Call for Papers: "Adjectives, categorization and argument structure"

Workshop at the 21st International Morphology Meeting, 28 - 30 August 2024

Convenors:
Martina Werner (martina.werner@oeaw.ac.at)
Laura Grestenberger (laura.grestenberger@oeaw.ac.at)
Austrian Academy of Sciences

Keynote speaker:

Antonio Fábregas

Norwegian University of Science and Technology, NTNU

The aim of this workshop is to investigate and compare the morphology and morphosyntax of different classes of adjectives or "adjectival concepts", their categorization/lexicalization, and their morphosemantics and argument structure from different theoretical perspectives. As is well known, the lexicalization of property concepts (in the sense of Dixon 1982) differs cross-linguistically in terms of category: some languages express these concepts as "primary" (root-derived) adjectives, while others use a "verbal" strategy (Dixon 1982, 2004; Thompson 1989; the papers in Mitrović & Panagiotidis 2022, a.m.o). Cross-cutting the distinction in terms of lexical category is the difference between what Francez & Koontz-Garboden (2017) term the "predicative" and the "possessive" strategy: While the predicative strategy makes use of canonical predication devices available in a given language (e.g., the copula), (1a), the possessive strategy uses possessive morphology to express property concepts, (1b).

(1) Predicative vs. possessive lexicalization of property concepts (Francez & Koontz-Garboden 2017: 22)

    a. *Pierre*   *is*   *hungry.*   (English)
    b. *Pierre*   *a*   *faim.*   (French)
        Pierre   has   hunger

Property concept adjectives or *qualitative adjectives* (QAs), which encode properties such as *brave cat*, *funny dog*, *loud car* are formally and semantically distinct from *relational adjectives* (RAs; also termed "classifying", "classificatory", "pseudo-adjectives"; cf. e.g. Gunkel & Zifonun 2008; Zifonun 2011; Rainer 2013), which are well-described from both a theoretical and a cross-linguistic perspective (e.g. for Romance, cf. Fábregas 2007, Marchis 2010, 2015, Ramaglia 2011, ten Hacken 2019 among others).

       In a long-standing tradition in grammatical theory (seminal Bally 1944: 96), RAs are usually said to have "[the] morphological shape of an adjective but behave in many respects like nouns" (Fábregas 2007: 3). Thus, in this respect they differ clearly from qualitative/property concept adjectives with respect to categorization and morphosemantics, since QAs are gradable, modifiable, nominalizable, adverbially and predicatively usable.

       Due to their non-qualitative, non-scalable or non-polar character, RAs as in (1a), on the other hand, cannot occur in predicative position, (1b), nor in a comparative, (1c), adverbial or negated form (1d), and cannot be nominalized (see 1e; on formal properties cf., e.g., Fábregas 2007, Holzer 1996, Zifonun 2011, among many others).

(2) German RAs

    a. *(Die) ärzt-**lich**e Begutachtung*   '(the) medical-**RA** examination'
    b. *#Die Begutachtung ist ärzt-**lich**.*   'The examination is medical-**RA**.'
    c. *#(Die) ärzt-**lich**ere Begutachtung*   '(the) more medical-**RA** examination'
    d. *#(Die) Begutachtung läuft (un-)ärzt-**lich**.*   'The examination runs (non-)medically-**RA**.'
    e. *#Die Ärzt-**lich**-keit der Begutachtung*   'The medicality of the examination'

From a cross-linguistic perspective, recent studies have pointed out the importance of argument structure for RAs (cf,. e.g. Holzer 1996; Alexiadou & Stavrou 2011; Ramaglia 2011; Marchis Moreno 2010, 2015; Fábregas 2020). Specifically, we find two types of RAs, one with and the other one without argument structure. While the first type is also labelled as classifying or classificatory adjectives (3a), RAs of the second type (3b) are called thetic (theta role-providing; after Fábregas 2007).

(3) German non-thetic/classificatory and thetic RAs
    a.   *angeblicher Spion*   *gestriges Mahl,*   *tönerner Krug*
              'alleged spy'   'yesterday's meal'   'clay jug'
    b.   *betriebliche Entwicklung*   *studentisches Lernen*   *richterliche Entscheidung*
              'company development'   'student learning'   'judicial decision'

The [+/- argument structure] divide of RAs has also been recently confirmed by synchronic studies e.g. on German insofar as RAs typically have subject and not object interpretations (cf. Gunkel & Zifonun 2008: 293). In this regard, RAs differ from QAs. Furthermore, adjectives can also display other forms of argument structure, cf. (4), and QAs/property concepts are famously argument-taking when embedded under verbal structure in the inchoative/factitive alternation (Koontz-Garboden 2014; Francez & Koontz-Garboden 2017).

(4) *She is dependent **on** her job.*

The goal of this workshop is to shed light on the interdependence of adjectival morphology and argument structure from different theoretical perspectives, including those that do not treat "adjective" as a categorial primitive (cf. Mitrović & Panagiotidis 2020). We also welcome papers that treat RAs and QAs from a cross-linguistic typological/comparative perspective. Topics that could be treated include (but are not limited to):

- What is the division of labor between the derivational base and the adjectival "superstrate" in encoding argument structure in (different classes of) adjectives? Which argument structure properties can correlate with which kinds of morphological marking?
- Which aspects of RA and QA morphosyntax are universal, which are language-specific?
- How does RA- and QA-related morphology interact with other lexicalization strategies, especially in the verbal domain?
- Is the difference between RAs and QAs primarily a semantic or a morphological/syntactic one? That is, does it follow from the meaning (abstract vs. concrete) or category (root vs. nominal) of the base, or is it gradient? Do we find syntactic correlates of morphological patterns, or vice versa?
- How does possessive morphology relate to QA & RA morphology, especially in languages that use the "possessive strategy" mentioned in (1)?

Abstracts (anonymous, between 500-750 words + references, in English) for 20-minute presentations should be sent to the workshop organizers at the above e-mail addresses no later than **Nov. 30, 2023**. Notifications of acceptance will be sent around Jan. 15, 2024.

References

Alexiadou, A. & Stavrou, M. 2011. Ethnic adjectives as pseudo-adjectives: A case study on syntax-morphology interaction and the structure of DP. *Studia Linguistica* 65.2, 117–146.

Dixon, R. M. W. 1982. *Where have all the adjectives gone? And other essays in semantics and syntax*. The Hague: Mouton.

Dixon, R. M. W. 2004. Adjective classes in typological perspective. In Dixon, R. M. W. & A. Y. Aikhenvald (eds.), *Adjective classes: A cross-linguistic typology*, 1–49. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fábregas, A. 2007. The internal structure of relational adjectives. *Probus* 19/1, 1-36.

Fábregas, A. 2020. *Morphologically derived adjectives in Spanish*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Francez, I. & A. Koontz-Garboden. 2017. *Semantics and morphosyntactic variation: Qualities and the grammar of property concepts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gunkel, L. & Zifonun, G. 2008. Constraints on relational-adjective noun constructions. A comparative view on English, German and French. *Zeitschrift für Anglistik und Amerikanistik* 56.3, 283–302.

Holzer, P. 1996. *Das Relationsadjektiv in der spanischen und deutschen Gegenwartssprache*. Wilhelmsfeld: Egert.

Koontz-Garboden, A. 2014. Verbal derivation. In R. Lieber & P. Štekauer, *The Oxford handbook of derivational morphology*, 257-275. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Marchis Moreno, M. 2010. On the morpho-syntactic properties of relational adjectives in Romanian and Spanish. *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics* XII.1, 77–92.

Marchis Moreno, M. 2015. Relational adjectives as interfaces. *Studia Linguistica* 69.3, 304–332.

Mravlag, H. 2013. *Relationsadjektive im Deutschen, Französischen und Russischen*. Innsbruck: University Press.

Mitrović, M. & Ph. Panagiotidis. 2020. Adjectives exist, adjectivisers do not: a bicategorial typology. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 5(1): 58. 1–28. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.940

Mitrović, M. & Ph. Panagiotidis (eds). 2022. A^0 – *The lexical status of adjectives*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Rainer, F. 2013. Can relational adjectives really express any relation? An onomasiological perspective. *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* [online] 10(1). http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/JTL22/pdf_doc/02.pdf.

Ramaglia, F. 2011: Adjectives at the Syntax-Semantics Interface. München: Lincom..

ten Hacken, P. 2019. Relational adjectives between syntax and morphology. *SKASE Journal of Translation and Interpretation* 19(1):77–92.

Thompson, S. A. 1989. A discourse approach to the cross-linguistic category 'adjective'. In R. Corrigan, F. Eckman & M. Noonan (eds.), *Linguistic categorization*, 245–265. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Zifonun, G. 2011. Relationale Adjektive – ein „klassisches" Muster im europäischen Vergleich. *Deutsche Sprache* 9.2, 98–112.