



If and When

Author(s): Jerry L. Morgan

Source: *Linguistic Inquiry*, Vol. 1, No. 1 (Jan., 1970), pp. 144-145

Published by: [The MIT Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4177544>

Accessed: 15/06/2014 00:55

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The MIT Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Linguistic Inquiry*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

occurs with the subordinate clause, but less clearly: reversing (26) is difficult, but possible if taken as a switch to a serious injunction to do the act; (28) sounds as if she ought to have; (33) sounds as if one meant to add "and the fun has worn off." (29), (31), and (35) can hardly be reversed without a violent shift in the point of view.

The restrictions on *do so* appear to be mainly semantic and most properly to attach to the lexical entry for *so*, not to any special subentry for *do so*. So for *say so*:

(37) *He always said so if he was tickled

(38) He always said so if he was displeased

Though (37) is possible, (38) has better conditions for implying frankness about something that one would prefer not to disclose. *So* is somber. *It* is neutral.

References

Zwicky, Arnold M. Jr. (1968) "Naturalness Arguments in Syntax," *Papers from the Fourth Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistic Society*.

TWO TYPES OF IDIOMS

John Robert Ross,
Massachusetts Institute of
Technology

Idioms like *to crane one's neck*, *to arch one's back*, *to stub one's toe*, etc. and *to hold one's breath*, *to lose one's temper* (*cool*, *way*, etc.) exhibit certain systematic differences.

A. Parts of the former, but not of the latter, are modifiable.

(1) He craned his spindly (long, disgusting, etc.) neck.

(2) *He held his dank (fetid, foul, sweet, etc.) breath.

B. Parts of the former, but not of the latter, are pronominalizable.

(3) He craned his neck while the doctor examined it.

(4) *He held his breath while the gasologist tested it.

(Actually, pronominalization is possible, but only with certain paired verbs, where these verbs must have the same subject.)

(5) a. He held his breath, and then he released it.

b. *He held his breath, and then he froze it.

c. *He held his breath, and then Schwarz released it.

It is as if *neck* retains more of its properties as an NP than *breath* does: the latter type of idiom is more frozen than the former type.

IF AND WHEN

Jerry L. Morgan,
University of Chicago

(1) The flowers will bloom if and when spring comes.
is not paraphrasable as (2) or (3):

(2) The flowers will bloom if spring comes and the flowers will bloom when spring comes.

- (3) The flowers will bloom if spring comes and when spring comes.

ruling out conjunction reduction as a source. (4) and (5) do seem to paraphrase it, however:

- (4) If spring comes, the flowers will bloom then.
(5) The flowers will bloom when spring comes, if spring comes.

Where does the *and* in (1) come from?

Usually AND Unusually
Arnold M. Zwicky,
The Ohio State University

Usually in *The children are usually noisy* is a sentence adverbial, but *unusually* in *The children are unusually noisy* is a degree adverbial associated with *noisy*. The contrast is not a peculiarity of the pair *usually-unusually*, but is a property of a large class of positive-negative pairs: *typically-atypically*, *normally-abnormally*, *characteristically-uncharacteristically*, *possibly-impossibly*, *probably-improbably*, *commonly-uncommonly*, *naturally-unnaturally*, *ordinarily-extraordinarily*, etc.; even *generally* versus *particularly* and *especially*. Adverbs derived from psychological predicates act as degree adverbials, like *unusually*: *surprisingly*, *amazingly*, *disgustingly*, *alarmingly*, *bothersomely*, *shamefully*, *fantastically*, *incredibly*, *unbelievably*, *marvelously*, *dreadfully*, *awfully*, *preposterously*, *terribly*, etc. What is the explanation for this assignment of forms?

A PROBLEM OF ADVERB
PREPOSING
Paul M. Postal,
Thomas J. Watson Research
Center, IBM
John Robert Ross,
Massachusetts Institute of
Technology

If there is a rule which preposes adverbs, as has often been assumed, why is it that its operation is restricted by the tense on higher verbs? That is, while (1a) can be converted into (1b),

- (1) a. I expect him to be there at midnight.
b. At midnight I expect him to be there.

(2a) cannot be converted into (2b), unless the preposed adverb is contrastively stressed.

- (2) a. I expected him to [be there at midnight].
b. *At midnight I expected him to be there.

We have bracketed the adverb and the embedded VP in (2a) to indicate that we are focussing here only upon that sense of (2a) in which *at midnight* modifies *be there*. It is only in this sense that (2b) is impossible; if *at midnight* is taken to modify *expected* in (2b), the string is, of course, perfectly grammatical.

Sentences paralleling (2b) can, however, be constructed in such a way that they are totally ungrammatical, not only ungrammatical on one reading. Thus *tomorrow* in (3a) cannot be taken to modify *expected*, and correspondingly,