

KINDS OF ADNOMINALS: ADJECTIVES, NOUNS, AND IN BETWEEN

Part I:

Adnominal properties: Chaos or order?
Frans Plank (Konstanz)

Part II:

Anchoring vs. non-anchoring adnominals and their properties
Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (Stockholm)

decades-long work in (imperceptible, if any) progress

Mission statement:

We examine a representative selection of adnominals from a wide range of languages whose word-class is in between those of prototypical adjectives and prototypical nouns. Our aim is to determine whether the differences between them are **random** or **orderly**. (We have already determined that the difference between adjectival and nominal adnominals isn't categorical.)

The differences are orderly to the extent that individual morphological, syntactic, and semantic properties of adnominals turn out **not to vary independently**; this suggests implicational relations between them. On the evidence that we have, we suggest that the difference of adjectival and nominal adnominals is indeed an orderly continuum. Knowing a pair of crucial properties of any adnominal anywhere – that pair which is at the transition point of adjectival and nominal properties – virtually all others are predictable.

Example:

In English, *royal* in *the royal concubines* is an adnominal that is clearly an adjective while *king's* in *the king's concubines* is equally clearly a noun – to mention only some properties, relevant for English, distinguishing them:

INTERNAL MORPHOLOGY AND SYNTAX

(1) adjectival adnominals, when non-basic, are **derivational** forms (perhaps suppletively so, such as *royal* instead of *king-ly*) while nominal ones are **inflectional** forms (with the genitive perhaps the prototypical case for this purpose) or forms in syntactic construction with words (perhaps clitic ones) marking their adnominal function;

(2) adjectival adnominals take adjectival **derivational morphology** (including gradation) while nominal ones take nominal derivational morphology (*the un-royal/un-happy concubines, the ex-king's/*un-king's concubines*).

(3) adjectival adnominals show no **number opposition** for themselves while nominal ones do (*the king's/kings' concubines*, or, more audibly, *the child's/children's father*);

(4) adjectival adnominals do not show a **definiteness** opposition for themselves while nominal ones do (*the/a king's concubines*);

(5) adjectival adnominals are **modified by adverbs** (*the eminently royal concubines*) while nominal ones are **modified by adjectives** (*the eminent king's concubines*);

(6) adjectival adnominals cannot normally take other typically nominal **dependents**, in particular ones including an NP, while nominal ones can, allowing recursion (*Bavaria's king's concubines*);

(8) in non-subordinate constructions such as complex proper names, apposition, or coordination, adjectival adnominals combine with adjectives while nominal adnominals combine with nominals (**the royal Ludwig's/King Ludwig's concubines; the royal and ducal/*the duke's concubines; the king's and the duke's/*ducal concubines*);

EXTERNAL MORPHOLOGY AND SYNTAX

(10) adjectival adnominals do not **induce definiteness** on the NPs containing them while nominal ones do (*the king's concubine* = 'the / *a concubine of the king'), although there are uses where they don't (*This country is a fools' paradise*);

MEANING / FUNCTION

(11) adjectival adnominals are **referent-modifying** expressions, answering to the questions "what kind of?" and "which?", while nominal adnominals are themselves **referring** expressions, answering to the question "whose?" (but simultaneously they may also modify, insofar as they answer to "which?", although not to "what kind of?");

(12) adjectival adnominals are not available for **cross-reference** while nominal ones are (*the *royal/king's concubines eloped with his [i.e. the king's] majordomo*);

(13) adjectival adnominals express **relations** such as human propensity, physical property, dimension / form, colour, value / quality, age, duration, kind, or material, not necessarily including that of possession, while the relations expressed by nominal adnominals include those of possession and of subject and object (with nominalizations).

[English adnominals in *-al/-ly* do permit possessive and subjective / objective readings: *ancestral house* 'house owned by the ancestors', *parental love*; but they are not freely interchangeable with genitives: *the king's/*royal removal from the throne*, *the king's/*royal mother-in-law*. The genitive can be used to express meanings such as duration: *a day's journey*]

Showing NP-internal agreement, the German translation equivalents of the English examples allow us to add two further distinctions.

INTERNAL SYNTAX/MORPHOLOGY

(7) adjectival adnominals do not control **agreement in gender** (or class or animacy), number, or case should words capable of agreeing in such categories be able to accompany them (none are in German), while nominal adnominals do act as agreement controllers for such categories (*die Konkubinen d-es früher-en Königs* 'the-MASC.SG.GEN former-MASC.SG.GEN king's concubines').

EXTERNAL SYNTAX/MORPHOLOGY

(9) adjectival adnominals agree with their heads in the relevant categories of NP-internal agreement, such as gender (class, animacy), number, or case, while nominal adnominals do not (or, if they do, they agree in categories that include person) (*den königlich-en Konkubinen* 'the kingly-FEM.PL.NOM concubines', *den Konkubinen des Königs*).

But not all adnominals, in these two languages and elsewhere, are instances of these two polar types.

In English, for example, adnominals in *-ian* based on proper names, as in *the Shakespearian tragedies*, are predominantly adjectival but they share at least two properties with nouns: if pressed, they permit a **referring** use in addition to a perhaps more common referent-modifying one (*Whose tragedies are longer, the Shakespearian or the Marlovian ones?* – which is more or less equivalent to: *Shakespeare's or Marlowe's*), and when used referringly they are available for **cross-reference** (*the Shakespearian tragedies weren't written by him but by Marlowe*).

In German, adnominals in *-sch*, also limited to proper names (unlike *-isch*), behave analogously, and they in addition **agree** with their heads in true adjectival manner (*die Shakespearschen Tragödien*).

More examples

	<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>g</i>	<i>h</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>j</i>	<i>k</i>	<i>l</i>	<i>z</i>
(10)	A	A	A	A	Ø	Ø	A	A	Ø	?			AN
(9)	A	Ø	A	Ø	A	A	A	A	A	A			N
(2)	A	A	A	A	A	A	a	a	a	A			N
(1)	A	A	A	A	A	A	N	N	a	N			N
(8)	A	A	A	A	A	AN	?	?	AN	N			N
(4)	A	A	A	A	Ø	Ø	A	N	n	?			N
(7)	A	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø	A	A	N	N	N?			N
(3)	A	A	A	A	n	A	n	n	n	N			N
(6)	A	A	A	A	A	n	A	N	N	N			N
(5)	A	A	A	A	A	A	N	N	N	?			N
(12)	A	A	An	An	N	AN	N?	N?	N	N?			N
(11)	A	A	An	An	N	AN	N?	N?	N	N			N
(13)	An	An	AN	An	AN	AN	AN	AN	AN	AN			aN

key:

- N eminently nominal
- n more nominal than adjectival
- a more adjectival than nominal
- A eminently adjectival
- NA alternatively eminently nominal or eminently adjectival
- na alternatively more nominal than adjectival or more adjectival than nominal
- Ø inapplicable
- ? unclear or no information

adnominals examined (columns – ordered so as to suggest an orderly transition from adjectival / left to nominal / right adnominals):

- a* German *-lich*
- b* English *-al, -ly*
- c* German *-sch* with proper names
- d* English *-ian* with proper names
- e* Russian *-ov/-in*
- f* Latin *-i, -ān, -īl*
- g* German Romany *-kər/-gər*
- h* Kelderash Romany *-k*
- i* Upper Sorbian *-ow/-in/-yn*
- j* Ancient Anatolian Indo-European "genitival adjectives / adjectival genitives"
- z* English 's ("genitive")

properties considered (lines – ordered so as to suggest which properties are interrelated in the transition from fully adjectival to fully nominal; though no perfect Guttman Scale, there is some order rather than complete chaos):

INTERNAL MORPHOLOGY AND SYNTAX

- (1a) The adnominal is formed either on a more or on a less productive pattern.
- (1b) The adnominal is formed either more or less regularly, in conformity or non-conformity to the paradigm of other relational marking.
- (2) The adnominal may undergo derivation characteristic either of basic nouns or of basic adjectives.
- (3) The adnominal either has or lacks a number opposition for itself.
- (4) The adnominal either has or lacks a definiteness opposition for itself.
- (5) The adnominal permits modification either by adjectives or by adverbs.
- (6) The adnominal either takes or does not take determiners such as articles, demonstratives, possessives, and other typically nominal dependents.
- (7) The adnominal either controls or does not control agreement in gender (or class or animacy), number, or case should words capable of agreeing in such categories be able to accompany them.
- (8) The adnominal combines either with nominals or with adjectives in non-subordinate constructions such as proper-name sequences, apposition, or coordination.

EXTERNAL MORPHOLOGY AND SYNTAX

- (9) The adnominal either does not agree or agrees with its head in the relevant categories of NP-internal agreement, such as gender (class, animacy), number, or case.
- (10) The adnominal either induces or does not induce definiteness on the NP containing it.

MEANING AND FUNCTION

- (11) The adnominal either is a referring expression, answering to the question "whose?" (but simultaneously it also modifies, insofar as it answers to "which?", although not to "what kind of?"), or it is a referent-modifying expressions, answering to the questions "what kind of?" and "which?".
- (12) The adnominal either is or is not available for cross-reference.
- (13) The adnominal either expresses relations that include those of possession and of subject and object (with nominalizations) or it expresses relations such as human propensity, physical property, dimension/form, colour, value/quality, age, duration, kind, or material, not necessarily including that of possession.

Latin *-i*, *-ān*, and *-īl*

- (9) A agree with heads in gender, number, case
(11) N referential rather than referent-modifying (doesn't mean: 'a wife appropriate for someone like Turpilius' or 'a wife in the manner of Turpilius', but answers the question 'Whose wife?')

Turpīl-i-a

uxor

Turpilius-ADN-FEM.SG.NOM wife_{FEM} (SG.NOM)

'Turpilius's wife'

- (8) N may combine with nominal in complex name

ex Anni-ān-ā

Milōn-is

dom-ō

from Annius-ADN-FEM.SG.ABL Milo-SG.GEN house_{FEM}-SG.ABL

'from Annius Milo's house'

- (6) N take typical nominal dependent, viz. possessive pronoun

- (7) A do not control gender-number-case agreement of this dependent

me-am

er-īl-em

concubīn-am

my-**FEM**.SG.ACC master_{MASC}-ADN-FEM.SG.ACC concubine_{FEM}-ACC.SG

'my master's concubine'

(11) AN are referring (with proper names and also with common nouns as bases), but may also be referent-modifying

domus

rēg-i-a

house_{FEM} (SG.NOM) king-ADN-FEM.SG.NOM

'house of the king', 'royal house'

"adjectival genitives/genitival adjectives" in Ancient Anatolian Indo-European, in particular in Cuneiform and Hieroglyphic Luwian, in Lycian A and B, and in Lydian and perhaps Carian (marginally in Palaic, and almost not at all in Hittite, whose preferred adnominal marker is a straight genitive), which – although unlike "real" genitives they do agree with their heads in number, case, and possibly gender – are farther on the nominal side than their traditional name suggests (Mittelberger 1966, Stefanini 1969, Neumann 1982, Bader 1988, 1993, Adiego 1994, Hajnal 2000, Hoffner 2006, Luraghi 2008, Melchert 2010, Bachvarova 2007)

- (11) N "adjectival genitives" are referential rather than referent-modifying (although they can be referent-modifying, too)
- (3) N they show number opposition for themselves, by virtue of accompanying demonstratives / possessives inflecting for number (Lycian), or by virtue of being limited to singular referents (with the genitive used for plural referents), or by innovated agglutinative plural suffixes (cf. Cuneiform Luwian plural ablative-instrumental, *-nzati*, contrasting with original *-(a)ti*, which is number-neutral in nouns and exclusively singular in adnominals, thus enabling them to distinguish number in the company of heads in the ablative-instrumental)

Lycian A

*hrppi esedeñnew-i χñn-ahi ehbi-ehi (<*ebe-hi) /*
for progeny-SG.DAT grandmother-ADN.SG.DAT this/his-ADN.SG.DAT /
eb(e)-tte-hi
this/his-PL-ADN.SG.DAT
'for the progeny of his grandmother / grandmothers'

- (6) N take typically nominal dependents, viz. demonstrative and possessive pronouns, and they take adnominals of the same kind, being recursive

Cuneiform Luwian

za-šši-n DUMU-ann-ašši-n anni-n waralli-n
this-ADN-SG.ACC child-ADN-SG.ACC mother-SG.ACC own-SG.ACC
'the own mother of this child'

Lycian A

hrppi esedeñnew-i χñn-ahi ehbi-ehi
for progeny-SG.DAT grandmother-ADN.SG.DAT this/his-ADN.SG.DAT
'for the progeny of his grandmother'

Lycian B

ên-esi-ke ted-esi-ke χug-asi χñtawaza
mother-ADN-and father-ADN-and grandfather-ADN dominion (SG.NOM)
'the dominion of the grandfather on the maternal and the paternal side'

(8) N combine with genitival nouns in close apposition

Hieroglyphic Luwian

Muwatallis-si-s

tarwana-sa

nimuwaiz-as

Muwatallis-ADN-SG.NOM judge-SG.GEN son-SG.NOM

'son of judge Muwatallis'

When we examine how adnominals differ among each other, we do not take for granted that there is a grammaticalized word-class distinction between nouns and adjectives in the languages concerned.

We assume that basic words, in any language, differ along lines such as these:

- they may denote individuals, especially persons / things / places (what is visible and tangible), or properties;
- they may denote property bundles or simple properties;
- they may denote something more or less time-stable;
- they may be predisposed to serve as heads or as dependents of NPs.

For simplicity, when words of such opposite semantic or functional classes show different morphosyntactic behaviours, we distinguish their properties by the labels N and A.

The question which we then ask is this: If there is some overt marking or some syntactic recognition of the relationship between NP-heads and adnominals (which is a wide notion, comprising all kinds of NP-dependents, and including those having modifier and determiner functions), of what kinds can this marking or recognition be?

One possibility is that NP-heads and adnominals are words of the same kind (that is, of the same lexical class and with the same morphosyntactic potentials) in syntactic construction with each other, differing only in that one or both are marked for their functions of head and adnominal (by means of linear order, case / adpositions or state, agreement / cross-reference).

Another possibility is that NP-heads and adnominals are not in syntactic but in morphological construction with each other, with the adnominal perhaps de-categorialized and de-activated in the process of incorporation, whatever its original lexical class and morphosyntactic potential (e.g. *village idiot*).

Yet another possibility is that words are re-categorized when used in adnominal function, perhaps modeled on basic words lexically predisposed to have this function.

Our interest now is in whether re-categorizations of words as adnominals (NP-dependents) are

- categorical ($N \rightarrow A$) or gradual ($N \rightarrow n \rightarrow a \rightarrow A$),

and when they are gradual, whether they are

- orderly or disorderly.

Re-categorizations are orderly to the extent that losses, acquisitions, or exchanges of individual properties of the words re-categorized are not independent of each other. Our contention is that re-categorizations as adnominals are gradual and quite orderly, in particular languages and cross-linguistically.