DECODING AND ENCODING GRAMMATICAL INFORMATION IN ADJECTIVAL ENTRIES: THE BASICS[1]

Joaquín Comesaña Rincón

Universidad de Sevilla

Dictionaries usually characterise the Adjective in limited categorial terms (notional and positional). The present study —the first of two issues —tries to broad the lexicographical adjectival horizons by laying the theoretical foundations of a lexicon centred on individual members of the adjective category, in parallel fashion to Garrudo (1991, 1996) in the verbal field. Syntactic and semantic discreteness of adjectival items will be described in accordance with their potential to function predicatively in an ascriptive structure. However, their discreteness does not preclude the relationship of certain adjectival entries through different syntactic processes. The items will be streamlined by their subcategorisation features and their collocational and/or selectional restrictions. All this leads to configurational patterns or distribution typologies of adjectival forms through different notational conventions.

OBJECTIVES

It was Harris (1951: 5) who established that *distribution* is the core of the distinction and conceptualisation of linguistic facts:

> Descriptive linguistics, as the term has come to be used, is a particular field of inquiry which deals not with the whole of speech activities, but with the regularities in certain features of speech. These regularities are in the distributional relations among the features of speech in question, i.e. the occurrence of these features relatively to each other within utterances.

---

[1] The present paper is designed to be a blueprint for the syntactic lexicon of English adjectives *Diccionario Sintáctico del Adjetivo Inglés* (forthcoming), co-developed with Dr Garrudo (University of Seville, Spain). This lexicon is the second stepping stone leading to the elaboration of a general syntactic lexicon of English predicative lexical items, where not only verbs but also adjectives and nouns will play a decisive predicative role. In this predicative endeavour Dr Tamayo (University of Seville, Spain) will also be a co-participant regarding the nominal sphere.

As pointed out elsewhere (Comesaña 2000: 175), since adjectival distribution has been traditionally shown to be more limited than verbal,[2] it is commonplace to define the potential of adjectival entries in dictionaries with regard to categorial behaviour and following two different variables: *(a)* notional definitions —mainly based on semantic factors; and *(b)* positional occurrences —pointing at their potential syntagmatic arrangement:

> **12 Adjectives**. The primary subdivisions of adjectives was into qualitative adjectives, colour adjectives and classifying. The positions they could occur in (i.e. premodifying, predicative, and postnominal) were an essential part of their syntax notation. (Krishnamurthy 1987: 67)[3]

Unlike current lexicographical usage, my theoretical proposal in the present study (and also in Comesaña (2001) has several goals:

(i) To unveil the individual, not categorial, distributional properties that different adjectival entries may display, in Garrudo's (1991, 1996) fashion. To do so, several variables are taken into consideration: *(a)* the adjectival entry will be introduced within the limits of the structure which represents the prototypical word order of declarative ascriptive sentences (Lyons 1977: 469); *(b)* only those adjectival forms with predication capacity or potential for forming ascriptive sentences will be considered; *(c)* this means that only central and/or peripheral predicative adjectives will have predication value and, as a consequence, they will be seen as controlling elements with the potential for a syntactico-semantic expansion,[4] according to their subcategorisation features and selectional and/or collocational restrictions;[5] *(d)* when

---

[2] See Hornby (1954), for instance, and compare the number of verbal patterns to adjectival patterns. More recently, *The BBI Combinatory of English Dictionary* has no room for adjectival patterns.

[3] This author, one of the senior compilers of *COBUILD*, confirms the theoretical position adopted in the lexicographical production when dealing with the adjectival reality.

[4] My theoretical point of departure, as can be foreseen, runs parallel to the assumptions adopted in dependency grammar regarding the important role of the verb. In our case, the syntactic characteristics of the sentence are shaped by means of the relationships held between the adjectival entry and the elements controlled or governed by that entry. See Matthews (1980: 41-49) and Matthews (1981: 71-ff.).

[5] By *subcategorisation features* I mean those elements whose participation is basic as intuitive (or logical) idiosyncratic constituents of the lexico-semantic properties of an adjectival lexical entry and are, at the same time, undisputed sentence elements. In other words, an adjectival entry may or may not call for certain categories (what is widely known as 'complement') which furnish its intuitive (or logical) architecture and to deny or accept them would entail non-intended meanings, (She is good (and extrovert) *vs.* She is good *at dancing)* ungrammatical or, at least, nonsensical sentences (She is flexible vs. *She is flexible *that she endures hard conditions*). Features which are not considered to be part and parcel of the lexical entry (known as 'adjunct' or 'peripheral elements') have neither the same grammatical status nor the same grammatical potential (She was good *enough* at dancing). In this dual distinction I stick to Huddleston (1984: 177-ff.). By *selectional restrictions* I mean that certain features of sentential elements are contingent on the adjectival lexical entry concerned. For instance, there are adjectival forms which select the type of Subject of its including sentential structure and this favours further syntactic behaviours (Steve is a *naughty* child. He is being *naughty* today vs. *The table is *naughty*. *The table is being *naughty* today). By *collocational restrictions* I mean the co-occurrence potential with other constituents that adjectival forms acquire. For instance, as pointed out by Baer (1972: 15), adjectival entries indicating a more or less permanent quality will block the occurrence of locative adverbials within the same sentential boundaries (George is *intelligent* vs. *George is *intelligent* in New York and George is *happy* vs. George is *happy* in New York).

adjectival entries subcategorise or call for (logical or intuitive) elements, these will be subsequently distinguished into two different sets: *(d₁)* those elements that belong with the lexical entry and cannot be deleted anyway. They are obligatory; *(d₂)* those that belong with the lexical entry but are optional and syntagmatically dispensable.[6]

(ii) To discover the potential for real lexicographical autonomy of different and distinct readings that are normally found geographically undifferentiated within the limits of one single lexical entry.

(iii) To streamline the inherent grammatical features that are also recorded in those readings which make them be different from others and, consequently, can constitute differentiated lexical entries on their own. That is, homonymous forms will be readily distinguished.[7]

(iv) The connection of sentences with different syntactic disposition but having the same lexical adjectival form as the cornerstone of their relationship.

(v) The display of a system of processes and subcategorization features that relate grammatically (and lexicographically) those different sentences.

(vi) Due to *(iv)* and *(v)*, the build-up of an interconnected system which reflects inherent individual information and, consequently, the distinction of typologies of grammatical behaviours or adjectival patterns.

(vii) Finally, to provide the (Spanish) users of the lexicon with the necessary grammatical tools for a better use and comprehension of English adjectival entries. For this final goal, an approximate translation of the entry into Spanish will be provided.

1. ADJECTIVAL ENTRIES

As stated before, the distributional possibilities of the adjectival entries studied will be based on their potential for forming ascriptive sentences. It is those adjectival forms with the capacity for functioning both attributively and predicatively, ADJ_C,[8] that will be members of the adjectival lexicon:

1.a. He gave me a positive answer
1.b. His answer was positive
2.a. There are radical groups in Gaza
2.b. Some groups are radical

On the same line of argumentation, adjectival forms which do not have that dual or functional centrality but exclusively function predicatively,[9] ADJ_P, will also be included:[10]

---

[6] For a distinction between obligatory and optional complementation, see Matthews (1981: 125).

[7] In this I follow the consideration of (total and partial) homonymy established by Lyons (1977: 559-60).

[8] Quirk *et al.* (1985: 403 ff.) label them 'central adjectives', hence 'ADJ_C'.

[9] Marchand (1966: 134) labels them 'dual adjectives'.

[10] They are known as 'peripheral (predicative) adjectives' in the Quirkian tradition. See note 8. Despite

3.a. The door was ajar
3.b. *An ajar door
4.a. The girl is afraid of rats
4.b. *An afraid girl

As can be foreseen, adjectival forms that are, say, secluded to attributive position and do not display predicative capacity will not be included:[11]

5.a. A working knowledge of Dutch is a prime requirement
5.b. *That requirement is prime
6.a. The very idea of a heart attack frightens me
6.b. *That idea is very

Furthermore, it is also convenient to pin down the fact that there exist adjectival forms which seem to be central, but a moment's reflection will reveal them as unparalleled to real central adjectival entries.

7.a. My old friend ≠ 7.b. My friend is old[12]
8.a. The late president ≠ 8.b. The president is late

In these examples we have the classical distinction between reference (a-examples) and referent, (b-examples) modification adjectives (Bolinger 1967). Their different syntagmatic arrangement provoke drastic meaning changes. Only referent modification adjectival forms which have real predicative potential will be accounted for.

The adjectival lexicon is designed to admit both simple and more complex adjectival forms. That is to say, although in a lesser amount than in the verbal sphere, adverbial (BETTER OFF, FULL UP, RUN DOWN), prepositional (ALLERGIC TO, GUILTY OF, MAD AT) and adverbio-prepositional forms (BRASSED OFF WITH, FED UP WITH, HET UP ABOUT) will also be witnessed in our adjectival lexicon.

Following Garrudo's (1991, 1996) verbal procedure, each adjectival entry recorded will account for the different syntactico-semantic behaviours which one single form may require. This brings us to the fact of different (total or partial) homonymous forms:

9.a. $GOOD_1$: She is good
9.b. $GOOD\ AT_2$: She is good at teaching
10.a. $CONSCIOUS_1$: He is conscious (not dead)
10.b. $CONSCIOUS\ OF_2$: He is conscious of the affair

---

theoretical considerations, adjectival forms which seem to be confined to a predicative peripheral consideration (AJAR, ALIVE or AWAKE) can be ascribable to an attributive functioning - and a central consideration, then - when they are adverbially premodified, (*half-alive* people, a *slightly ajar* door or a not *fully awake* freshman), as pointed out by Jacobsson (1996: 207-08).
[11] They are known as 'peripheral (attributive) adjectives' in the Quirkian tradition. See notes 8 and 10.
[12] For the cognitive implications conveyed by this example, see Taylor (1992: 13-15).

When dealing with the entries conforming our adjectival syntactic lexicon, participial forms, namely *ed*-participles, are a case in point. Adjectives are usually known as those items with descriptive qualities: "'Adjective' is a major word class, containing words that describe properties or qualities" (Dixon 1994: 28).[13]

The *ed*-participles included and studied create no problem in adjectival characterisation. They correspond to this notional approach. However, this is not a cut-and-dried reality. Some *ed*-participles blur categorial frontiers up to the point that it is difficult to draw a clear line between verbal and adjectival realms.[14] They do not have the same distribution potential although they maintain that descriptive capacity. It is theoretically and methodologically important, then, to delimit the distributional properties of the *ed*-forms included in the lexicon and pertaining to the category Adjective:

(A) Capacity to function in prenominal position:

  11. A broken vase

(B) Capacity to function in predicative position not only with the verb BE, as pointed out before, but also with the rest of the traditional intensive verbs:

  12. She seems annoyed at me

(C) Capacity to occur in comparative and superlative structures:

  13. Barbie is more convinced than Ken

(D) Capacity to admit prototypical adjectival pre-intensifiers:

  14. She was very frightened

(E) Capacity to co-occur with prefixation *un-*:

  15. The food was still untouched

(F) Capacity to co-occur with the typical adverbial suffix *-ly*:

  16.a. His alledged brutality
  16.b. He was alledgedly condemned

(G) Capacity to co-occur with another coordinated adjectival form:

[13] It is clear that this notional approach cannot be soundly maintained. As pointed out in Comesaña (2000: 152), there are items not classified as adjectives which are in accordance with that definition. For instance, His *cleverness* was seen at making such a proposal, She must be a *fool* to be in love with you or A chasm 30 metres in *length* can be found there. See also Bhat (1994).

[14] Some *ed*-participles 'participate' in both categories (AMAZED, AMUSED, EMBARRASED or INTERESTED). Linguistic literature has displayed countless attempts to offer coherent theoretical differentiations, dating back to Curme (1931: 443-47) and his distinction between *statal vs actional* passives and stretching to more recent analytical approaches such as Roeper & Siegel (1978), Granger (1983) or Palmer (1987).

17. Lew was happy and pleased

(H) The proform SO substitution for the *ed*-participle:

18. Ruth is distressed, or so she seems

2. ASCRIPTIVE STRUCTURE

As previously stated, the adjectival entries will be introduced in a predicative ascriptive structure, also known as 'copulative'. The prototypical verb, V, in these structures is BE and due to this it will not be explicitly disclosed in the sentential description which introduces the adjectival entry:

19. S + V + *TALL* + (A)

It is important to notice that BE is semantically colourless but other verbs, known as 'intensive', (Halliday 1967: 40-ff. or Quirk *et al.* 1985: 54, note) (BECOME, SEEM, TASTE, etc), can freely characterise the ascriptive sentential structure[15]. However, when the adjectival entry is univocally related to an intensive verb other than BE, that verb will be straightforwardly displayed in the syntactic description:

20.a. S + lie + doggo + A[16]
20.b. We lie doggo in her room

The adjectival description will not account for structures which have undergone rearrangements motivated by thematic changes of different nature (extrapositions, 21, questions, 22, inversions, 23, or ellipses, 24). In order to accomplish a syntactic description of adjectival entries, we will situate ourselves at an untransformed (or in Garrudo's (1988: 275) terms 'pre-transformed') level of description previous to all syntagmatic alteration. By doing so, we will be able to leave aside a diversity of syntactic arrangements and this procedure will substantially reduce the variety of possible structures, which may seem unlimited and may not contribute to an accurate and unifying description. Examples displaying any kind of variation from the canonical word order of the ascriptive structure will be analysed regarding the adjectival form and its descriptive possibilities:

21.a. It is foolish of him to spend that money

---

[15] Unlike BE, this group of intensive verbs are semantically loaded. Very revealing are the words of Lyons (1977: 437), who clarifies the nature of BE: "The lexeme 'be' is classified as a verb in English because, with respect to concord and the realization of tense, it is pivotal in the way that 'work' and 'play' are pivotal. Given that such lexemes as 'work' and 'play' are verbs and that they are inflected for such morphosyntactic categories as person, tense and number, 'be' is also a verb with respect to any rules in the grammar which account for the distribution of the inflexional forms of verbs. It is important to realize, however, that these rules are morphological and morphosyntactic rather than purely syntactic. It is not its copulative function as such that makes 'be' a verb.... If we discount the so-called absolute existential use of 'be' ... there is no convincing syntatic or semantic reason for classifying 'be' in English as a verb".
[16] In this particular example, A is being called for by *lie* not by *doggo*.

21.b. <u>To spend that money</u> <u>is</u> <u>foolish of him</u>
                S   V   C[17]

22.a. What is she afraid of?

22.b. <u>She</u> <u>is</u> <u>afraid of something (unknown)</u>
      S   V   C

23.a. Unclear remains the real cause of his death

23.b. <u>The real cause of his death</u> <u>remains</u> <u>unclear</u>
             S   V   C

24.a. -Are you sure of your victory?

24.b$_1$. - I am pretty sure

24.b$_2$. - <u>I</u> <u>am</u>   <u>pretty sure of my victory</u>
       S V   C

3. FORMULAE AND CONVENTIONS

After the fashion of Garrudo (1991, 1996), the adjectival lexicon will use the same repertoire of symbols to describe the grammatical properties of adjectival entries:

/ /   Double slash is to signify the completing syntactic pattern of the adjectival entry:

25. *ABLE /O/* ADJ$_C$ *(capaz DE hacer algo)*
S + V + *ABLE* + O + (A)
O = *to*-infinitive
She is able to shout

26. FOND OF /PO/ ADJ$_P$ (aficionado A)
S + V + *FOND* + *OF* + PREP O + (A)
PREP O = NP / *ing*-clause
I am fond of icecreams

/ Single slash is meant to indicate elements in paradigmatic relationship:

27. ANGRY (ABOUT/AT/WITH) /(PO)/ ADJ$_C$ (enfadado CON)
S + V + *ANGRY* (+ *ABOUT/AT/WITH* + PREP O) + (A)
PREP O = GN
Are you angry (about/at/with me)?

( ) Parentheses indicate optional or dispensable elements:

28. ACCOUNTABLE (TO) (FOR) /(PO) (PO)/ ADJ$_P$ (responsable DE algo ANTE alguien)
S + V + *ACCOUNTABLE* + (*PREP* O$_1$) + (PREP O$_2$) + (A)

---

[17] The ascriptive sentence where the adjectival form is found will be described in terms of the sentential elements traditionally considered for that type of sentence, S(ubject), V(erb), C(omplement), etc (vid. Quirk *et al.* 1985: 56-ff.), not in terms of the different ways these elements can be characterised.

PREP O = NP
John is accountable (to me) (for anything he does)

= The equals sign indicates how the elements concerned are carried out. For instance, PREP O is characterised as being developed by an NP in the preceding entry.

⇐ This arrow indicates that the lexical entry is derived from a preceding one referred to after the oriented arrow due to several reasons specified in the entry:

29. CONSCIOUS$_2$ /O/ ADJ$_P$ *(consciente DE* + cláusula *QUE)*
⇐ CONSCIOUS OF$_1$ /PO/ Preposition deletion before *that*-clause
S + V + *CONSCIOUS* + O + (A)
O = *that*-clause
We are conscious that a comprehensive look at the fact ...

+ This sign indicates the sequence of co-occurring elements in the ascriptive structure.

4. SUBCATEGORISED ADJECTIVAL ELEMENTS

The syntactic pattern symbol, / /, houses different elements which are also symbolically represented according to their inherent nature:

Ø   This symbol implies that the adjectival entry is syntactico-semantic autonomous and requires no completing structure

30. *UNIQUE /Ø/* ADJ$_C$ *(único, sin parangón)*
S + V + *UNIQUE* + (A)
The printing quality of Hewlett Packard is unique

Ã This symbol indicates that the adjective entry can admit an adverb as its constituting completing element. This adverb is not contrastive with any other and forms an atomic functional unit with the adjectival form:

31. *FULL (UP)* /(Ã)/ ADJ$_P$ *(*[persona] *ahíto,* [lugar y/o persona] *lleno hasta los topes)*
S + V + *FULL* (+ *UP*) + (A)
S = NP, typ. LOCATIVE, also fig.
The ball room was full (up)
He never seems to be full up. He is always eating

PO It indicates that the adjectival entry conforms its syntactic nature by means of a subcategorised Preposition and its corresponding Prepositional Object:

32. *KEEN ON /PO/* ADJ$_C$ *(entusiasta DE)*
S + V + *KEEN* + ON + PREP O + (A)
PREP O = NP / -*ing*-clause
He is keen on Physics

She is keen on writing poems

This possibility can also co-occur with adjectival entries which also subcategorise for Ã:

33. **FED UP WITH** /ÃPO/ ADJ_P *(aburrido/harto DE)*
S + V + *FED* + *UP* + *WITH* + PREP O + (A)
PREP O = NP / -ing-clause
She is fed up with her girlfriend

/PC_{S2}/ This symbol indicates the co-reference relationship held between the Object of the subcategorised Preposition, the adjective and the Subject of the ascriptive structure:

34. *CONVERTIBLE (INTO)* /(PC_{S2})/ ADJ_C ([moneda] *convertible EN*)
S + V + *CONVERTIBLE* (+ *INTO* + PREP C_{S2}) + (A)
PREP C_{S2} = NP
Did he say which bonds are not convertible into shares?[18]

5. ADJECTIVAL PATTERNS

As developed in Comesaña (1998: 187 ff.) and Comesaña (2000: 175 ff.), six different models of completing adjectival patterns are readily distinguished:

(A) Intransitive: Self-sufficient adjectival entries with no need for any completing structure, symbolically represented by /Ø/, for simple adjectival forms, 35, 36, and /(Ã)/, for complex adjectival forms, 37:

35. *ABLE_2* /Ø/ ADJ_C *((muy)capaz)*
⇐ *ABLE_1* /O/ O deletion for absolute adjectival degree[19]
S + V + ABLE + (A)
They are very able students[20]

---

[18] It is interesting to notice the close relationship between this adjectival entry and its morphologically related verbal origin (Garrudo 1991, 1996):
   CONVERT INTO/TO 7 /PC/ (convertirse, transformarse en; (moneda) cambiarse)
   <—> **CONVERT INTO/TO 6** /OPC/ Causatividad
   S + convert + INTO/TO + CS PREP + (A)
   CS PREP = GN
   Electricity easily converts to many forms of power / This seat converts into a bed / At what rate does the pound convert into francs?

[19] See Comesaña (2001: 2-3).

[20] This lexical entry usually co-occurs with deverbal or agentive nouns. Another perspective is likely to be adopted regarding these deverbal nouns. As pointed out in Comesaña (1992), deverbal nouns may well reveal themselves as arguments or subcategorised structures required by the lexico-syntactic information of the adjectival entry concerned, in our case ABLE: "Ciertas formas adjetivas se realizan sintácticamente no sólo en posición predicativa donde sus rasgos completivos son palpables, sino también atributivamente, donde la alineación inmediata de adjetivo + sustantivo deverbal ayuda a definir sus rasgos sintácticos y, claro está, semánticos. Por tanto, el contenido sintáctico-semántico de ciertas formas adjetivas dependerá del contenido semántico de los sustantivos con los que se alinee:
   (i)   He is a good boy

He was known as being very *ABLE* but an ambitious businessman

36. *IRRATIONAL* /Ø/ ADJ$_C$ *(irracional)*
S + V + *IRRATIONAL* + (A)
Pol Pot's attacks on Vietnam were irrational

37. *FULL (UP)* /(Ã)/ ADJ$_P$ *([persona] ahito, [lugar y/o persona] lleno hasta los topes)*
S + V + *FULL* (+ *UP*) + (A)
S = NP, typ. LOCATIVE
The ball room was full (up)
He never seems to be full up. He is always eating

(B) **Transitive**: Transitive adjectival entries need a completing structure. Different subtypes are distinguished:

(B)₁ **Monotransitive**: Monotransitive adjectival entries require one completing structure, symbolically represented as */O/,*[21] 38-41, */PO/,* 42, or */ÃPO/,* 43:

38. *LIKE* /O/ ADJ$_P$ *(parecido A, como)*
S + V + *LIKE* + O + (A)
O = NP
She is very like her father

39. *AFRAID* /O/ ADJ$_P$ *(temeroso de* + cláusula *QUE)*
S + V + *AFRAID* + O + (A)
O = *that*-clause / clausal proforms SO/NOT
I'm afraid your mother is coming this weekend
- Is she really coming? - I'm afraid not
- Do you think you've failed the exam? - I am afraid so
I do not think we will be able to buy a new car, I am afraid[22]

40. *WONT* /O/ ADJ$_P$ *(dado A hacer algo)*
S + V + *WONT* + O + (A)
O = *to*-infinitive
The old couple were wont to play backgammon

41. *BUSY* /O/ ADJ$_C$ *(ocupado haciendo algo)*
S + V + *BUSY* + O + (A)
O = *-ing*-clause
She was busy knitting

42. *AVERSE TO* /PO/ ADJ$_p$ *(adverso o contrario A algo/hacer algo)*

---

*He is good at/in ...??!!
(ii)   He is an expert worker
        He is an expert in/at working" (1992: 187-88).
Along the same lines, see McConnel-Ginet (1979: 146).
[21] For a more extensive treatment of this syntactic possibility, see Comesaña (1998: 192-94).
[22] As can be appreciated, this *AFRAID* makes it possible for the clause structure where it is found to have an intonation contour typical of disjuncts or comment clauses (see Quirk *et al.* 1985: 1112-ff.). This intonation pattern and distribution potential is lacking in **AFRAID OF** */PO/.* They are two homonymous adjectival entries.

S + V + *AVERSE* + *TO* + PREP O + (A)
PREP O = NP / -*ing*-clause
Some movie stars are averse to the press
The Government is *averse to* making futile comments on terrorism

43. *HARD UP FOR /ÄPO/* ADJp *(escaso DE)*
S + V + *HARD* + *UP* + *FOR* + PREP O + (A)
PREP O = NP
The Government is hard up for a new education system

(B)₂ Ditransitive: Ditransitive adjectival entries require two prepositional phases as completing structures, symbolically represented as */POPO/*:

44.*INDEBTED TO FOR /POPO/* ADJp *(endeudado CON alguien POR algo)*
S + V + *INDEBTED* + *TO* + PREP O_1 + *FOR* + PREP O_2 + (A)
PREP O = NP
I am indebted to you for your help

(C) Adjunctive: Adjunctive adjectival entries require an Adjunct[23] of time or place for their syntactico-semantic characterisation. This is symbolically represented by */A/*. This adverbial does not form a lexico-semantic unit with the adjectival form. It can refer to time or space:

45. *BOUND /A/* ADJp *(destinado A)*
S + V + *BOUND* + A + (A)
A = ADV / PP, esp. FOR + NP, typ. LOCATIVE $_{Direction}$
This train is North bound[24]
The plane is bound for Logan (Boston)

46. *TENABLE /A/* ADJp *(*[puesto de trabajo] *duradero)*
S + V + *TENABLE* + A + (A)
A = ADV / PP, esp. FOR + NP, typ. LOCATIVE$_{Time}$
How long is his post tenable?

(D) Copulative: Within the structure of an ascriptive sentence, the adjectival group —adjectival entry + dependent PP —is co-referent with the Subject of the sentence. As a sentence element, this group behaves as a Subject Complement, C_S. Focusing on the elements of this syntactic group, the adjectival entry is primarily featured by having a dependent PP whose nominal element is co-referent with both the adjectival entry and the Subject of the sentence. Due to this, the term 'copulative' has been used and the symbol */PC_{S2}/* represents the prepositional nature of the completing structure and the double referential role of the nominal element in the PP:

47. *TANTAMOUNT TO₁ /PC_{S2}/ (equivalente A)*

---

[23] For the use of this term in phrase and not sentence realms, see Comesaña (2000: 180 n42; 323-ff.).
[24] In this entry, A is used prenominally when it is realised by an Adverb Phrase.

⇐ *TANTAMOUNT TO$_2$ /PC$_{S2}$/* monotransitive verb deletion, especially SAY

S + V + *TANTAMOUNT* + *TO* + PREP C$_{S2}$ + (A)

PREP C$_{S2}$ = NP / -ing-clause, typ. SAYING

Bureaucractic heaviness is tantamount to bureaucratic ineffectiveness

48. *TANTAMOUNT TO$_2$ /PC$_{S2}$/ (equivalente A)*

S + V + *TANTAMOUNT* + *TO* + PREP C$_{S2}$ + (A)

PREP C$_{S2}$ = *-ing*-clause, typ. SAYING

Sony is tantamount to saying hi-tech[25]

6. FINAL REMARKS

Several pivotal points should be differentiated in this study: *(i)* to create a lexicon of adjectives with predicative potential, they should be grammatically characterised in terms of more definitory parameters than the ones found in current dictionaries —notional and positional; *(ii)* parameters mainly based on subcategorisation features which unfold the individual distribution potential of adjectival entries and the elements which (logically) belong with them; *(iii)* this potential unveils the distinction of homonymous forms which lead to a system of different configurational patterns through notational conventions, in Garrudo's (1991, 1996) fashion; *(iv)* the grammatical (and lexicographical) connection of adjectival entries have also been hinted, since different adjectival entries may share semantic readings but differ in syntactic dispositions due to distinct syntactic processes —this being the main descriptive goal in Comesaña (2001).

REFERENCES

Baer, L.A. 1972: "The Predicate Adjective in English: A Case Grammar Analysis". *Languages and Linguistics Working Papers* 7: 13-32.

Bhat, D.N.S. 1994: *The Adjectival Category: Criteria for Differentiation and Identification*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bolinger, D. 1967: "Adjectives in English: Attribution and Predication". *Lingua* 18: 1-34.

Comesaña Rincón, J. 1992: "La Modificación Adjetiva de Sustantivos Deverbales en Inglés: Hacia una Tipología Transitiva de los Adjetivos". *Proceedings from the Ninth National Meeting of AESLA*. Bilbao: País Vasco University Press: 179-89.

———— 1998: "La Transitividad Adjetiva: Hacia una Tipología Completiva del Adjetivo en Inglés". *Transitivity Revisited*. Ed. M. Martínez Vázquez. Huelva: Imprenta Beltrán. 187-99.

---

[25] Compare the TANTAMOUNT entries with their morphologically related verb AMOUNT. Garrudo (1991, 1996) characterises it as a copulative or intensive verb.

——— (2000): *Introduction to the Morphosyntax of the English Simple Sentence.* Granada: Comares.

——— (2001): "Decoding and Encoding Grammatical Information in Adjectival Entries: Processes and Cases". *Atlantis* 23.2 (forthcoming).

Curme, G.O. 1931: *A Grammar of the English Language. Vol 3. Syntax.* Boston: Heath.

Dixon, R.M.W. 1994: "Adjectives". *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics.* Eds. R.E. Asher & J.M.Y. Simpson. Exeter: Pergamon: 29-35.

Garrudo Carabias, 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.* Pamplona: University of Navarra: 273-86.

——— 1991, 1996: *Diccionario Sintáctico del Verbo Inglés.* 2 vols. Barcelona: Ariel.

Granger, S. 1983: *The Be + Past Participle Construction in Spoken English with Special Emphasis on the Passive.* Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1967: "Notes on Transitivity and Theme in English". *Journal of Linguistics* 3: 37-81, 199-244.

——— 1968: "Notes on Transitivity and Theme in English". *Journal of Linguistics* 4: 179-215.

Harris, Z. 1951: *Structural Linguistics.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hornby, A.S. 1954: *A Guide to Patterns and Usage in English.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Huddleston, R. 1984: *Introduction to the Grammar of English.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jacobsson, B. 1996: "A New Look at "Predicative-only" Adjectives in English". *Journal of English Linguistics* 24: 206-19.

Krishnamurthy, R. 1987: "The Process of Compilation". *Looking Up. An Account of the COBUILD Project in Lexical Computing.* Ed. J.M. Sinclair. London: Collins Publishers: 62-85.

Lyons, J. 1977: *Semantics.* Cambridge: Cambrdige University Press.

Marchand, H. 1966: "On Attributive and Predicative Derived Adjectives and some Problems Related to the Distinction". *Anglia* 84: 131-149.

Matthews, P.H. 1980: "Complex Intransitive Constructions". *Studies in English Linguistics for Randolph Quirk.* Eds. S. Greenbaum, G. Leech & J. Svartvik. London: Longman. 41-49.

——— 1981: *Syntax.* Cambridge: University Press.

Mcconnell-Ginet, S. 1979: "On the Deep (and Surface) Adjective Good". *Contributions to Grammatical Studies. Semantics and Syntax.* Eds. L. Waugh. & F. Van Coetsem. Leiden: E.J. Brill. 132-50.

Palmer, F.R. 1987: *The English Verb.* New York: Longman.

⬆INDICE