

0000 - Buro, Bazi son = martawa	"	"	0195 - "
0400	"	"	0470
0525 Bazi son, martawa = cep zarak	"	"	0649
= Martau Martinez	"	"	0748
= Martau Konzaves (Meko)	"	"	0842 Bazi son martawany
	"	"	1000

TR 1 = vobe  
 TR 2 = founh (Konzaves +  
 2 martawez  
 (alkmaty))  
 TR 1 = Bawke swg, TR 2 =

v = zarak; H = Konzaves; G = Martawez

Kug S, Bawos

Martawany  
 woletk (stoy kin)

1. relation between diff. kinds > VHS & VC ; general interest of TD : why these instruments (consider the age of children)

- 3. range music vs. Hebbum.
- 4. looked son???
- 5. more elaborate formal study of song texts.
- 6. posture & style in playing & singing.
- 7. ability work
- 8. Value study of musicians
- 9. How much economic loss does musicianship entail?
- 10. Read & expand the whole word study.

(note: music for Rosano)

BIZ = hawk (yamsilk)  
 BOC = groundful = (?)  
 BOF = 400 bundles (of that)  
 BUS = pile (rects, eath, com)  
 CEP = load (firwood, com, burlap bag of aw)  
 CEX = branch  
 CEV = branch  
 COH = hawk (fwood), shu (heads - necks), yte (of oven)  
 COL = row (people, plants, horses)  
 COP = family, pair (sunder), suit (rotes), group (people)  
 CUK = head bunch (gavite, flowers, yatak, stubble)  
 CUP = object held against body in dotes (1 or 2 only)  
 CAK = lot (land), division (com), group (people)  
 CET = pile (wood, cabbage, stubble, turps, pine needles, yatak)  
 CIX = handspan, ear-of-com  
 COB = torch, falling star, St. Barbara's (19 n-1)  
 COH = hole, opening (luminous & doors)  
 C2H4B = pair between yams & fingers  
 ZEL = large mound (logs, stores, straw, fruit, adobe)  
 ZOP = small pile  
 ZOT = units fastened together, ropes, stiles pushed together, main cars  
 ZOL = one piled on top of other (clearer begins w. the)  
 ZUH = a little, little piece (only with 1)  
 ZETL = the round of drink = one recipient  
 HAV = split section, size  
 HOU = amspan (woven palm, rope, wire, fava)  
 HEC = bite (of fruit, potato)  
 HEK = branch, leg of boat  
 HEP = chip (wood, horse, pine)  
 HETAV = fork, prong (only up to 5)  
 HIL = strip (dried meat)  
 HLS = section of clothing  
 HOP = handful  
 HOT = side (1-4)  
 'IC = rest, passage, swallow  
 KEP = bunch (wide inflorescence) (bananas)  
 KIL = length (necklace, type, wire)  
 KOT = step, layer (wings), the (cone), dream, gate (wing), part (song), stem (building)  
 KOL = all animals (but man), supported things  
 KOL = page, room  
 KIOS = piece broken off (com, banners, wood, shirt)  
 KED = amspan (weeds, wood)  
 KEX = change (clothing, office)  
 KET = handful (tobacco, water)

I. Scope of discussion of musician's role -

1. Hektum vs Parage
2. Kinds of music - ~~text~~ words
3. Role - various senses
4. Eticization problems
5. Some theoretical interests

definitional (problems)

Role in context  
 Role if given event  
 Role in musical group

Why do many

II. (range) Ethical occasions in music

1. Brief description of circumstances (house & church, essential situations for our purposes)
2. Musician as tutor, referee, describer
3. Musician as entertainer, mover

III. The Musician in the Community

1. Economic disadvantage of musicianship
2. Choice, availability & pay for musicians
3. Musicians as part of a helper class in ritual world (like Sacristans)

IV. Resonators & External Forms

1. Conceptual role of musician & music of circumstances
2. Is there a musician class?
  - a) Not organized in some way as sect. or career.
  - b) Not formally ranked - popularity unranked in
3. Status - insofar as decidable - mixed
  - a) (thus, little pressure on youth to learn music)
  - b) Why one would enter the 'extensional-class' -

→ various ways to test success vs. popularity of musicians (see p. 73)  
 (3) can value (since v's of success others joining group)

V. Asides

1. Uses & functions of music
2. ED musicians role less formal, different interest
3. Parage musicians as lower in merit of communities

at the moment - happiness (internal) - validation (external) - validation (internal)

21: rev of Interpreted Theory, Ford of C., 1965, p. 133 ff. : The inadequacy of theory not to be held against, for the theory is strong.

Ziff: <sup>About</sup> what and Adequate Grammatical Do, p. 5, Vol. 1; considerable sources of ambiguity and dissolving of it which are outside bounds of 'sensible grammar'.

§9 I saw the shooting of the children (elephants)  
He was shot by an ape (elephant.)  
The man tore up the street (the feet)  
I found a large oyster bed (succulent)  
They are visiting railroad men (stations.)

Vol 3, 1966, # 1, Feb 67, Stead: Some Semantic Relations Between Sentences  
(Many relations between sentences intuitively seen as paraphrases.  
(some work in the lexicon to construct a.)  
Topic & comment (questions of meaningfulness of questions etc.)

2 ways?

I am typing on this page with my new ribbon!!!

Leske thought  
them & bad bye!  
Good

how this new goddammed ribbon is going to work for a change or now it's bloody awful and no telling where it will all end anyway but what I'm waiting for is the Ribbon to rise anyway it seems to work OK now how does the corresponding truck go at the other end when the tape runs out??? It works!!!

Complain on goddammed pen.

Clog up  
THICK thin

This pen writes  
This pen writes  
This pen writes  
This pen writes

(Cartesian eyes)  
thick  
Love (J.M.)

1. Competence → syntax (questions...)  
JP LXI V#2, Feb. 2, 1967

2. What semantic theory must explain (interpretation of sentences) = can this be handled in terms of competence.

3. Katz: a system for generating a list, definition of syntactic (con it work).  
4. How much data must one know about words to handle them?

5. Among the semantic universals must be included: concepts for defining entities?  
6. Katz says that w/o regard to context, semantic competence gives: semantic  
ambiguity, anomaly, singleness of meaning. (reasonable request)

7. Similarly, may we expect semantic theory to write on larger categories than  
sentences (?) (Paragraphs: an ambiguous sentence clarified by its structure.)

8. How many kinds of ambiguity (states of meaning?) with the theory  
specify, which can be formalized.

9. Category of ambiguity gives interp. as a specially structured string of semantic markers.  
10. Begged questions: paraphrase, ambiguity, identity of meaning, semantic categories, synonym.

11. There is a sense in which a theory assigning interps. to pm's is exactly the  
theory of semantics needed; is this sort of interp. significant to philosophy?

12. In fact, the idea of assigning readings to nodes seems useful and a good beginning (even  
if the essential machinery in Katz is badly flawed - ?)

13. Note: the readings thus assigned (and their form/status) mysterious) to  
not suggest enough: would not for example, allow one to (necessarily) to  
understand (?) - eg, are certain (language) the sentence, its use, even with  
Katz must think that a complete grammar gives a non-speak entity into  
to discover ~~essentially related~~ S's strict (if grammatical). Aspect of answer?

14. Katz will derive from S, if equipped with suitable syntax and semantics, what  
of both formation and explaining certain examples of linguistic 'givenness'

15. A class of questions about bridging between syntax & semantics: often a question  
of givenness. The distinct between competence and practice may blur.

16. Often in philosophy questions are suggested by taking a given expression as  
normal (or putting a normal expression in a given place) but are given  
expressions ever capable of being saved?

17. Philosophically significant theory must have the capability of  
operating (perhaps clarifying) philosophically significant semantic  
observations. Are these formalizable in other than hoc ways by Katz?

18. What is a reading for S?  
19. It seems hard to avoid one problem or other: (a) it's heavy assumes ling. universal  
(semantic markers, or some) - ~~some~~ where readings are expn. in some sort of  
universal vocabulary? (b) the system gives translations? (under a notion of  
new sentences go.)

20. Is all our information about meanings incorp. in the theory? Probably not.  
What sort of things will the theory, with which: e.g., explanation, clarifying  
evidence, proof, justification. What relations between sentences & other  
than paraphrase etc. will be desirable. Syntax of least shows transformational  
relations - structural similarities etc.

# I Introduction → Justifying ordinary language → Discovering how

- Some Philosophers = Justification =
- B. Formalized linguistic descriptions: syntax & semantics as a better discipline. Syntax seems to offer a basis for enumerating sentences in any lang; certain universals seem quite common. Introductory questions about meaning & those which are philosophically most interesting. Perhaps then, a formalized semantics clears the road, makes things a bit simpler. Non-philosophical ways that meaning is interesting: conceptualization, world views, (art, etc.)
- C. Introductory questions about meaning & those which are philosophically most interesting. Perhaps then, a formalized semantics clears the road, makes things a bit simpler. Non-philosophical ways that meaning is interesting: conceptualization, world views, (art, etc.)

## II. What Syntax Gives

- A. Description of what a syntactic description is. Importance: linguists compete. Though there may be problems; the distinctions can be made. - rare clumsiness at his word.
- B. The formal mechanisms: rule types etc. briefly
- C. The lexicon as part of syntactic component - the syntactic machine.

## III. The Border between syntax and semantics

- A. A false question, but hitting things to be accounted for (1) early clumsiness; syntax is independent of semantics? Why (2) degrees of grammaticalness (3) different sorts of odd sentences; which are clear cases?
- B. Is semantics everything excluded by syntax (and phonology) use theories etc. possible. Syntactic descriptions placed up against what? What's clear semantics?

## IV. The Katz-Fodor conception of semantics - ~~some~~ ~~Attainment~~

~~A simple presentation of the theory - meaning, the dictionary, projection~~

- Questions about the theory
- A. The F-conception of a semantic theory - single sentences, offering explanation of grammars, interp, anomaly.
- B. The theoretical apparatus
  - 1. Meaning, projection rules, dictionary entries, the role of the syntactic description.
  - 2. What are these things: matrices, readings etc. How is the question of transformations and meaning-bearing elements more than a matter of decision? (set up of the theory... Is this a translation model?)
- C. The philosophical results
  - 1. Theories about meaning - treatment of analytic & synthetic
  - 2. Treatment of "competence" on the basis of semantic matrices & redundancy rules.
  - 3. Suggestions for living with the analysis: (sample: dictionary entry for 'good')
  - 4. How convincing are these results? The matter of catenae seems in lang. a matter of putting down dict entries or relating them?

2. matter of putting down dict entries or relating them?  
4. How convincing are these results? The matter of catenae seems in lang. a matter of putting down dict entries or relating them?

## IV. Some alternative ideas in semantics:

- A. Theoretical possibilities (inquiries) vs. the philosophical results.
  1. Composite theory in semantics: the distinction becomes crucial (especially given use, theories: philosophy seems not so interested).
  2. The solution limitation to single sentences is a logical question (unless we show how a combination sentence is treated - and then why limit the theory, if we know how: there is no solution to the question "how does a sentence affect the meaning of its verb?") [not just a matter of (mitigation of senses?)].
  3. Notions of 'semantic anomaly' are inadequate for philosophical results. There is more than a kind of anomaly - of an interesting sort. (Though the Katz-Fodor theory makes it funny - essentially funny.)

- B. Some systematic possibilities for theory in semantics:
  1. Central question is the scope of the theory - possibilities: "Meaning of a word" - to give meaning, or "translation" - return to the ideal speaker to see what is meant by semantic interp. (understanding - can the crucial terms be made out with stipulation? How does one avoid the ad hoc. Why is there even the assumption that a formal mechanism is possible for the semantic component as desired. The notions of meaning seem less separate.
  2. Would a possible complete semantic theory exactly:
    - (1) construct paraphrases
    - (2) note semantic complexity in various ways
  3. Grammatical structure provided by PM - Katz-Fodor gives set of 'agreement rules' - the same idea expressed by some study of semantic relationships implied by grammatical relations as defined by the PS rules. [What more does Katz-Fodor have in addition to highly constructive proposals about 'meaning']
  4. Partial theory, then, (could provide some tests for semantic anomaly at various funds: [or: mechanical passage structure, as other examples]) to necessarily implication of interpretation theory.
  5. Must the process be one of building from word-blocks? - can the process work from the top of a diagram, with



1. Importance to Katz of the recursive nature of 'understanding': (SL12)
2. Piérony use coupled to an implicit theory of semantics/syntax (SL12)
3. Role of language - not explained by analogies.
4. "What is needed is a theory which tells us what ability is and articulates which kinds of ability are philosophically objectionable and why." (p. 57) 57
5. see note: p 17 (SL)
6. Culture-language studies show that phrases to be taken in 'fetal meaning' rather than as the basis of comp. hypotheses. 'How are you?' - Harris, p 37 SL.
7. Chomsky's notion "reduces from general grammar utterance" to explain degrees of grammaticalness: (SL, 387 ff.)
8. The problem that the understanding of semi-sentences must also be fixed for.
9. Katz proposal for semi-sentences: speaker associates, on the basis of structure, of his sentences with the semi. (cannot a similar pred. be created for regular sentences. (seems the only non-contentious way to work).)
10. "Semi-sentences are comprehensible to a speaker according only to his linguistic abilities" (SL, 415)
11. (Leuridan): sources of stimulus meaning as test for synonymy? (Linguistically neutral)
12. Talk of meanings is hard into trying to learn language (Linguistically neutral meaning is hard to find.) 'many others - Omit.

ps7: "until the results of these comparative studies (of Alouk and Urdar) are in, I think that talk about linguistic universals is somewhat fraudulent." (It would be some sort of necessary universal that might have phos. sign.) Note that the job of spelling how what a ling. description will look like is what Katz does with his 'tree of language'. Thus: Katz wants rather the common characteristics of linguistic descriptions. p. 59: "since the locutions requiring transformational grammar are dispensable, it seems to me doubtful that transformational grammar is of any essential philosophical interest."

[They are 'dispensable' in the sense that they are not the sort that introduce new meaning... as Katz wants to show elsewhere.]

Function of <SR> to limit ambiguity and point out 'semantic anomaly'; Semantics markers represent idea-classes, but are MERELY theoretical constructs. This seems a weak way out (as must be any such appeal) has Katz "got himself involved in a mythological psychology" (p. 60)?

For the definition of analytic (Katz) to work, dictionary entries must be to restrictive (in some way: is entry for 'human' -> (human)? or 'male' -> (male)?)

For Wilson: the theory "rests on the unclear notion that dictionary entries in general give the 'meaning' of a word that a sentence is analyzed if it can be got from the dictionary." (p. 62)

Dictionary entries don't do this kind of thing: no -> pron., necess. suit. entry for structures being X.

Qum: "There is no sharp distinction between what properly belongs in a dictionary & what properly belongs in an encyclopedia." (p. 63)

concept - as system of beliefs (64)

"It seems to me what what is required are answers to the questions: where does the dictionary, where from? Why do you put this rather than that item in a certain dictionary entry?" (p. 64)

The 'synonymous' and 'analytic' expressions with which the native can fiddle phrases? To language the mental thing? "A's ability to speak English may be quite different from B's (he is much more fluent) but it is the same language" (p. 66)

"meaning" in terms of 'semantic universals' is not satisfactory here.

suggest of H12 = one sentence after paragraph by 2 sent.; structural rel. all three.

Somemarks on Egan on Analytic-Katz.

p. 48 "The inclusion of a semantic marker in lexical readings for different morphemes is the manner in which grammar states a regularity over those morphemes, for those lexical items whose readings contain this marker are also to be grouped together as semantically similar in the respect in - dictated by the semantic marker."

### ED Music:

1. What are the pieces — who do we hear them
2. What do they play like — style
3. Who plays? Who teaches how to play?
4. Who lives? Who asks these people to come? Who tells them what to do.
5. What about the instruments? Rault? Ownership? Name? Standards
6. Description of ED activity around a given virtual for: function, feeling, standards.
7. Stories about ED music?
8. Who are all the ED musicians? → Things to them.

### NO music?

1. Talk with old men about songs...
2. Why do these people seem so long: prayers
3. Investigate the pattern of instruments.

### CONCEPTS TO INVESTIGATE:

1. Sound description & musical perception: what sorts of variation in music are perceived and describable (can use C music as a variable.)
2. Instrument: description of action, possible faults & virtues
3. Musician: value & varying words, ability words, combinations.

Use accomplished by excessive tapping and falling.

This survey of music in education may exhaust the reader but it is hardly exhaustive. My methods were crude and as I had ~~not~~ time, at the time of fieldwork, see training in anthropology - my results may seem either trivial or dull. Before closing, however, I feel obliged to indicate some areas in which my own work suggests possibly interesting studies yet to be attempted.

(1) An elaborate study of song texts, ~~not~~ treating them both as examples of class/maya style and as forms an integrated system (see note p. 23)

- (2) More detailed examination of the social structure of musicians as a class, and of the musician's role (see, as a special trial paper, I think, for example, with many questions on musical categories.
- (3) Continued examination of sound concepts
- (4) A treatment of possible musical manifestations (if any) of culture change, as, for example, studies play taking times and take up the manuscripts
- (5) Comparative studies of music in neighboring municipalities

My apology is this: I am sorry to have written so long a paper as to suggest that the subject is closed. It is not.