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I. Meeting and matrimony.

Recently it has usually been considered to be the case that there are certain instances of noun-phrase conjunction which are not to be plausibly accounted for by a simple reduction of a conjoining of sentences (cf. particularly Lakoff & Peters, 1969; McCawley, 1968: 142-55; Dik, 1968: chs. 5-7; Dougherty, 1970, 1971). Consider in this connection the example in (1):

(1) The Mosel and the Rhine meet at this point

and compare with it the anomalous:

(2) *The Mosel meets (at this point) and the Rhine meets at this point.

From such phenomena, involving in particular various 'topological' verbs, we might begin to inquire whether (at least some instances of) NP-conjunction and S-conjunction should be allowed for separately in underlying structures (whatever form they may take). The sentence in (1) would thus be (in such terms) an example of underlying NP-conjunction rather than a reduction.

Further, and more crucially for our subsequent discussion, we can derive, according to the first of these accounts, the variant in (3):

(3) The Mosel meets the Rhine at this point

by a simple 'objectivization' of the second conjoined NP - Lakoff & Peters' (1969) 'conject movement'. (The selection of this variant appears to have something to do with topicalization or with the speaker's estimation of the 'relative importance' of the referents of the two NPs.) This is claimed to be associated with the fact that meet is also 'symmetric', in that (3) entails The Rhine meets the Mosel at this point. Meet would then be subcategorized as the sort of (intransitive) verb that requires a non-singular subject - non-singular (and $\exists + \text{joint } \exists$ - McCawley, 1968) by NP-conjunction or categorically, as in (4):

(4) The rivers meet at this point

or lexically (as with collectives - see Dougherty, 1970: 3).

Similar in their syntax are converge and join, except that the latter can also be causative, as exemplified in (5) (and the corresponding 'passives'):

(5) a. John joined the pieces (together)
   b. John joined the wheel and the axle (together)
Notice in such cases the optional presence of *together*, a fact to which we shall return below. Perhaps more usual than (5b) is (6):

(6) John joined the wheel to the axle

which can once more be derived via conjunct movement. However, notice that we find the second NP marked with *to*; and *together* (which contains a similar-looking element) is not permitted here. Without an agent, we can list (one interpretation of - the other being causitive) the sentences in (7):

(7) a. The pieces are joined (*together*)
   b. The wheel and the axle are joined (*together*)
   c. The wheel is joined to the axle

(the third sentence again rejecting *together*).

Before proceeding to examine the significance of the distribution of *together* in the examples (5) through (7), I want to note that marry would seem to be a 'topological' verb of some sort. Consider the examples in (8):

(8) a. The Smiths married in Birmingham
    b. John and Mary married in Birmingham
    c. John married Mary in Birmingham

Compare the examples in (8) as regards 'symmetric' properties, implausibility of an underlying sentence conjunction etc., with those in (3) and (4) (and corresponding sentences with *join*, etc.). Together with (8), we also find variants parallel to those in (7) with *join*:

(9) a. They are married
    b. John and Mary are married
    c. John is married to Mary
    d. Mary is married to John

And, of course, there are causative occurrences corresponding to (5) and (6) (but with a rather restricted type of agent) like those in (10) (and the equivalent 'passives'):

(10) a. The Rev. Jones married them
    b. The Rev. Jones married John and Mary
    c. The Rev. Jones married John to Mary
    d. The Rev. Jones married Mary to John

(though (10c) and (10d) strike me as somewhat odd). Consider too, an alternative to *marry* like *join* in wedlock, which suggests that *marry* may represent a 'lexicalization' of the sort described in Anderson, 1968, 1971 b. However these various sentences are allowed for, it is clear that the notional and distributional similarities between *marry* on the one hand, and 'topological' verbs on the other, will require explanation; and in view of the intuitive similarities in the relationships involved, one would expect this to be in terms of identity of underlying relations - the distinction between them having to do with the 'lexical' characterization of *marry* (which, as I have noted, may be introduced transformationally) vs. that for *meet*, *join*, etc. Thus, such phenomena provide in principle further evidence
in support of a localistic hypothesis concerning 'grammatical functions' (Anderson, 1971a): the 'abstract' marry is relationally identical to the possibly 'concrete' meet/join. Correspond (to) and match are syntactically like meet/join; and it is worth noting at this point that match as a noun can be applied to matrimony.

Let us return now to a consideration of the occurrences and non-occurrences of together with respect to the examples involving join. In the sentences in which the insertion of together is not possible ((6) and (8 c)), we already have a to-phrase present. Moreover, these are the sentences in which the subject is singular (superficially, at least). I want to suggest that together is itself a (deletable) to-phrase; but in this case the NP is reciprocal. That is, together here is equivalent to to each other, which may indeed be inserted wherever together is permissible in the examples in (5) and (7). Further, each other is insertable, as object, in (1) and (4) (even though together, containing to, is rather unnatural here - though perhaps less so with an agent as subject). This would account for the paraphraseability of meet, etc. by come together. Each other can also be interpolated, without a change in cognitive meaning, in a and b in (8), and to each other in a and b in (9) and (10), although, particularly in the b instances these phrases are superficially even more redundant than with the other verbs. This further increases the similarities between meet etc. and marry. But also if we interpret these various sentences in this way as involving a reciprocal NP, then we can regard the examples in (3), (6), (7c), (8c), (9c) and (10c) as merely the singular (and necessarily non-reciprocal) equivalents of such, and not derived from the same structure. If we are to allow meet to take a reciprocal object, then it is preferable to also permit non-reciprocal objects, singular or plural: meet is distinctive in permitting (indeed preferring) deletion of a reciprocal object rather than in requiring objects of a certain sort. Notice that there are other verbs which to ensure a 'NP-conjunction' reading require the presence of the reciprocal, as in We encountered each other in a mist or He laid this piece and that piece together. We could within such an interpretation (whereby (1) is a reduced reciprocal) dispense with the rule providing for examples like (3) by deformation of an underlying NP-conjunction. Derivation of the sentence with conjoined NPs from a structure including a reciprocal NP (whatever form this may take) will not involve us in additions to the grammar, since there is clearly a general principle (i.e. not limited to sentences with conjoined subject) whereby a reciprocal form is developed and then (optionally) deleted. A deleted reciprocal object underlies, for instance, one interpretation of They fought like fury. The alternative is the presence of the otherwise unmotivated / + joint / feature on the subject.

II  Against conjunct movement

Before accepting such a conclusion, however, it behoves us to give some consideration to the arguments adduced by Lakoff & Peters (1969). They do indeed refer (1969: 140-1) to the reciprocal interpretation of sentences like (1) proposed by Gleitman (1965); but they claim that there is one kind of example which shows that such a solution is 'impossible'. (Actually, even if this were true, it would only show that in this particular kind of example such a solution was impossible). And they cite the following pair:

11 a. John killed a man with Bill
b. John was killed with Bill
They propose that (11a) is derived from the structure underlying (12a) and (11b) from that underlying (12b):

(12) a. John and Bill killed a man
    b. John and Bill were killed

and they comment (1969: 120): 'Bill in (11b) is understood as part of the superficial subject of be killed, which is to say, it is understood as part of the underlying object of kill... In (11a) Bill is understood again as part of the superficial subject of kill, but it is also understood as part of the underlying subject of kill... These examples show that the underlying grammatical relation that the object of with bears to the other elements in the sentence is not fixed, but depends at least on whether or not passivization has applied...'.

Say we accept that something like the distinction they posit between (11a) and (11b) is appropriate - though this is not at all straightforward: an agentive passive like John was killed by Bill with a friend seems to allow either interpretation. Now, their interpretation requires that passivization precede conjunct movement: the structure underlying (12b) precedes that giving (11b). But Dougherty (1970: 861; 1971: 303-4) has adduced examples showing a requirement for the reverse ordering; consider (13):

(13) a. His understanding and his wisdom match
    b. His understanding matches his wisdom
    c. His wisdom is matched by his understanding

Here the structure underlying (c) derives from that underlying (b) by passivization, which in turn results from (obligatory) conjunct movement (cf. (a)). That is, passivization must follow conjunct movement. As Dougherty observes: 'The Conjunct Movement formulation leads to a dilemma'. Given Lakoff & Peters' proposals, passivization must both precede and follow conjunct movement. This dilemma is not quite as fatal as Dougherty appears to be concluding; it is fatal only if the passive is given a solely transformational or simplex interpretation. Suppose instead that it involves rather a superordinate copulative predication of some sort (for alternative formulations, see Hasegawa, 1968; R. Lakoff, 1968: 2.8; Anderson, 1972a: II). Thus, underlying (11b) and (13c) might be (schematically), if we adopt, for the sake of discussion, something like Hasegawa's proposal (though nothing crucial hangs on this), (14a) and (14b) respectively:

(14) a. 

b. 
On the first cycle conjunct movement applies to the lower sentence in (b), resulting in (15):

(15)

\[ S_1 \overset{\text{his wisdom be}}{\rightarrow} S_2 \overset{\text{his understanding matches his wisdom}}{\rightarrow} \]

On the second cycle, passivization applies in both cases, producing respectively (16a) and (16b):

(16) a. John and Bill be killed
    b. His wisdom be matched by his understanding

followed by conjunct movement in the case of (16a):

(17) John be killed with Bill

This of course depends on independent motivation for some such non-simplex interpretation of the passive. But since a simple sentence interpretation of the passive still awaits (not only an adequate formulation but also) the revelation of syntactic arguments in its favour, it is at least clear that Dougherty's dilemma is not a definitive counter-argument.

However, this same modification of our interpretation of the passive also, on the other hand, largely destroys Lakoff & Peters' argument concerning (11) and (12), since (even if we accept their interpretation of) (11a) and (11b) these now have the distinct underlying structures (18a) and (18b) respectively:

(18) a.

\[ \text{with Bill} \]

John kill a man

b.

\[ \text{with Bill} \]

John be \[ \Delta \text{kill John} \]
In each instance, Bill is construed as 'accompanying' the subject immediately below. Thus, Lakoff & Peters' argument for conjunct movement involving the pairs in (11) and (12) either results in a dilemma (if passivization is simply transformational) or is invalid (if it is not).

Similar considerations attach to the evidence concerning adverbials like for fun which modify 'deep subjects', discussed by Andrews (1971: §2). With a pair like Howard and Mary kill frogs for fun and Howard kills frogs with Mary for fun, the adverbial in each case modifies the subject, Howard and Mary and Howard respectively. This is quite compatible with the view that the members of such a pair have distinct underlying structures, which is the position I would advocate. In particular, the second member does not derive from a conjunction. However, it could perhaps be maintained, if one wished to retain conjunct movement, that the underlying distinction lay solely in the source for for fun, this representing a reduction from, respectively, so that they (Howard and Mary) may have fun and so that he (Howard) may have fun. Alternatively, Andrews suggests, if we abandon the transformations-as-meaning-preserving hypothesis, we may conceive of there being a rule of semantic interpretation which assigns appropriate readings to the adverbial. Now, clearly, this rule, or its alternative, the rule reducing so that...fun to for fun, must follow conjunct movement. Equally clearly, the for fun rule (whatever its character) must precede passivization: it involves crucially the deep subject. Thus, conjunct movement, Andrews argues, precedes the for fun rule which precedes passivization: i.e. conjunct movement precedes passivization. Once more, given Lakoff and Peters' arguments for the reverse ordering, we arrive at an ordering dilemma like that indicated by Dougherty. However, as we have seen, this dilemma is disastrous only under a simplex interpretation of the passive. Nevertheless, it is still more clear that Lakoff and Peters' original argument is at best inconclusive.

I shall not dwell here upon problems arising from how we are to interpret conjunct movement as affecting structures in its domain. These are illustrated by the discussion in Andrews 1971: §1, where it is shown that the structures of different sentences alleged to derive from application of conjunct movement are not constant under Lakoff and Ross' (1966) do-so test. Rather, we shall continue to focus on Lakoff and Peters' arguments for the existence of conjunct movement, since if these are insufficient, such considerations of derived structure need not detain us.

They further observe (1969: 121) that the object of a with-phrase of accompaniment may never be a reflexive pronoun, as illustrated by the anomalous character of (19):

(19) *John left with himself

and they assert: 'This follows from the fact that we do not get reflexives in phrasally conjoined noun phrases'. That is, (19) is out because (2) is out:

(20) John and John left
But (21) is also anomalous:

(21) * John is with himself

Are we to explain this on the basis of the deviance of (22)?:

(22) * John, and John, are

This means that be is a kind of verb that if it has an underlyingly conjoined subject must undergo conjunct movement, in view of the acceptability of (23):

(23) John is with Fred

but not (24):

(24) * John and Fred are

unless together is present:

(25) John and Fred are together

But together is reciprocal. It seems preferable to suggest that be is simply a verb which, unlike meet, does not permit reciprocal object deletion, and that (23) is not derived from the structure underlying (24). This is reinforced by the following examples:

(26) a. * John is at himself
    b. * John is in himself
    c. * John is in front of himself
    d. * John is under himself
    etc.

which show that the deviance of (21) has nothing to do with derivation from a putative underlying NP-conjunction, but simply follows from a semantic constraint on locating anything with respect to itself (if we exclude, as exemplifying this, as Lakoff and Peters do, John is by himself and the like). Similarly, (19) is semantically anomalous in predicating self-accompaniment of John. Observe that a sentence involving collide like (27):

(27) The car collided with the truck

is not, in its most obvious interpretation, a paraphrase of (28)

(28) The car and the truck collided

and is thus presumably not to be derived from the structure underlying (28) via conjunct movement, even though (28) is clearly like (1) in not being a reduction of a sentential conjunction of the form The car collided and despite the other similarities with meet noted by Dougherty (1971: 312-3). But (29) is anomalous:

(29) * The car collided with itself
Some other explanation than derivation from an underlying NP-conjunction is required. The range of evidence thus does not accord with Lakoff and Peters' claim.

A third argument involves selectional restrictions. They observe (1969: 125) that 'the selectional restrictions between the main verb and noun phrase that appears as superficial subject are identical to the selectional restrictions on the objects of these prepositions' and that 'this is an automatic consequence of the analysis we have given'. Even if this were true, it provides no support for the conjunct movement hypothesis as against the reciprocal proposal. And in fact there are phenomena like those offered by Dougherty (1971: 325) which follow in a natural way from an analysis in terms of reciprocals but are contrary to what is predicted by a grammar including conjunct movement. Dougherty cites the sentences in (30):

(30) a. *John and the lamppost embraced  
    b. John embraced the lamppost  
    c. *The lamppost embraced John

Restrictions on the object of **embrace** are not predictable from the restrictions on the (conjoined) subject. But **embrace** appears to be like **meet** in, for instance, not allowing (31a) as a plausible source for (31b):

(31) a. *John embraced and Mary embraced  
    b. John and Mary embraced

Again, we might take this as an indication that **embrace** is like **collide** in that (32)

(32) John embraced Mary

is not to be derived from conjunct movement, but independently. Note that **collide** presents similar problems to those found in (30):

(33) a. *The car and the brick wall collided  
    b. The car collided with the brick wall  
    c. *The brick wall collided with the car

But we would then be in the position of proposing that there are two sets of verbs, sharing a number of properties, one of which includes **meet** and occurs intransitively with an underlyingly conjoined subject and which permits conjunct movement, the other of which includes **embrace** and **collide** and occurs intransitively with an underlying conjoined subject, does not permit conjunct movement but also occurs transitively in underlying structures (as in (30b) and (33)). However, the situation is even worse than that, for though one might talk vaguely about justifying independent sources just in such cases in terms of 'imputation of agency' or the like, notice that it is possible to find similar examples even with **meet**, as illustrated by (34):

(34) a. John met an old man  
    b. *John and an old man met

Of course, one might claim that conjunct movement was obligatory in just these instances; but this would in the case of (30) - (33) render Lakoff and Peters' claim almost totally vacuous, and with (34) and the like require a
replication of whatever principles govern FSP. In terms of the reciprocal analysis, on the other hand, the deviance of (30a) and (33a) follows automatically from the anomalous character of (30c) and (33c) respectively.

Dougherty (1970: 858-60; cf too H 1971: § 1) adduces a number of examples showing lack of a paraphrase relation in cases where an interpretation in terms of conjunct movement would (given Lakoff and Peters' own assumptions concerning transformational relationships) require such. Notice now that this discrepancy is quite general with with-phrases in negative sentences. Take a pair like that in (35):

(35)  
   a. John and Bill left (together)  
   b. John left with Bill

(35b) is presumably in such a framework derived by conjunct movement from the structure associated with the phrasal-conjunction interpretation of (35a). Consider now (36):

(36)  
   a. John and Bill didn't leave  
   b. John didn't leave with Bill

I can associate with (36b) either the interpretation 'John left but not with Bill' or (particularly with stress on didn't) 'John didn't leave when Bill left (and he may be still around)'. (36a), on the other hand, means 'John and Bill didn't leave (either separately or as a pair)'. We get a bit closer to the meanings we can associate with (36b) in (37):

(37)  
John and Bill didn't leave together

which, as we would expect of such a reciprocal, allows of three relevant possibilities: 'John and Bill left but not together', 'John is possibly still around', 'Bill is possibly still around'. -- That is, (37) involves a union of the interpretations associated with (36b) and (38):

(38)  
Bill didn't leave with John

Such empirical phenomena are incompatible with conjunct movement as formulated by Lakoff and Peters', but follow naturally from an analysis in terms of 'reciprocals'.

Thus, as far as I am aware, Lakoff and Peters succeed in providing no motivation for a rule of conjunct movement, even for those with-examples concerning which Lakoff and Peters make the strongest claims (and which are not, incidentally, our main interest in this discussion as a whole). The 'transitive' structure of (3) is thus not derived from an underlying NP-conjunction, and (1) involves a deleted reciprocal object. It is not my concern to establish how reciprocals are developed — say, by conjunction reduction (Gleitman, 1965: §§ 3-4) or lexically (Dougherty, 1970: 6) or by some combination (which should not be ruled out), or otherwise. It is sufficient for the present discussion to establish that (3) is, if anything, more rather than less basic than (1).

3. Separation and divorce.

However, at this point we are confronted anew (if Lakoff and Peters')
solution is rejected) with the problem of characterizing the relations underlying such sentences as (1) and (3). What functions do the (reciprocal or non-reciprocal) NPs involved enter into? Before reflecting on this problem, I think it appropriate to extend somewhat the range of the phenomena under consideration. We can observe that sentences with separate, diverge and part show the same range of possibilities as those containing join, with one significant difference. Typical examples are (39):

(39)  
   a. The roads separate at this point
   b. The Stirling road and the Glasgow road separate at this point
   c. The Stirling road separates from the Glasgow road at this point

From each other can in this case be inserted in a and b; they once again appear to contain an underlying reciprocal NP, but on this occasion within a from-phrase. (39c) already contains a from-phrase, and rejects from each other. This situation also characterizes the examples in (40):

(40)  
   a. The two parts are separate(d)
   b. Part A and part B are separate(d)
   c. Part A is separate(d) from Part B

and the corresponding causative forms. Notice too that just as marry represents a particular 'abstract' 'institutional' kind of 'topological' verb, so corresponding to the sentences in (39) and (40) are the 'institutional' uses of separate and divorce. Like marry, divorce does not appear to accept concrete non-human NPs — though abstracts are quite acceptable. Otherwise, sentences containing divorce and 'institutional' separate show the same range of possibilities as we have associated with part and separate (though there is no 'institutional' use of adjectival separate), and in particular they have from + NP in places where we found to-phrases with join and marry. This symmetry supports further our localistic interpretation. And the correlation between to and 'convergence', and from and 'divergence', respectively, will require our attention below.

4. Near and far

But compare now a further type of 'topological' sentence containing near and similar forms, as exemplified in (41):

(41)  
   a. His house is near the park
   b. His house is close to the park
   c. His house is adjacent to the park
   d. His house adjoins the park

Once again we have a 'spatial' relation represented by a mixture of forms with and without to, with and without a copula. There is also a corresponding set of reciprocals:

(42)  
   a. The baker's and the butcher's are near (to) each other
   b. The baker's and the butcher's are close together/to each other
   c. The baker's and the butcher's are adjacent (to each other)
   d. The baker's and the butcher's adjoin (each other)
   e. The baker's and the butcher's are adjoining
The similarity with our other examples is clear, despite the fact that (as we shall pursue further below) they represent in part a distinct set of underlying relations. There are also from-forms, though these do not show as extensive a range of surface possibilities, but only the adjectival variants exemplified in (43):

(43) a. Edinburgh is \(\{\text{far (away)}\}^{\text{distant}}\) from London
b. Edinburgh and London are far \{\text{apart}\} from each other

In this case too, parallel to these typically 'spatial' instances, we have the 'non-spatial' examples in (44):

(44) 1a. He is like his brother
    b. He is similar to his brother
c. He resembles his brother
d. He and his brother are like each other
e. He and his brother are similar (to each other)
f. He and his brother resemble each other
g. He and his brother are alike

2a. He is different from his brother
    b. He differs from his brother
c. He and his brother are different (from each other)
d. He and his brother differ (from each other)

Compare (44 1) with the sentences in (41) and (42), and (44 2) with (43) — though notice that there is nothing in (43) corresponding to b. and d. in (44 2). Otherwise, we find almost the same range of variants (with minor differences as to what in particular is deletable) and, I would suggest, the same underlying relations (however they are to be characterized) — the differences between the 'spatial' and the 'non-spatial' deriving from the specifications of the particular (nominal and verbal) lexical items involved (cf. Anderson, 1969: 322; also Sechehaye, 1927: 107).

5. Distance

Now, a characterization of the relational structure of the sentences involving 'topological' verbs in §4, or of those discussed earlier in §§1 and 3, is not immediately obvious (to me, at least). For instance, a description of (44 1b) or (44 2a) involving simple co-occurrence of, say, any two of the set of 'cases' allowed for by Fillmore (1968, or subsequently) is neither compelling nor very revealing. Nor is much explained by marking close as an adjective that takes a prepositional object which happens to be a to-phrase and far as one that takes a from-phrase as prepositional object. It seems to me that the data surveyed in §§1, 3 and 4 show a sufficiently systematic correlation between from and 'divergence' and to and 'convergence' for us to conclude that the distribution of prepositions is, in this instance at least, not an idiosyncratic property of individual predicates.

The paradigms exemplified in §4 are uniformly 'stative' — the exception here being sentences including the verb near, as (45):

(45) We are nearing the end now

They are moreover paraphraseable as follows:
(46)  
1a. Edinburgh is far from London
   b. The distance from London to Edinburgh is \{ great \}

2a. The park is close to his house
   b. The distance from the park to his house is small

Cf. too the pair in (47):

(47)  
a. Edinburgh is a great distance from London
   b. It is not [far \{ a great distance \}] from London to Edinburgh

(47a) can be derived from the structure underlying (46 lb) by processes with an independent motivation; if far is regarded as an alternative lexicalization of what underlies a great distance, then (46 la) also has such a source.

Some confirmation for this comes from the fact that the positive equivalents of the two sentences collapsed as (47 b) seem to me equally 'odd' (without a marked break before from):

(48)  
? It's \{ far \} from London to Edinburgh

On the other hand, (46 2a) corresponds to (49) and not a sentence with to:

(49)  
The park is a short distance from his house

However, this situation is not unprecedented. Elsewhere (Anderson, 1971a: 5.41) I have discussed the triple in (50):

(50)  
a. Fred caused Mary to leave
   b. Fred prevented Mary from leaving
   c. Fred allowed Mary to leave

Allow is the marked member of the antonymic pair prevent/allow; it incorporates an inherent negation. This is associated with a shift from from to to in the complement. Similarly, here, the complement of distance is from; but if an element including an inherent negation (short) is incorporated, yielding close, then to is substituted, as in (46 2a).

However that may be, it is clear that far and distance both take a from prepositional object. From normally marks the source in a directional predication which also includes an allative, or directional locative, as in (51):

(51)  
Fred travelled from London to Edinburgh

(cf. Anderson, 1971a: §§8.1-2). Compare here (46 lb), which on the most natural interpretation appears to include a directional component subordinate to distance. But as well as examples like (51) there are also such as (52):
Fred received a present from Mary

in which the superficial subject, prepositionless of course, is the directional locative, the goal (Anderson, 1971a: 9.41). But Edinburgh in (46 la) and (47a) is also clearly a goal; once again a directional component is present, though the sequence of arguments differs, as with travel/receive.

Observe at this point that there is a rather difficult to formulate constraint associated with direction predications which requires that their two locational arguments, the ablative and the allative, be 'commensurate', as illustrated by (53):

(53)  
la. Fred walked from the door to the table  
b? *Fred walked from Paris to the table  
c? *Fred walked from the door to Brussels  
d. Fred walked from Paris to Brussels

2a. Fred took the parcel from Joe to Bill  
b? *Fred took the parcel from Manchester to Bill  
c? *Fred took the parcel from Joe to Liverpool  
d. Fred took the parcel from Manchester to Liverpool

Receive in general takes animate allative and ablative (with marginal extensions like The Rhine receives the waters of the Mosel): apparent exceptions like Fred received a parcel from Australia are interpreted as 'Fred received a parcel from someone in Australia'. There are similar restrictions on the arguments of 'distance' that we are suggesting are directional, as shown by, for example, (54), compared with (46 la) and (47a):

(54)  
? *The door is \{far [a great distance] \} from London

I now want to try to show that the shared relational structure of the examples in (46) and the divergent developments, resulting in (46 la), (46 lb) or (47a), can be accounted for in terms, respectively, of structures which in this way have their independent motivation and via processes already formulated with respect to distinct phenomena.

Distance is, then, a substantive predicate with directional arguments, and underlying (46 lb) is the structure in (55), which ignores irrelevant considerations like tense etc:
(V = predicate; N = term; nom = nominative, abl = ablative, loc = locative). The circled N's are referentially identical, and the path in (55) from one to the other is what underlies nouns in general — i.e. a term with a subordinate predication containing that term as nominative argument. (Cf. here Bach, 1968; Anderson, 1972b: ch. 8, forthcoming a, b, c.) The normal development for a substantive predicate involves subjunction (cf. Anderson, 1971b) of the lower (subject) term to its predicate, as in (56) (which also shows pruning of the nom node):

(56)

and subjunction of the predicate to the upper term, as in (57) (with again pruning, plus elimination of the repeated term):

(57)

distance from London to Edinburgh

Given the presence of a superordinate copula predication (cf. Anderson, 1972b: ch. 8, forthcoming a. chs: 4-5) this results eventually but obviously in the structure immediately underlying (46 1.b.).

However, there is an alternative development. Consider as an illustration the alternative derivations for quantified sentences resulting in the pair in (58) (discussed in some detail in Anderson, 1972b):

§ 8.4, forthcoming b, c):

(58) a. There are many girls who read books
    b. There are many girls read books

Underlying both is the structure in (59):
\( V_1 \) is the \textit{there are...} predication, \( V_2 \) is existential (\( N_e \) indicates the existential \( N \)), and the circled \( N \)'s are once more identical. With normal relative development (the lower \( \Box \rightarrow \text{who} \)), and the abjunction of \( V_2 \) to be re-attached directly to \( V_1 \):

(60)
and copying of the subject $N$ of $V_2$ on to the empty nominative of $V_1$ and the locative of $V_2$ on to the empty locative of $V_1$ (pronominalized to there), followed by (normal) deletion of the original existential $N$ and subjunction of $V_2$ to $V_1$ there results (56a). Alternatively $V_3$ is abjoined, and re-attached directly to $V_2$, as in (61):

\[ (61) \]

This blocks relative-formation; instead, the upper $N$ is superimposed on the lower, which, with subjunction of $V_3$ to $V_2$, results in (62):

\[ (62) \]

With abjunction of $V_2$, copying of the subject and locative and deletion of the existential in $V_2$, we get (63):
It is such a development as this latter one that we must now consider in connection with (55).

Suppose that abjunction of $V_2$ occurs before subjunction to the upper N can take place. The structure represented in (64) is the result (after pruning):

Since normal noun-formation for the subject is thus blocked, by a general constraint for languages like English (cf. e.g. Perlmuter, 1971: 100; Anderson, forthcoming c: §3), the expletive formative, here it, is introduced to fill the subject position. Such a development (with the addition of the copula, and negation, which need not concern us), eventuates in the second alternative in (47b). The first alternative requires subjunction of $V_2$ to $V_1$, as indicated in (65):

The whole complex retains the predicate-type of the governing V, i.e. $V_1$, viz. it is adjectival rather than substantival - in accordance with the principle formulated in Anderson, 1971b.

Thus far we have dealt only with instances in which the lower,
directional V is of the travel type (cf. (51)). But this leaves unexplained the development leading to (46 l.a) and (47a). I observed above that the sequence of arguments in these is like that in a directional predication like (52). I now propose that underlying them is a structure like that in (64) but in which the locative argument occupies subject position in V₂, as in (66):

(66)

The former of the two developments described above with reference to (53) - i.e. normal noun-formation - is not available here, in that the lower N is no longer in subject position. Thus, after subjunction of the lower N to V₂ and abjunction of V₂, we have (67) (after pruning in V₂):

(67)

Once again subjunction of V₂ to the upper N is blocked; but in this instance the subject-raising which generally follows abjunction (cf. e.g. Anderson, 1972a) is possible (V₂ in (64) is subjectless). We thus derive (68) (again after pruning):
The variant with *far* ((46 1.a)) once more involves subjunction of $V_2$ to $V_1$.

The extension of such an interpretation to the various examples we considered in §4, including the reciprocals, and to further possibilities like those in (69):

(69)  a. The distance between his house and the park is \{small\} \{considerable\}

b. The difference between him and his brother is \{small/slight\} \{considerable\}

(which are presumably reduced reciprocals) does not seem to present any problems of principle. – Note, however, the gap with the 'abstract' verbs represented by (70):

(70) *The difference from him to his brother is great

This may be because different represents both the unmarked (cf. distance) and the positively marked (cf. great distance) predicate in the semantic triple. But it now remains to consider in this light the phenomena considered in §§1 and 3, involving sentences which are both 'stative' and 'non-stative'.

6. No distance

The 'non-stative' near, as in (45), is clearly the 'inchoative' equivalent of the 'stative', that example equalling 'The distance from us to the end is becoming small(er) now'. Notionally verbs like meet and separate are also, in a sense, 'inchoative' congener of the forms we have been discussing. But they are the limiting cases: with meet the distance separating two terms becomes nil, it goes out of existence; with separate it comes into existence. Compare the adjective separate(d) and the verb separate. The former predicates existence of distance; the latter the coming-into-existence of distance.

In this respect they are related as 'progressive aspect' is to the 'inceptive Aktionsart': the progressive predicates existence of an event at a certain time; the inceptive predicates of an event a coming-into-existence (at a certain time). -- See the discussion in Anderson, 1972a: §§IV & VI, 1972b: ch. 7, forthcoming a. We can thus characterize the difference between the verbs meet and separate as in (71a) and (71b) respectively:
Once again (cf. §5) the lower predicate is 'distance', but now there is predicated of it not a relative quality but movement out of (a) or into (b) existence: \( N_e = \text{'existence'}, N_{ne} = \text{'non-existence'} \). Separate the adjective involves a \( V_1 \) lacking the ablative argument in (71b); joined lacks the ablative in (71a).

If we consider now the derivation of sentences with the verb separate as in (72):

(72) It separated from them

It is clear that it is entirely like that we have just sketched out for (68 1.a), starting from (66). It may be delineated as follows in (73 a - c); meet presumably differs in showing subjectivization of the ablative in \( V_2 \) and objectivization of the locative.
The last stage involves the deletion of the existentials: separate is thus the realization of the predicate 'distance' when subjoined to a positively oriented existential V, just as far is its interpretation when subjoined to 'great'.
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