to be construed generously:

   \[
   \text{Ann} \xrightarrow{\text{you}} \text{and Bob's house} \]

   * Bob and \{you, your\}'s similarity

4. Maybe this is somehow connected with deletion itself:

   ?? The poor's plight

   * The ten's similarity

   Benet: If so, then why \{He's\} OK? \{That's\} This obeys stricter (and fewer) laws
From Dick Abraham's hero, p. 47

When I walked into the room, I noticed

that John's kick had caused the house

of cards to collapse

But

A kick may cause a house of cards to collapse

8.24.76
In linguistics there is and has long been a tendency to
drop the metatheoretical framework of the hard sciences,
including attitudes about what counts as a fact, with
the result that a wide variety of controversies have to
do with unspoken premises about data.

Why is long OK here?

I have long wanted to X.
I have long been aware that I
I have long been aware that I
Pretty poor even w/o long,
through.

* I have long "suspected"
* I have long been "afraid"

* Only OK w/ "perfect"
  * They may long try for X
  * They were long hoping that
The Eagle Has Landed p. 152 L-20

He's a bad bastard vs. Arthur

NB:

Arthur vs. a bad bastard

?? Arthur vs

?? vs

?? to

?? to be
Bill Graham: 8.6.76

Ignore me at your peril = If you ignore me, I will punish you

Similarly: at your risk to your detriment

Always, there will be semantically predicates which can take a sentential argument

NB: Ignore me at your peril

Or: If you ignore me, it is at your peril
Daniell:

That would be great for taking a picture of.
All the articles here are definite, which suggests the existence of a constraint to that effect in the statement of the rule.

NB also: here's a case where it seems to have condition on rules — it is possible, but it seems pointless to generate both

\[
\text{on of the part of X}
\]

and to throw out this "on semantic grounds."
I. The nearer to Vee, the less delectable.
II. The more basic a S, the more delectability.

I sprayed {*(paint) (on the wall) }
{*(the wall) (with paint) }

I blamed {*(Harry) (for the mischief) }
{*(the mischief) (on Harry) }

Therefore, this is less basic.

I made {*(the egg) (into cookies) }
{*(cookies) (out of the egg) }

Basic

{Your} acorn developed (into an oak tree).
{Every} acorn developed into {Your} oak tree.

An acorn developed into {Your} oak tree.
An oak tree developed out of {Your} acorn.
Thoughts from reading Erich's Sears:

5.27.76.

Your business would prosper (here)

↑

If your business were here, it would prosper

↑

? Your child would be lucky

↑

If you had a child, [if he] would be lucky
Articlelessness +

Y be in mind.
X have Y in mind.

x's idea is Y
[Permanent, created by x]

Y be on X's mind.
X have Y on X's mind.

X's concern is Y
[Temporary, not deep-rooted]

6.11.76
X bring Y to mind
X put Z in mind of Y

No: The P which allow articlelessness are
in and to

9.24.76

and at and from He returned from school left

[cf. 3.5.76]
All are impossible in predicate position on this reading.
Articlelessness

Return always taken to, except 'home'

French

- *metropole
- *ville
- *village

an volant [at the wheel]
an hir [in bed]

Bill: Articleless N are social products.

Exceptions: {up} {stream > river}
{down} {stream + brook}

Only metaphorical

at sea
*lake
go to sea
*lake
So: the first place where I deletion is / go to —

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No article</th>
<th>With article only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in origin</td>
<td>in a flash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in return</td>
<td>on the way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in question</td>
<td>at the beginning/ end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at issue</td>
<td>by the rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in mind</td>
<td>follow in X's footsteps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under foot</td>
<td>thick of the wheat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at/ on/ in hand</td>
<td>in the way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at heart</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under attack</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on fire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>underway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from hand to mouth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slip of hand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. 3: Oshima-san: + idioms with from [e.g. from school, etc.]

To articlelessness depends on shortness of both repetition + use.
Who do you expect to want to leave?
From The Elephants:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{I injected the cattle with } D_2 COH_2 NH_7 \\& \\& \\
&\text{My injection of } D_2 COH_2 NH_7 \text{ into the cattle}
\end{align*}
\]

Most V seem to allow only ① when nominalized:

- My presentation \[
\begin{align*}
&\text{of the award to Hank} \\
&\text{Hank with the award}
\end{align*}
\]

But since injection allows both, we can say within lexication only one of the following:

1. ① and ③ are related by a lexical rule, not by a T.

2. If T, which must be shown to apply to non-derived N too (I doubt that this is possible).

   Then ① \(\Rightarrow\) ③ will be done by a widened rule.

3.
So, \( W(0) \to \emptyset \) and we work below in a 
appropriate

\[
\int_{\text{Ker of End}} \left\{ \text{Hey} \right\} \quad \text{with} \quad \left\{ \text{Gee} \right\}
\]

\( \emptyset \leftarrow M.4 \)

9.12.76
12. just used to have been

4.10.76.
Dictionlessness

Dictionless body parts:

Y is on hand

\[ \begin{align*}
Y & \text{ remained on hand} \\
X & \text{ kept } Y \text{ on hand}
\end{align*} \]

Y event is at hand

Y keeps Y in mind

good at heart

on foot
1. A some articleless do
   - enter college
   - eat
     - breakfast
     - lunch
     - dinner
     - supper
     - snack
     - dinner
   - attend
   * wear

2. Before breakfast Tom wrote to Jane

3. Rich: short words only, in
   - prop
   - past
   - the
   - chicken
   * coldbase

4. He: = immediacy
   He is in
   - the
   - jail
   * he is a prisoner
From nap with Jim Goldsmith.

4.6.76.


? * Any lion doesn't have an adder.
Flip and correct and right
+ Say $\Rightarrow 0$

4.1.76.

"Harry was correct that $S$

"I'm being gypped"

If Harry is correct (that $S$

No: 3 (If Harry is correct about $S$

1. how long we waited
2. Nothing for you get the hell out

In that $S$ was correct of Harry
it was correct of Harry that $S$
Saying that $S$ was correct of Harry

I was right that $S$

I was right in saying that $S$

I was right to say that $S$

So there must be a rule of Say $\Rightarrow 0$

What are its limits? Why not here?

[Obviously because say that is basic]
Say \(\emptyset\) and right

You are right in

\[
\left\{
\begin{array}{l}
\text{Saying} \\
\text{Telling Jack} \\
\text{(telling, speaking)} \\
\text{In a whisper} \\
\text{In a scream}
\end{array}
\right\}
\]

\(\text{That's}\)

\(\text{In saying}\)

\[\begin{array}{l}
\text{I'm popular} \\
\text{for us to shut up} \\
\text{how long I waited}
\end{array}\]

\(\text{That's}\)

\(\text{In saying}\)

\[\begin{array}{l}
\text{I'm popular} \\
\text{for us to shut up} \\
\text{how long I waited}
\end{array}\]

\(\text{That's}\)

\(\text{In saying}\)

\[\begin{array}{l}
\text{I'm popular} \\
\text{for us to shut up} \\
\text{how long I waited}
\end{array}\]

NB:

Maybe this won't delete because I'm sorry.

A faint note on the right corner:

\(-5\)
Say -> 6 and right

Bill was

right sounds first

right of

thats 1

in Ving X

in Norm

correct

?? to say

in saying

in his description

thats

* to say thats

in saying x

in his characterizing

belief

* refused

Why $$$ Bill was true X

* to stand there

NB: It is true

* feel Jack

? scream

* inform them (x)

* speak about x

* thats

* for

* &

Nays!

AND

It is true thats
An idlet is a poem.
Negations and RC-oids

3.31.76.

* He knows everything that there ought (not) to be to know

So: that only 5's don't like negation
Andy Rausch

3.24.76.

Think said a sentence like this this morning:

There seem to be there's X

/
Citizenship

Fact from John Lawler's: 3.20.74.

* I believe there to look like there's enough milk
  \underline{\text{[headway to look like it's finally going to be made]}}

Andy Rogers's rule produces poor citizens,

whose poverty shows up in their unenlightenedness, etc.
Potency

From rap with John Lawler: 3.20.76.

1st choice for object: an affected human being
2nd choice for object: an affected element

5:

Me: What I did to [Harry] was look at [him]
[the chair] 1 4 1

John: What I did to [Bill] was tell Card
[the soup] 1 1

that [he] was full of shit.
[it] 1 1

What I led to the theory was require
[global rules to affect it]
[Bill to memorize it]
bodily activities

activities of the body

bodily injury

injury to the body

3.20.76

10.8.76.

NB: bodily is also only a PPA — it has no other uses — not in predicate position, nor prenominal.
Possessive Ascension and hair color

Hair's hair is blond $\Rightarrow$ Possessive Ascension

* John is blond hair $\Rightarrow$ Rule C

?+ John is blond- headed $\Rightarrow$ Rule C

* John is a blond hair $\Rightarrow$ Reheading

How related to?
John has blond hair

* Jim's head is red $\Rightarrow$

* John is red head $\Rightarrow$ Rule C

John is red-headed $\Rightarrow$

John is a redhead $\Rightarrow$

* John is a red
Hey!

\{ Climbing \}
\{ To climb \}

This mountain is \{ ok? possible \}
\{ ok? feasible \}
\{ ok? preferable \}
\{ ok? doable \}

3.18.76
Law

generically in the ground oils a process, generically in the figure ranks of

3.18.76.

This novel translates well

for Fred

for Sophomore

Ted is fun (*for Jack) to be tickled by

3.19.76.

Scriven: (5.3a) I believe Mary capable of anything
(5.7) I believe Tom capable, if not astonishingly competent
For me, (5.3a) > (5.7) [ept of $D$ of -S] thus these also

Figure

I believe { (? a beaver
* a beaver with any brains at all
* any beaver

the beaver

to be a lot smarter than any domestic pet

3.19.76. But: Conferences plan easily > ? This conference planned easily