

10.5 Types of Verbal Conflation

In this paper it has been seen how one or a combination of the expression-types from within a translatory structure -- viz., those specifying FIGURE, DIRECTIONAL, and GROUND -- can move into adjunction and then conflate with the MOTIVE verb. The same process has been seen for an expression-type from outside the translatory structure -- viz., what has been called the 'MANNER expression'. In this section we look in somewhat greater detail -- though still very sketchily -- at this latter expression: its sources, types, and conflational processes.

The conditions for 'MANNER' conflation are present when at the underlying level there is a complex structure whose leftmost embedding is a translatory structure; the structure embedded at the right is then the source of the MANNER expression. The complex structure seems always to be either a causative structure -- for which the rightmost embedding is, as seen earlier, an adactive structure that later derives into a FROM-clause -- or a temporal structure -- for which the rightmost embedding will now be termed a *co-structure*, this later deriving into a *co-clause*. In conceiving the syntactic arrangement thus, we intend that all semantic specification of translatory motion/location in fact be localized within the translatory structure on the left, and none in the adactive or co-structure on the right. The extent to which this specificatory separation is achievable will be examined for each example presented below.

Beginning the survey with temporal structures, we note that the co-structure therein can be of several types. One of these is the *positional structure* (to be treated more fully later), e.g.,

containing the verb *float*, as can be exemplified by

the craft floated (was afloat) on a cushion of air.

When this is in construction with a translatory structure, something like the following derivation -- the like of which has already been seen several times earlier in the text -- takes place:

(109)

(a) it, that the craft MOVED into the hangar,

OCCURred GNIRUD

it, that the craft floated on a cushion of air

(b) \Rightarrow the craft _oMOVED into the hangar ELIHW floating on a cushion of air

(c) \Rightarrow the craft _oMOVED \leftarrow [ELIHW-floating] into the hangar
floated

on a cushion of air

(d) \Rightarrow the craft floated into the hangar on a cushion of air

Here, the positional structure specifies a situational circumstance -- viz., the buoyancy relation between the craft and the cushion of air -- which exists independently of the motion specified by the translatory structure. It might also be noted that the final phrase in (109d), *on a cushion of air*, can only belong with *float*, and its presence at the end of the sentence offers a kind of dramatic evidence that *float* has indeed moved to, rather than arisen in, its main-verb location.

The sentence representing the positional-structure was of course

purposely chosen to evidence such a discontinuity at the surface, and as far as possible a similar choice of sentence will be made to represent the other types of co-structure shown below.

The next such type we proceed to is the locative indiscrete (i.e., specifying a 'SHAPE') self-referencing translatory structure, as exemplified by

the water (f) BE_L (M) in-drops-of (D) itself (g)

⇒ the water is in (the form of) drops.

When this is in construction with a translatory structure, there derives a sentence with an FM/fMDg verb (as was treated in section 9 for a motional but not a locative SR structure), as shown more fully in (110) and in sketch form in (111):

(110)

(a) it, that the water MOVEd into the sink

OCCURred GNIRUD

it, that the water WAS_L in drops

(b) ⇒ the water _oMOVEd into the sink ELIHW BE_Ling in drops

(c) ⇒ the water _oMOVEd <[ELIHW-BE_Ling-in-drops] into the sink
~~~~~  
 dripped

(d) ⇒ the water dripped into the sink

(111)

(a) the water MOVED into the sink, in drops

(b)  $\Rightarrow$  the water MOVED  $\leftarrow$  [in drops] into the sink  
dripped

(c)  $\Rightarrow$  the water dripped into the sink

A specificatory separation again holds here: the dispositional state of the water, as specified by the co-clause, is independent of its motion, as specified by the translatory structure.

As seen earlier in the text -- in fact, using the same example -- a motional indiscrete self-referencing translatory structure like

the frond (f) MOVED (M) TO-a COIL-OF (D) itself (g)

$\Rightarrow$  the frond coiled (up)

can construct with a translatory structure, again producing a sentence with an FM/fMDg verb, presentable in sketch form as

the frond MOVED into its sheath, coiling (up)

$\Rightarrow$  the frond coiled (up) into its sheath.

Here, the specificatory-separation is not complete, since the translatory motion and the self-referencing motion are not wholly independent of each other, but are to a certain extent coordinated. In particular, in order for the frond to move into its sheath, it must be the top end which curls down towards the basal end, and not some other form of curling. How such specificatory coordination may be accounted for is not resolved

here.

Two further types of co-structure -- kin to the preceding type in specifying motion which is 'self-contained' (able to go on [indefinitely] without [extended] translation), if not self-referencing (because requiring reference to a rectilinear framework or to objects outside its own moving object) -- are the *oscillatory (-motion) structure* and the *rotary (-motion) structure*. The former of these, as exemplified by

the ball bounced (up and down) [on the pavement]

can construct with and then conflate into a translatory structure, as in the following sketch:

the ball MOVEd down the hall, bouncing (up and down)  
 ⇒ the ball bounced down the hall.

The latter of the structures, as exemplified by

the log rolled (around and around) [in the water]

can also construct and conflate with a translatory structure:

the log MOVEd down the hill, rolling (around and around)  
 ⇒ the log rolled down the hill.

In the former example, there is good specificatory-separation between the co-clause and the main clause by virtue of the fact that the oscillatory motion takes place in a different dimension (the vertical)

than the translatory motion does (the horizontal). To a certain extent, a similar separation is present for a similar reason in the latter example. Nevertheless, some specificatory-coordination is evident here between the co-clause and the main clause; in particular, the rotary motion must be clockwise if the translatory motion is to the right, and it must take place at just the rate at which no slippage occurs.

The problem with specificatory-separation is particularly acute for a type of co-event which cannot take place by itself but only in conjunction with translation, and hence for a type of co-structure which cannot appear by itself but only in construction with a translatory structure. Such a co-structure, e.g., is one specifying the notion of 'sliding', as can appear in a temporal structure derived as follows:

the box MOVEd down the incline, sliding on its side  
 ⇒ the box slid down the incline on its side.

Separation would be achieved if the verb *slide* could be entered in the lexicon solely with its semantic specifications for characteristics of friction and surface-contact between objects, all specification of translatory motion having been abstracted away (and consigned to its designated specifier, the translatory structure). This is difficult to do for *slide* since, among other reasons, the frictional characteristics it specifies only exist when motion is present, and then only in the directional dimension of that motion. One possible solution is

to consign to *slide* a specification for 'vagile' (wandering) motion -- as if it were to be entered in the lexicon with an inherent meaning something like 'slide about' -- thereby putting it on a par with such 'self-contained' motion verbs as oscillatory *bounce* and rotary *roll*. Another verb for which similar issues as for *slide* are involved is *swing*, as in:

the gate MOVED out, swinging on its rusty hinges  
 ⇒ the gate swung out on its rusty hinges.

Another type of temporal situation than one where an 'extent' co-event goes on during an 'extent' translatory event -- as primarily seen above -- is one where a 'point' co-event occurs at a 'point' translatory event. Furthermore, of the components of the translatory event, the co-event need not be limited to sharing the FIGURE, as seen above, but may additionally or solely share the GROUND. These new possibilities can be exemplified by (112) and (113):

(112) the door MOVED against the jamb with a slam  
 ⇒ the door slammed against the jamb.

(113) the capsule MOVED into the ocean with a splash  
 ⇒ the capsule splashed into the ocean.

In (112), the point co-event of 'slamming' occurs at the point of translatory contact-making between door and jamb, and inherently involves the presence of both those FIGURE and GROUND objects.

In (113), the point co-event of 'splashing' occurs at the point of translatory entry of the capsule into the ocean water, and involves the presence solely of that latter GROUND object.

In a causative structure, the adactive structure has of course been seen in Part I as the source of an expression which moves into the translatory structure to conflate with the *MOVE* verb. A recapitulation of the derivation involved here is sketched in (114), as before for the verb *blow*.

(114)

(a) it, that the box *MOVED* into the street

FOLLOWED FROM

it, that a gust of wind blew on the box

(b)  $\Rightarrow$  the box <sub>f</sub>*MOVED* into the street FROM a gust of wind blowing on it

(c)  $\Rightarrow$  the box <sub>f</sub>*MOVED*  $\leftarrow$  [FROM...blowing on it] into the street

*blew*

FROM a gust of wind

(d)  $\Rightarrow$  the box *blew* into the street from a gust of wind

The structure in (114), which specifies beginning-point causation, is paralleled by one specifying extent causation:

(115) the box *MOVED* down the alley, FROM the wind blowing on it

$\Rightarrow$  the box *blew* down the alley from the wind (for 20 seconds).



Another example of causative verbal conflation involving a different verb from *blow* is seen in (116):

(116) the ball MOVEd out of its socket

FROM the attached spring's excessive force pulling on it

⇒ the ball pulled out of its socket

from the attached spring's excessive force. The specificatory-separation in this last example -- in particular, the absence from the adactive structure of any specification of translatory motion -- is especially clear. For, the adactive structure can stand alone to yield the acceptable surface sentence

the attached spring pulled on the ball,

in whose specifications there is no implicit presence -- if not an explicit absence -- of motion. Similarly for the previous example, the adactive structure, as taken alone to yield

the wind blew on the box,

does not specify any motion for 'the box'. In the translatory structures, on the other hand, 'the ball' and 'the box' are specified as the moving FIGUREs of their respective translatory events. The surface characteristics of English, moreover, mark a distinction between the no-motion-specifying adactive structures and the motion-specifying post-conflational causative structures. To wit, the former's verbal phrase -- *blow on, pull on* -- contains the preposition *on*, while the latter's -- *blow down, pull out* -- contains a translatory

DIRECTIONAL preposition.

A single translatory structure can of course be in construction with either a co-clause or an adactive clause:

(117)

(a) the box MOVEd across the ice, sliding on its side

⇒ the box slid across the ice on its side

the box MOVEd across the ice from the wind blowing on it

⇒ the box blew across the ice from the wind.

But it is particularly interesting when one is in construction with both types of clause at once. In such a circumstance, either one of the clauses can conflate, the other remaining external (as per the Spanish pattern); in some cases, there is the third option that neither clause conflates, both remaining external. For the translatory structure in (118a), which gives rise to the DG satellite *←shut* (homologous with the DG satellite *←home*, as discussed in Part I):

(118)

(a) [a PLANE] MOVE TO ACROSS an OPENING  
the door shut

(b) ⇒ the door MOVE shut

(c) ⇒ the door MOVE *←shut*,

all three options can be observed:

(119)

(a) the door MOVEd shut with a slam from the wind blowing on it

(b<sub>1</sub>) ⇒ the door slammed shut from the wind blowing on it(b<sub>2</sub>) ⇒ the door blew shut from the wind with a slam(b<sub>3</sub>) ⇒ the door shut with a slam from the wind blowing on it

Here, in (b<sub>1</sub>), the co-phrase *with a slam* has conflated with *MOVE*. In (b<sub>2</sub>), a portion of the FROM-clause has conflated with *MOVE*, the rest remaining external (shown before the co-phrase because the other order invites a misreading). And in (b<sub>3</sub>), the DG satellite *shut* has conflated with *MOVE* to yield the MDG verb *shut*, thereby taking up the conflational space which might otherwise have been filled by the co-phrase or FROM-clause -- these now being forced to remain external.

All the conflational characteristics seen above for a co-structure and an adactive structure remain when these latter appear in an effective (or 'effective-like': e.g., an adductive) structure. For the case where a co-event is specified, one example of such a structure, taken at a later derivational stage, is

(12)

(a) I EFFECTEd TO it,

that the box MOVEd across the ice,

ELIHW (its) sliding on its side.

Two different derivational routes from this structure suggest themselves. By one, the co-clause in the lowest line first conflates with the translatcry structure, and then the whole 'effectivizes':

(b<sub>1</sub>) ⇒ I EFFECTed TO it,  
                   that the box slid across the ice on its side

(c<sub>1</sub>) ⇒ I<sub>e</sub> slid the box across the ice on its side.

By the other, effectivization first takes place separately for the two clauses, and then the resultants conflate:

(b<sub>2</sub>) ⇒ I<sub>e</sub> MOVEd the box across the ice  
                   ELIHW<sub>e</sub> sliding it on its side

(c<sub>2</sub>) ⇒ I<sub>e</sub> slid the box across the ice on its side.

For the case where an adactive event is specified, one example of an effective structure, shown partly derived in a manner familiar from Part I, is:

(121)

(a) I EFFECTed TO it,  
                   that the box MOVEd across the ice  
                   BY it,  
                   that I<sub>e</sub> pushed on it with my left hand

(b)  $\Rightarrow$  I <sub>e</sub> MOVEd the box across the ice  
 BY <sub>e</sub> pushing on it with my left hand

(c)  $\Rightarrow$  I <sub>e</sub> MOVEd  $\leftarrow$  [BY- <sub>e</sub> pushing-on-it] the box across the ice  
 pushed  
 with my left hand

(d)  $\Rightarrow$  I pushed the box across the ice with my left hand.

It should also be noted that the parallel sentences

I slid the box across the ice

I pushed the box across the ice

can derive equally from structures specifying beginning-point causation (I stand at the ice's edge and set the box in motion) and from structures specifying extent causation (I move along with the box).

The surface distinction noted before between the verbal phrase in an adactive structure and that in a post-conflational causative structure is particularly evident in the effective case. For, in the former structure, which does not specify FIGURAL motion, the verbal phrase contains the preposition *on*, while in the latter structure, which does specify FIGURAL motion, it takes a direct object:

I blew on the ant

I blew the ant off the plate

I pushed on the door

I pushed the door open

I pulled on the door

I pulled the door shut

Additional examples of this phenomenon can be seen for the verb *chop (on)* in the effective structure:

I <sub>e</sub> MOVEd the tree down BY chopping on it at the base

⇒ I chopped the tree down at the base,

and for the verb *press (on)* in the adductive structure (containing an embedded self-referencing 'SHAPE' structure):

this machine <sub>a</sub> MOVEs hay into bales WITHBY pressing on it

⇒ this machine presses hay into bales.

Starting with a particular autic translatory structure, we will now trace the full route by which the particular relevant lexical verb is keyed in, moves through more complex structures, and conflates. Containing the D preposition ALIDE ('into collision with'), which in English keys in any of the prepositions *into*, *onto*, *against* (although the devised *alide* will also be used in the formulations below), the translatory structure in (122a), with three of its four constituents multiply specified, gives rise to the FMDG verb *kick*:

(122)

(a) an ENTITY's FOOT (F) MOVE (M) ALIDE (D) a SURFACE (G)  
 my left foot alide (into) the wall

(b)  $\Rightarrow$  my left foot (F)

[an ENTITY's FOOT (F)] $\triangleright$  MOVE (M)  $\leftarrow$ [ALIDE (D)]  $\leftarrow$ [a SURFACE (G)]  
 kick (FMDG)  
 alide (D) the wall (G)  
 (into)

(c)  $\Rightarrow$  my left foot (F) kick (FMDG) alide (D) the wall (G)  
 (into)

[<sup>x</sup>my left foot kicked into the wall]

When this translatory structure is embedded in an effective structure,  
 the whole gives rise to the 'effected verb'  $e$ kick:

(123)

(a) I (A) EFFECT ( $\rho$ ) TO ( $\delta$ ) it ( $s_T$ ),  
 that my left foot (F) kick (FMDG) alide (D) the wall (G)  
 (BY my WILLING ON my left foot  $\Rightarrow \emptyset$ )

(b)  $\Rightarrow$  I (A) EFFECT ( $\rho$ ) TO ( $\delta$ ) kicking (FMDG) my left foot (F)  
 $e$ kick ( $\rho\delta$ FMDG)  
 alide (D) the wall (G)

(c)  $\Rightarrow$  I (A)  $e$ kick ( $\rho\delta$ FMDG) my left foot (F) alide (D) the wall (G)

[<sup>x</sup>I kicked my foot into the wall]

The structure in (123c) is in  $\alpha'$ -order. This is now emplaced in the full paradigm of effective structural orders in (124):

(124)

$\alpha'$ : I (A) <sub>e</sub>kick ( $\rho\delta$ FMDG) my left foot (F) alide (D) the wall (G)

[<sup>x</sup>I kicked my left foot into the wall]

$\beta'$ : I (A) <sub>e</sub>kick ( $\rho\delta$ FMDG) alide (D) the wall (G) with my left foot (F)

[<sup>x</sup>I kicked into the wall with my left foot]

$\gamma'$ : I (A) <sub>e</sub>kick ( $\rho\delta$ FMDG) the wall (G) with my left foot (F)

[I kicked the wall with my left foot]

The  $\gamma'$  structure in (124) may now be embedded in a second-order effective structure, shown derived in (125) with the functional transvaluations indicated:



(125)

(a) I (A) EFFECT ( $\rho$ ) TO ( $\delta$ ) it ( $s_T$ ),  
 that the ball (F) MOVE (M) across (D) the field (G)  
 BY it ( $s_e$ ),  
 that I (A)  $e$ kick ( $\rho\delta FMDG \Rightarrow \rho\delta IMDF$ )  
 the ball ( $G \Rightarrow F$ ) with my left foot ( $F \Rightarrow I$ )

(b)  $\Rightarrow$  I (A)  $e$ MOVE ( $\rho\delta M$ ) the ball (F) across (D) the field (G)  
 BY  $e$ kicking ( $\rho\delta IMDF$ ) the ball (F) with my left foot (I)

(c)  $\Rightarrow$  I (A)  $e$ MOVE ( $\rho\delta M$ )  $\left[ \text{BY } e \text{kicking } (\rho\delta IMDF) \text{ it } (F) \right] (BC)$   
 $e^+$ kick ( $\rho\delta MBC$ )

the ball (F) across (D) the field (G) with my left foot (I)

(d)  $\Rightarrow$  I (A)  $e^+$ kick ( $\rho\delta MBC$ ) the ball (F) across (D) the field (G)  
 with my left foot (I)  
 [I kicked the ball across the field with my left foot]

From the preceding presentation we can extract this point of particular note: the WITH-phrase in a sentence like

I kicked the wall with my left foot

contains the FIGURE-specifying nominal, and that in a sentence like

I kicked the ball across the field with my left foot

contains the INSTRUMENT-specifying nominal.

The verb *hit*, of course, works very much like *kick*, arising in autic translatory structures like

the hammer hit aside the window.

Thus, in a sentence like

I hit the window with the hammer,

*hammer* specifies the FIGURE. However, in a sentence like

I broke the window with a hammer,

*hammer* specifies the INSTRUMENT, as can be seen from the immediately-underlying structure

I broke the window BY ACTing ON (hitting) it with the hammer.

It should be noted that a self-referencing translatory 'SHAPE' structure like

the window MOVEd TO a BROKEN-SHAPE OF itself

⇒ the window MOVEd broken

⇒ the window broke

does not permit the conflation of its *MOVE* verb with an expression from an adactive structure:

\* I hit the window broken with the hammer

(although I understand that Mandarin does have just such a construction).

In the remainder of this section we present brief notes and sketches relating to additional aspects of verbal conflation.

'Positional structures' can be exemplified by

- (126) the craft floated on a cushion of air  
 the rope hung from a hook  
 the cabinet stood on a layer of stones  
 the cabinet lay on a layer of stones  
 the knife stuck in the wood.

They can appear as the co-structure along with a translatory structure (in a temporal structure). Here, the GROUND nominal of the former is often the same as the GROUND nominal of the latter in form, but these two nominals should in principle not be identified with each other in function. We illustrate the construction in (127) with locative translatory structures; here, the two GROUND nominals have been kept distinct in form:

- (127) the craft WAS<sub>L</sub> in the hangar, floating on a cushion of air  
 ⇒ the craft floated in the hangar on a cushion of air.  
 the rope EXTENDED across the canyon, hanging from two hooks  
 ⇒ the rope hung across the canyon from two hooks  
 the cabinet WAS<sub>L</sub> in the water, standing on a layer of stones  
 ⇒ the cabinet stood in the water on a layer of stones  
 the cabinet WAS<sub>L</sub> in the water, lying on a layer of stones  
 ⇒ the cabinet lay in the water on a layer of stones.

The two GROUND nominals make only one appearance between them in a sentence like

the pen WAS<sub>L</sub> on the table, lying on the table

⇒ the pen lay on the table.

The types of translatory structure with which a positional structure can appear in construction is peculiarly limited. Thus, of the positional structures in (126), only the one with *float* can appear with a motion translatory structure:

(128)

(a) the craft MOVED into the hangar, floating on a cushion of air

⇒ the craft floated into the hangar on a cushion of air.

(b) the pen MOVED down the incline, lying on it

⇒\*the pen lay down the incline.

Likewise, if a positional structure is to appear with a structure containing the *PUT* verb (a form of effected translatory structure), the latter's DIRECTIONAL preposition must be *TO*:

(129)

(a) I PUT (put) the pen TO ON (on) the table, on which it would lie

⇒ I laid the pen on the table

(b) I PUT (took) the pen FROM ON (off) the table, on which it had lain

⇒\*I laid the pen off the table/\*I unlaid the pen from the table

- (c) I PUT (moved) the pen ALONG ON (along) the table,  
on which it was lying

⇒\*I laid the pen along the table.

Atsugewi, by contrast with English, does have forms comparable to those in (129)

In some cases, a more adequate account can be given for a set of similar confluents into a translatory structure when this latter is already partly derived and contains a particular verb, e.g., *PUT*. This is now shown more fully for *PUT* and for several other such verbs:

(130)

- (a) paint COVERed the wall in dots

⇒ paint dotted the wall

the wall was COVERed with paint in dots

⇒ the wall was dotted with paint

- (b) dirt COVERed her cheeks in streaks

⇒ dirt streaked her cheeks

her cheeks were COVERed with dirt in streaks

⇒ her cheeks were streaked with dirt

- (c) boulders COVERed the field in a strew

⇒ boulders strewed the field

the field was COVERed with boulders in a strew

⇒ the field was strewn with boulders

(131)

(a) he WENT to N.Y. by plane

⇒ he flew to N.Y.

he WENT to N.Y. by ship

⇒ he sailed to N.Y.

(b) he WENT all the way to N.Y. reading a book

⇒ he read a book all the way to N.Y.

she WENT to the party wearing a green dress

⇒ she wore a green dress to the party

(132) I PUT the pen on the table, on which it would lie

⇒ I laid the pen on the table

I PUT the lamp on the table, on which it would stand

⇒ I stood the lamp on the table

I PUT the picture up on the wall, on which it would hang

⇒ I hung the picture up on the wall

I PUT the knife into the wood, in which it would stick

⇒ I stuck the knife into the wood

- (133) I AFFIXed the notice to the board with  $\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{tacks} \\ \text{staples} \\ \text{nails} \\ \text{glue} \\ \text{paste} \end{array} \right\}$   
 FIXed <FAST
- I  $\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{tacked} \\ \text{stapled} \\ \text{nailed} \\ \text{glued} \\ \text{pasted} \end{array} \right\}$  the notice to the board -

Situations which involve state and change of state seem to be organized by the human mind in such a way that they can be specified by structures homologous with translatory structures. We do not now go deeper into this matter, but illustrate it with a few examples. These are shown only in sketch form, without indication of most derivational steps or distinctional niceties. The symbol ' is placed before a MOTIVE verb with the new, generalized sense. We begin by presenting forms for the notion of 'sleep':

(134)

- (a) he 'BE<sub>L</sub> AT SLEEP  
 a- sleep

[he is asleep]

- (b) he 'BE<sub>L</sub> AT SLEEP  
 sleep

[he is sleeping]

- (c) he 'MOVE TO SLEEP  
 go to sleep

[he went to sleep]

- (d) the baby <sup>1</sup>MOVE TO SLEEP, rocking  
to sleep

[the baby rocked to sleep]

- (e) he <sup>1</sup>MOVE TO SLEEP  
fall a- sleep

[he fell asleep]

- (f) he <sup>1</sup>MOVE TO SLEEP  
\*asleep

[\*he aslept; compare the Russian  
°on zasnu]

- (g) she <sub>e</sub> <sup>1</sup>MOVE him TO SLEEP  
put to sleep

[she put him to sleep]

- (h) she <sub>e</sub> <sup>1</sup>MOVE the baby TO SLEEP, by rocking him  
to sleep

[she rocked the baby to sleep]

- (i) she <sub>e</sub> <sup>1</sup>MOVE TO SLEEP him  
\*asleep

[\*she aslept him]



With *WAKE(FULNESS)* in place of *SLEEP*, there do exist English (f) and (i) forms:

she awoke

I awoke her.

Conflation does not seem possible for the (d) form:

she 'MOVE TO WAKE, from the sunlight shining on her face  
a- wake

[\*she shined awake from the sunlight on her face],

but it can occur for the (h) form:

I<sub>e</sub> 'MOVE her TO WAKE, by shaking her  
a- wake

[I shook her awake].

With *DEATH* in place of *SLEEP*, one particularly revealing set of forms arises:

(135)

(a) he 'MOVE TO DEATH, from choking on a bone  
die

[he died form choking on a bone]

(b) he 'MOVE TO DEATH, from choking on a bone  
to death

[he choked to death on a bone]





In the same way, it can be determined that the verb *be*, as in

the bank is on the corner of Oak and Elm  
 my friend is on the corner of Oak and Elm

does not simply *lack* the distinction between simple and progressive present maintained by other verbs, but *deletes* it:

the bank BE<sub>L</sub> on the corner  
 my friend  $\underbrace{\text{BE } -\text{ing}}_{\emptyset}$  BE<sub>L</sub> on the corner

so that there never arises a surface form such as

\*my friend is being on the corner ...

However, the progressive marker *BE* *-ing* does not delete -- and hence its presence under the surface can be ascertained -- once a positional verb like *stand* conflates with the *BE*<sub>L</sub>:

the bank stands on the corner of Oak and Elm  
 my friend is standing on the corner of Oak and Elm

We now consider the case where the generalized translatory structure gives rise to the verbs *FORM* and *MAKE*. In (137) appears an example which derives through all three  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ , and  $\gamma$  forms, conflating the FIGURAL noun with the *FORM* verb in the latter two:

(137)

$\alpha$ : ice 'MOVE INTO EXISTENCE over the windshield  
FORM

[ice formed over the windshield]

$\beta$ : it FORM WITH> ICE over the windshield  
ice up

[it iced up over the windshield]

$\gamma$ : the windshield FORM WITH> ICE  
ice up

[the windshield iced up]

In (138) appears an example which conflates an external expression with the *FORM* verb; several delicate issues as to what constitutes FIGURE and what GROUND are passed over here:

(138)

(a) a hole FORM in the ice from the ice melting

[a hole formed in the ice from the ice melting]

[a hole melted in the ice]

(b) a hole FORM through the table from the cigarette burning the table

[a hole formed through the table from the cigarette  
burning it]

[a hole burned through the table from the cigarette]

An example of the above structure-type in the effective is

she 'MOVE INTO EXISTENCE a cake  
 e FORM  
 MAKE

[she made a cake]

Again, external expressions may conflate with the *MAKE* verb:

(139)

she MADE a cake by baking (stuff)

⇒ she baked a cake

she MADE a sweater by knitting

⇒ she knitted a sweater

the mouse MADE a hole in the sack by nibbling on the sack

⇒ the mouse nibbled a hole in the sack

I MADE a path through the jungle by clearing (stuff away)

⇒ I cleared a path through the jungle

We conclude this section and the Appendix with an example showing multiple, or nested, confluations:

(140)

(a) could you give (hand) me that bottle  
by getting it down off the shelf  
by reaching to it with this clasper?

(b)  $\Rightarrow$  could you get me that bottle down off the shelf  
by reaching to it with this clasper?

(c)  $\Rightarrow$  could you reach me that bottle down off the shelf with this  
clasper?