the simile is involved, it is associated with the direct object rather than the subject of the verb. To my knowledge, the example is unique in this regard.

4. For additional Indonesian examples in each category, see Rose (1969, Appendix). Indonesian examples are cited throughout in the highly consistent standard orthography of Bahasa Indonesia, in which only the following conventions require mention: \( \mathbf{j} = /\mathbf{y}/, \mathbf{tj} = /\mathbf{E}/, \mathbf{dj} = /\mathbf{j}/, \mathbf{nj} = /\mathbf{E}/, \mathbf{ng} = /\mathbf{r}/, \mathbf{e} = /\mathbf{e}/, \) and \( \mathbf{e} = /\mathbf{e}/. \) (The symbol \( \mathbf{e} \) is an unorthographic representation of the ambiguous phonemic value of the symbol \( \mathbf{e} \)).

On August 17, 1972, a spelling reform proposal was officially adopted by the Indonesian government, comprising half a dozen changes with the older spelling as input and based on phonological principles. However, since no dictionaries exist in the revised spelling, the older orthography is used throughout.

5. But notice English dust the furniture 'remove dust' beside dust the crops 'apply dust'.

6. Jackendoff (1966) has proposed a similar scheme as an account of systemic potential.

7. Chomsky (1965: 187) has suggested: 'Perhaps one must regard the gaps as accidental, at least in some such cases, and allow for nonoccurring as well as actual cases.'

8. Marchand (1966) cites true: untrue: false as a rare exception to this generalization.

9. It appears that the constraint is much narrower if a few Greek roots are excepted. There are but a handful of non-coronal finals such as those that appear in sympathize, philosophize, and syllabize — all of which are of Greek origin. Syllabize, an exception to my constraint, is a dictionary discovery for me. I use — and have seen used — only syllabize.

10. In Indonesian, these relationships are a part of a more complex system of morphological derivation. That is, for example, many derived verbs in \( \mathbf{\mathbf{i}} \) are not based on nouns (e.g. menakim \( \mathbf{t}\mathbf{a}\mathbf{n} \) 'climb a pole' based on \( \mathbf{n}\mathbf{a}\mathbf{k} \) 'rise'). Furthermore, corresponding to the formations in \( \mathbf{i} \), there is typically a transitive form in \( \mathbf{\mathbf{-k}}\mathbf{n} \) which bears quite a different relationship to subject and direct object. The several distinctions are beyond the scope of the present discussion; but it may be noted that for certain \( \mathbf{i} \) and \( \mathbf{\mathbf{-k}}\mathbf{n} \) verbs derived from the same basic form, what is named by the direct object is conceived of as stationary in the case of \( \mathbf{i} \) verbs and as moving in the case of \( \mathbf{\mathbf{-k}}\mathbf{n} \) verbs.
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***

ON CONSTRAINTING THE PRODUCTION OF DENOMINAL VERBS

In a recent article (Rose, 1973), James Rose claims that the production of denominal verbs in English is quite lawfully constrained, in contrast to the view expressed earlier by Bloomfield (1933) and others. Rose makes the following strong proposal:

\[ \text{[...]} \text{it is possible to distinguish a small set of regular relationships — one of which occurs in every instance of a homophonous denominal verb in English. These relationships, with examples, are listed in (4):} \]

(4) (a) CAUSE vb GO TO object
   i. water the lawn
   ii. air the room

(b) CAUSE vb COME FROM object
   i. peel an orange
   ii. bone a chicken

(c) CAUSE object BE + LOC. vb
   i. crate books
   ii. pocket a pen

(d) BE (LIKE) vb TO object
   i. father a child
   ii. mother a child

Rose supports this claim with data from English, and, in addition, he shows that instances of these same nominal types occur in Indonesian.

One need not look far, however, to find a number of denominals in both English and Indonesian which do not belong to any of the four classes that Rose permits. In many cases, these denominals can be grouped into well-defined classes similar to Rose’s. Below I list four of these additional types, with examples from English:

(1) (a) COMMUNICATE TO object BY MEANS OF vb
   i. telephone the President
   ii. wire Grandmother
   iii. cable Tom
   iv. radio the crew
(b) COPY object BY MEANS OF vb
   i. photograph the children
   ii. tape the conversation
   iii. Xerox the article
   iv. trace the map

(c) LOCOMOTE TO object BY MEANS OF vb
   i. cycle to Boston
   ii. ski to the bottom of the slope
   iii. leg to the other side of the bridge

(d) CAUSE object TO HAVE TRAJECTORY OR FORM OF vb
   i. circle the enemy
   ii. arch the back
   iii. hook the ball (in golf or bowling)
   iv. cross the arms

These denominals show that the set of four classes proposed by Rose must be at least doubled in number. In support of Rose's more general claims, however, we note that the denominals can be grouped according to fairly well-defined types, each of which is governed by a productive derivational rule.

Instances of two of these additional classes occur in Indonesian:

(2) (b) memotret (formerly mempotret) 'to photograph'
     (d) membentari 'to circle'

There are still other denominals that Rose fails to consider which, unlike the above cases, do not form well-defined classes. Such denominals seem at first glance to have just the kind of idiosyncratic nature pointed out by Bloomfield (1933). Consider (3):

(3) (a) PERCEIVE object BY MEANS OF vb
   i. eye the stewardess
   ii. *ear the cheerleader
   iii. *skin Mary's touch
   iv. *taste bud the baked potato
   v. *nose the zinnia (this is acceptable in some dialects)

(b) CONFER STATUS OF vb ONTO object
   i. knight the hero
   ii. *colonel the officer
   iii. *bishop the priest
   iv. *wife Jennifer

The acceptable denominals in (3a) and (3b) have no counterparts in Indonesian. As for the unacceptable denominals, it is quite unlikely that these can be explained away as 'accidental gaps' — that is, as potentially acceptable forms which native speakers can readily paraphrase. At least some of the starred forms in (3) are totally unacceptable, and native speakers find themselves unable to render appropriate paraphrases. These observations lead one to suspect that the acceptable forms in (3) are not purely idiosyncratic. And, in regard to (3a), it has recently been shown (Cooper, 1974) that such denominals do obey a weak order relation involving the referents of sensation. This finding indicates that, alas, the derivation of these denominals is not random. While continuing to search for a more precise account, however, we might at least pause to appreciate

Bloomfield's original skepticism.

MIT

William E. Cooper

FOOTNOTES

The Indonesian does contain denominals which resemble (1a) and (1c):

(2) (a) mentilagram 'to telegram'
       memiljon 'to telephone'
     (c) bersepeda 'to cycle'

However, unlike (1a) and (1c), respectively, the denominals in (2a) are intransitive, while (2c) connotes USE rather than LOCOMOTION. I am grateful to John W. M. Verhaar for providing these examples.
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INVENTION AND INNOVATION IN DENOMINAL VERBS

In a recent article (Rose, 1973), I proposed the following scheme of categories as an account of the systematic relationships which hold between English denominal transitive verbs and the nouns from which they are derived:

(1) (a) CAUSE vb GO TO object
   i. water the lawn
   ii. air the room

(b) CAUSE vb COME FROM object
   i. peel an orange
   ii. bone a chicken

(c) CAUSE object BE + LOC. vb
   i. crate books
   ii. pocket a pen

(d) BE (LIKE) vb TO object
   i. father a child
   ii. mother a child

I went on to show that denominal verbs in Indonesian marked by the suffix -j not only exhibit the same range of relationships to the nouns from which they are derived but in large measure, the same nouns are involved in each relational category. Thus, parallel to the above English exam-