

Superlatives

12/6/70

Tom is the littlest  
\* little  
a little boy

little can only occur personally —  
therefore, there was an N here

But if \*a content van  
vs ? Tom was the most content

Is this really good?

I need more examples

or's + Q's

11/23/70

I don't know when either Tom or Bob left

= I don't know when Tom did and I don't know  
PMP when Bob did

≠ I don't know when Tom or Bob visited her

? I don't know whether it was Bob who came  
and I don't know whether it was Tom who came

I don't know (\*either) whether it was Bob who left  
or whether it was Tom who left

//<sub>o</sub> I don't know whether it was (\*either) Tom or Bob  
who left (cf. Did (\*either) Tom or Bob leave. Tom.)

Agreement + Insertion Constraint

11/28/70

If agreement is always copying,  
Greek agreement destroys the Insertion Constraint

Apparel Deletion

11/18/70

Joe took Sally's pants off AMBIG

whose pants did Joe take off (of {her} / {\*him})?

Sally's pants Joe took off AMBIG

Sally's pants Joe took off (of {him} / {\*her})

Sally's pants were taken off by Joe (of Sally) / {\*of him}

Sally's pants were taken off by Joe (of him) / {her}

who took whose pants off = who stripped who  
\*who directed himself of whose clothes

(Binding)

11/16/70

I bought Mary a knife { \* which is } to shave herself with.  
\_\_\_\_\_

Shows we need (WHIZ → ~~to~~ ← Pruning  
EQUI

because EQUI only wipes out NP under identity  
with members of next clause up

{ Clefthug }

11/16/70

From Pat Brogan:

It wasn't until 5 that he left

From me: It was until 5 that he didn't leave

I don't { believe } that it was until 5 that he left  
{ \*claim }

(happen)

11/16/70

\* It doesn't happen that he likes cheese

but  
heles

\* He doesn't happen to like cheese (I don't think)

(From he happens not to like cheese ?) <sup>(\*I don't think)</sup>

But again? \* Tom didn't happen to visit Marnie

heles<sup>2</sup>: OK Tom didn't happen to visit her, did he? ↗

\* ↘

Gasps





(however + Perf Anal)

11/13/70

John <sup>says</sup> thinks ?realizes that Bill, however, may have a chance  
\*doubts  
?\*hopes

\* John realizes that Bill will, however, sign the bill

argues that only  
Mass, who has, however, certain reservations, will sign  
The people who had (\*however,) reservations, signed  
appcls are in obj of performative V's.

(Q's + Perfs)

11/10/70

when, please, was it, \* (I wonder)?

This suggests that these aren't Q's.

But if the source is I wonder I alone,  
how come  $\exists$

who, besides yourself, knows him?

Hum.



as to

11/6/70

? It has not been determined as to when he left

I couldn't determine (\*as to) when he left

I'm not sure (\*of) as to) when he left

The question (as to) when he left has not been settled.

I've been wondering { about (\*as to) / as to (\*about) } when he left

What's the environment for this rule?  
rule?

# Conjunctive $\Phi$ + Disjunction

11/5/70

I couldn't determine whether (??either) Max or Tom was there

when either Max or Tom will go be there

either Max or Tom \* went ?\* was there

(all of these ??)

are OK, I think  
w/ meaning  
either why  $S_1$ , or  
why  $S_2$

why either Max or Tom was there

how long (\*either) Max or Tom stayed

NB: ?\*I was able to determine how long (either) Max or Tom had  
slept

Question Deletion

11/3/70

Sylvia Schwartz's conjecture, that only embedded  $\phi$ 's delete, is supported by these facts:

I  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{cant} \\ *can \end{array} \right\}$  determine

# Conjunctive $\Phi$ 's

10/31/70

Best argument that conj  $\Phi$ 's come from that-clauses is the parallel complementarity of disj  $\Phi$ 's, and [conj  $\Phi$ 's or that-clauses] after determine, which Barbara noted.

---

Maybe what is quantified over in conj  $\Phi$ 's is the set of  $n$ -ads that could satisfy the frame.

Who slept where - Mort upstairs + Fritz downstairs - is wild.

No - I still don't understand it

(Presups of Ps)

10/31/70

Who left? presupposes not only that someone left,  
but that more than one could have:

\* What picture tube in your set do you want me to fix?



so and App Cls

10/31/70

the man [ ) ] who was so tall [ ) ] was blind  
\* - [ - ]  
| | | |

Emphatic so is only possible in appositive cl's,  
which proves that they come from upstairs,  
and are the DO's of performatives.

(Audiability and Slippiness)

p.1

10/30/70

Maybe this unambiguity

I found a woman to kiss my genitalia, and

Bill found her too

is just because her is visible

---

What about?

6 " and Bill found two of them

---

This also seems unambig, so even if Paul  
is right in saying that two  $\leftarrow$  two of them  
the source doesn't have the right slippiness.

Audibility and Suppression

10/30/70

Jack approved of the picture of his house,

and Tom approved of it } to UNAMBIG  
                                  } ← AMBIG

~~That Ed would have to shut up was obvious (to him)~~  
~~and that Bill would was obvious (to him) too~~

Opacity and Specificity Funnal  
day → some

10/30/70

Bill believed that something fell

This doesn't have an opacity ambiguity.  
Is this because the purported other reading  
has to be at least as specific?

Or what?

Whatever it is, it's more evidence for some  
coming from or:

Joe believes that we will get ham or eggs

Either ham or eggs has  
opacity ambiguities, but not the whole object.

# Opacity and Audibility

should be this, because of any 10/30/70  
L has a phonological pronoun - getting rub,  
it will behave like a  
deleting L.

Is A opaque and B not?

(A)

You said that Tom kicked the priest but Bill doesn't believe that Joe kicked

{the priest}  
him

(B)

B

η

Joe did

That would account for the  
non-ambiguity of

Joe believes that P was muggy {here}  
{there}

● If opacity is only a property  
of visible NPs.

↓  
⊗