Squib (skwib), n. (From O.E. squippe, for swippe (comp. squeamish for similar letter change), to move along swiftly, to sweep along; Icel. svipa, to flash, to dart, svipr, a swift movement; allied to sweep and swoop. Skeat.) 1. A little pipe or hollow cylinder of paper filled with gunpowder or other combustible matter which being ignited it flies along, throwing out a train of fiery sparks, and bursting with a crack. 'Hung up by the heels like meteors, with squibs in their tails.' B. Jonson.

Lampoons, like squibs, may make a present blaze. Waller.

2. A sarcastic speech or little censorious writing published; a petty lampoon; as, an election squib; a squib upon a rival. --3. A petty satirist.

The squibs are those who, in the common phrase of the word, are called libellers, lampooners, and pamphleteers. Steele.

Squib (skwib), v.i. pret. & pp. squibbed; ppr. squibbing. To use squibs or sarcastic or severe reflections; to contend in petty dispute; as, two members of a society squib a little in debate. (Colloq. United States.)

Squid (skwid), n. (Probably from squib, from its squirting out black matter.) A popular name of certain cuttle-fishes belonging to the dibranchiate group of the class Cephalopoda, and included in several genera, of which the most familiar is that of the calamaries. See CALAMARY.
Threshing the Verb Phrase

This squib investigates the internal structure of the verb phrase. We have already abandoned the flat VP rule in which there is one VP node per sentence. For instance, facts involving the behavior of VP Deletion with respect to Auxiliary Verbs motivate a right-recursive VP rule [VP --> V VP] that produces nested VPs. I propose adding a left-recursive VP rule [VP --> VP PP] as well. We will thrash verb phrases with the two transformational flails of Tough Movement and WH-Clefting; some constituents will move, and some will not. The new VP rule will enable us to predict which of the constituents can move, that is, which will prove to be wheat, and which chaff.

Tough Movement: Separating the Wheat from the Chaff

Consider the following grammatical sentence:

1. Max gave a book to Marie at midnight.

If we insert (1) into an appropriate structure, then Object-to-Subject Raising (Tough Movement) permits us to raise a noun phrase from (1) into matrix subject position.

Here is an appropriate structure:
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S
  |  
NP  VP
  |  
S-BAR
  |  
V  Adjp
be tough
Comp for
NP Max
  |  
V NP PP PP
give a book PP to NP NP at midnight
```

And here is our formulation of Raising:

```
[1] 2 3 4 5
--- --- -- 2 5 + [4/2]
```

This rule says to find a clause that contains an S-BAR that contains a noun phrase, to replace the S-BAR with the noun phrase, and to move the S-BAR minus (in our notation, slash) the noun phrase to the right.

The subcategorizations for 'be' and 'tough' specify that the S-BAR must appear in subject position and that the moved noun phrase must begin in any position except embedded subject position. These conditions permit Raising to promote "Marie" to the subject position in the matrix sentence to get (2):

2. Marie is tough for Max to give a book to at midnight.
3. *Midnight is tough for Max to give a book to Marie at.

But the conditions as they stand also permit Raising to move "midnight". Unlike (2), the result in (3) is ungrammatical. Apparently, "any noun phrase not in subject position" will not suffice as a restriction upon the noun phrases that Tough Movement can move.

One obvious explanation for these facts would be that "Marie" is the indirect object of 'give', and "midnight" is not. If our grammar could tell what an indirect object was, we could then try the following restriction: the moved noun phrase must be either a direct or an indirect object.

Unfortunately, Tough Movement contrasts occur for objects that are not indirect objects at all:

   *Max bought five dollars a book.
   Five dollars is tough for Max to buy a book for.

   *Max bought fun a book.
   *Fun is tough for Max to buy a book for.

If an example contains more than one sentence, then the first sentence will correspond to a deep structure, and subsequent sentences will represent the effect of a the application of a single transformation to that deep structure. Thus the second sentences in (4) and (5) demonstrate that the result of Dative Movement, when applied to the first sentence is ungrammatical.