

Corners

5.11.78

Berlin

This corner presuppose ARTIFACT?

?? The left near corner of the cave was damp.

One corner of the { postcard } was bent.  
?? leaf

One corner of the { pebble } was chipped  
gem



Topicity + There's Insertion

8.1.78.  
Tina

Who was in the bathtub?

Noone (was ( there ) ) ← Why?

There { was noone ( there ) }  
          { wasn't anyone ( there ) }

Who was there in the bathtub?

? Noone

Noone was \* ( there ) ( there ) ← OK!?!  
                  { in it }  
There { was noone ( there ) }  
          { wasn't anyone? ( there ) }

Order of complementizers

7.25.78.

Dined Antony Talking at the Boundaries

"The invention of fact" between 5 and 10  
pages in my handpage notes had

X observed that when S, his could X?

↑ Historical

7.26.78.

? He observed that with all the facts, who would have  
to win?



? \* He observed that ~~who would have to work with all the~~  
facts

Performances

7.21.70

Frankly S

Frankly only modifies  $\checkmark$   
say

\* I sliced I frankly.

Eindruck → Ø

6.12.78

Er macht einen müden

? guten

\* langen

What's this say for good old non-recoverable

?



Adjective Incorporation

5.12.78

They look { qualified  
? separated  
\* depended on } //5

{ qualified  
? separated  
\* depended on } - looking

Also: an innocent-seeming look

? These shoes are paid for-looking.

? There is some sat-on looking bread

All explained, of course, if I rule of incorporation.

End of the line

5.1.78

That's not even { slightly  
a little  
? somewhat  
\* rather  
\* very } funny

He didn't even { interest  
astound } us

We didn't reach even { the midway point  
\* the top }

TM and To Be Deletion?

4.21.78.

Ardley

Pres. Paul:

This dilds is designed to be easy to manipulate by artists

? intended  
\* considered

This language is designed to be easy to use } by people  
Paul: to be used

Who know Fortran

? This wood is designed to be easy to burn by youngsters

So both V are selected



able

4.5.78

fashionable — Ø V fashion

palatable — Ø V palate

Supfix Law(?)

4.5.78.

[en + able<sub>A</sub>]<sub>V</sub>

Counterexamples

[en + vision<sub>N</sub>]<sub>V</sub>

[en + power<sub>N</sub>]<sub>V</sub>

before

Maybe the law(?) governs only productive affixing?

hack

4.1.78

Basically a (Neg)  $\diamond$  polarity item, except that Neg  
is somewhat  $\sim$  D.

I hope I can hack it

think

know

am surprised that

\*regret

\*Hack it!

He has been hacking it for years

In which case

3.31.78.

Sal may { ? have drunk  
be drinking  
drink } , in which { case  
event } { we'll celebrate  
\* we celebrated }

\* Sal { is drinking  
has drunk  
drank } , in which case, X

If it rains, we'll stay in, in which case X  
\* We'll stay at home, in which case X  
\* He'll win, as is possible vs. ? If you play, he'll win, as is possible

4.1.78.

It { could (can't)  
may (must)  
would  
should  
? has to } rain, in which case X

Have → ∅

3.24.78.

I have Jamieson in tow

(?\* I'm getting Jamieson in tow)

//s

I { want  
need  
expect } Jamieson in tow by noon.



Whether ... or

3.16.78.

Janice's hatred - (whether for pizza or (for) cornbread) is irrelevant  
\*for whether pizza or cornbread

↑ T Somehow

That Janice (hates something) { whether Janice hates pizza or (whether) she hates cornbread  
whether it is pizza (that she hates) or whether it is cornbread (that she hates)  
whether it is pizza or { ?? whether it is cornbread } that she hates  
? it is cornbread.  
is irrelevant

A handful - whether of grapes or of raisins - would be enough

So it doesn't seem easy to use this as a litmus for transformationalism.

When all is modified by almost, it can float, but only  
off of subjects

We have almost all seen that movie.

I kissed them (\*almost) all.

I gave melons to them (\*almost) all.

X-like

2.10.78.

Can everything incorporate into -like?

child-like

? bookcase-like

?\* American history teacher like

\* works

Reassessing

2.7.78  
Tokyo.

Shin points out: \* He was explained to that S

My observation: reassessing is out of  $\exists$  higher-ranking term.

This explains this

Terris was talked to (about it)

vs

It was talked about (?? to Terris)

↑  
This can't be reassessed from  $\hat{0}$  to 2 so well of  $\exists$  that is around

Passives of prepositional objects

2.6.78

??

Japan

talk to  $\cong$  tell

talk about  $\cong$  discuss

look at  $\cong$  inspect

count on  $\cong$  trust

believe in  $\cong$  ? [Just believe?] <sup>3.22.78.</sup>

3.22.78

live in  $\cong$  inhabit [So why is it bad if object is country?  
Inhabit allows country objects.]

play in  $\cong$  use (very roughly) but applaud in equals nothing

Near's idea: "pseudo-passives" are only possible if ViP is a verb, i.e., if the object of P can be interpreted as a 2.

So maybe these facts are relevant:

re. { <sup>talk</sup> } the problem  
think

This concert hall has been { played in by some great orchestras  
\*applauded in by some large audiences }

//5

The BSO played top halls in Europe

\* These audiences applauded top halls



Prefix Law

2.5.78.

A possible counterexample to the Prefix-Law (namely, prefixes don't change category) is Arabic

ma ktab

Two possible wiggles:

(1) Is ma- prefixed to verbs, or to a stem? If the latter, betts are off - no problem

(2) If Arabic has category-changing prefixes, does it have any such suffixes? Maybe languages can change categories from either end of a word, but not from both.

2.6.78.

Problems: [hin + über] Adv  
Pref P  
?

[be + side] P  
Pref N

[be + cause] Conj  
N, V

[up + right] Adj  
Pref Adj  
?

Possible wiggle: these are not productive patterns of prefixing.

From Konarik Reddy (Sound of Meaning)

1.23.78.

Tamil

→ dhamaal - dhimil — noise of a stone [or heavy obj] rolling down a hill

adi apaa — Mummy beat me for being so stupid

Angali

ayú: aya: ≈ Oh gee — Hindi

ata jata — Hindi

coming going

ákad bákad bambai boo

asi nabé pure soo

soo kalóte títar móote ← [tat]

Collog.  
Hindi

Law: no prefix changes category

Word-building rules

1.22.78

stem

V → V    be+, for+  
 re#, mis# etc; Incorporation bedgehop, backbite

V → A    {#} able, #ing (N) — +en (heart broken)

V → N    tal, -ment, +ion, #er, #ee

A → V    -en

A → A    +ish (longish [g])    over#, under#    in# ~ in+  
 But: dumbish [\*b]

A → N    +th, +ity, +ty (loyalty), #ness

N → V    FASTEN X (DOWN) WITH Y ⇒ Y X? (DOWN)  
 PUT X ON Y ⇒ X Y

N → A    #like, #worthy, #y, -ful { unselfful, gleeful, boastful, truthful }

N → N    non# un# [unworth]    #hood #ship

Law: \*X → stem

Stem → V    ify (crucify)    ize (aggrandize, baptize)    ate (rotate)

Stem → A    -ent, -ant, -ian, -al (minimal), -ous, -esque?, -ary

Stem → N    -on, -oon (spilloon), -ex

## Overkill Passive

Sentence heard from Justice Groves, a friend of Uncle Viss: 1.22.78.

This amendment was sought to be made

Since seek does not seem to be a  $\beta$ -Passive  
(although further checking is necessary here)  
this S must have been derived from

X sought to make this amendment

Thus when seek to make is  
treated as a { compound }  
                          { complex }  
                          { conjoined } ? ✓

Both seek and make must get  
passive morphology.

But what kind of super rule?

Swinn says there's something like this in Turkish, that Jack and 1.22.78.

(Agentivity)

Rep with Jake:

11.28.77

(to Jim)

They're screaming for it to be possible

? for people to walk at night

? that we'll get back on time

So agentivity doesn't go by form: Abstract isn't always equally

good.



Immediacy: Animal + Meet  
 Me Me

11.27.77.

	Me [= animal]	Me [meat of animal]	
Voice? C <sub>f</sub> #	kow	beef	1-1 (or 2-1?)
P	sheep	mutton	1-0
C <sub>i</sub> V C <sub>f</sub>	lamb	veal	3-1
V? C <sub>f</sub> #	pig	pork	2-0 (or 3-0?)

Cf. also Stern 20.10.77. p. 162-163

Eike Christian Hirsch: Deutsch für Besserwisser (column) "Welscher Tand"

	Me	Me		
P	Mut	Courage		
(P)	Rache	Revanche		Hirsch points
C <sub>i</sub> # C <sub>f</sub> # C <sub>i</sub> V C <sub>f</sub> #	Ehre	Pres/tige	V <sub>1</sub> Q <sub>2</sub>	4-2 2 out that the French words all have an ironic connotation.
C <sub>i</sub> # Q C <sub>f</sub> Q C <sub>f</sub>	Unglück	Malheur	C <sub>f</sub> # 2	5-1 2

Split Ihr

11.16.77.

Helmut Schnelle's father, speaking to Helmut and me: "... Each..."  
[although he doesn't dut me] → Ihren is wrong.

On the other hand, speaking to Helmut and to some high tier,  
he would have to say Ihren.

What's the rule? Is it because I'm close enough to being dutzbar that it would be more of an insult to Helmut to include him in an Ihren than it is presumptuous to include me in an Each? While with the Bundeskanzler, I would be presumptuous [like trying to sneak du-wards - often ~~can~~ one can Ihnen before one can dutzen], more presumptuous towards the BK than distant from Helmut.



Intransitive 2's + -ung

11.7.77.

Uta Quasthoff didn't like Erierung —

It turns out that it's got to be transitive: \* Schlafung  
\* Tanzung  
\* Singung

No: Dieter Hartmann pointed out that Erfrierung is

transitive but OK

Reason: Die Orangen { \*frieren  
erfrieren }

11.8.77.

Ernung

Sitzung  
Tagung  
Werbung

1.20.  
not intran

Uh oh: götter - \*götter

Wartung

Intr. Erscheinung

Offnung



Plural Incorporation

10 or 11.77.

leaves drop {  
Ø  
er  
ing }

The leaves were shed [leaves thus is a plural]

Probably OK because of \*leave

But why then is \*outsided so lousy?

outsider is better.

Probably then because NN is more tightly bound than N(P?)V {  
ing  
er }

---

But scissor (??s) grinder  
headlight (\*s) adjuster  
?? paint trimmer



die Tatsache

Ich hatte vergessen, dass sich mein Vater diesen Hut gekauft hatte.

~~\* Ich hatte ~~vergessen~~ den Hut vergessen, den sich ~~hatte~~ mein Vater gekauft hatte.~~  
(I think)

12.2.77.  
false take + Ewald shoot it down

So this rule only works in superficial non-relative

subordinate clauses

↑  
NB

① Why? ② How? Note that here, RC word isn't  
easy to define configurationally.

German participial incorporation

10.12.77

From a Mose David brochure:

↓  
Frömmeliger blendet

Die Frömmerei blendet X

//s

Preisgekrönt

\*\* Der Preis krönt X

Juwelbeschnückt

Die Juwelen beschnücken X

(why -s?)

Kriegsverletzt

\* Der Krieg verletz X

Wasserbeschädigt

- Das Wasser beschädigt X

\* Axtgetötet

- Der Axt tötet X

What predicts the possibilities here?

Place > Time

10.11.77.

It was beautiful { there then  
? then there }

Imperative-bound idioms + politeness

10.8.77.

Tunisia?

Cut it out

Move it / Kiss off

Make it snappy / Shake a leg / Move your ass / Get a move on

Or else

All these occur only in imperative clauses, and all are impolite.  
I don't know of any that are imperative only that are polite.

Why is this? Is it because the unmarked imperative is impolite, and idioms can only penetrate unmarked contexts? Or what.

Extrapolation of PP

9.29.77.

Ornstein  
p.133

"Manuals of Sufic practice are not <sup>readily</sup> available,  
whereas ones are for Yoga and Zen."

\*... but ones should become available



Homonymy + spelling

Why is it that only syllable finals are so homophonous?

Mostly dentals have graphic variants

9.28.77

[iyt] -eat -eet -ete

[eyt] -eat, -ate -eight -ait  
-aight

[äyt] -ite -ight -ait <sup>krait</sup> <sup>kyt</sup>  
<sup>eight</sup>

[iɣd] -cal -eed -ede

[ēɣd] -ade -aid -aide

[äɣd] -ide -yde

[iys] -iece, -eece -ease <sup>leare</sup>

[ēys] -ace, -aice, -ass

[äys] -ice <sup>vi:se</sup>  
-ise

[iɣz] -eeze  
-eeze -ease

[ēɣz] -aze -arize

[äɣz] -ize <sup>rise</sup>  
-ise

[iɣn] -ean, -een

[ēɣn] -ane, -ain <sup>Mary Louise</sup>  
-ean

[äɣn] -ine

[iɣr] -ear, -eer, -ier

[ēɣr] -are, -air -aire

[äɣr] -ire -yre

[iɣl] -cal -eel

[ēɣl] -ale, -ail

[äɣl] -ile

[iɣ] -ee -ea

[ēɣ] -ay -ey

[äɣ] -ie, -ye, -y

Quote for Linguistics

9.26.77.

Robert Frost: Something there is which doesn't like a wall.