Prediction: blocking inaccessible elements shall produce*

Harry gave a book to this man?

Harry gave this man a book?

This man was given a book by Harry?

For this reason, Harry went to Moscow twice last week?

We saw? Ted and that man yesterday*
1. Argue that enter/leave are deprepositional

2. Note that enter school = embark on a course of study ≠ enter a building

3. Also: he is at school = school is in session ≠ he is in a building

4. Check:
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[go to] navigate</th>
<th>[be] remain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>home</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>church</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bed</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>breakfast</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>table</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>market</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>never</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Where are you:
   
   zoom in (1.3)
   near (1.7)
1. If A commands ċagj, add 4. If A does not command ċagj, subtract 4.
2. If A and B both command, and ċagj is between A and ċagj, subtract 2 from A.
3. If A is to the left, add 1.
4. If A is closer to the left (or right?) than B, subtract 2 from B.
5. If A is to the right, subtract 5.
6. If A is commanded by ċagj, subtract 1.
7. If A and B are both commanded and A is between ċagj and B, subtract 10 from B.
8. If A is left of B right, subtract 1 from B.
9. Highest score wins, lower than -5, cover is impossible.
Treachery, body parts

- in mind
- at heart
- at hand
- on foot
- by hand
- in hand

(by) take to heart

by word of mouth

in spirit

in person

by [car, plane, boat] or jet

rule of thumb

zur Fuss

[foot, ship, fleet]

sleight of hand
From Dick:

2.26.76.

1. The less marked the more deletion:
   
in church/chapel/to temple/* basilica
   
at school/collage/to university/* academy

2. Some paraphrase with possessives some don't
   a. Do: in hand (= in X's hand)
   b. Don't: in church ≠ in X's church
   c. Possessive ~(): in (*X's) question
So the relative pronoun 
that is slightly worse after conjunctions

with 

Tom hates people who you scowl at.

{ who } like you
{ that }

and { who } I scowl at
{ that }

or { who } I scowl at
{ that }

but { who } I don't scowl at
{ that }

Tom hates people that you scowl at,

{ who } I scowl at
{ that }

or { ... } I scowl at
{ who }

but { ... } I don't scowl at
{ who }

Tom hates people you scowl at,

{ who } I scowl at
{ ... }

or { who } I scowl at
{ ... }

but { who } I don't scowl at
{ ... }
Tom hates people to whom I write.

Such people as I knew [and as Sheila liked] were knights.

We have some scissors for you to play with [and] for Tom to throw.
The farther away from me (just any is, the more)

Ann: [I don't believe any metal will float]

Bookin: [He won't buy any car]

Never would be buy any car.

Never would any car be bought.

I don't consider any car to be suitable any car suitable.

More stress on any required.
I photographed nobody because \{ he was photogenic > \\ I liked him > \\ you liked him > \}. <

Nobody was photographed because \{ he was photogenic \}.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{I paid nobody for his help} < \\
\text{Nobody was paid for his help}
\end{array} \]
2.10.76.

Nobody looked at his cards, which [could have been]

* we're

all black
There remain a lot to be done

A lot remains to be done

* Harry remains [to be working, to have left, to be famous]

So this looks like an A-race that will only race when the next V down is to be fast

But: It remains [to be thought that we are cute]

2.9.76

He remains to be proved {what is, ?to go}

John remains to be forced {?to leave, with leaving}

This theorem remains to be proven {to be general}
This sorts out surprised at / by

Harry remains to be surprised - { by } Tex

Other passive meanings

?? Jack remains to have their break with my house

?? They remain to undergo surgery.

?? He remains to be under surveillance by a private agency.

These reports remain to - { receive } the kind of study

?? They deserve

?? Tax, Dep, OP work, won't write

?? He seems to remain to be taken seriously.

The letters remained { *(to be) opened } - Good
der Mann, den zu sehen ich versucht habe

* Wen zu sehen hast du versucht?
This is for sharing [oneself, myself, with oneself, yourself, himself]

* Bill left, but this is for sharing himself with

*Bill's suitcase is here, and this is for sharing himself with

Bill {Said, granted, knew} that that was for sharing {himself, myself, oneself} with

So it seems that a command

restriction is D.
Hey! What is the source?

an innocuous-seeming construction

what are the limits on incorporation?

1. Note first that only steer [ho ho - however that is to be defined]
can incorporate:

A. (not quite) straight-seeming road [But: a longer-seeming cane]
A. (2 miles) wide-seeming river
* A broken-hearted seeming suitor

* A well-known-seeming result

2. The rule works only with seem: *a wide-appearing river

3. These guys show up only in modifier position:

* That is innocuous-seeming

* Nothing innocuous-seeming should be eaten.
While reading Ann Backin's thesis:

Ann shows that passive can't be generic, false, IIs, non-referential, etc.

Now look:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{I believe of} & \quad \left\{ \\
\text{a beaver} & \\
\text{any beaver} & \\
\text{headway} & \\
\text{under the bed} & \\
\text{from LA to SF} & \\
\text{5th students} &
\right\} & \text{that I}
\end{align*}
\]

I expect from any beaver—that's no better
Sirs: From Ann Borkin's there:

Ch. 6.

(3a) I believe Mary capable of anything

(7) I believe Tom capable, if not astonishingly competent.

She has them, but for me (3a) is clearly better.
Why does this have 2 meanings?

1) \( x \) is fearful of \( y \) \( \equiv \) \( x \) fears \( y \)

2) \( x \) is fearful to \( y \) \( \equiv \) \( x \) causes \( y \) to fear

Why does \( *x\) be fearful to \( y\) of \( z\)?

Is this maybe because this should really be analyzed to

\( y \) cause [x fear]

Note that when clause union applies to adjectives, the adjectives must be intransitive.

He thicken the paint. He enabled there to be a fair trial.

Maybe not: He enabled me to leave to stay then till 5.

That facilitated my leaving. In hat es war ermöglicht, kalt zu werden.
The ones *(that I need) are here.

I like those hats *(that you bought)*

but I don't like these ones.

This agrees that this came from

but I don't like these ones that you bought.

via RCO
From nap with Bill:

This one takes 3 NP's

I bet Bob $50 that S

What I bet Bob 50*(on) was that S

I bet Xe with Y on Z
If this story is a chimeric, what is it

* Bill was told by Barry this story.

It's not merely that other chimeras can't exceed it – nothing can.

Bill was told. I think, the story.

[write]

So it seems to be that nothing likes to go between V and NP.

This story was written (I by Ted) last week.
Long agreement works here

There seem to be onions in my soup.

On the wall seem to have hung at least 3000 forlorn.

Very important seems to have been the prevalent pece on capital punishment.

From this seem to follow a number of weird facts.

By looking seem to have been discovered a wealth of great pubs.

To her son are likely to be given most of the Justice.

From the 5th to the 7th seem to be the least month of a pregnancy.
He began \{ to help \} \{ helping \} \{ cook the bagels \}

Presumably, all poor citizens \{ like help V \}

will be worse with \{ begin \} \{ Ing \} than with \{ begin to \}
We need him as a member with a Caddy as a cooperating partner.
Is it ever possible to win?

If so, begin

The water began

Harry began

But: ? Harry may begin hating the climate — better than this, is?

Who will you begin to watch?

Are you going to begin to watch?

The water began to fascinate me.
The movie began \( \rightarrow \) starring

Foreign actors began \( \rightarrow \) starring in his movie.

The sky began reddening

? The puddle began thickening

?* The plot began thickening

The moon began \( \rightarrow \) subtending \( \rightarrow \) an arc of 30°

There began \( \rightarrow \) some interest in a Veda Cult in

Gak! What's this from?

There began by being nobody who would listen.
First use of this notation on train north of New Haven, 1.22.76

It began to be hard to find example.

?? It began seeming that we were doomed
There began by being a big shock about credentials.

Where do these come from?

Harry began as a doctor.

Harry began happy. [Maybe from ACD?]

* There had begun by being no visitors
1. Franklin Horowitz pointed out:

   3
   u MALE $\rightarrow [+masc.]$ but $\not\exists$ u INANIMATE $\rightarrow [+neuter]$
   u FEMALE $\rightarrow [+fem.]$

   Neuter show up in Latin when $\exists$ noun.

   rubrum = red (THING)
   - Human
   - Animal

2. Me: $\exists$ gender systems like Masc - Neuter
   Fem - Neuter

   Masc + Fem imply each other.

3. Me: are there gender systems which have M+F and a classifier system? I've never heard of any.
From reading Ellen Bruce on Nep-Racing in French:

John said "I [feel] that S" ⇒
John [thought] that S

John said "I [believed, guessed, imagined, hoped, figured, reckoned] that S" ?

John [believed, guessed, imagined, hoped, figured, reckoned] that S

Also  

Think / guess 3-0
Think / believe 1-0 (P)
Think / feel 2-0
Nude Photos of each other

We took nude pictures of each other.

What can we learn about the source of each other from such N's?
From nap with Sindra:

Pronominalization cont. ORChers, I hate cheers.

For a child to play with: I'd never buy a knife for that.

Playing with:

How can this get zapped w/o a movement rule?

On the table and under the chair: I saw a lot of bear there.

I deeply conjugated PPs:

The table, I saw a bear:

There

Under it

Under the table

Under the table, I saw a bear:

There

Under it

Under the table

Sindra: Paris, we're flying to it.
Jindra:

That everyone will fall asleep - I don't think his talk will be boring.

Me: As for under the table, we saw bears there.

Anti-communist fact:

That people could walk the streets at night without fear - we never achieved that. [Maybe amnesty - cf.]

*We never achieved that's

Sharing himself with a spin - I think she will avoid any incursion into his control.

1, 21, 76: Working on taxes - I've never liked busting my hump.
From rap with Indra:

A very type S's: the more sentence the prepos, the more necessary is this arrow.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{If } S_1, \text{ then } S_2 \quad &\gg \quad ?*\text{ If } S_1, \text{ then } S_2 \text{ then} \\
\text{In the event of a fire,} &\quad ?*\text{ I'd move} \\
&\quad \text{I'd move then}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{When it rains,} &\quad \text{then the crops grow well} \\
&\quad ??\text{ the crops grow well then}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{In a rainstorm,} &\quad ?\text{ then the crops grow well} \\
&\quad \text{the crops grow well then}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Where I live,} &\quad \text{there I planted corn >} \\
&\quad ??\text{ I planted corn there}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{In my yard,} &\quad ??\text{ there I planted corn} \\
&\quad \text{I planted corn there}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{What I cooked,} &\quad ??\text{ he ate >} \\
&\quad \text{he ate that} \\
&\quad *\text{ he ate it}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{The bagel,} &\quad ??\text{ he ate that} \\
&\quad \text{he ate it}
\end{align*}
\]

1.19.76.
That Daniel ate rice was hard to achieve.
Elke: *We waited up.*

We want the wait for X sense, not
the stay awake for X sense.

We

{ have to

?? must

should

? could

? might

can

?* are to

are going to

wait up

They *(must)* have waited up.

I

{ made Jack

tried to

managed

condescended

refused

*to wait up

* I began to wait up
I commented him to be eating *(at 5)*

He must be eating *(at 5)*

1.17.76.
**How to Parent**

Parenting is hard

?? I want Ann to parent

* I doubt she'll make parents
B Raising and Agapicity

Why is it that there are so few active B Raising verbs?

prove

demonstrate

claim

show

permit

allow

make $[\text{to} \rightarrow \emptyset]$

With form -ing

prevent

Of course, there are no A-Raising verbs which are agentive...
If you are in doubt, you should write.

If you are in doubt, you should write.

If the proof is valid, the proof is incorrect.

If necessary, we will welcome.

If necessary, we will welcome.

If (\lambda^2 - 4)^2 = 0, then (\lambda^2 - 4) = 0.

If (\lambda^2 - 4)^2 = 0, then (\lambda^2 - 4) = 0.

Everything in front.

How do we write?
Note the kinds of conjunctions which allow this operation:

\{
  \text{Where, When, Though, While, It, Red Cls, Unless} \\
\}

possible

The following don't:

\text{because, since, before, after}
What is this a possible pro-form for?

Bill suggested that I say buzz, and acted accordingly.
P: * These glasses are beginning to have had it.

But, They seem(ed) to have had it.

?? If they had had it, we would have bought more.

They \{ \begin{align*}
\text{may} & \quad \text{must} \quad \text{have had it} \\
? \text{can't} & \\
? \text{could} & \\
\star \text{will} & \\
\star \text{are to} & \\
\star \text{are going to} & \\
\end{align*} \}

I want them to have had it \* ?? by tomorrow at 6
1.6.76.

Advances and deletions

He supplied * (blankets) *(to X).

He supplied * (the troops) *(with X).

Why will neither delete here?

Is it because they have been raised?
Dave Perlmutter:

In English, \textit{kill} \neq \textit{cause to die}.

In Sonrai (a language of Africa),
they are the same.

Is this because English has causatives, while Sonrai doesn't?
Sonis found with Dominique Sartiola:

L'homme que je [croyais, supposais, considérais] être, [venu, allé, arrivé] [s'être, tué, trompé] [lavé les mains, avoir été malade, avoir mangé]

But:

* Je croyais l'homme être malade

* Je le croyais être malade

* Qui crois-tu être veiné?

So the only operation which can repair

the * is RCF
Each other + plurals

Each of them has a picture of the other.

They have a picture of each other.
? I was fortunate to meet Dr. Shanky and

Sandy was fortunate to, too

Sandy was fortunate in {that respect}, too

WHY?
Where do you trust that he will put it?

Trust seems to occur only in tense in which a performative interpretation is possible, and only with a subject which contains 1st person.

- I
- He
- You
- They

* It is trusted that S

How can I assess keep them from forming? Jack said he trusted that.

I guess it is O.K. though.

So it would seem best to be able to say

1. Higher clauses like like this [state tense et al. restrictions on performatives]

B. Trust occurs only immediately below [say? But NB: may be only in assertions?]

NB: this provides an argument for shifting.

* I think I trust this. It's *I trust that S. I think
Jack said \[ \text{he promised} \] \[ \text{he could promise} \] \[ \text{the was promising that} \] \[ \text{promise was obviously going to be broken} \]

So the conditions on tense etc. are a part of sentence grammar.
A. There are equi-speaker restrictions: be damned if I trust.

B. 1st person only: I'll be a monkey's uncle.

C. There may be equi-listener restrictions.

There are no predicates that require 3rd person.

(I don't think).

What's the conclusion from this?
That would give the creep to somebody, or somebody else.

Parmeles

Fred
A little something and I'll

A little something would be easy to fix.

No, a little something was ready for us to eat.
IM and amnesties

12.30.75

From nap with Paul Batal:

Getting them to vote will be hard to achieve

12.31.75

It seems that what is required is
non-contingency:

Typicalization: ?Getting them out are never achieved?

RNR: We did not achieve, though we did attempt, getting them out.

?NP Shift?: We achieved, with great effort, getting them out

out w/o commas
From nap with Paul Postel:

12.30.75.

Sentence complements can’t bear the relation of overweight

1. NP shift: *I consider remarkable that S

2. AP shift: Very obvious is *the fact* that S

3. By prep / prep: By Leifing was discovered that S

4. Than whole: That S_2 is more obvious than it. That S_2
Rap with Paul:

McNulty, I was arrested by him

his book was written by him

? Gorillas, this cage keeps them easily

? Syphilis, Goethe translates easily for them

Law: chamois don't dislocate

They do apocope, though

2 arguments

for a difference between the rules.

NB: in German, dislocations don't trigger inversion, apocolypters do.
Thought while reading Bill Wilt on Stress and Tropes.

\[
\begin{align*}
\{ & \text{You} \\
\text{+} & \text{defend yourself, and I'd defend myself} \\
\text{--} & \text{be deleted.}
\end{align*}
\]

So contrastively stressed elements can't be deleted.

Note that this is an exception to the distinctiveness convention—

You normally deletes whether \([\pm \text{sg}]\),
\([\pm \text{masc}]\) etc — but not \([\pm \text{emp}]\).

Hm—this suggests the need for a principle: delete only under stress.\]
Why does the complement in (1)

(1) I prevented everybody from signing.

have the Neg-φ, not the Neg-V, reading? [i.e., I caused

\[ \{ \text{not everybody to sign} \} \]

\[ \{ \text{*everybody not to sign} \} \]

I think I'm wrong - (1) allows both readings

But in (2), the reverse seems to hold:

(2) I discouraged everybody from signing.

\[ = \text{I caused} \{ \begin{array}{c}
\text{not everybody to sign} \\
\text{everybody not to sign}
\end{array} \} \]

In (2), though, the Neg-φ reading seems almost impossible to get.

In (3) the Neg-V reading seems unthinkable.

(3) I doubt that everybody will sign.
I have the tape, said Mike, *that* you wanted.

* * *

J's?

*That*

Nobody was there we had ever talked to.
Neg Incorporation

1. Incorporation seems to "reinforce" (whatever that may mean) the feeling of negation.

I talked to them about descriptions of my students.
(This seems only possible when we bear stress.)

2. Incorporation is visible with superlatives.

He read not the tiniest bit of my letter.

? He talked to Harrison about not the tiniest bit of my data.

It seems to weaken as the distance it travels increases.

3. What's interesting is the following correlation: the less accessible a NP is, the harder it is for Neg to travel there, and the less negativeness is produced.

12.13.75.

12.14.75.
Pronouns and definiteness

12.12.76.

Why are 1st and 2nd person pronouns always definite? One can make some naturalness wobble in the singular, perhaps, but not in the plural.

I bet this fact is trying to tell us something about definiteness.
Distance in Korean

Since the subject condition in Korean applies not only in adjacent Ss, but across 2 (or more?), the notion of distance is not exactly right.

Q: does the semantic class of the intervening V make a difference.
More cases for Marica:

Nobody talked to [a center man] about anything.

Nobody talked to each man about anything in a different language.

Nobody talked about anything to each man in a different language.

When did Mike [several men] buy anything?

I talked to [the boy] about knowing how to defend themselves.
From Liz:

That the man who said that the sailor

\{ stole a sleeping bag that I liked \} \textcolor{red}{\text{from Ed}}

\{ put a sleeping bag that I liked \} \textcolor{red}{\text{on Ed}}

so lying is obvious

I will steal a sleeping bag, from Ed
Why is there no beer?

What is there no beer for?
Ken points out: Walbiri has \{ no freezers \}

\{ no compoundy \}

Instead of the latter, they have \( x \ NP_{1} , \ NP_{2} , \ Y \)

but also \( x \ NP_{1} , Y \ NP_{2} , \ Z \)

as long as the 2 NPs are in the same case.

French has few freezers

So maybe freezing = compoundy?
Parlatur, ergo sum.

I invented this title in a letter to

Chuck Fillmore

12.3.75.

If English doesn't exist, how about the "fact" that all "speakers of English" communicate better than any one of them and a "Turk"?

Well, there are lots of half-way languages-

spontaneous pidgins - halfway between English + Turkish [my German, e.g.]

To say nothing of pidgins.

12.4.75.
The first food

hungry and thirsty

Myopia

(P) hunger and thirst
9.1.23.76.

1. Clause-structure and ZBO

12.1.75.

A. I consider there *(to be) likely + be a fire

[So: fakes don't like to show up when their source is too hard to retrieve.

[Why then OK: There seems likely + be a fire

Maybe ZBO is stronger in subject position.]

B. Fact noted by Andy Witten (23.757 student)

What I want this door *(to be) is open

What I consider Jack *(to be) is pompous

Hmm. So w/ 230, NP status of copulative weaker.

Fact from nap w/ Paul Postal

?? How pompous do you consider him?
C. He seems sad to me?
   \[ \text{He seems to be sad to me?} \]
   \[ \text{He seems to me to be sad} \]

How sad does he seem to be to you?

D. This proof is difficult to consider (§6.1 valid)

E.
Topicalize unstressed

1. Some N won't prepose [dropped]
   [*Some [quick] he was talking to [a boy]]

2. Can't precede Q's or imperative
   [Fact from Tanya]
   * The balloons cut down
   * The bed what did you put in?

3. Often PP won't move:
   * On him we can depend
   Bill I never write letters to
   ? To Bill I never write letters

Topicalize contrastively stressed

1. Some N will prepose [and a N]
   [*Some [quick] he was talking to [a boy]]

2. Can precede Q's and imperatives
   The balloons, cut down
   ? This bed, what did you put in?
   Better:
   This bed, did you put raisins in?

3. Can move:
   On him we can depend
   To Bill, I never write letters
Maybe the pesky *worth* comes like so:

Jane's worth [=value] is $20.

\[\text{Raising}\]

Jane is $20 in \{\text{worth}\}

\[\text{Worth}\]

Jane is worth $20

This would be better than calling *worth* an adjective — since it precedes *$y* [but why *$b$*?], on morphological grounds, *P* should be an N.
The constituent must read like so:

The constituent before and after the niche
must be stressable
contrastively

[not "stressed"]

Because in

Yesterday, said Harry, I promised to call her

This is unambiguous w/o stress on

Yesterday, just as the sentence w/o nicking.
11.25.75.

If you are going to NY, you \{ can \} stay with Bob.

If you were going to NY, you \{ can \} stay with Bob.
Thoughts on Bob Stedaker's talk on assertions.

Either Zsa Zsa Gabor, Zsa Gabor, talking or Bo Elizabeth Anscombe.

[? It* (else) might be Jane Fonda.]

\[ \Rightarrow \ast \text{ Since it might be Jane Fonda, let's bug all three of their phones.} \]

They feel like Lee Baker's

I know who left, but I don't know whether Mary did or not.

NB: It was Bill who left.

\[ \Rightarrow \ast \text{ Also, Mary did.} \]

This shows that also \( \Rightarrow \ast \text{ I add} \) has the force of rejecting an implied universal — note that asserted ones can't be rejected in this way.

\[ \ast \text{ Only the boys left. The girls also did.} \]

\[ \ast \text{ All the boys left. But one didn't.} \]
That $\rightarrow \varnothing$

\[\begin{align*}
* \text{I wonder} & \\
? \text{It's a wonder?} & \quad \text{be amazed} \\
* \text{I marveled} & \\
* \text{It's a mystery} &
\end{align*}\]
Puzzle from Bruce:
When is a little bit good?

\{ 
\text{fat}, \text{thin}, \text{short}, \text{tall}, \text{well}, \text{ill}, \text{drunk}, \text{sober}, \text{hungry}, \text{full} \}
High hopes for subject - hunger

11.19.76.

From talk with Liz:

(1) SUC produces worst violations in subject position

(2) ?? That that is too bad is not true <

?? It's not true that that is too bad

(worse in subject than in object)

(3) A picture of AS was sent to me <

He sent a picture of AS to me

(It's harder to waste a V+X

intentionally than a PP)

12.9.76.

This may be a hunger phenomenon - the to-phrase

with send isn't very necessary. However it is

I attributed a picture of Kent, Sarah, & Whitten

This seems worse than Hub. 9/ 12.9.76.
Quantifiers float and ascension

Maybe there are more by the same rule.

The eggs cost $2 [each] [a dozen].
? Have been wounded on the first turn were six cyclists from Korea.

? Looks like this is from Stuffing.

NB: Passive derived clauses will go:

Taken to SF were several prisoners who were sick

Intentional relative won't go: To slices the pears were several knives.

But: When we know that the Ven phrase can't be a modifier, no deal:

* Made on this problem was a vast amount of headway.

? With a pistol near him was Billy the Kid.

This can't come from a modifier - if.

? There was Billy the Kid with a pistol near him.
How much?
SL: 7

1. Con P used in CN?
2. CSC
   a. Ad loc
   b. Role partic
   c. L partic
   d. NP partic
   e. Con vs. part of con
3. What do CNP + CSC have in common?

Passports for ford trunks?
Bill got more bananas than I recommended. Giving to Sally, but Herman got exactly that many — as many as I recommended giving to Sally.
* What was Harry to interfere?

Who was Tom to interfere? [each of them] {asked Harry} {I wondered} [question my judgement cat]

* Who has he been to VX?

Who might he be to VX?

Who could he be to VX?

* It is unknown who he might be to VX

But NB: Who are all of them to VX? [they all]
Charlotte pond:

All linear spatial P's can be used for temporal relations.

* among the days of the week
* behind 2:00
* under Thursday

before and after seem to be basically temporal—why?

between Fri & Mon

near 2:00
around 2:00
at 2:00

on Tuesday

effectively 2:00
Thursday
January

Is there a location analogy for before/since?

about 7 from 2:00 (on)

Why & along the hour *(up) + 7:00

through the night

Yes: from the ball rolled for 3 feet
It's these heretics that I'll be up like, that noon until work on
your brain felt

has made me get discouraged.

So it looks as if the way the SSC
must be formulated is like so:

The first is up from the

supper
can't be a subject.
Extrapol from NP and Wounding

10. 22. 76.

What stops swooping [NP] to [NP] [or vice versa?]