Predicative Adverbs – Evidence from Polish

Agnieszka Patejuk and Adam Przepiórkowski

It is commonly – even if usually tacitly – assumed that adverbs cannot act as primary predicates. Although it is not fully clear whether it is meant as a crosslinguistic generalization, an explicit statement to this effect may be found in a prominent monograph on predication (Rothstein 2001:129): "I assume that the absence of a predication relation is because adverbs are just not syntactic predicates. They never appear in a position in which they can be predicated of events; this is not because they must be predicated of events, since even if the argument denotes an event, it cannot have an adverb predicated of it. The examples in [(1)–(3)] are all unacceptable with adverbial predicates, though the corresponding adjectives are all OK."

(1)   The destruction of the city was brutal/*brutally.

(2)   The reading of the verdict was slow/*slowly.

(3)   John considered [the running slow/*slowly].

More often, discussions of nonverbal predication concentrate on nominal, adjectival, and prepositional predicates, implicitly assuming that adverbs cannot be productive predicates. For example, the only adverbial predicates mentioned in Roy 2013, a monograph on nonverbal predication, are lexical idiosyncrasies such as the Irish and Spanish equivalents of *well* in *John is well*.

The aim of this squib is to show that it is not universally true that "adverbs are just not syntactic predicates" or that they may act as primary predicates only exceptionally. We demonstrate on the basis of attested data[1] that, in Polish, a certain – relatively large and varied – class of adverbs may be productively used as predicates in copular constructions, namely, in constructions in which the subject is a verbal constituent – a complementizer phrase (CP) or a bare infinitival phrase (henceforth, InfP; not to be confused with InflP or IP, i.e., Inflectional Phrase) – denoting a fact or an event kind.[2]

1 Verbal Subjects of Predication

It is well-known that, crosslinguistically, CPs and InfPs may act as grammatical sub-
jects, also in predicative constructions in which they are predicated of, that is, in which
they act as subjects of predication. (4)–(5) are examples from Uhrig 2018:ch. 6, a recent
corpus study of English subjects:[3]

(4)   [That he ate lots of junk food] was not healthy.

(5)   [To redouble humanitarian efforts during Ramadan] would also be both hon-
      ourable and politically effective.

Similarly for Polish, as in the attested (6)–(11) from the National Corpus of Polish:[4]

(6)   Ciekawostką jest,   [że w akumulatorach jako paliwo używany będzie alkohol].
      curio.INS   is.3SG that in batteries   as   fuel   used   will   alcohol
      'It is an interesting fact that alcohol will be used as fuel in batteries.'   (NKJP)

(7)   Grzechem jest   [oglądać   ten film].
      sin.INS   is.3SG watch.INF this film
      'It is a sin to watch this film.'   (NKJP)

(8)   Jasne   było,   [że pochodzi on z   kradzieży].
      clear.NOM.SG.N was.3SG.N that comes   he from theft
      'It was clear that it had been stolen.'   (NKJP)

(9)   Ciekawe   jest   [odpowiadać na znane sobie pytania]?
      interesting.NOM.SG.N is.3SG answer.INF on known self   questions
      'Is it interesting to answer questions known to oneself?'   (NKJP)

(10) Bez   sensu było,   [że atakowali cały   świat].
      without sense was.3SG.N   that attacked whole world
      'It did not make any sense that they were attacking the whole world.'   (NKJP)

(11) W dobrym guście jest   [zapożyczyć coś   z   męskiej garderoby].
      in good   taste is.3SG borrow.INF something from male   wardrobe
      'It is in good taste to borrow something from men's wardrobe.'   (NKJP)

Polish is a relatively free word order language, and the typical (but not exclusive) word order in such constructions is 'predicate – copula – verbal subject', perhaps due to the relative heaviness of such verbal (CP/InfP) subjects. In (6)–(7), the nominal predicate is in the instrumental case, just as in the usual predicative constructions with nominal subjects (see, e.g., Pisarkowa 1965 and Przepiórkowski 1999). Similarly, in (8)–(9), the adjectival predicate is in the nominative, again mirroring the usual predicative constructions with nominal subjects. As shown in (10)–(11), the predicate may be a prepositional phrase, just as in the case of nominal subjects. Examples (6)–(11) show that all six possibilities – nominal/adjectival/prepositional predicate $\times$ CP/InfP subject – are fully acceptable and attested. Note that, in all six examples, the copula occurs in the 'default' third person singular neuter[5] form because the grammatical subject is not nominative (it is not cased at all) – this is an instance of so-called 'default agreement' (Dziwirek 1990).

Such verbal subjects of predication may also occur in 'small clause' constructions involving verbs such as *uważać* 'consider', where – unlike in (6)–(11) – they are grammatical objects rather than grammatical subjects:

(12) Koledzy… uważali za dyshonor [przegrywać z kobietą].
colleagues.NOM considered.3PL as dishonor.ACC lose.INF with woman
'Colleagues… considered it a dishonor to lose against a woman.' (NKJP)

(13) Uważam za prawdopodobne, [że wirus ten może się rozprzestrzenić].
consider.1SG as probable.ACC.SG.N that virus this may REFL spread
'I consider it probable that this virus may spread.' (NKJP)

As expected, such subjects of predication in the object position become grammatical subjects in the passive voice (*by*-phrase may also be used, as shown in (14)):

(14) [Przegrywać z kobietą] było uważane za dyshonor
lose.INF with woman was.3SG.N considered.NOM.SG.N as dishonor.ACC

3

(przez kolegów).

 by   colleagues

'To lose against a woman was considered a dishonor (by colleagues).'

(15) Jest   uważane   za prawdopodobne,   [że wirus ten może się

     is.3SG considered.NOM.SG.N as probable.ACC.SG.N that virus this may   REFL

     rozprzestrzenić].

     spread

     'It is considered probable that this virus may spread.'

In brief, it is uncontroversial that verbal (CP/InfP) constituents may act as subjects of predication – and often as grammatical subjects – in Polish predicative constructions.

2   Predicative Adverbs in Polish

It turns out that in such cases the predicate may often be expressed by an adverb, for example:[6]

(16) Dobrze   jest,   [że czują respekt].

     good.ADV is.3SG that feel   respect

     'It is good.ADV that they feel respect.'   (NKJP)

(17) Najłatwiej   i   najtaniej   było   [upłynnić ziarno czy ziemniaki].

     easy.ADV.SUP and cheap.ADV.SUP was.3SG.N sell.INF grain or potatoes

     'It was easiest.ADV and cheapest.ADV to sell grain or potatoes.'   (NKJP)

Forms marked in (16)–(17) as ADV, while glossed here with English adjectives, are uncontroversial adverbs in Polish. Although they are morphologically related to corresponding adjectives, for example, *dobrze*.ADV :: *dobry*.ADJ.NOM.SG.M, they cannot be analysed as adjectives: 1) they cannot be used adnominally (see (18)); 2) they can be used adverbally (see (19)); and 3) they are not syncretic with any forms in the inflectional paradigms of corresponding adjectives.[7]

(18) {dobry.ADJ.NOM.SG.M / *dobrze.ADV} pływak.NOM.SG.M   'good swimmer'

(19) On {dobrze.ADV / *dobry.ADJ.NOM.SG.M} pływa.3SG.   'He swims well.'

Constructions with adverbial predicates are analogous to those with typical – nominal, adjectival, and prepositional – predicates: in both, the copula may be dropped in present tense, as in (20)–(21); in both, other verbs that can combine with nonverbal predicates may be used (e.g., *wydawać się* 'seem', *stać się* 'become'), as in (22)–(23); in both, the verbal CP/InfP subject triggers 'default agreement' on the verb.

(20) Najtrudniej   [pogodzić   się   z   tym] ludziom   młodym.
     difficult.ADV.SUP reconcile.INF REFL with this   people.DAT young.DAT
     '[It is] most difficult.ADV for young people to come to terms with this.'   (NKJP)

(21) Przykro, [że nie udało   się   uratować sosen].
     sad.ADV   that NEG managed REFL save   pines
     '[It is] sad.ADV that we did not manage to save the pines.'   (NKJP)

(22) Praktyczniej   wydaje   się [mieć   ją na oku w koalicji].
     practical.ADV.CMP seems.3SG REFL have.INF her on eye in coalition
     'It seems more practical.ADV to keep an eye on her in the coalition.'   (NKJP)

(23) . . . stało   się lepiej,   [że   teraz kadrę poprowadzi ktoś
          became.3SG.N REFL good.ADV.CMP that now   team lead   somebody
     inny].
     else
     '. . . it is (lit. became) better.ADV that somebody else will now lead the national team.'   (NKJP)

When predicative adverbs are replaced with corresponding adjectives, the meaning normally remains the same[8] – compare the predicative constructions in (16)–(17) above with (24)–(25) below.[9]

(24) Dobre   jest,   [że czują respekt].
     good.ADJ is.3SG that feel   respect

(25) Najłatwiejsze i   najtańsze   było   [upłynnić. . .].
     easy.ADJ.SUP and cheap.ADJ.SUP was.3SG.N sell.INF. . .

Furthermore, it is possible to coordinate an uncontroversial prepositional predicate

with an adverb, as in the attested (26).

(26) W dobrym guście i   modnie   było   [mieć   w domu wypchanego

in good   taste   and trendy.ADV was.3SG.N have.INF in home stuffed

cietrzewia].

grouse

'It was in good taste and trendy.ADV to have a stuffed grouse at home.'   (NKJP)

While it is a matter of debate which cases of unlike category coordination should be analysed via ellipsis of sentential coordination (so-called 'conjunction reduction'), it is generally assumed that the unlike category predicates are conjoined directly, within a single predicative position, by virtue of bearing the same predicative features (Sag et al. 1985) or predicative 'supercategory' (Bruening and Al Khalaf 2020). Indeed, (26) has the same predicative meaning as the prototypically predicative (27), which involves a nominative gerundial subject instead of an InfP and an adjective in place of an adverb:

(27) W dobrym guście i   modne   było   [posiadanie   w

in good   taste   and trendy.ADJ.NOM.SG.N was.3SG.N having.NOM.SG.N at

domu wypchanego cietrzewia].

home stuffed   grouse

'Having a stuffed grouse at home was in good taste and trendy.ADJ.'

3 Predicative Adverbs versus Predicative Adjectives

As noted above, in the case of InfP and CP subjects, the same predicative meaning may be expressed by adverbial and adjectival predicates – compare again (16)–(17) with (24)–(25). While there is no systematic difference in meaning between the two constructions, there are some idiosyncratic lexical differences. For example, there is no adverb with the meaning corresponding to the main meaning of the adjective *ważny* 'important',[10] so only the adjective may be used, see (28), and – conversely – it seems that only the adverb *głupio* 'stupid, awkward' has the meaning 'awkward', so only the adverb can be used in the intended sense in (29).

(28) Bardzo ważne / *ważnie jest [ukazać jego naturalne piękno].

    very important.ADJ/*ADV is.3SG show.INF his natural beauty

    'It is very important.ADJ to show his natural beauty.' (NKJP)

(29) ...{głupio / #głupie} było [milczeć], skoro jechałyśmy

    {awkward.ADV / #stupid.ADJ} was.3SG.N be-silent.INF as traveled.1PL.F

    razem metrem.

    together subway.INS

    'It was awkward.ADV to be silent, as we traveled together on the subway.'

    (NKJP)

However, there are systematic syntactic differences between the two constructions. First, only in the case of adjectival predicates may the nominalizer *to* 'it' be added to the subject CP – compare (30) with (16) and (24).[11]

(30) Dobre / *Dobrze jest [to, że czują respekt].

    good.ADJ/*ADV is.3SG it.NOM.SG.N that feel respect

    'It is good.ADJ that they feel respect.'

Second, extraction out of InfP is only possible with adverbial predicates.[12] The following example, not involving extraction, is attested with the adjectival predicate *najtrudniejsze* 'most difficult', but it is at least equally acceptable with the adverb *najtrudniej*:

(31) {Najtrudniej / Najtrudniejsze} jest [udowodnić swoją wartość ... w

    difficult.ADV.SUP/ADJ.SUP is.3SG prove.INF self's.ACC value.ACC in

    seniorach].

    seniors

    'It is most difficult.ADV/ADJ to prove one's value at the senior level.' (NKJP)

However, when the direct object of the infinitive is topicalized, only the version with an adverb is acceptable:

(32) Swoją wartość {najtrudniej / *najtrudniejsze} jest [udowodnić w

    one's.ACC value.ACC difficult.ADV.SUP/*ADJ.SUP is.3SG prove.INF in

7

seniorach].

seniors

Third, as noted in footnote 8, when an InfP subject may occur either with an adverbial predicate or an adjectival predicate, the adverbial version is much more frequent and often preferred. Thus, the adverbial version of (31) seems more natural than the attested adjectival version, and similarly for (17) vs. (25). No such acceptability contrast is observed with CP subjects, in which case adjectival predicates are often more frequent.

These facts can be explained by postulating that adverbs subcategorize for strictly verbal subjects of predication, while adjectives take nominal(ized) subjects of predication. That is, whenever adjectives seem to combine with verbal subjects of predication, these apparently verbal subjects have an outer nominal layer. This explains the extraction facts in (32): on the assumption that the additional nominal layer results in an island constraint, nominalized InfPs occurring with adjectival predicates are barriers to extraction, while purely verbal InfPs occurring with adverbial predicates are not. Moreover, on the assumption that syntactically more complex structures are dispreferred to synonymous simpler structures, frequent preference for predicative adverbs is also explained (though it is not clear why this preference is only observed in the case of InfP – and not CP – subjects). This categorial difference in subcategorization properties of predicative adverbs and adjectives also explains the fact that – while unlike category coordination of predicates is robust in Polish (see, e.g., (26)–(27)) – adjectival and adverbial predicates cannot be coordinated; compare the ungrammatical (33) below with the grammatical (17) and (25) above.[13]

(33) *Najłatwiej   i   najtańsze   było   [upłynnić ziarno czy ziemniaki].

 easy.ADV.SUP and cheap.ADJ.SUP was.3SG.N sell.INF grain or potatoes

 'It was easiest.ADV and cheapest.ADJ to sell grain or potatoes.'   (intended)

This inability to coordinate adjectival and adverbial predicates is explained by conflicting expectations as to the actual categorial status of the shared InfP subject: predicative adverbs require an InfP, while predicative adjectives require a nominalized InfP. Finally,

this analysis also explains the fact that when CPs are nominalized overtly, as in (30) above, they may combine with adjectival predicates, but not with adverbial predicates.

A potential problem for the proposed analysis is that InfPs cannot be nominalized overtly, whether the predicate is adverbial or adjectival (or in any other context); compare the grammatical (31) above with the ungrammatical (34):

(34) *{Najtrudniej / Najtrudniejsze} jest   [to   udowodnić swoją wartość].

      difficult.ADV.SUP/ADJ.SUP   is.3SG it.NOM.SG.N prove.INF   self's value

While there is a tension between overt nominalization facts and the hypothesis about different subcategorization patterns of predicative adverbs and adjectives, the impossibility of overt nominalization of InfPs does not rule out covert nominalization – a hypothesis supported by extraction facts in (32) and the coordination puzzle in (33) which cannot be explained otherwise. The relevant facts can be modeled by stating that the overt nominalizer *to* 'it' subcategorizes for CPs, while the empty N head acting as the covert nominalizer subcategorizes for both CPs and InfPs.

In summary, adverbs may be used as primary predicates in Polish, they occur in typical predicative constructions, including copular constructions, and they express predicative meanings analogous to those expressed with adjectives. However, the subjects of predication of such adverbial predicates must be strictly verbal: InfP or CP, and – given the limited range of abstract objects that such verbal constituents may denote (events, facts, etc.) – the range of predicative adverbs is much smaller than the range of predicative adjectives (which may also predicate of nominal subjects, which may refer to a wide range of abstract and physical entities); this is the issue to which we turn next.

4 Types of Predicative Adverbs in Polish

What kinds of adverbs may act as primary predicates? They do not seem to correspond directly to any of the classes postulated within classifications we are aware of (including Cinque 1999, Ernst 2001, and Maienborn and Schäfer 2011). They might be preliminarily characterized as 'evaluative' in a sense:[14] they describe per-

ception of eventualities (events, states, processes; Bach 1986) or facts as positive or negative, either in general, or in some specific respect. The following are among the most common predicative adverbs in the National Corpus of Polish: ● good/bad in general: *dobrze* 'good', *fajnie* 'cool', *pięknie* 'beautiful' (used metaphorically), *wspaniale* 'wonderful'; *źle* 'bad', *niedobrze* 'not-good'; ● evoking good/bad emotions: *miło* 'nice', *przyjemnie* 'pleasant', *zabawnie* 'funny', *ciekawie* 'interesting'; *przykro* 'sorry', *głupio*, *niezręcznie* 'awkward', *smutno* 'sad', *straszno* 'scary'; ● reasonable/unreasonable: *rozsądnie* 'reasonable', *mądrze* 'wise', *sensownie* 'sensible'; *głupio* 'stupid'; ● easy/difficult: *łatwo* 'easy', *nietrudno* 'not-difficult', *prosto* 'straightforward', *wygodnie* 'convenient'; *trudno* 'difficult', *ciężko* 'hard', *niewygodnie* 'inconvenient', *niełatwo* 'not-easy'; ● other: *(nie)bezpiecznie* '(un)safe'; *korzystnie* 'profitable', *tanio* 'cheap'; *zdrowo* 'healthy', *praktycznie* 'practical', and others.

The complete list of such adverbs is much longer, and many of them occur in predicative constructions very frequently. For example, within the 300-million-token balanced subcorpus of the National Corpus of Polish, there are a few thousand occurrences of predicative *trudno* 'difficult', *łatwo* 'easy', and *dobrze* 'good', and hundreds of occurrences of *ciężko* 'hard', *miło* 'nice', *przyjemnie* 'pleasant', and others. Both the number of different adverbs that can be used predicatively and the frequency of such predicative uses demonstrate the productivity of the construction.

The observation that predicative adverbs often refer to subjective perception of facts or events (or event kinds, see below) rather than to their objective characteristics, is supported by minimal pairs such as the following:

(35) Jan   dobrze   pływał.

    Jan.NOM well.ADV swam.3SG.M

    'Jan swam well.'

(36) Janowi dobrze   było   [pływać].

    Jan.DAT well.ADV was.3SG.N swim.INF

    'Jan enjoyed swimming.'

While (35) means that Jan was a skillful swimmer (even though perhaps he did not like swimming), (36) may only mean that swimming felt good to Jan (even though

perhaps he was a terrible swimmer).

5 Predicative Adverbs with Experiencers

Since predicative adverbs often – but perhaps not always (see, e.g., *tanio* 'cheap') – express subjective attitudes, it is not surprising that they often take an experiencer argument – a dative nominal phrase, as in the attested (20) and (37)–(38):[15]

(37) Maciusiowi bardzo przyjemnie było,   [że królewski poseł nie mówił w

Maciuś.DAT very   pleasant.ADV was.3SG.N that royal   envoy NEG spoke in

zagranicznym języku].

foreign   language

'It was very pleasant.ADV to Maciuś that the royal envoy was not speaking in a

foreign language.'   (NKJP)

(38) Oczywiście autorowi   najtrudniej   było   [uzyskać szczegóły].

obviously   author.DAT difficult.ADV.SUP was.3SG.N get.INF details

'Obviously, it was most difficult.ADV for the author to get the details.'   (NKJP)

While in (37) the experiencer is an argument of *(bardzo) przyjemnie* '(very) pleasant.ADV' only, in (38) the dative dependent of *najtrudniej* 'most difficult.ADV' is at the same time the subject of the infinitival phrase headed by *uzyskać* 'gain', that is, the dative experiencer controls the subject of the infinitival subject of predication.

According to the criteria in Landau 2013:29, this is an instance of obligatory control: the dative experiencer and InfP are codependents (they are dependents of the predicative adverb)[16] and the controlled 'PRO' (the subject of InfP) is interpreted as a bound variable, as evidenced for example by the exclusively sloppy readings under ellipsis:

(39) Janowi najtrudniej   było   [poprosić o pomoc],

Jan.DAT difficult.ADV.SUP was.3SG.N ask.INF   for help

{Marysi   też / ale nie Marysi}.

Marysia.DAT too but NEG Marysia.DAT

'It was most difficult.ADV for Jan to ask for help,

{for Marysia too / but not for Marysia}.'

Here, the elided clause may only be understood as 'It was most difficult for Marysia to ask for help' (and similarly for the negated version), but not as 'Jan asking for help was most difficult for Marysia'.

While the issue of obligatory control into subject is controversial, it has been reported for languages as diverse as Balinese (Arka and Simpson 1998) and German (Stiebels 2007). Constructions with predicative adverbs, dative experiencers, and infinitival subjects provide another argument against a ban on control into subject.

6   Semantics of Predicative Adverbs

Let us consider the following constructed examples, with InfP and CP subjects of predication, the latter with a pro-dropped subject, here assumed to refer to Jan:

(40) Janowi   miło   było   {[pływać] / [że   pływał]}.
      Jan.DAT nice.ADV was.3SG.N   swim.INF   that swam.3SG.M
      'Jan enjoyed {swimming / that fact that he swam}.'

They both seem to be saying that Jan experienced a certain event as nice. However, their meanings differ: the InfP version may only mean that he enjoyed swimming, while the CP version means that he considered it nice that he swam – perhaps because swimming was nice, or perhaps because he thus overcame his fear of water. Hence, only the CP version may be followed by something like *ale samo pływanie nie było takie miłe* 'but the swimming itself was not so nice' without creating a direct contradiction.

Such considerations lead to the conclusion that predicative adverbs may predicate of two sorts of abstract objects: events (or their kinds, see below) expressed by InfPs or facts expressed by CPs. This conclusion is supported by the fact that while all of the adverbs listed in section 4 occur with InfP subjects, only some of them – mostly those expressing general or emotional attitude – may occur with CP subjects. Thus both events and facts may be good, bad, nice, reasonable, and so on, but only events – not facts – may be easy, safe, healthy, and so on. Also the textual frequency of predicative adverbs

12

with CP subjects is a couple of orders of magnitude lower than with InfP subjects.

The preliminary conclusion that predicative adverbs occurring with InfP subjects refer to specific event tokens is incompatible with the following example:

(41) Janowi   trudno   było   [wstać].

      Jan.DAT difficult.ADV was.3SG.N get up.INF.PFV

      'It was difficult.ADV for Jan to get up.'

The verb *wstać* 'get up' has perfective aspect, so it seems to refer to telic events. But (41) does not assert or presuppose that there was any particular getting-up-by-Jan event – (41) may describe a situation in which Jan did not even seriously start getting up. Rather, what was perceived by Jan as difficult was (instantiating) the getting-up-by-Jan telic event *kind*. Where InfP is interpreted as referring to particular events, it is because of the veridical entailments of the predicate: unlike *trudno* 'difficult', *miło* 'nice' is veridical in this sense.[17]

On the basis of these observations, and representing facts as true propositions, we propose the following partial meaning representations (leaving out tense, etc.) for the InfP and CP versions of (40):[18]

(42) $\lambda s.\ nice(s) \wedge exp(s) = j \wedge arg(s) = (^{\cap}\lambda e.swim(e) \wedge ag(e) = exp(s))$

(43) $\lambda s.\ nice(s) \wedge exp(s) = j \wedge arg(s) = (^{\wedge}\exists e.\ swim(e) \wedge ag(e) = j)$

These representations follow the neo-Davidsonian approach to event semantics (Davidson 1967, Castañeda 1967, Parsons 1990), in which particular thematic roles such as experiencer or agent are represented as separate functional predicates, for example $exp(s) = j$ or $ag(e) = j$. For concreteness, the predicative schema proposed in Rothstein 2001 is assumed here, on which the semantic representation of, for example, *John is nice* would be $\lambda s.\ nice(s) \wedge arg(s) = j$ (leaving out tense and aspect contributed by the copula); that is, the subject of predication is represented via the arg function from the predicate state s to the subject j. Such states s may host various semantic roles (Rothstein 2001:295), here the experiencer role. What is special about the constructions considered here is that the subjects of prediction are not ordinary entities, but

13

rather kinds of events (see, e.g., Gehrke 2019 and references therein) and facts. Again for concreteness, in (42) we adopt Chierchia's (1998:348–349) down operator $^\cap$, which shifts properties into corresponding kinds. In this case, it shifts the property (function from entities to truth values) of being a swimming-by-Jan event to the respective event kind (i.e., an entity). After existential closure over s, this representation leads to the proposition that this event kind is nice for Jan.[19]

Similarly, understanding facts as true propositions and employing the standard intensional representation of propositions, (43) is saying that Jan considers the fact that he swam as nice. This encoding of facts results in a formal difference between (42) and (43). In the case of (42), the semantic type of the subject of predication (i.e., the value of $arg(s)$) is of type e (an event kind understood as an entity), and in the case of (43), it is of type $\langle s, t \rangle$ (an intensional proposition, i.e., a function from worlds to truth values). This suggests that perhaps two different – even if clearly related – predicates $nice$ are involved in (42)–(43), let us call them $nice_e$ and $nice_{st}$. If so, all adverbs combining with InfP subjects denote predicates such as $nice_e$, and those additionally combining with CP subjects are ambiguous, as they also denote predicates such as $nice_{st}$.[20]

However, there is another common understanding of facts, on which they are not propositions, but particulars (see, e.g., Kratzer 2002, Mulligan and Correia 2017, and references therein), that is, entities of type e. If so, predicative adverbs are unambiguous. A possible argument for this view could be the acceptability of sentences such as (44), in which an InfP and a CP are coordinated within the subject position:

(44) Janowi miło   było   [pływać i   że pływała z   nim też Maria].
     Jan.DAT nice.ADV was.3SG.N swim.INF and that swam   with him also Maria]

     'Jan enjoyed swimming and the fact that Maria was also swimming with him.'

Assuming that only constituents of the same semantic type may be coordinated, (44) suggests that denotations of InfP and CP subjects are of the same semantic type e.

Unfortunately, neither of the two arguments for the two positions above is very strong. On the "formal ambiguity" view, (44) could be explained via some coercion

or type-shifting operation turning an event kind into a fact (that an instance of this event kind took place). Conversely, on the "no ambiguity" view, the cooccurrence of different predicative adverbs with InfP and/or CP subjects could be a matter of syntactic selectional restrictions of particular adverbs. We leave this issue for future research.

7   Conclusion

The main aim of this contribution was to refute the (often tacit) assumption that adverbs cannot act as primary predicates. In Polish, a relatively large class of adverbs may be used in predicative constructions when subjects of predication are abstract objects – event kinds and facts – expressed by InfPs and CPs. This requirement of purely verbal rather than nominal(ized) subjects of predication is the main difference between predicative adverbs and predicative adjectives, explaining differences in their syntactic behavior with respect to extraction and coordination. Predicative adverbs usually express an attitude towards event kinds and facts and may often combine with dative experiencers; in the case of InfP subjects, the dative experiencer acts as an obligatory controller into the subject. Constructions with predicative adverbs are textually frequent and fully acceptable – they clearly belong to the "core" rather than the "periphery", if such a distinction is made.

Dedication

This squib is dedicated to the memory of Susan Rothstein (1958–2019).

References

Arka, I Wayan, and Jane Simpson. 1998.   Control and complex arguments in Balinese.   In *The Proceedings of the LFG'98 Conference*, ed. by Miriam Butt and Tracy Holloway King. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.   URL http://web.stanford.edu/group/cslipublications/cslipublications/LFG/3/lfg98arkasimpson.pdf.

Bach, Emmon. 1986. The algebra of events. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 9:5–16.

Bańko, Mirosław. 2001. Co jest niewłaściwego w czasownikach niewłaściwych? In *Nie bez znaczenia... Prace ofiarowane Profesorowi Zygmuntowi Saloniemu z okazji jubileuszu 15000 dni pracy naukowej*, ed. by Włodzimierz Gruszczyński, Urszula Andrejewicz, Mirosław Bańko, and Dorota Kopcińska, 55–65. Białystok: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Białostockiego.

Bondaruk, Anna, and Bogdan Szymanek. 2007. Polish nominativeless constructions with dative Experiencers: Form, meaning and structure. *Studies in Polish Linguistics* 4:61–97.

Bruening, Benjamin, and Eman Al Khalaf. 2020. Category mismatches in coordination revisited. *Linguistic Inquiry* 51:1–36.

Castañeda, Hector Neri. 1967. Comment on D. Davidson's 'The logical form of action sentences'. In Rescher (1967), 104–112.

Chierchia, Gennero. 1998. Reference to kinds across languages. *Natural Language Semantics* 6:339–405.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and functional heads: A cross-linguistic perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dalrymple, Mary, John J. Lowe, and Louise Mycock. 2019. *The Oxford reference guide to Lexical Functional Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Davidson, Donald. 1967. The logical form of action sentences. In Rescher (1967), 81–95.

Dziwirek, Katarzyna. 1990. Default agreement in Polish. In *Grammatical relations: A cross-theoretical perspective*, ed. by Katarzyna Dziwirek, Patrick Farrell, and Errapel Mejías-Bikandi. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Ernst, Thomas. 2001. *The syntax of adjuncts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gehrke, Berit. 2019. Event kinds. In *The Oxford handbook of event structure*, ed. by Robert Truswell, 205–233. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Grimm, Scott, and Louise McNally. 2015. The *-ing* dynasty: Rebuilding the semantics of nominalizations. In *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT) XXV*,

ed. by Sarah D'Antonio, Mary Moroney, and Carol Rose Little, 82–102.

Grzegorczykowa, Renata. 1975. *Funkcje semantyczne i składniowe polskich przysłówków*. Wrocław: Komitet Językoznawstwa, Polska Akademia Nauk and Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.

Kaplan, Ronald M., and Joan Bresnan. 1982. Lexical-Functional Grammar: A formal system for grammatical representation. In *The mental representation of grammatical relations*, ed. by Joan Bresnan, 173–281. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Kibort, Anna. 2004. Passive and passive-like constructions in English and Polish. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Cambridge.

Kratzer, Angelika. 2002. Facts: Particulars or information units? *Linguistics and Philosophy* 25:655–670.

Landau, Idan. 2013. *Control in generative grammar: A research companion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Laskowski, Roman. 1999. Zagadnienia ogólne morfologii. In *Gramatyka współczesnego języka polskiego: Morfologia*, ed. by Renata Grzegorczykowa, Roman Laskowski, and Henryk Wróbel, 27–86. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 3rd edition.

Maienborn, Claudia, and Martin Schäfer. 2011. Adverbs and adverbials. In *Semantics: An international handbook of natural language meaning*, ed. by Claudia Maienborn, Klaus von Heusinger, and Paul Portner, volume 2, 1390–1420. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Mulligan, Kevin, and Fabrice Correia. 2017. Facts. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, `https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/facts/`. First published Fri Sep 21, 2007; substantive revision Wed Nov 8, 2017.

Parsons, Terence. 1990. *Events in the semantics of English: A study in subatomic semantics*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Patejuk, Agnieszka, and Adam Przepiórkowski. 2018. Predicative constructions with infinitival and clausal subjects. In *The Proceedings of the LFG'18 Conference*, ed.

by Miriam Butt and Tracy Holloway King, 304–324. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications. URL `https://web.stanford.edu/group/cslipublications/cslipublications/LFG/LFG-2018/`.

Pisarkowa, Krystyna. 1965. *Predykatywność określeń w polskim zdaniu*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.

Przepiórkowski, Adam. 1999. Case assignment and the complement-adjunct dichotomy: A non-configurational constraint-based approach. Ph.D. dissertation, Universität Tübingen.

Przepiórkowski, Adam, Mirosław Bańko, Rafał L. Górski, and Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, ed. by. 2012. *Narodowy korpus języka polskiego*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Przepiórkowski, Adam, Mirosław Bańko, Rafał L. Górski, Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, Marek Łaziński, and Piotr Pęzik. 2011. National Corpus of Polish. In *Proceedings of the 5th Language & Technology Conference: Human Language Technologies as a Challenge for Computer Science and Linguistics*, ed. by Zygmunt Vetulani, 259–263. Poznań, Poland.

Rescher, Nicholas, ed. by. 1967. *The logic of decision and action*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Rothstein, Susan. 2001. *Predicates and their subjects*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Roy, Isabelle. 2013. *Non-verbal predication: Copular sentences at the syntax-semantics interface*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sag, Ivan A., Gerald Gazdar, Thomas Wasow, and Steven Weisler. 1985. Coordination and how to distinguish categories. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 3:117–171.

Saloni, Zygmunt. 1974. Klasyfikacja gramatyczna leksemów polskich. *Język Polski* LIV:3–13, 93–101.

Stiebels, Barbara. 2007. Towards a typology of complement control. In *Studies in complement control*, ed. by Barbara Stiebels, 1–80. Berlin: Universitätsbibliothek

Johann Christian Senckenberg.

Uhrig, Peter. 2018. *Subjects in English*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Witkoś, Jacek. 1995. Wh-extraction from clausal complements in Polish: A minimality/locality account. *Folia Linguistica* XXIX:223–264.

(Patejuk)

Institute of Computer Science, Polish Academy of Sciences

Faculty of Linguistics, Philology and Phonetics, University of Oxford

agnieszka.patejuk@gmail.com

(Przepiórkowski)

Institute of Philosophy, University of Warsaw

Institute of Computer Science, Polish Academy of Sciences

Faculty of Linguistics, Philology and Phonetics, University of Oxford

przepiorkowski.adam@gmail.com

Notes

[1]This paper is almost exclusively based on authentic examples drawn from the National Corpus of Polish (NKJP; `http://nkjp.pl`; Przepiórkowski et al. 2011,

2012).

[2]While there are other constructions in Polish that might perhaps also be analysed as involving predicative adverbs, in this squib we concentrate exclusively on constructions with verbal subjects.

[3]For the sake of clarity, subjects of predication are marked with square brackets.

[4]Verbal subjects in Polish predicative constructions are further discussed – and provided a syntactic analysis couched in Lexical Functional Grammar (Kaplan and Bresnan 1982, Dalrymple, Lowe, and Mycock 2019) – in Patejuk and Przepiórkowski 2018.

[5]In Polish, gender is overt on finite verbs only in the past tense, that is, above, in (8) and (10), but not in the other four examples.

[6]The existence of predicative uses of adverbs has occasionally been pointed out in Polish linguistic literature, especially in Grzegorczykowa 1975:32–36, where constructions with InfP subjects are discussed; predicative adverbs are also mentioned in Kibort 2004:sec. 4.5 and Bondaruk and Szymanek 2007:sec. 4.2.

[7]Moreover, since the adverbs in (17) are superlative (comparative could also be used, as in (22)–(23)), it is not feasible to analyse them as some sort of defective verbs, or 'quasi-verbs' (see Saloni 1974, as well as Bańko 2001 and references therein, on this grammatical class), as is sometimes done in Polish linguistics (see, e.g., Laskowski 1999:60–61).

[8]In the case of InfP subjects, as in (25), adjectives are sometimes perceived as degraded with respect to the corresponding adverbs. They are also much less frequent in the National Corpus of Polish, although naturally occurring and fully acceptable examples may easily be found; see, e.g., (28) and (31) below.

[9]In such constructions with verbal subjects of predication, predicative adjectives must appear in the 'default' nominative singular neuter form (Patejuk and Przepiórkowski 2018), so – for reasons of space and to avoid unnecessary clutter – such forms are henceforth glossed as ADJ rather than (ADJ.)NOM.SG.N.

[10]The morphologically related adverb *ważnie* seems to only have legal uses, where it

means 'binding, valid', as in *małżeństwo ważnie zawarte* 'valid marriage', lit. 'marriage bindingly established'. The English sentential adverb *importantly* may be expressed in Polish as *co ważne* lit. 'what('s) important'.

[11]InfPs cannot be nominalized in this way; see (34) below.

[12]Extraction out of CP is generally very limited in Polish (see, e.g., Witkoś 1995), so we do not examine it here.

[13]Given that PPs may predicate of either nominal or verbal constituents, prepositional predicates may coordinate with either adverbial predicates (which – by hypothesis – expect verbal subjects) or adjectival predicates (which – by hypothesis – expect nominal subjects); cf. (26) and (27).

[14]This is also how they are characterized in Grzegorczykowa 1975:36.

[15]In the case of adjectival predicates, such an experiencer is instead expressed by a prepositional phrase headed by *dla* 'for', as in (i) below, corresponding to (38) in the main text:

(i) Oczywiście dla autora   najtrudniejsze   było   [uzyskać szczegóły].
    obviously   for author.GEN difficult.ADJ.SUP was.3SG.N get.INF details
    'Obviously, it was most difficult.ADJ for the author to get the details.'

[16]The experiencer is a dependent of the adverb rather than the copula since: 1) its acceptability depends on the particular predicate, not on the copula; 2) the absence of the copula does not affect the experiencer – see (20); see also Patejuk and Przepiórkowski 2018. Bondaruk and Szymanek 2007 also analyse the dative experiencer as a dependent of the adverb, albeit as its external argument.

[17]See Grimm and McNally 2015:92 for similar considerations in the context of English gerunds referring to event kinds and interpreted as referring to event tokens by virtue of the entailments of the higher predicate.

[18]Note that $ag(e) = exp(s)$ in (42) is truth-conditionally equivalent to $ag(e) = j$, as in (43); this difference in representation between (42) and (43) stems from the fact that the agent within InfP subjects – but not within CP subjects – is established via control.

21

[19]We assume that, from the fact that some event kind is experienced as nice by Jan, it follows that tokens of this event kind are also experienced as nice by Jan; hence the aforementioned contradiction when (40) with an InfP subject is followed by *ale samo pływanie nie było takie miłe* 'but the swimming itself was not so nice'.

[20]As suggested by LI squib editors, perhaps these meanings could be related by a type-shifting rule triggered by some meaning component of those adverbs that also combine with CP subjects.