(1) I [think] that he's here, isn't he?

(2) He is. I [think] he's here, isn't he?

(1) shows that there is a certain class of embedded (NB the that) sentences to which Tag questions apply. Unless parentheticals come from matrices, they will require double statements.

Problem: Surprisingly, he was sick, wasn't he?

but + It was surprising that he was sick, wasn't he?
A: $S_1 \text{ not even } NP \equiv S_4$, $wa\ la\ hatte\ NP$

$3$ difference between $too$ and $either$—both are kawām

$S_4$, neither $S_2 \equiv S_1\ wala\ S_2$

and not

In these cases, $S_1$ must be negative

(1) ana mish misaddabahu, $wa\ la\ misaddabah\ believe\ him\ believe\ her$

[* bašūk fih, $wa\ la\ misaddabahu$ doubt in him

[bašūk fih, mi fi ha kawām - ok]

(2) * Sadad muš khibir] goyūh minadi, $wa\ la\ hatte$ number not great we go to the club

(f) you'll had

?OK (wa Hadli' muš Tabah)

we some far from students

none of

= on Monday
Negations in Egyptian

(3) wa la hadda raht - wa la hadda ma hadda

8. Polarity items - ay = any and abdān

1. only w/ trigger

(4) *Pārāa ay kutub

I read any books

(5) ma Pārāa ay kutub

[It can't be prepended - won't occur in δ]

2. Must follow trigger - thus passus-vamp

wrecks (5)

(6) *ay kutub mat tharāts

(7) wa la kitab it Pāra, wa la hadda il Had

wa la goes on singular or nominal only.

ay goes on singular or plural noun.
3. *wala* only precedes subjects + objects
   [in Lebanon - Mika]

(8) *imbarat* *makalte* *wala* *Haaga*

   I ate

   *maSa* (*wala) eat had

   with

   *ay* Saltab

   friend

out for Wagab

? for Cega

C. E rule of Neg Deletion

(9) *wala* *kitab* *wePe9* ? = no book fell

   *fell*

   This contrast shows that *maš*
   must be deleted

   { *mawéPe9* } = no book didn't
   fall - all fell.

(10) *imbarat* *wePe9* ? *wala* *kitab*

   yesterday *mawéPe9* = no book
Negation in Egyptian

1. Few = Ṭubayyāla — this isn't a
t
(small in number

negative trigger

* Kutub Ṭubayyāla we ṭīt, un la hatta
books few fell and at every
gun el Had
day Monday
1. I some nouns that occur referentially and not: boy

2. I some nouns that occur only non-referentially:
   sky, gassle [P.10.75 Perry De Camp: rhetoric]
   a breeze, weller,? passport?, a friend in need

3. I some that occur only referentially

   [But; what about?]

A. Proper nouns
B. Pronouns

If 3 can be established, P would be explained by saying that all referential N derive from

\[ \text{NP \{wh \ is \ NP \}} \]

referred to non-referential 5 \text{NP}

by a rule which can have simple exceptions.
1. \( V \in E \in N \)
2. \( E \in A \in N \)
3. \( E \) Participle \( > E \) Adj
4. \( E \) Adjectival N \( > E \) Adj

Principle: \( \neg \) Middle
w/e extremes

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Pred} \\
\downarrow \\
N \rightarrow [-V] \quad [+V] \\
\downarrow \\
[-Adj] \quad [+Adj] \quad [-Part] \quad [+Part] \\
\downarrow \\
\text{Normal - Non} \\
\text{or} \\
\text{free} \\
\text{free etc. (i)}
\end{array}
\]

Where do prepositions come in?

\( P \rightarrow N \) or even \( P \rightarrow A \)?

I get this latter as too strong
\[
\frac{\text{left suffering + even only}}{1000}
\]

* Only? Who left? [To whom (also)? did Bell write?]

almost //’s

It was (only [also] [even]) Tom that left

//’s

The men (only [even]) who were tired left

X’s

Only Tom did I see.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Even Tom} \\
\text{[also Tom]} \\
\text{Tom too}
\end{align*}
\]

I saw
Extrapolation seems to weaken Slicing:

(1) Exactly where is a mystery vs (2) It is a mystery exactly where.

Though with some predicates, it is somewhat better:

(3) It is not known \[ \text{why} \] \[ \text{where} \]

Note that anyway, Slicing doesn't like to leave why:

(4) It is a mystery why.

The point here, though, is that there is another factor involved: extrapolation.

(5) is much better than (4).

(5) ? Why is a mystery.

The third factor to date is the presence of exactly in (1) — without it, the sentence is weaker:

(6) ? Where is a mystery.

It doesn't seem to involve merely length, because how long in two words, as is exactly where, but (7) still seems to need exactly to achieve viability.

(7) \[ \text{Exactly \{ ?? \}} \text{how long is a mystery} \]

Revealed at no meetings, the differences between (1) and (2), and between (4) and (5), show pretty clearly that in my speech, Extrapolation and Slicing interact.
FACT FROM MUM

 Lots of words with d - that mean bad

dead, death, doubt, disease, dumb
drear, deep, devil, despair, danger
drood, drab, destroy, deprive, dracula
drank, drake, dry, dump, drudgery
delia, delight, dainty, delicious, daughter
dall, deliver, dally, delicacy, doll

drich, thing - o
There are a welter of Armenians in my Soc class.

A welter of people just sat down?

I wonder here.

I could fit in a guy.

May be a welter.

I like slow,

only more so.

?? A welter of Armenians are in my Soc class.

Try to imagine a welter of Armenians asking questions.

I want a welter of Armenians to ask questions.

A large welter of people just appeared.

I hope a welter of supporting evidence will emerge.

I discovered a welter of exceptions.

Maybe welter is only used in presentation contexts.
He lives close to where he works.

The place where he lives is close to the place where he works.

6.26.75.

He left close to when I got back.

6.26.75.

No: it can't be maintained that close to is a left-adjunct of place [which would be deleted].

1) He described (*close to) the place.

2) *He lives that place. The source would be bad w/o close to.
18 June 1975

Dear [Name],

I'm not going to be able to come in today, so here are the sentences I found. They are from "Сердце Олега" (Oleg's death) in Akhmatova's Бессмертный Лен (I think).

1) Конь, едущий любящим и близким на нем, horse which you love and ride on him
отъ того, что умер, from that one you [det] died [inf]

2) Как есть конь мот, едущий везде, where is horse my which I had
поставил картою и близости его? set to feed and watch him

Note that the relative pronoun consists of the personal pronoun + me. However, the late occurrences of the pronoun do not seem to be relative pronoun - me, since they are not moved to the beginning of the clause. There seem to be actual violations of the compound construction constraint.

Sincerely,

Sarah Bell
John, I can't stand the bastard.

But

* John knows that the bastard will win.

Then I bought a car that the bastard had dented.

* Whatever the deep command relation is,

left between these 2.
The man in front of us = there is a constable

I must photograph the man
I didn't want to photograph the man

I was sitting between the man and the door

? The man's hat didn't fit
* The man's hat's don't fit

Facts checked by Wilson
One consequence of the messsng up of the data has been a general lack of interest in rationalism vs. empiricism.
stand for a largely a negative future prospect item.

But:

I have stood for this long enough

You should not (be willing to) stand for that

Anyone who can stand for this must be asleep

And what is the relationship between stand for

and stand?
I went to the bank.

We ate candy.
Idiom: + enough

5.17.75.

to choke a horse only shows up in the complement to enough [or sufficient]

He ate enough spaghetti to choke a horse
Strange RCs and Nearest + conjunctions

I'm amazed at {why he got into this}

I'm ignorant {the reason he got into this}

I wonder {the duration of his stay}
Conjunctive + disjunctive Q's

5.12.76.

dry Q's > cry Q's

I don't think I something that cry Q's can do that dry Q's can't.

Why is this? [ ]
Strange RCC + the possessive constraint

5-12-75

5: from Jeff Cohen: Things like this are only good if there isn't no.

7: I know a girl's name who used to live here.

Me: No — none (I think) can get.

* A girl's name who used to live here had 2 in it.

So I bet that goodness tells us something about how strange RCC's are formed.
Tenseless clauses + TMY + clauseness

NB

These would be {foolish
easy
hard
imper

that they learn

that they have learned

so tenseless clauses are more islandy
than tenseless ones.

Cf. also cases from Italian (Donna fi)
cited by Dave & Scott.

(OR)

References can sink into the S's from
subjects to non-term targets only if the S's
are subjunctive.
Synchronicity

I see Barbara Lust just after I've opened a letter containing a paper on gossip.
Proper naming

What can be given a proper name:

1. Any (?) non-mass concrete, including bodies of water
2. Forces of nature? Winds, etc. Hurricanes
   NB: a flash of lightning could not be — the only reason hurricanes can be is that their paths can now be charted.
3. Places
4. Time periods [5:02:07, days, months, years, decades, centuries, eras]
5. Organizations — The Mafia
   Teams — The Tribe
   Orchestras — Love
   NB: undifferentiated disorganized sets of individuals can’t be given a mass name: The Americans
   not *American folk
6. Some man-made abstractions: written poems, theories, forms, books, paintings

What can’t be:

1. Nominalizations
2. Propositions
3. Events, unless planned for or predictable in some way [*The unknown Peter]
4. Geometric count nouns: right of way, circumference, etc.
5.1.75

I can only delete an object of a Vi

* I bought some pants, but I wore.

* I bought some pants yesterday and wore.
Agency + reflexivizability

The men portrayed themselves in pictures.
Garden paths

The man (?? who) that Ted went home disturbed so fell

4/30/75
CR with words

motions + wet troscopy

**tele + microscopy**

Indra points out that this could be out because *tele* is a dummy word
(CR + plurals)

Senators Kennedy + Goldwater

President [x] Truman + Eisenhower

Titis for king, mayor, etc.

Plurals only for titles all more than one hold
What goes here?
Dear to Sarah: In {my school, it's way}

Dear to Michael Schmidt: In {our little school}

Me to Ken: There are 35 students in {the department}

Me to Elke: {Our car is selling fast}

Me to Elke: *Your filler-in-law
John & Eric's talk.

Feature of law

1. Susan Matlin's example: This law [raises the price of coffee]
   [to reap] effects of law
   [structure of program]

2. Me: [description of machine using the program]
   The program [doesn't get into loops]
   [can't getting]

3. Me: The engine [doesn't smolder anymore - I just refuted]
   [can't smoking anymore - I take an old cock]

4. John Erch: structural statements are stronger than
   phenomenal ones, therefore

   Fred is being generous, it's true to imply
   that he isn't always.

5. Me: Jim [hitting] the ball well [is hitting] OK after seeing
   [requires more than one]
   [but to say]
No storm will allow the free insertion of stuff and VP's. It will not allow stuff to be inserted between NP and VP.
Arguments for amount-deletion

1. They occur w/ except, which otherwise allows only extent + amount

2. They are never islands

3. They only work w/ bases that can be modified by amount. [Roughly, this is the worst link]
   Advantage: won't provide by amount

4. Right meaning, but does classify, weakly, for me.

5. Multiplier lessness is impossible

   the headway was insufficient

---

Problem: how can I get

The amount of headway that I made was sufficient

How, if this is a relative clause on amount

does of headway drag along?
The empty N requires restrictive relative clauses

He disappeared in a way (T) which surprised us all.
Tom is the only $O_i$ to defend $O_i$. 
From rap at the Medici w/ John Lawler 4/14/75

{ 
  Plato (o's)
  Skeeve (*'s)
  *Howard
  *Mary Lemon
  *Bill
  *Leo

  enthusiasts
}
Any O.C. should command!

From nap with Carlos 4/26/75

+ Anything wasn’t remembered by Harry

? Story about anybody weren’t told

? Buying anything wasn’t begun

That he said anything wasn’t believed

Checked with TM, Top, & Left Palace

Systematically worse than G & F
It's hard to imagine him eating nothing.

Nothing is hard to imagine him eating.

It's almost impossible to get this to mean that.

Why? Should be fine, under TM.
Nonness and emptiness

The truth that I am hungry
being muggy
running constantly
* being back to live up to

So various it can go, but not there

And not after me
Fred knows that Mary was very disgusted by him.

This argues that not both of these are

presumed
Conversation with Alberta:

Ellen:

Can citations ever be in conflicting orders for conflicting sources?

The functions they fill can be:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
 le & \text{and} & V \\
 PO & IO & V \\
 me & le & V \\
 IO & DO & \\
\end{array}
\]

But not the words themselves. So keeping two citations, you always know that the first one has function x; the only
for anyone who may not know him. Professor Hintikka lives in LA.

since there may be someone who does not.

Professor Hintikka lives in LA.
4/1/75

?? He sent to her a box of cookies,

+ she — to him a pound of mint

He sent to her, and she — to him, boxes of cookies

why I a difference?
It's not only that one can't be constructively stressed — no pronoun referential to I can be either.

One always knew when it was himself for which the word was yelling.
So indefinite are they hard to prepare anyway,
and they can never precede their negatives.

He [never said] that I could marry anybody.

Anybody [he said] that I could marry.

Why better?
* There was believed being no milk to be possible by them.

It can't be the SSC, because of

* A picture was believed of Jack to have been taken.
Fact emerging in conversation with Jill:

Tom didn't come home drunk

= Tom wasn't drunk when he came home

≠ Tom was drunk when he didn't come home
"Nobody," said Ann, "knew that he was sick."

"Nobody will," said Ann, "know that he is sick."

"Nobody will know," said Ann, "that he is sick."
3/19/75

Bill said that from the looks of you others...

From the looks of you, him, etc.
I would like to have \( \Rightarrow \phi \)

A word with you if I may

A word with you if I may

As he - how to motivate that?
Do all non-continuous idioms involve V?

Why is it impossible to conceive of an idiom in which S ≠ O are fixed, but V is free?
That was a decision to which I was not privy.

Why?
I have been reading a paper by Howard Melon.

Howard's point is that there is no ego.

When Melon comes here, I want to talk to Howard Melon.
Fact discovered while talking with Mike Chen:

each only goes into perfective 5's

Each man \{ learned ? that 5.\}

Each man walked \{ to \} NY.

Each man \{ fell asleep \}

Each man \{ stepped \} in sleeping *(two hours)*
He was *not* long in learning

{knewing that he was sick}

\?

It was (at) long before he answered

{to ask that he was sick}
Sometimes you win, {some other} {you lose}

{you win sometimes}

{you win sometimes, you lose sometimes}

{sometimes you win}

NB: if E written in S, CE and S

Maybe there are the same as

so... as

once... always

I believe that some people were sick

{I know others were making funny}

{others I know were}
2/6/75

This seems to have no good perfect time

You must have {? stood} up many times before this

Look - tell her {?stood} the joint up

{? stood}
Q: Did we take pictures of Mike or of Harry?

A: Pictures of Mike

I took pictures of Mike, and he took pictures of me.

Q: Did we make headway on Chapter 1 or on Chapter 2?

A: Headway on Chapter 1

On Chapter 1
Chapter 1

We made headway on Chapter 1, and

they made headway on Chapter 2.
Can trigger any and SVI

2/3/75

? In any field can one camp or which there are no bulls

Thus the trigger for SVI seems to be:

[\( \text{NP} \) [\( \text{NP} \) \( \text{V} \) \( \times \)]

\( \text{NP} \) _specific_

2/4/75

NB that if they are true, then varying trigger strength would not imply every neg. join every _etc._

NB:

Everybody [did he invite] who looked interesting

Is there a meaning difference here?

Cf. Everybody who looked interesting he invited

Lieberman.
Clickization and 2nd position

The reason that it's a mistake

So that it's never go 5 initially
Is that how fingerprints were on the glass

wounded Smith's murderer

ambiguous? I suspect that it can't have
the attributive meaning.
He began to remember (?) the fact that the cups were breaking.
He answered negatively definitely in the negative, affirmatively.

His answer was negatively in the negative; that is, it was not so.

He answered, responded, replied.

Among the others: answer, response, statement, remark, report.
This is a (kind of) rabbit.
This is a no polarity item

I \{ \begin{align*}
\text{well} \\
\text{didn't} \\
\text{can't} \\
\text{couldn't} \\
\text{wasn't able to}
\end{align*} \}

NB It's too sweet to stomach
\[
\left\langle \begin{array}{c}
\frac{d^-}{d^0}
\end{array} \right\rangle
\]

don = \text{put on} \iff \text{do + on}

diff = \text{take off} \iff \text{do + off}
most ≠ most
He ran his fastest
"He ate his worst"
both of which I like and 

\[ \text{She adds} \]

\[ \text{we should consider} \]
Flip with suspect

2/6/75: The meaning of suspect that S (= hedged declarative)
is nowhere battled in the paradigm

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{I} & \quad \text{[suspect]} \\
& \quad \text{(a)} \quad \text{[Ann's eagerness]} \\
& \quad \text{(b)} \quad \text{[that S]} \\
& \quad \text{(c)} \quad \text{\Rightarrow} \\
& \quad \text{(d)} \quad \text{\Rightarrow} \\
& \quad \text{(e)} \quad \text{\Rightarrow} \\
& \quad \text{(f)} \quad \text{\Rightarrow} \\
& \quad \text{(g)} \quad \text{\Rightarrow} \\
& \quad \text{(h)} \quad \text{\Rightarrow} \\
& \quad \text{(i)} \quad \text{\Rightarrow} \\
& \quad \text{(j)} \quad \text{\Rightarrow} \\
& \quad \text{(k)} \quad \text{\Rightarrow} \\
\end{align*}
\]

? That S

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[Jack]}
\end{align*}
\]

\text{no suspect (?? to me)}

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[That S]}
\end{align*}
\]

\text{no suspicious (to me)}

Why is Flip easier for the adjective than for the V? G.
Valence of Modifier Shift

Children \{ \text{much older} \} \quad \text{liked it.}

\{ \text{x older} \}

?? Much older children

\{ \text{significantly older children} \}

\text{liked it.}

?? The children, much older, liked it.

?? The much older children

Why this difference?
It's raining,

\[ \text{which} \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\text{what Bill claimed}\\
\text{Bill's claim}
\end{array} \right\} \]

\[ \text{which is what} \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\text{what Bill claimed}\\
\text{Bill's claim}
\end{array} \right\} \]
The more nouns, the more modifiable by a RCC:

That he refused *( )

(for him) to refuse *( )

Him refusing *( )

His refusing *( )

The refusing *( )

The refused *( )

which was expected

Wild synchronicity:

I went 2 days ago in a squad with 5's only.

He asked why.

Today I read Dick Irwin's paper, which hints to something.

What he attempted was to refuse and refusing and a refusal and.

Hey! Maybe there's no ambiguity with the meaning.

I attempted something (say, phrasing the newspaper) that was interpreted as a refusal.
Counterfactual Inversion

This rule won't work with \( n_t \)

\[
\begin{cases}
\text{If you had } \frac{\text{not}}{n_t} \text{ left} \\
\text{Had you not left} \\
\text{Hadn't you left}
\end{cases}
\]

\( n_t \) pizza pieces would have plummeted.

This is a further piece of evidence that this rule is involved in \( \text{Were } n^* \text{ for } X \)

So, because of

\( \text{Weren't } n^* \text{ for } X \)
Amnesties always go one way: in isolation, a predicate requires a manner complement. It requires an amnesty environment.

Thus he achieved to win a war.

But, what he achieved was to win early.

But if I doubt that this sincerity and ?? what I doubt is his sincerity is not significantly better.
Sentential opposition and ungroundability of the head

Is this related to the fact that the whole NP in RRC's can't be modified?

Bill Telesco, which foreman we had fired,

* Nobody who [who] was a foreman was sick

* No foreman which poet I had met earlier laughed
Bill, a picture of whom (that was unpanel) Jan had brought along, was drinking heavily.

Why is this bad?
Niching and the 2 types of pseudo-clefts

1/24/70

What you see is

\[ \land \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{a picture of you} \quad \text{← Predicational} \\ \text{a picture of yourself} \quad \text{← Specificational} \end{array} \right. \]

Higgins says that true pseudo-clefts, syntactically connected ones, are frozen between copula and cleftee.
1/22/75

He was tickled instead of *being* pulled

So *being* won't delete before passives, even before passive workers:

He was *tired* instead of *being* tired

And *being* won't delete initially:

Instead of *being* boring, it was interesting
why are these only appositive?

hm
OBL. Extrp

* That I dawned on me

4/17/75
Can there be a subtle position?

? A "while" skin of caps crushed in

1/30/75

Seems so, upon mature reflection.
Fantastic argument for Prof Del. It accounts for this gap!
Runner must be a V, because if:

? Yes That he likes knives is rumored

only V require extrapolation
Like do, then required further
Further environment for them is often be

in on
be up on
down on
out for

? left

No: they can't have their Piped piped either:

on which I was in
A. Can't be triggered by a genuine, even forward.

B. Backward: ok
1. If downward (hierarchically) Compare (3a) and (3B)
2. If to a non-peer, but only if the trigger is in a lower clause
3. If from a subject to a clause mate of lesser rank

C. Forward
1. Upward - one clause only, unless intervening ones have no possible ancestors
   (Forward from comp to that)
2. Coordinate - adjacent clauses, unless intervening ones have no possible ancestors
3. Downward - two clauses only, unless intervening ones have no possible ancestors