



---

A Problem of Adverb Preposing

Author(s): Paul M. Postal and John Robert Ross

Source: *Linguistic Inquiry*, Vol. 1, No. 1 (Jan., 1970), pp. 145-146

Published by: [The MIT Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4177546>

Accessed: 24/04/2013 23:29

---

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>

- (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,

(3b) is impossible (without contrastive stress on *tomorrow*), though (3c), which parallels (1b), is grammatical.

- (3) a. I expected him to [be there tomorrow].
- b. \*Tomorrow I expected him to be there.
- c. Tomorrow I expect him to be there.

What explains this difference in preposability?

*Whether-DELETION*

John Robert Ross,  
Massachusetts Institute of  
Technology

A fact supporting deriving yes-no questions from embedded *whether*-questions is the following: while embedded questions can in general contain more than one *wh*-word (cf. (1)), they cannot contain any if the embedded question is headed by *whether* (cf. \*(2b)) (unless the *wh*-word bears emphatic stress).

- (1) I wonder who sent what (to whom) (on what occasions), etc.
- (2) a. I wonder whether Bill left.
- b. \*I wonder whether who left.

These facts are exactly mirrored in independent questions:

- (3) Who sent what (to whom) (on what occasions), etc.?
- (4) a. Did Bill leave?
- b. \*Did who leave?

While I have no explanation for the contrast in (2), this contrast can be used to argue that (4) is derived from an embedded *whether*-clause.