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FOOTNOTES

1. Indonesian does contain denominals which resemble (1a) and (1c):
   (2a) mengilgram 'to telegram'
   (2b) mentupan 'to telephone'
   (2c) 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. become 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 -i 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-
classes defined in terms of recurrent features such as
CAUSE, MOTION, LOCATION, etc. The introduction of
such semantically complex features as COPY, HAVE TRA-
JECTORY OR FORM OF, COMMUNICATE TO, PERCEIVE,
and CONFERENCE OF indicates a serious misunderstand-
ing of what I meant by "factoring out" underlying regularities.
Obviously, there are many ways to subcategorize denominal
verb phenomena in terms of an open-ended set of semantic
classes. Consider, as an illustration, the following exam-
ple (4) of my proposed category (1b) CAUSE vb COME
FROM object:

(4) i. peel the apple
ii. milk the cow
iii. weed the garden
iv. scale the fish

It is altogether possible, of course, to paraphrase such ex-
pressions using the highly specific verbs pare, saw, squeeze,
pull, and scrape respectively. Furthermore, it is conceiv-
able that one might choose any one of these verbs as a cate-
gory label—making it possible to observe, correctly, that
the example is unique, idiosyncratic, and therefore not part
of a productive process. In a parallel fashion, one might
choose to abandon phonological features, phonemes, allo-
phones or any other abstract phonological entities on the ba-
sis of very real variations in articulatory/acoustic proper-
ties of speech sounds from speaker to speaker or from ut-
terance to utterance by the same speaker. In short, to igno-
re the consistent "remove" reading in the examples listed
in (4) is to abandon analysis.

Still, Cooper's examples do not fit in any obvious way
into the categories I have proposed; and, accordingly, they
fail for explanation. Part of the explanation, I believe, lies
in the exceptional character of some of the examples Cooper
cites; the remaining part does, indeed, require a modifi-
cation of the categories presented in (1). I deal with these
matters in turn.

First, for want of any reference to the discussions of
"category collapsing" that have appeared in the last decade,
I am surprised to find Cooper's intransitive examples (3c)
in a discussion of verb/object relationships. I conclude that
this is an oversight. Nonetheless, essentially the same
objections could be raised against the transitive construc-
tions (5) which I partially overlooked and partially misinter-
preted earlier.

(5) (a) cart the groceries
(b) pedal the bicycle
(c) paddle the canoe
(d) pump the water

In my original formulation (Rose, 1973, p. 513, fn. 2),
I proposed that the expression cart the groceries was close-
ly associated with the category (1c) above (e.g. bag the
groceries), being distinct only in terms of a motional/sta-
tive dichotomy (i.e. GO in a cart vs. BE in a bag). The
remaining examples of (5) -- and many more -- preclude
that analysis and appear to require an instrumental inter-
pretation of the sort (6).²

(6) CAUSE object GO + INST. vb.

The Indonesian denominal verb formation in -i fails to
parallel the English "zero derivation" in this case, a fact to which I return after considering Cooper's further exceptions.

Consider now Cooper's first two classes (2a and b). It is striking, it seems to me, that all but one of the denominal verbs cited: telephone, wire, cable, radio, photograph, tape, Xerox (but not trace), involve relatively recent technological advances. Considering the complex and particular function of such instruments, it is extremely difficult to imagine how they could fit, in any straightforward way, into a scheme of noun/verb relationships that antedates the inventions literally by millennia. If, in fact, these examples establish new categories, it is important to note that the inventions referred to have altered reality. In so doing, they call forth an accommodation in any linguistic system in which their functions are to be verbalized. It comes as no surprise, therefore, that the English/Indonesian parallelism observed in (1) and (2) above does not, as Cooper correctly observes, extend to these examples. Thus, it is largely owing to lack of regularity in the noun/verb relationship that Indonesian fails to exhibit forms such as *menilgrami, *menilpomi, *memotreti, etc. (from tilgram 'telegram', tilpon 'telephone', and potret 'portrait', photograph, respectively). The significant point is that Indonesian denominal verbs in -j are "marked" for precisely the range of meanings that I have described: this suffix is simply not available for the necessary innovation in that language. The considerations which bear on the limits of morphological productivity constitute an enormously important question which cannot begin to be adequately dealt with in a short space. For the present, let it suffice to emphasize the necessity for a coherent scheme of derivational relationships within which particular morphological systems may be examined and compared.

In this regard, it seems significant to me that Cooper's examples (2a and b) are so closely associated to my examples (1a and b). That is, an expression such as telephone the president differs systematically from one like water the lawn only as to the overt expression (or lack of it) of the subject of the motional verb and the instrumental NP. Thus, in the formulas (7):

\[
\begin{align*}
(7) & \quad \text{(a) CAUSE (unspecified "message") GO TO object INST (vb)} \\
& \quad \text{(b) CAUSE vb GO TO object (INST. (unspecified))}
\end{align*}
\]

There is a uniform relationship which holds among the elements CAUSE, GO TO, and object. Similarly, the systematic difference between photograph the children and bone the chicken appears to rest not with the causative and motional (COME FROM) aspects of the verb/object relationship but with something like a figurative/literal distinction regarding what is extracted. Alternatively, it may be appropriate to regard an expression like photograph the children as an extension of my category (1c): (CAUSE object BE + LOC. vb), in which case it would be interpreted as something like "cause the children to be (in existence) in a photograph."

Further alternatives suggest themselves (e.g., photograph as INSTRUMENT) in which case the expressions of (8) will doubtlessly prove to be closely associated in the final analysis:

\[
\begin{align*}
(8) & \quad \text{(a) pencil a sketch} \\
& \quad \text{(b) pipe a tune} \\
& \quad \text{(c) pen a letter} \\
& \quad \text{(d) voice an objection}
\end{align*}
\]

More significantly, the same relational categories that I proposed originally continue to come to bear on expressions for which they were not designed. Thus, the prospects for this line of inquiry would seem to be enhanced rather than diminished.

Returning now to Cooper's remaining exceptions, the last of Cooper's classes listed above (3d) in far from uniform. First of all, the example (3di) circle the enemy surely doesn't mean "cause the enemy to have the form of a circle." Rather, it means, ambiguously, "form a circle around the enemy" or "cause the enemy to be located in a circle," both of which readings appear in my original formulation.

Before dealing with the remainder of Cooper's apparent exceptions, I wish to turn to another omission in my earlier discussion of possible noun/verb relationships (1). In my original presentation (Rose, 1973, p.18, fn.3), I cited the expression baby someone as a unique exception to my proposal. It has occurred to me in the meantime that the expression is neither unique nor significantly beyond the categories provided. This and many other exceptions are accounted for as causatives of the only one of my categories which is not a causative in the first place. That is, baby someone rests on the underlying semantic relationship: CAUSE object BE (LIKE) vb. Similarly, Cooper's exceptions arch the back (3dii) and cross the arms (3div) are causatives of the expressions: the back BE LIKE an arch and the arms BE LIKE a cross, respectively. The remaining example -- hook the ball (in golf or bowling) (3diii) -- differs from the foregoing only with respect to the statical/motional dichotomy which I noted in relation to category (1c) in the original formation (Rose, 1973, p.513, fn.2). Thus, arch the back differs systematically from hook the ball only with regard to the distinction between BE and GO in the formulas (9):

\[
\begin{align*}
(9) & \quad \text{(a) CAUSE object BE LIKE vb} \\
& \quad \text{(b) CAUSE object GO LIKE vb}
\end{align*}
\]

Furthermore, it is important to note that the literal/simile option (represented originally by (LIKE) is maintained in the causatives of the expressions in (1d) as well. Thus, beside the simile readings on arch, hook, and cross just noted (with which dice the vegetables and cube the meat seem to fit) we find quite literal, but otherwise parallel causative readings in the expressions (10):

\[
\begin{align*}
(10) & \quad \text{(a) orphan the children} \\
& \quad \text{(b) widow the woman} \\
& \quad \text{(c) pauper the royalty}
\end{align*}
\]

Cooper's remaining exception to a productive derivational process: eye the stewardess (i.e., why not *ear the cheerleader, *note the simia, etc.) does indeed appear to lie beyond my proposed categories. Once again, however, we find in expressions like lay eyes on, cast a glance, look into, etc., that the motional (GO TO) reading of (1a) is far from irrelevant in this case as well. At the same time it may be important to notice that expressions involving vision are considerably more numerous than those concerned with other senses. Thus, it would be reasonable to suppose that the process of denominal verb formation has been extended beyond its ordinary limits in this special circumstance.

I noted earlier that Indonesian denominal formations
in -i 'fail to parallel the additional English zero derivations that I have discussed here. Since my original presentation was intended to describe the (still remarkable) correspondence between the two derivational systems, this consequence is not altogether unexpected. Still, as a result of Cooper's (and others') comments, it is clear that I earlier underestimated the difficulty of formulating a notion of 'possible derivational relationship' even in the extremely limited domain of denominal verb formation in only two languages. Though humbled, I remain confident that a formulation of productivity is not only possible, but essential to an understanding of the boundary between the syntax and semantics of human language. Accordingly, I conclude with a few remarks on the lack of correspondence between English and Indonesian denominal verb formations.

While the Indonesian expressions of (2) are freely and repeatedly elicited from native informants, other sets of expressions which seem to be uniform in English (e.g. (3a and b), (5), and (8) above) elicit clearly distinct correspondences. Thus, English expressions such as telephone the President, photograph the children, cart the groceries, and pencil a sketch are never freely translated (and apparently cannot be) with Indonesian denominal verbs in -i. While a portion of such exceptions are readily explained by the notion of 'preemption' (cf. Rose 1973, p. 521), and others seem to result from language specific constraints on the use of morphological elements; still others clearly call for an extension and refinement of categories.

My original proposal took note of examples like Indonesian membuli ajam (from bulu 'feather') attributing the lack of an English expression feather a chicken in the intended meaning, to preemption by the established verb pluck. A parallel case could be made for an Indonesian expression in -i corresponding to the English one suggested by Cooper - cross the legs owing to the existence of bersilang kaki, where the base silang 'cross wise, intersecting' is adjectival rather than nominal. Similarly, it is reasonable to suppose that established periphrastic expressions such as menganggap anak (anak) 'regard as a child (childish)' preclude Indonesian verbs in -i corresponding to English baby someone.

Still, while such explanations appear to be correct for exceptions to established categories, it would be less than realistic to suggest that they account for all gaps in morphological correspondence between the two languages. The immediately obvious solution is to accept, in cases like (5) and (8), that the two morphological systems diverge at these points. At the same time, it is important to note that a precise specification of the divergence is statable only in terms of a system of relationships such as that which I have proposed and refined here and elsewhere. Accordingly, keeping in mind the extent of regularity, I continue to suppose that the structured limits on productivity in particular languages is accessible only through an assumption of a universal set of potentially relevant relational features and principled limitations on their arrangement.

I conclude, as I did earlier (Rose, 1973, pp. 525-26), that there must be some quite general principles which govern potential innovations in the domain of derivational morphology." In short, if linguistic history is being made in the patent office, the linguistic innovations are probably less likely to be "something new under the sun" than the inventions they describe.

Purdue University
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FOOTNOTES

1. The meN- prefix has no bearing on the question at hand.

2. It appears likely that denominal intransitives can be analyzed into relational categories similar to and closely associated with the ones I postulate for transitive. However, owing to complexities in the morphological marking of intransitives expressing parallel semantic relationships in Indonesian and English, I purposely and explicitly (Rose, 1973, p. 510) restricted my attention to verb phrase types in which the verb is followed immediately by a noun phrase.

3. I am indebted to Professor L. Lipka for first demonstrating the need for such a class.

4. The relationship of the verb trace to its nominal source is indeed obscure both historically and synchronically. Systematically, the reading of (1b) CAUSE v COME FROM object seems appropriate; but what results in this case, unlike the others in this category, is not a trace but a tracing - suggesting that the word is now an established verb in English. This conclusion is further supported by the fact that the noun trace (in the appropriate sense of 'imprint, copy') is virtually frozen in negative expressions such as without a trace, not a trace.

5. The matter is further complicated by the more general (i.e. not restricted to denominal verbs) use of the -i suffix in a frequentive meaning. Forced to interpret the sentence "Dia meniponi saja", two informants readily agreed to something like "He (or she) keeps on phoning me."

6. Note that Indonesian membentari shares the same ambiguity. Such intersections of semantic relationships (equivalently, clothe, cover, blanket, and numerous others) suggest either historical bifurcations in the system or, alternatively more comprehensive semantic categories synchronically. It is altogether possible that the categories I have proposed are, in part, regularly associated subcategories in a more general analysis of conceptual regularities.

7. For a discussion of look as a verb of motion, see Gruber, 1967.
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