

Sentences (5bi, ii) show that the NP following *reached* in (5ai,ii) are true direct objects (in relational grammar terms,¹ they are 2's). The *there* in the object of *reach* in (5aiii) shows that we could not propose any general restriction which forbade all *there*'s from occurring in the objects of verbs, and sentences like (*Over*) *there would be a poor place for the meeting* show that *there* is not always restricted from appearing as a subject. Sentence (6) argues that the *there* in such sentences must be an NP, since it inverts with the tensed auxiliary, as do all good subjects:

(6) Would (over) there be a poor place for the meeting?

Thus we need a more specific restriction to exclude the bad sentences in (3) – (5) above, and I suggest the one in (7):

(7) **Adverbs are millstones**
No adverbial terms that are either pronominal or non-specific indefinites may advance.

where “advance” is to be understood as in relational, arc-pair, or metagraph grammar.²

We have seen instances of this restriction at work in the ungrammaticalities of (3)–(5); in what follows we will see how it applies to a wide range of non-specific indefinite adverbials, such as *where*, *everywhere*, *nowhere*, *somewhere*, *anyplace*, *someplace*, *when*, *sometime*, *anytime*, *no time*, *every time*, etc. We see the need for the inclusion of these words in such sentences as those in (8):

(8) a. Tom cleared the snow from everywhere.
a'. *Tom cleared everywhere of snow.
b. *Somewhere was swarming with bees.
c. [No hotel / *Nowhere] was reached by midnight.

Furthermore, if we assume, as seems reasonable, that whatever the source of sentences like (9) are, the temporal adverbials which can surface as the subjects of weird verbs like *see* and *find* were post-verbal PP's in deeper structures and have been advanced to subject position in (9), as suggested in (10),

(9) a. 1988 saw Michaelson winning regional elections.
[From something like (10a)?]
b. 2076 may find the Winter Olympics on Mars.
[From something like (10b)?]

(10) a. (X??) saw Michaelson winning regional elections in 1988.
b. (X??) may find that the Winter Olympics are on Mars.

then (7) will provide a possible basis for the explanation of the ungrammaticalities of the sentences in (11).

(11) a. *Then saw Michaelson winning regional elections.
b. *Sometime may find the Winter Olympics on Mars.

Intuitively, the reason for the existence of (7) would seem obvious: the function of syntactic advancements is to highlight (and also make more accessible (cf. Keenan and Comrie (1977) for the notion of accessibility) the terms that undergo them, while the function of adverbiality is the opposite. Adverbial terms are contexts, or backgrounds, in front of which the figures (Cf. Talmy (2003a,b) for

figure/ground) – the nuclear terms, the 1's, 2's and 3's of relational / metagraph grammar – disport themselves. Nuclear terms are the best topics for texts – adverbial terms are either weak or impossible ones. Thus in (12b), the *there* backgrounds the tower, as opposed to the *it* of (12a), which leaves the tower as a possible topic.

- (12) a. We climbed up the tower and then we dove from it.
b. We climbed up the tower and then we dove from there.

This contrast may ultimately be able to account for the ungrammaticality of *(13b).

- (13) a. What Max said about the tower was that that was what we dove from.
b. *What Max said about the tower was that there was [where /?≤ what] we dove from.

The outlines of a theoretical understanding of the notion of adverbiality are at best only dimly visible. I suspect that the working out of the details is going to be exceedingly tricky, for the adverbiality of a noun may not always be an independent feature of that term, but may be imposed on it by a context. Thus note that there is a difference between *prison*, *country*, and *Denmark* with respect to the extent to which they must each be treated adverbially. This is noticeable in the type of proforms which substitute for them,

- (14) a. No one has ever escaped from [that prison / it / there].
b. No one has ever escaped from [that country / ?it / there].
c. No one has ever escaped from [Denmark / *it / there].

and then in the corresponding passives:

- (15) a. That prison has never been escaped from.
b. ?That country has never been escaped from.
c. *Denmark has never been escaped from.

Note that we cannot account for the badness of (15c) by assigning to *Denmark* some feature or other mark (say, [+Obligatorily functions adverbially], for *Denmark* can be a topic in sentences in which it was not deeply given an adverbial tint by some preposition or verb: (16) is fine.

- (16) We talked more about Denmark than it had ever been talked about before.

Such verbs as *talk about*, *discuss*, *photograph*, *criticize*, etc. do not mandate that the NP's that follow them be "taken adverbially," to launch an unfortunate terminology. By contrast, verbs like *reach* do brand certain nouns as spatial adverbials, as we see in (17) and (18).

- (17) a. They reached the hotel before we reached [it / there].
b. They reached Denmark before we reached [??it / there].
(18) a. The hotel was reached at midnight by the paratroopers.
b. ?? Denmark was reached at midnight by the paratroopers.

The parallel between (17) and (18) suggests that passivizability is not something determinable from an inspection of constituent structure. Rather, what must be determined, by an interaction between the inherent locativeness of a noun and the “strength of adverbial tinting” of the verb or preposition that precedes it **NB: in remote (or deep or semantic etc.) structure** is the place to decide whether an NP can be taken as an argument, or only as a context.

At this point, I would like to remind readers of a splendid contrast that was constructed by David Perlmutter (**WHERE??**)

- (19) That concert hall has been played in by some of the largest orchestras in Europe.
- (20) *That concert hall has been applauded in by some of the largest audiences in Europe.

What seems to be relevant here is a lexical matter: some nouns appear to have to be associated lexically with respect to the verbs of certain prototypical actions. Thus *chair* is associated with *sit on*, *knife* with *cut with*, *pen* with *write with*, and so on. In unmarked cases, if certain adjectives like *good*, *useful*, *crummy*, etc. modify these nouns, they will have the interpretation of adverbs like *well*, *usefully*, *crummily*, etc. Thus the NP's in (21) will have the interpretations of the corresponding ones in (22).

- (21) a. a good chair
b. a useful knife
c. a crummy pen
- (22) a. a chair [which is good for sitting on / (*which sits on well)]
b. a knife [which is useful for cutting with / (?a knife which cuts usefully)]
c. a pen [which is crummy for writing with / a knife which writes crummily]

We might want to call these “manner adjectives,” citing *snazzy* as another one, since *snazzy* appears only with such nouns as *dresser*, or (adverbially) with such verbs as *dress*: cf. (23).

- (23) a. Mort is a snazzy [dresser / ?*runner / *reader].
b. Mort [dresses / attires himself / decks himself out / *runs / *reads] snazzily.

Context can override the lexical association: saying (24a) makes a nonce linkage between knives and bulb-planting, which allows *good* in (24b) to have the contextual meaning of “good for planting bulbs with”:

- (24) a. He likes to use long sharp thin things to plant crocuses with.
b. He wants me to buy him a good breadknife.

The relevance of manner adjectives for Perlmutter's sentences is thus as follows: without special contextual licensing, concert halls are *for musical groups to play in*; they are not for audiences to applaud in. This lexical association of *concert hall* and *play music in X*, where X can be *nightclub*, *theater*, *gym*, etc., makes it possible for X to escape the adverbiality with which we would normally associate it. It becomes enough of a direct-objectoid to allow a sentence like (19). Note, however, that what

helps the deadverbialization along is the pragmatic association of *concert hall* with *orchestra, string quartet, rockabilly band*, etc. Thus if we hear (25), it will nonplus us,

(25) ? This concert hall has been played in by some of the most famous sushi masters of Algeria.

even if we happen to know that Algerian sushi masters are all, without exception, harpists. The pragmatic glue between sushi mastery and Algerian sushi production is simply too noncy to withstand the torsion.

I will end with one more set of observations. Consider the contrasts in (26).

- (26) a. I lived in that house.
 b. I lived in that country.
 c. I lived in Denmark.
- (27) a. It was in that house that I lived.
 b. It was that house that I lived in.
- (28) a. It was in that country that I lived.
 b. It was that country that I lived in.
- (29) a. It was in Denmark that I lived. >
 b. ?It was Denmark that I lived in.

Assuming that other speakers make the same kinds of distinctions in grammaticality that I am hearing here, there will be a number of theoretical chips which will have to be let fall where they may. Let's wait till we get to that bridge before we jump off of it.

Footnotes

¹ For an initial exposition of relational grammar, cf. Perlmutter and Postal (1983). The connection between direct objects and passivizability is gone into in detail in Postal (1986).

¹ Arc pair grammar and metagraph grammar are descended from relational grammar. Cf. Postal and Johnson (1980) and Postal (2004)

References

- Keenan, Edward L., and Bernard Comrie. (1977). Non phrase accessibility and universal grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8:63-99.
- Postal, Paul M. (1980) *Arc Pair Grammar*, (with D. E. Johnson), Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.
- _____. (1982) "Some Arc Pair Grammar Descriptions", In Pauline Jacobson and Geoffrey K. Pullum (eds.) *The Nature of Syntactic Representation*. Dordrecht, Holland, D. Reidel Publishing Company.
- _____. and David M. Perlmutter (eds.). 1983. *Studies in Relational Grammar 1*,

- University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois.
- Postal, Paul M. (1986) *Studies of Passive Clauses*, The State University of New York Press, Albany, New York.
- _____. and Brian D. Joseph (eds.) (1990) *Studies in Relational Grammar 3*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois.
- _____. (2004). *Skeptical Linguistic Essays*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ross, Haj. (1995) "A first crosslinguistic look at paths – the difference between end-legs and medial ones," in Lynn Eubank, Larry Selinker and Michael Sharwood Smith (eds.) *The Current State of Interlanguage Studies in Honor of William E. Rutherford*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, the Netherlands, pp. 273-285.
- _____. (1997) "There, there: strong and weak path-linked proforms" in Kora Singer, Randall Eggert, and Gregory Anderson (eds.), *Proceedings of the Thirty-Third Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, Chicago Linguistic Society, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, pp. 351-363.
- Talmy, Leonard. (2003a) *Towards Cognitive Semantics, Volume 1: Concept Structuring Systems (Language, Speech, and Communication)* Cambridge: MIT Press
- Talmy, Leonard. (2003b) *Towards Cognitive Semantics, Volume 2: Typology and Process in Concept Structuring (Language, Speech, and Communication)* Cambridge: MIT Press
- _____. (2003c) "Figure and ground" in Talmy (2003a)

28.II.MMVII. /25.V.MMX
