

## DECODING AND ENCODING GRAMMATICAL INFORMATION IN ADJECTIVAL ENTRIES: PROCESSES AND CASES<sup>1</sup>

Joaquín Comesaña Rincón

*Universidad de Sevilla*

In order to create a syntactic adjectival lexicon, the preliminaries suggested in Comesaña (2001) described adjectival entries in terms of their syntactic and semantic potential as likely non-discrete entities. The present study tries to unveil how this non-discreteness can be featured. To achieve this descriptive goal, it will be found that adjectives, as predicative controlling elements in the ascriptive structure (Comesaña 2001: 2), can hold a grammatical (and, analogously, lexicographical) relationship motivated by different processes. These processes will affect the syntactic layout of the sentential structure where the entries are found and, consequently, their configurational patterns. An important definitory part in the account of adjectival entries is also played by the semantics of the arguments called for by that entry. These arguments will be defined according to case labels. These will also offer the possibility for the connection of entries.

### OBJECTIVES

As stated in Comesaña (2001: 1), adjectival entries in current lexicographical productions are mainly featured by a limited potential distribution - namely notional definitions and positional arrangement. This approach reveals itself as insufficient and not very reliable in order to comprehend the inherent potential of adjectival entries. As sketched in the general outline in Comesaña (2001: 1-4), my proposal in this study leads to two important theoretical considerations —in Garrudo's (1991, 1996) fashion again:

a) Adjectival entries and their distribution patterns are not isolated lexicographical entities. Unlike standardly used dictionaries, the lexicon we are aiming at will show that adjectival entries with different syntactic distribution patterns are characterised by their non-discreteness. That is to say, the entries and their corresponding patterns of syntactic behaviour may be interconnected through different processes, (deletion, raising, or reversibility, for instance). These processes

---

<sup>1</sup> This study is presented as the theoretical extension and consequence of Comesaña (2001).

will surely affect the syntactic layout, which confirms their subclassification as homonymous forms in certain cases.

b) The lexicon will also specify how the choice of one lexical entry may also have a semantic effect on the type of elements —semantically arguments or participants— which co-occur with that entry within the ascriptive sentence. The predicative adjective is the controlling element, and as far as one of the controlled arguments is changed this may alter the syntactico-semantic constituency of the sentence and/or its validity as a whole. In other words, the ascriptive sentence where the adjectival entry is found will be analysed in terms of its logical form and the participants involved.

An adjectival entry, then, will embrace not only the syntactic potential of the adjectival form, but it will also depict the semantic internal relationship<sup>2</sup> established between the adjectival predicative controlling form and the other co-occurring sentence elements. All this will be reflected in the use of case labels such as AGENT, LOCATIVE, or EVENTIVE, for example. The case labels used mainly correspond to the ones found in Quirk *et al.* (1985: 740-54). However, as pointed out by Garrudo (1991: xli) in the verbal field, the adjectival lexicon is not a lexicon streamlined on the basis of a casual system. Therefore, case labels will be used when their distinction is methodologically clarifying for the grammatical potential of the adjectival entry or in order to explain differences between entries.

## 1. PROCESSES

### 1.1. Deletion

#### 1.1.1. Deletion of subcategorized completing structures due to the globalised or absolute degree of the adjectival quality (briefly, deletion for absolute adjectival degree)

As pointed out in Comesaña (1992: 85), this process makes reference to the capacity that some gradable adjectival forms have in order to delete their subcategorised completing structures when the individual implied quality of these forms is amplified to the highest degree. In other words, the global —not relativised or partial— quality of the referent is represented or denoted. This scalar amplification is usually carried out by the prototypical adjective intensifier VERY.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup> In fact, this internal relational nature is the one defined by Fillmore: "Within semantics in general, the notion of deep cases is part of what might be called INTERNAL, as opposed to EXTERNAL, semantics; that is, it concerns, not the semantics of truth or entailment or illocutionary force, but rather the semantic nature of the inner structure of a clause. Within internal semantics the concern is SYNTAGMATIC rather than PARADIGMATIC; that is, deep cases are among the types of semantic relations that elements of sentence structures have with each other in context, rather than with the system of contrasts and oppositions that differentiate constituents paradigmatically" (1977: 60).

<sup>3</sup> Although VERY is the prototypical adjective intensifier which triggers this syntactico-semantic distribution, other (quasi-)intensifiers are also likely members to carry it out, as pointed out in Comesaña (1992: 90):

I.a. I am *no end* grateful

This syntactico-semantic characteristic enables us to consider two different related adjectival patterns,<sup>4</sup> one derived from the other. The entries will be related by means of an oriented arrow indicating the adjectival source:

1. *ABLE<sub>1</sub> /Ø/ ADJ<sub>C</sub> ((muy) capaz)<sup>5</sup>*
- ⇐ *ABLE<sub>2</sub> /O/ O* deletion for absolute adjectival degree
- S + V + *ABLE* + (A)
- They are very able students<sup>6</sup>
- He was known as being very able but an ambitious man
  
2. *ABLE<sub>2</sub> /O/ ADJ<sub>C</sub> (capaz DE hacer algo)*
- S + V + *ABLE* + O + (A)
- O = *to*-infinitive
- Will Andre Agassi be able to win a gold medal?
- I don't think I will be able to make it

### 1.1.2. Preposition deletion before *that*-clause or infinitive<sup>7</sup>

It is not infrequent to find syntactic phenomena which affect categories with predicative potential (Adjective, Noun and Verb). One of these phenomena is the obligatory deletion of a subcategorised preposition before a *that*-clause or a *to*-infinitive. This deletion also creates two lexical entries graphically related by means of an oriented arrow indicating the adjectival prepositional source:

---

1.b. He was *always* jealous and envious

This dual characterisation runs parallel to the distinction drawn by Bolinger (1972: 39) who established that adjectival forms pre-intensified by *WELL* are featured by an 'accident' (or relativised) reading, 2.a-b, 3.a-b. This semantic reading has an obligatory completing structure as its syntactic counterpart; on the contrary, an 'essence' (our globalised or absolute) reading, 2.c, 3.c, calls for the use of another pre-intensifier, *VERY*, and does not require any completing structure at the syntactic level (Examples in 2 and 3 are due to Bolinger 1972: 39):

- 2.a. I want a man who is well able to take care of himself
- 2.b. \*I want a man who is well able, cheerful, and a good mixer (an able man)
- 2.c. What is needed is a man who is very able, very cheerful, and a good mixer
- 3.a. George is a lad who is well alert to the possibilities
- 3.b. \*George is a lad who is well alert (an alert fellow)
- 3.c. George is a lad who is very alert

<sup>4</sup> What I am proposing is parallel to what Allerton (1975: 214) named 'indefinite deletion': "In INDEFINITE DELETION, on the other hand, we are faced with an object that is not recoverable, because it has not been thought of and it is not expected that the listener should concern himself with it. If in answer to the question *What's John doing?*, I say "He's reading", the answer is quite self-sufficient and does not require my collocutor to deduce what John is reading".

<sup>5</sup> As stated in Comesaña (2001: 4), since the adjectival lexicon is primarily directed to Spanish speaking users, they will find it useful to have a cross-linguistic characteristic of the adjectival entry by means of an approximate translation.

<sup>6</sup> As for the likely role played by deverbal nouns in syntactic adjectival patterns, see Comesaña (2001: 14, n20).

<sup>7</sup> This type of deletion corresponds to what Allerton (1975: 219) calls 'forbidden-sequence-avoiding deletion': "An element is deleted because it offends against a general law of co-occurrence for the language, like the impossibility of preposition + conjunctive *that* sequences".

3. *CONTENT*<sub>1</sub> /O/ *ADJ*<sub>P</sub> (*conforme/contento CON hacer algo*)  
 ⇐ *CONTENT WITH*<sub>2</sub> /PO/ Preposition deletion before *to*-infinitive  
 S + V + *CONTENT* + O + (A)  
 O = *to*-infinitive  
 Are you content to admit online censorship?  
 He is quite content to accept that money
4. *CONTENT WITH*<sub>2</sub> /PO/ *ADJ*<sub>P</sub> (*conforme/contento CON algo*)  
 S + V + *CONTENT* + *WITH* + PREP O + (A)  
 PREP O = GN  
 I'm afraid that I'm not quite content with your explanations

## 1.2. Ergativity

Within verbal realms, it has been acknowledged that certain verbs have the potential for functioning with and without complementation. The possibility of exchanging their respective completing patterns would end up in non-intended meanings, 5.b, or non-acceptable structures, 6.b. This syntactic versatility has made them be traditionally witnessed as both transitive and intransitive verbs:

- 5.a. John moves the stone  
 5.b. \*John moves  
 6.a. The stone moves  
 6.b. \*The stone moves John

The choice, however, is not motivated on the basis of optionally deleted completing elements, but on the type of Subject adopted by the verb. This causes the expansion of the verb into two different related lexical entries. The relationship held between the lexical entries in the verbal realm is generally known as >ergativity= (Lyons 1968: 352-ff).<sup>8</sup> Along the lines of Cinque (1990: 2),<sup>9</sup> or more recently Stowell (1991), I will maintain that, in parallel fashion to verbal behaviour, there are adjectives that allow the possibility of two different, but related, lexical entries motivated by their different complementation pattern. This double syntactic configuration of these entries with identical lexemic content will be determined by semantic factors. Certain adjectives have the capacity for filling the Subject slot of the ascriptive structure with elements (namely NPs) that have two different semantic roles. This double choice provokes different configurational patterns in accordance with the type of semantic argument selected for the subjective slot. One of the

<sup>8</sup> Garrudo (1991: xlix-ff) prefers the term 'causatividad', although this term embraces much more than simply formal identity.

<sup>9</sup> One general consideration pointing to the existence of ergative adjectives is the fact that there exist adjectives entering the alternation typical of strictly ergative verbs of the *affondare* 'sink' class. Thus alongside pairs like 1.a-b, one finds such pairs as 2.a-b :

- 1.a. Il capitano affondò la nave (*The captain sank the boat*)  
 1.b. La nave affondò (*The boat sank*)  
 2.a. Gianni è certo/sicuro [che verrà] (*G. is certain/sure that I will come*)  
 2.b. [Che verrà] è certo/sicuro (*That I will come is certain/sure*).

syntactic patterns will reveal an intransitive adjectival entry /Ø/ and its ascriptive structure having a Subject with -animate features; on the other hand, the entry having an animate Subject will admit a transitive prepositional pattern /PO/:

7. *FRANK*<sub>1</sub> /Ø/ ADJ<sub>C</sub> ([cosa] *franco, sincero*)  
 ⇐ *FRANK* (*WITH*)<sub>2</sub> /(*PO*)/ Ergativity  
 S + V + *FRANK* + (A)  
 The discussion was frank and open
  
8. *FRANK* (*WITH*)<sub>2</sub> /(*P O*)/ ADJ<sub>C</sub> ([persona] *franco/sincero CON alguien*)  
 S + V + *FRANK* (+ *WITH* + PREP O) + (A)  
 S = NP, typ. AGENT  
 PREP O = NP  
 To be frank with you, I was not there at dawn  
 He was frank when he told you that

### 1.3. Raising

#### 1.3.1. Subject-to-Subject raising

Certain lexical entries of our lexicon will accept a double adjectival functional pattern due to another connecting device known as 'raising'. That is to say, an element (Subject or Object) of a (complex<sup>10</sup>) non-transformed ascriptive sentence can change sentential status by ascending, as it were, from the subordinate (or lower) clause to the main (or higher) clause in order to become its Subject. In a sentence such as the following,

9.a. It is likely that Gore will win the USA elections

LIKELY will be analysed as having an intransitive adjectival pattern /Ø/. This syntactic consideration is originated from a pre-transformed descriptive approach (Garrudo 1988: 275), where syntagmatic changes, such as clausal extraposition, are not accounted for (Comesaña 2001: 9-10):

9.b [That Gore will win the USA elections] is likely

However, in a sentence such as 10,

10. Gore is likely to win the USA elections

we find another syntagmatic possibility, that is, a thematic change of the same adjective LIKELY. This new linear disposition is carried out by a (Subject-to-Subject) raising. *Gore* is no longer the Subject of the original subordinate (*that*-) clause and becomes the thematic Subject of the verb of the main (*to*-infinitive)

<sup>10</sup> 'Complex' in the sense of Quirk *et al.*: "In a complex sentence one or more of its elements, such as direct object or adverbial, are realized by a SUBORDINATE clause" (1985: 719).

clause. This thematic change does not alter the propositional value. *Likely* is still being predicated from the proposition expressed in sentence 9, "Gore will win the USA elections". As a matter of fact, if we look at the different syntactic configurations developed by the homonymous  $LIKELY_{ADVERB}$ , it will be confirmed that the intransitive features of  $LIKELY_{ADJECTIVE}$  are not blurred by syntagmatic alterations:

- 11.a. Gore will (very) likely win the USA elections
- 11.b. Very likely Gore will win the USA elections

In other words, these examples show that  $LIKELY_{ADVERB}$  (and, analogously,  $LIKELY_{ADJECTIVE}$ ) transcends the scope of the personal reference, *i.e.* syntactic personal Subject in an ascriptive environment.  $LIKELY_{ADVERB}$  is a comment on the truth-value of the whole proposition ("Gore will win the USA elections"), as an adverbial disjunct in Quirkian terms (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 620).<sup>11</sup> This syntactico-semantic display enables us to characterise  $LIKELY_{ADJECTIVE}$  bearing an extraposed clausal Subject as intransitive, /Ø/, whereas  $LIKELY_{ADJECTIVE}$  in raised configurations as a 'disjunct' adjectival entry, symbolically represented as /*disjunctive adjective*/. As a consequence, the adjectival lexicon will differentiate between two lexical entries of the same lexeme *LIKELY*. These entries will reveal themselves as thematic alternatives in order to show difference in informative foci and, as a consequence, no relationship of priority or derivation holds between them, this being displayed notationally as  $\Leftrightarrow$ :

- 12.  $LIKELY_1 / \emptyset / ADJ_C$  (*possible*)  
 $\Leftrightarrow$   $LIKELY_2 / \textit{disjunctive adjective}$   
 S + V + *LIKELY* + (A)  
 S = NP/ that-clause  
 It is likely that Gore will win the USA elections  
 That is not a likely story  
 Gore's victory is likely
- 13.  $LIKELY_2 / \textit{disjunctive adjective} / ADJ_P$  (*possible* + cláusula *QUE*)  
 $\Leftrightarrow$   $LIKELY_1 / \emptyset /$  Subject-to-Subject raising  
 S + V + *LIKELY* + *to*-infinitive + (A)  
 Gore is likely to win the USA elections

It is important to notice that not all adjectives within the scope of a likelihood reading behave as *LIKELY* does.<sup>12</sup> Consequently, they will not be accounted for dually in our lexicon. *CERTAIN* or *SURE*, for instance, are parallel to *LIKELY* in

<sup>11</sup> This is also the treatment given to certain modal (non-auxiliary) verbs in Garrudo (1991, 1996). See entries of *APPEAR* 3/4 in his dictionary. *APPEAR* 4 is considered to be an auxiliary disjunct because of its similarity with the content disjunct *CERTAINLY*.

<sup>12</sup> As pointed out by Kiparsky & Kiparsky (1970: 144), being a non-factive predicate is not a semantic feature which, syntactically speaking, must tie in all similar semantic elements such as *LIKELY* or *POSSIBLE*.

their dual functioning. However, DEFINITE (quasi-synonymous with CERTAIN or SURE) and POSSIBLE (straight synonym with LIKELY) do not admit that dual configuration, since they do not admit the promotion or raising of their respective subordinate Subjects:<sup>13</sup>

14. DEFINITE /Ø/ ADJ<sub>C</sub> (*definitivo, seguro* (+ cláusula QUE))

S + V + DEFINITE + (A)

S = NP / *that*-clause

It is definite that the 118 Russian sailors are dead

\*The 118 Russians sailors are definite to be dead

15. POSSIBLE /Ø/ ADJ<sub>C</sub> (*posible* (+ cláusula QUE))

S + V + POSSIBLE + (A)

S = NP / *that*-clause

It is possible that the 118 Russian sailors are dead

\* The 118 Russians sailors are possible to be dead

### 1.3.2. Object-to-Subject raising

Our lexicon will also contain lexical entries related by a different raising process. As previously stated, this process does not imply a propositional change but thematic reordering. This will be notationally reflected by the bidirectional arrow,  $\Leftrightarrow$ . They will show that promotion to Subject from a subordinate clause is not restricted to a lower Subject, but a lower Object can also be raised. As previously stated, this process implies neither the derivation of one entry from another nor a propositional change, but just a thematic reordering. This will be notationally reflected again by the bidirectional arrow:

16. EASY<sub>2</sub> /O/ ADJ<sub>C</sub> (*fácil de llevar a cabo*)

$\Leftrightarrow$  EASY<sub>1</sub> /Ø/ Object-to-Subject raising

S + V + EASY + O + (A)

O = *to*-infinitive

The solution to the problem is easy to find<sup>14</sup>

<sup>13</sup> Bolinger (1961: 377-78) holds the opinion that an individual, not dual, adjectival configuration is motivated by the gravitational effect the passive voice exercises on this set of adjectives. This is shown in a gradient ranging from truly passive structures (5.a-b) to really adjectival ones reminiscent of a passive origin (6.a-b). In between we find: (1) versatile adjectives such as CERTAIN or SURE (semantically akin to those representing both the extremes of the gradient) which admit a dual characterisation: (a) as personal orientation modifiers —passive-like behaviour—, in 7.a-b; (b) as non-personal orientation modifiers, 7.a-b; (2) adjectives with only one type of orientation, non-personal (DEFINITE, POSSIBLE or LIKELY); (3) other adjectives, 8.a-b, which only admit a personal characterisation in a mimetic behaviour to those morphologically related to a passive origin (Examples 5-8 are due to Bolinger):

5.a. He is condemned to suffer

5.b. He is forced to suffer

6.a. He is bound to suffer

6.b. I am minded to agree with you

7.a. He is certain to suffer

7.b. He is sure to suffer

7.a. It is certain that he will suffer

7.b. It is sure that he will suffer

8.a. He is apt to suffer

8.b. He is liable to suffer

<sup>14</sup> The transitive configuration of EASY<sub>2</sub> leads us to a further theoretical and well-founded consideration.

That was an easy task

17. *EASY*<sub>1</sub> /Ø/ ADJ<sub>p</sub>  
 ⇔ *EASY*<sub>2</sub> /O/ Object-to-Subject raising  
 S + V + *EASY* + (A)  
 S = *that*-clause  
 It is easy to find the solution to the problem

#### 1.4. Reciprocity

So far, lexical entries have been connected through different configurational or possibilities of distribution patterns. This process will also make two possibilities of distribution be related. This relation, however, will be witnessed under the same lexical entry, due to the special syntactico-semantic load inherent to the lexical entry. Reciprocity, then, will be understood as the "built-in component" (Payne 1997: 200) of certain adjectival entries which indicates the mutual relation 'R' held between two non-co-referent<sup>15</sup> variables 'a', 'b'. That is to say, this mutual relation grants that a change in the (linear) direction of the relation provokes no alteration in the relation itself: 'a' 'R' 'b' = 'b' 'R' 'a', as can be seen in examples in 18:

- 18.a. On critical issues, Bush is different from Gore  
 18.b. On critical issues, Gore is different from Bush

The syntactic consequence of this mutual (semantic) relation is the inherent distribution potential the adjectival entry acquires. In other words, reciprocity makes it possible to view the Subject slot in the ascriptive sentence as having the capacity to house the two variables maintaining the reciprocal relationship:

- 18.c. On critical issues, Bush and Gore are different<sup>16</sup>

As an inherent feature of certain adjectival entries, reciprocity, then, makes it possible to have two simultaneous distribution patterns for the same lexical entry. The first pattern will reflect the non-transformed thematic disposition of the variables, /PO/ corresponding to 18.a-b; the second will correspond to the transformed thematic disposition where the plural Subject embraces the variables of

---

*EASY* and its following infinitival structure can become an atomic entity and behave as a compound unit. This unity is usually typographically represented through joining hyphens. As such it would admit normal attributive distribution, for example, in sentence 9: It is an easy-to-find solution. This is the standpoint established by Nanni (1980: 574). This author classifies adjectives such as *EASY*, *HARD*, *TOUGH*, *DIFFICULT*, *SIMPLE* (her *easy*-type adjectives) not as simple linguistic entities, but as entities which have a compound-like status due to their syntactic distribution: "The complex adjective proposal not only accounts for the prenominal occurrence of such *A-to-V* sequences, but also permits certain other peculiarities to be explained. The central claim made by this proposal is that prenominal sequences like *easy to take* and *hard to find* are single lexical items of the category 'Adjective'".

<sup>15</sup> Co-reference would imply a reflexive relationship.

<sup>16</sup> It is important to remember that the syntactico-semantic features of reciprocal adjectives call for two variables. The absence of one of these variables makes the syntactic distribution inviable: \*On critical issues, Bush is different from.



the reciprocal relationship, symbolically /Ø/.<sup>17</sup> This double distributional pattern under the same lexical entry prevents the lexical entry from a real intransitive categorisation.

18.d. *DIFFERENT FROM/TO /PO/ /Ø/* Reciprocal ADJ<sub>C</sub> (*diferente DE*)

/PO/: S1 + V + *DIFFERENT* + *FROM/TO* + S2 + (A)

/Ø/: S1 + S2 + V + *DIFFERENT* + (A)

On critical issues, Gore is different from Bush

On critical issues, Bush and Gore are different

Bush and Gore are different politicians

19. *AKIN TO /PO/ /Ø/* Reciprocal ADJ<sub>P</sub> (*parecido A*)

/PO/: S1 + V + *AKIN* + *TO* + S2 + (A)

/Ø/: S1 + S2 + V + *AKIN* + (A)

The profound mysteries in the cosmos are akin to the abysmal mysteries in the sea

The mysteries of the cosmos and the sea are akin

Adjectival entries lacking in this reciprocal feature can also manage to express a reciprocal relationship through an analytical strategy (*each other* or *one another*), but our adjectival lexicon will not account for that non-inherent reciprocal feature:

20.a. Peter is proud of Mary and Mary is proud of Peter

20.b. Peter and Mary are proud of *each other*

### 1.5. Reversibility

Certain adjectival forms—specifically prepositional adjectival forms—display the capacity for allowing the permutation of some elements of the ascriptive sentence, Subject and the Complement of the subcategorised preposition.<sup>18</sup> This permutation goes hand in hand with the display of a change in the preposition and different syntactico-semantic implications. This process motivates the creation of related homonymous lexical entries, whose relation will not be oriented in terms of precedence or derivation. In the lexical entry, this non-oriented relation will be symbolically represented as  $\Leftrightarrow$ :

21. *ABUNDANT*<sub>1</sub> /A/ ADJ<sub>P</sub> (*abundante EN algún lugar*)

$\Leftrightarrow$  *ABUNDANT WITH*<sub>2</sub> /PO/ Reversibility

S + V + *ABUNDANT* + A + (A)

A = ADV / PP, typ. LOCATIVE

<sup>17</sup> When the adjective conflates in Subject position the elements holding the reciprocal relation, the preposition FROM is not operative at thematic level: \*On critical issues, Bush and Gore are different from.

<sup>18</sup> Salkoff (1983: 289) also labelled this process as 'transposition'. This author, however, devoted his insightful article to this type of process within the verbal realms (but see 298-99): "The defining criterion of this phenomenon is the apparent transposition of the two noun classes associated with the verb—each appears as subject in one form, but as prepositional complement in the other".

It is said that bananas are abundant in the Canaries

22. *ABUNDANT WITH<sub>2</sub> /PO/ADJ<sub>P</sub> (rico EN)*

⇔ *ABUNDANT<sub>1</sub> /A/* Reversibility

S + V + *ABUNDANT* + *WITH* + PREP O + (A)

S = NP, typ. LOCATIVE

The Canaries are said to be abundant with bananas

23. *HEAVY ON<sub>1</sub> /PO/ADJ<sub>P</sub> (pesado/grande PARA)*

⇔ *HEAVY WITH<sub>2</sub> /PO/* Reversibility

S + V + *HEAVY* + *ON* + PREP O + (A)

PREP O = NP, typ. LOCATIVE

(Typ. PREP O = sb's shoulders)

Her duties are not supposed to be heavy on her shoulders

24. *HEAVY WITH<sub>2</sub> /PO/ADJ<sub>P</sub> (apesadumbrado CON)*

⇔ *HEAVY ON<sub>1</sub> /PO/* Reversibility

S + V + *HEAVY* + *WITH* + PREP O + (A)

S = NP, typ. LOCATIVE

Her shoulders are heavy with duties

## 2. CASES

Like the other categories (namely, Verb or Noun) with the potential for functioning predicatively, the predicative adjective, as the controlling element in its ascriptive structure, is also considered to have the potential for assigning a case to the participants (semantically, arguments) which conform the aforementioned structure (Cook 1989: 200-ff). The adjectival entries in our dictionary, then, will account for the type of participants involved. This distinction is mainly carried out in order to differentiate related entries and/or to clarify their syntactic patterns.

### 2.1. Agent

The distinction of this case in the adjectival realm runs parallel to the classical distinction between stative and non-stative adjectival forms (Lakoff 1966). Among other syntactic features, the former admit progressive and imperative<sup>19</sup> structures and semantically make a description of how someone acts, that is, they admit an animate participant that consciously takes part in the activity implied; whereas the latter clearly reject these syntactico-semantic possibilities:

25. *CAREFUL (ABOUT/IN/OF/WITH) /(PO)/ADJ<sub>C</sub> (cuidadoso CON)*

<sup>19</sup> Certain adjectival entries whose semantic structure does not house an Agent participant will also admit an imperative structure under which a condition can be encountered:

11. *POPULAR (AMONG/WITH) /(PO)/ADJ<sub>C</sub> (famoso, popular)*

S + V + *POPULAR (AMONG/WITH)* + PREP O + (A)

PREP O = GN, typ. EXPERIENCER or LOCATIVE

Be popular and you'll be criticised (= If you become popular, you'll be criticised)

S + V + *CAREFUL* (+ *ABOUT/IN/OF/WITH* + PREP O) + (A)  
 S = NP, typ. AGENT  
 PREP O = NP / *-ing* clause  
 Be *CAREFUL*, will you?  
 I don't think she's being careful with the project  
 Careful!

26. *NAUGHTY* /Ø/ ADJ<sub>C</sub> (*travieso*)  
 S + V + *NAUGHTY* + (A)  
 S = NP, typ. AGENT  
 Children are being naughty these days  
 Don't be naughty, please

## 2.2. Beneficiary

The use of this case label is not meant to indicate a referent viewed as an intended recipient or referent on behalf of whom the action is carried out.<sup>20</sup> In general, adjectives are not characterised by denoting actions but qualities. This case refers to the participant role expressed through the NP housed in the Prepositional Phrase subcategorised by the adjectival entry. It indicates the person on behalf of whom the quality denoted by the adjective applies. This case will be clearly expressed as far as the semantic reading of the entry conveys attitudes, situations or behaviours which are beneficial to (or have adverse effects for) someone:

27. *BENEFICIAL*<sub>1</sub> /Ø/ ADJ<sub>C</sub> (*beneficioso*)  
 ⇐ *BENEFICIAL TO*<sub>2</sub> /PO/ PO deletion for absolute adjectival degree  
 S + V + *BENEFICIAL* + (A)  
 I don't understand why some people say that smoking is beneficial  
 He has signed a beneficial contract

28. *BENEFICIAL TO*<sub>2</sub> /PO/ ADJ<sub>C</sub> (*beneficioso PARA*)  
 S + V + *BENEFICIAL* + *TO* + PREP O + (A)  
 PREP O = NP, typ. BENEFICIARY  
 I don't understand why some people say that smoking is beneficial to people's health

<sup>20</sup> In linguistic literature the label 'recipient' (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 741; or Downing & Locke 1992: 86-87) is used in the description of situations where an action is expressed. However, there are situations where neither action or agent is expressed, but someone benefits from the whole situation. Echoing Chafe, in:

- 7.a. Tom has (or Tom's got) the tickets.  
 7.b. Tom has (or Tom's got) a convertible.  
 7.c. Tom owns a convertible.

"[o]bviously ...Tom does not reflect a semantic agent.... On the other hand, there are reasons for thinking that Tom is not an experiencer either. No mental experience or disposition on Tom's part is involved in these sentences. Instead, there is a kind of 'benefactive' situation in which Tom can be said (in a broad sense) to be the one who benefits from whatever is communicated by the rest of the sentence. I shall call the verb in such a sentence a *benefactive* verb, and the noun which specifies the person benefited I shall call its *beneficiary*" (1970: 147).

29. *CRUEL*<sub>1</sub> /∅/ ADJ<sub>C</sub> (*cruel*)  
 ⇐ *CRUEL TO*<sub>2</sub> /*PO*/ *PO* deletion for absolute adjectival degree  
 S + V + *CRUEL* + (A)  
 S = NP, typ. AGENT  
 He is very cruel
30. *CRUEL TO*<sub>2</sub> /*PO*/ ADJ<sub>C</sub> (*cruel CON*)  
 S + V + *CRUEL* + *TO* + PREP O + (A)  
 S = NP, typ. AGENT  
 PREP O = NP, typ. BENEFICIARY  
 He is cruel to his children

### 2.3. Eventive

This label makes reference to the state of affairs whose simple existence is restricted to temporal boundaries (ANNIVERSARY, BIRTHDAY, RESPONSE, WELCOME, etc) and to which the quality expressed by the adjective is applied. The participant tinged with this semantic feature is syntactically developed as Subject or Adverbial of the ascriptive sentence:

31. *CHILLY*<sub>1</sub> /∅/ ADJ<sub>C</sub> (*frio, hostil*)  
 S + V + *CHILLY* + (A)  
 S = NP, typ. EVENTIVE  
 The reception I had was really chilly  
 A chilly welcome we had indeed
32. *CHILLY*<sub>2</sub> /∅/ ADJ<sub>C</sub> (*frio, que hace frío*)  
 S + V + *CHILLY* + (A)  
 S = NP, typ. EVENTIVE or LOCATIVE  
 I am afraid today is going to be chilly again  
 This room is chilly
33. *CHILLY*<sub>3</sub> /∅/ ADJ<sub>C</sub> (*frio*)  
 S + V + *CHILLY* + (A)  
 S = NP, exclusively AMBIENT *IT*  
 (A) = ADVP/ NP typ. EVENTIVE or LOCATIVE  
 It is chilly in this room  
 It is chilly today

### 2.4. Ambient 'it'

This label is not usually considered to be a genuine member of the list of case labels recognised in a case grammar matrix.<sup>21</sup> This may be due to the fact that *it* does

<sup>21</sup> Cook (1989: 191-92) distinguishes only five cases: Agent, Experiencer, Benefactive, Object and Locative. More recently, in his typological study of cases, Palmer (1994: 8-ff) distinguishes the two most important, Agent and Patient, and three subroles Beneficiary, Instrumental and Locative. In neither author is there a

not refer to a tangible entity or participant, semantically speaking. However, *it* really has a referential function. *It* exclusively refers to what Chafe (1970: 101) named *ambient* or, according to Bolinger (1977: 78), the *environment*.<sup>22</sup> On the other hand, *it* is generally viewed as a mere Subject slot filler and, as such, simply almost void of any semantic load (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 748). However, its distinction as a special case label is necessary. *It* has syntactic repercussions in the distinction of adjectival syntactic patterns, especially when *it* reveals itself as a syntactic alternative to LOCATIVE or EVENTIVE Subjects. This alternation conveys different syntactic distribution patterns:

34. *HOT*<sub>1</sub> /Ø/ ADJ<sub>C</sub> (*caluroso*)  
 S + V + *HOT* + (A)  
 S = NP, typ. LOCATIVE or EVENTIVE  
 Seville is very hot  
 Next week will be very hot
35. *HOT*<sub>2</sub> /Ø/ ADJ<sub>C</sub> (*caluroso; que hace calor* (EN + Grupo Nominal LOCATIVO))  
 S + V + *HOT* + (A)  
 S = NP, exclusively AMBIENT *it*  
 (A) = ADVP/PP, typ. LOCATIVE  
 It is very hot in Seville  
 We spent a hot summer in Seville  
 It is (very) hot<sup>23</sup>
36. *WINDY*<sub>1</sub> /Ø/ ADJ<sub>C</sub> (*ventoso*)  
 S + V + *WINDY* + (A)  
 S = NP, typ. LOCATIVE or EVENTIVE  
 Chicago is windy
37. *WINDY*<sub>2</sub> /Ø/ ADJ<sub>C</sub> (*ventoso; hacer viento* (EN + Grupo Nominal LOCATIVO))  
 S + V + *WINDY* + A + (A)  
 S = NP, exclusively AMBIENT *it*  
 (A) = ADVP/PP, typ. LOCATIVE  
 It is windy in Chicago  
 Chicago is known as 'the windy city'

---

mention of 'ambient *it*' as case role.

<sup>22</sup> This label was introduced by Chafe (1970: 101-02) and later used and developed in its grammatical implications especially by Bolinger (1973) and Bolinger (1977).

<sup>23</sup> The Adverbial is not made explicit because it is predictable from the situational context: Switch on the air-conditioner. It is hot (in here).

## 2.5. Locative

As previously displayed, certain adjectival entries are characterised by the presence of a participant that refers to the idea of location. This semantic idea can be unveiled in the obligatory Subject position (example 38), or in the typical Adverbial slot (examples 39 and 40):

38. *COLD*<sub>1</sub> /∅/ ADJ<sub>C</sub> (*frio*)  
 S + V + *COLD* + (A)  
 S = NP, typ. LOCATIVE or EVENTIVE  
 Newcastle is cold  
 The morning is getting cold
39. *COLD*<sub>2</sub> /∅/ ADJ<sub>C</sub> (*que hace frío* + Grupo Nominal LOCATIVO)  
 S + V + *COLD* + A + (A)  
 S = NP, exclusively AMBIENT *it*  
 (A) = ADVP/PP, typ. LOCATIVE  
 It is cold in Newcastle  
 It is cold<sup>24</sup>
40. *PREVALENT* /A/ ADJ<sub>C</sub> (*predominante EN*)  
 S + V + *PREVALENT* + A + (A)  
 A = ADVP/GP, typ. LOCATIVE  
 Prostate cancer is prevalent in men who are in their 60s or 70s.

## 2.6. Recipient

This label makes reference to the semantic argument which appears as Subject with stative adjectives. The semantic reading of these adjectives expresses the idea of sensory perceptions (*BLIND*, *DEAF*, *HOT*, *WARM*), cognition (*DOUBTFUL ABOUT*, *FORGETFUL OF*), emotions and mental states (*ANXIOUS FOR*, *FOND OF*):

41. *BLIND* /∅/ ADJ<sub>C</sub> (*ciego, que no puede ver*)  
 S + V + *BLIND* + (A)  
 S = NP, typ. RECIPIENT  
 He can't see. He is blind
42. *CHILLY*<sub>4</sub> /∅/ ADJ<sub>P</sub> (*frio*)  
 S + V + *CHILLY* + (A)  
 S = NP, typ. RECIPIENT  
 Do you feel chilly? If so, come near the fire
43. *FAMILIAR WITH*<sub>3</sub> /PO/ ADJ<sub>P</sub> (*conocedor DE, familiarizado CON*)  
 ⇔ *FAMILIAR TO*<sub>2</sub> /PO/ Reversibility

<sup>24</sup> See previous note.

S + V + *FAMILIAR* + *WITH* + PREP O + (A)

S = NP, typ. RECIPIENT

Are you familiar with Unix?<sup>25</sup>

44. *FORGETFUL*<sub>1</sub> /Ø/ ADJ<sub>C</sub> (*desmemoriado, olvidadizo*)

S + V + *FORGETFUL* + (A)

S = NP, typ. RECIPIENT

Although she is eighty, she is not forgetful<sup>26</sup>

This role is not restricted to Subject position. It can also be seen in the home territory of subcategorised PP's, especially *TO* + NP (*OBVIOUS TO, PLEASANT TO*). In these cases, the adjectival forms need not be stative always:

45. *OBVIOUS (TO)* /(*PO*)/ ADJ<sub>C</sub> (*claro/obvio PARA*)

S + V + *OBVIOUS* (+ *TO* + PREP O) + (A)

S = NP / *Wh*-clause / *that*-clause

PREP O = NP, typ. RECIPIENT

What she tried to do was obvious (to us)

46. *PLEASANT (TO)* /(*PO*)/ ADJ<sub>C</sub> (*agradable CON*)

S + V + *PLEASANT* (+ *TO* + PREP O) + (A)

S = NP, typ. AGENT

PREP O = NP, typ. RECIPIENT

Try to be more pleasant (to your mother), will you?

This non-subjective position will occasionally provide us with the opportunity to create different but related lexical entries. Their relationship will be established on the corresponding different syntactic disposition of the argument featuring the recipient role. That is to say, their distribution is based on reversible syntactic grounds:<sup>27</sup>

43. *FAMILIAR WITH*<sub>3</sub> /*PO*/ ADJ<sub>P</sub> (*conocedor DE, familiarizado CON*)

⇔ *FAMILIAR TO*<sub>2</sub> /*PO*/ Reversibility

S + V + *FAMILIAR* + *WITH* + PREP O + (A)

S = NP, typ. RECIPIENT

Are you familiar with Unix?

<sup>25</sup> This adjectival form has a homonymous entry in

13. *FAMILIAR (WITH)*<sub>1</sub> /(*PO*)/ ADJ<sub>P</sub> ([sentido negativo] *demasiado amistoso*)

S + V + *FAMILIAR* (+ *WITH* + PREP O) + (A)

S = NP, typ. AGENT

She told him: "Hands off, Don't be so familiar (with my wife)!"

<sup>26</sup> This adjectival form has a homonymous entry in

14. *FORGETFUL OF*<sub>2</sub> /*PO*/ ADJ<sub>P</sub> (*descuidado CON*)

S + V + *FORGETFUL* + *OF* + PREP O + (A)

S = NP, typ. AGENT

PREP O = NP

He is always being forgetful of his duties

<sup>27</sup> This reversibility potential was also pointed out by Postal (1970: 39) in his *psych*-movement rule.

47. *FAMILIAR TO<sub>2</sub> /PO/ ADJ<sub>C</sub> (conocido PARA)*  
 $\Leftrightarrow$  *FAMILIAR WITH<sub>3</sub> /PO/ Reversibility*  
 S + V + *FAMILIAR* + *TO* + PREP O + (A)  
 PREP O = NP, typ. RECIPIENT  
 Unix is familiar to me. I know how to manage it

In our adjectival lexicon, this role exchange will only be accounted for between homonymous forms. It will not be recorded when the exchange is carried out between morphologically-related but non-homonymous lexemes:

48. *AMUSED AT /PO/ ADJ<sub>C</sub> (encantado CON)*  
 S + V + *AMUSED* + *AT* + PREP O + (A)  
 S = NP, typ. RECIPIENT  
 We were amused at her performance
49. *AMUSING (TO) / (PO) / ADJ<sub>C</sub> (distráido PARA)*  
 S + V + *AMUSING* (+ *TO* + PREP O) + (A)  
 S = NP, typ. AGENT  
 PREP O = NP, typ. RECIPIENT  
 Her performance was amusing to us

### 3. FINAL REMARKS

The theoretical framework exhibited in the present study, along the lines of Garrudo (1991, 1996), leads to several final considerations: (i) the main goal is to favour the development of an adjectival lexicon where the grammatical information of adjectives is more refined and effective for non-native language learners than the one found in current dictionaries; (ii) the adjectival entry in that lexicon, as the controlling predicative unit of an ascriptive structure, calls for specific structural arrangements, on the one hand, and at times distinct semantic roles regarding the participants involved, on the other; (iii) the arrangements are validated and guaranteed by certain processes (deletion, ergativity, raising, reciprocity, reversibility); (iv) furthermore, these processes are also the key to the connection between certain identical entries; (v) the semantic roles distinguished (Agent, Beneficiary, Eventive, Ambient 'it', Locative, Recipient) are factors which will also enhance the quality and quantity of the intervening and defining grammatical values of adjectival entries.

### REFERENCES

- Allerton, D.J. 1975: "Deletion and Proform Reduction". *Journal of Linguistics* 11: 213-37.
- Bolinger, D. 1961: "Syntactic Blends and other Matters". *Language* 37: 366-81.



- 1972: *Degree Words*. The Hague: Mouton.
- 1973: "Ambient It Is Meaningful Too". *Journal of Linguistics* 9: 261-70.
- 1977: *Meaning and Form*. London: Longman.
- Chafe, W.L. 1970: *Meaning and the Structure of Language*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cinque, G. 1990: "Ergative Adjectives and the Lexicalist Hypothesis". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 8: 1-39.
- Comesaña R., J. 1992: "Notas a una Pseudo-Conversion Sintáctica en Inglés. Adjetivos Pseudo(-in-)Transitivos II". *Revista Española de Lingüística Aplicada* 8: 85-90.
- 2001: "Decoding and Encoding Grammatical Information in Adjectival Entries: The Basics". *Atlantis* 23.1: 27-40.
- Cook, W.A.C.S.J. 1989: *Case Grammar Theory*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Downing, A. and P. Locke 1992: *A University Course in English Grammar*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Fillmore, C. 1977: "The Case for Case Reopened". *Syntax and Semantics 8. Grammatical Relations*. Eds. P. Cole and J.M. Sadock. New York: Academic Press. 59-81.
- Garrudo, F. 1988: "Análisis y Estructuración de Modelos de Complementación Verbal en Inglés: Un Nuevo Código más Simple e Informativo". *Proceedings from the Fifth National Meeting of AESLA*: 273-86.
- 1991, 1996: *Diccionario Sintáctico del Verbo Inglés*. 2 vols. Barcelona: Ariel.
- Kiparsky, P. and C. Kiparsky 1970: "Fact". *Progress in Linguistics*. The Hague: Mouton. Eds. M. Bierwisch and K.E. Heidolph. 143-173.
- Lakoff, G. 1966: "Stative Adjectives and Verbs in English". *Mathematical Linguistics and Automatic Translation*. Report No NSF-17, Section I, Harvard Computation Laboratory. Cambridge, Mass. 1-16.
- Lyons, J. 1968: *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nanni, D. 1980: "On the Surface Syntax of Constructions with *Easy*-type Adjectives". *Language* 6: 568-81.
- Palmer, F. 1994: *Grammatical Roles and Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Payne, T.E. 1997: *Describing Morphosyntax. A Guide for Field Linguists*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Postal, P. 1970: *Cross-Over Phenomena*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Quirk, R., S. Greenbaum, G. Leech, J. Svartvik 1985: *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.

- Salkoff, M. 1983: "Bees Are Swarming in the Garden". *Language* 59: 288-346.
- Stowell, T. 1991: "The Alignment of Arguments in Adjective Phrases". *Syntax and Semantics. Vol. 25: Perspectives on Phrase Structure: Heads and Licensing*. Ed. S.D. Rothstein. San Diego: Academic Press. 105-35.

