

Re: to unprepare

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2005-03/2328.html>

From: Ekkehard Dengler (*ED-RS_at_t-online.de*)

Date: 03/17/05

Date: Thu, 17 Mar 2005 12:18:01 +0100

"Ron Hardin" <rhardin@mindspring.com> schrieb im Newsbeitrag news:42385DF4.4530@mindspring.com...

- > *What's wrong with the original is partly that you can trace out what happened.*
- >
- > *The intention :*
- >
- > *The principals are unprepared for their jobs.*
- > *The principals are not prepared for their jobs by education colleges.*
- >
- > *These two were coalesced into :*
- >
- > *The principals are unprepared for their jobs by education colleges.*
- >
- > *That though is made impossible by the emergent meaning of ``to unprepare,"*
- > *whether it exists beforehand or not, of taking something already prepared and making*
- > *it unprepared.*
- >
- > *That emergent meaning interferes with the plain intention of the sentence, and you*
- > *get a conflicting meaning of ``to unprepare," to fail to prepare.*
- >
- > *It is that verb that fails to exist.*

Well, yes. Let me ask you this, then: Do you feel the examples I quoted from the CALD ("undaunted/unaffected by") imply such conflicting meanings, too? If not, can you explain why you think "unprepared by" does? It's a little less usual, but that's probably all.

I can't help feeling you're going out of your way to read an absurd meaning into a sentence that isn't necessarily absurd. If your intuitive reaction is to reject the sentence, then fine, but I'd disagree with the notion that a reasonable interpretation can be rendered impossible by the possibility of an implausible alternative one.

sci.lang: Re: to unprepare

Regards,
Ekkehard