For two hundred years or more the following two notions have been persistently confused in discussions of English grammar:

- What kind of constituent is this? category
- What **role** does this constituent perform? function

For two hundred years or more the following two notions have been persistently confused in discussions of English grammar:

- What kind of constituent is this? category
- What role does this constituent perform? function

The **category** of a word can be listed in a dictionary: it is independent of the syntax of any particular sentence.

The **function** cannot be listed in the dictionary: It is entirely relative to the syntax of the particular expression containing the word.

Just to make sure the disastrous confusion continues for another hundred years or so, the Merriam-Webster dictionaries actually **use the term 'function' for '(lexical) category'**!

¹pig

Main Entry:

Pronunciation: 'pig
Function: noun

Inflected Form: -s

Usage: often attributive

Etymology: Middle English *pigge*

1: a young swine of either sex that has not reached sexual maturity; *broadly*: a wild or domestic swine — see HOG 1a...

Just to make sure the disastrous confusion continues for another hundred years or so, the Merriam-Webster dictionaries actually **use the term 'function' for '(lexical) category'!**

Main Entry: ¹pig
Pronunciation: ¹pig
Function:Category!! noun

Inflected Form: -s

Usage: often attributive

Etymology: Middle English *pigge*

1: a young swine of either sex that has not reached sexual maturity; *broadly*: a wild or domestic swine — see HOG 1a...



The functions of adjectives and AdjPs

Adjectives serve (of course) as Head of AdjP. (When nothing hangs on it I often say 'adjective' when strictly I mean AdjP.)

The two most important functions in which AdjPs serve are:

1. Attributive Modifier in the structure of NP (n.b.: stackable):

[NP those [Nom totally stupid [Nom red [Nom pants]]]]

2. Predicative Complement in the structure of VP:

Those pants [VP look really stupid]



The functions of adjective phrases and AdjPs

There are a few less significant functions of AdjP:

Postpositive Modifier in the structure of NP:

I'd never seen [NP anything so stupid]

External Modifier in the structure of indefinite NP:

I'd never seen [NP so stupid a [Nom pair of pants]]

(Marginally, perhaps also Subject function, though this isn't clear: think of <u>Totally stupid</u> is not a good way to be or <u>Totally stupid</u> is not quite as bad as totally evil.)



Traditional grammar crucially fails to recognize that

occurrence as Attributive \neq membership in Adj

In the same spirit as the 'thing word' definition of Noun, traditional grammarians define adjective as a word that 'modifies' or 'qualifies' or 'adds to the meaning' of a noun'.

This is vague, semantically-tinged function talk. As a definition, it is hopeless.

Consider: The good die young.

Two adjectives, no nouns. Modifying a noun is not necessary.

But as we shall see, it is also not sufficient.



Dictionaries often list various nouns with Adj as a second category. Merriam-Webster is typical:

Main Entry: ²head

Pronunciation: hed

Function: Category!! adjective

Etymology: Middle English heved, hed, from

heved, hed, n.

1: of, relating to, or for a head or the head

2 : PRINCIPAL, CHIEF, LEADING, FIRST (*head* chorister) (*head* cook)

3 : situated at the head \(\lambda head \text{ wall* \(\lambda head \text{ sails} \) \)

4 : coming from in front : meeting the head as it is

moved forward (head sea) (head tide)

Consider the modifiers in NPs like <u>Alaska</u> residents, <u>Beatles</u> recordings, <u>California</u> girls, <u>Dell</u> laptops, Edinburgh weather...

If serving in Attributive Modifier function is sufficient to determine adjectivehood, then the Adjective category will have to include

- all place names in the world (<u>Sheffield</u> steel)
- every company name (*Toyota truck*)
- every number name (prestigious 10025 zipcode)
- every name of a chemical element or other substance (<u>aluminium</u> foil, gold ring, <u>oil</u> painting, plutonium bomb...)
- every plant name (<u>mahogany</u> table, <u>pine</u> boards, <u>grass</u> verge) . . .



Under the traditional view the list of adjectives will never end.

Adjective will be an open category, even larger than Noun.

And there will be no distinction in grammatical properties between the two.

M-W is cautious in defining 'adjective', claiming only typicality, not criteriality:

...typically used as a modifier of a noun to denote a quality of the thing named ...

M-W is cautious in defining 'adjective', claiming only typicality, not criteriality:

... typically used as a modifier of a noun to denote a quality of the thing named ...

But amusingly, M-W also has an entry for 'adjective' as an **adjective**! The primary sense given is:

being an adjective \langle an *adjective* word \rangle : functioning as an adjective \langle an *adjective* clause \rangle : fitting or suitable to an adjective \langle adjective uses of nouns \rangle \langle adjective inflections \rangle

A classic confusion over what 'adjective' means, in a dictionary entry where *adjective* is wrongly analysed as an adjective!



So how do we define 'adjective', if not by reference to the function Attributive Modifier?

In any language, the adjectives (if there are any) are a grammatically distinct class of words including the simplest and most direct ways of denoting **one-dimensional** and **stative** properties such as being good, bad, large, small, new, old, black, white, etc.

But that is applicable only in universal grammar.

In English we can, and must, be more specific.



- Adjectives usually denote static and gradable properties, and many basic ones inflect for grade (old, older, oldest).
- Uninflectable adjectives, if gradable, express grade with pre-Head more and most.
- No adjectives show agreement for person or number.
- <u>Adverbs</u> function as pre-head Modifiers of Adjectives (unusually intelligent, insanely great).
- Typical AdjPs can serve as both Attributive Modifier (big boy) and Predicative Complement (looks big).
- The Complements that Adjectives select are typically PP or Clause — almost never NP.



AdjP can serve as **Adjuncts** (i.e., Modifiers or Supplements).

When such an Adjunct is fronted, it requires a **target of predication**.

If no such target is available, we get the **dangling modifier** effect — useful for diagnosing adjectives:

Away is a Preposition but afraid is an Adjective:

Away from home, John behaved properly.

Afraid of us, John behaved properly.

Away from home, there was just work.

*Afraid of us, there was just work.

[no target needed]
[target is John]

[target unneeded]

[BAD — NO TARGET]



The predicativity test is also useful in distinguishing adjectives from adverbs. The general principle is: **Prepositions and Adverbs always have some uses as non-predicative modifiers**; adjectives never do.

Again is an Adverb. Awake is an Adjective.

Again, we scarcely knew what to do.

Awake, we scarcely knew what to do.

Again, it snowed heavily.

*Awake, it snowed heavily.

[no target needed]

[target is we]

[target unneeded]

[BAD — NO TARGET]



The strange adjective worth

- Does not inflect for grade (despite being short).
- Can **never** be used attributively.
- Selects an NP complement, not PP.
- The complement it takes is obligatory.

The strange adjective worth

Compare with the typical adjective worthy:

The lexeme worth

worth, *worther, *worthest

- *It's a worth project.
- It was worth my time.

 *It was worth of my time.
- * It is certainly worth.

The lexeme worthy

worthy, worthier, worthiest

It's a worthy project.

- *It was worthy my time.
 It was worthy of my time.
 - It is certainly worthy.

The words *due*, *like*, *near*, *opposite*, and *unlike* are also puzzling, with a complex mix of Adjective and Preposition properties. But arguments can be given that

- due and opposite were adjectives but have evolved into prepositions;
- like and unlike are sometimes prepositions and sometimes adjectives with NP or Clause complements;
- near may be dually categorized, but is probably prepositional (though it inflects for grade!).

And now...

Prescriptive Poppycock time

Write with nouns and verbs, not with adjectives and adverbs.

E. B. White, in chapter 5 ('An Approach to Style') of Strunk & White's *The Elements of Style*

White's very next sentence is:

The adjective hasn't been built that can pull a <u>weak</u> or <u>inaccurate</u> noun out of a tight place.

The underlined words are, of course, adjectives.

Don't the rules apply to White himself?



Apparently they don't:

"It's very small and weak"

— Charlotte's Web, page 1.

Apparently they don't:

"It's very <u>small</u> and <u>weak</u>"

— Charlotte's Web, page 1.

But that's dialog. What about the expository narrative?

Apparently they don't:

"It's very small and weak"

— Charlotte's Web, page 1.

But that's dialog. What about the expository narrative?

The grass was wet

— Charlotte's Web, page 1.

Apparently they don't:

"It's very <u>small</u> and <u>weak</u>"

— Charlotte's Web, page 1.

But that's dialog. What about the expository narrative?

The grass was wet

— Charlotte's Web, page 1.

But that's predicative. What about attributive adjectives?

Apparently they don't:

"It's very small and weak"

— Charlotte's Web, page 1.

But that's dialog. What about the expository narrative?

The grass was wet

— Charlotte's Web, page 1.

But that's predicative. What about attributive adjectives?

A queer look came over John Arable's face

— Charlotte's Web, page 3.

the room smelled of coffee, bacon, damp plaster, and wood smoke

damp plaster, and wood smoke — Charlotte's Web, page 3.

There ... was the <u>newborn</u> pig. It was a <u>white</u> one. The morning light shone through its ears, turning them <u>pink</u>. "He's yours," said Mr. Arable. "Saved from an <u>untimely</u> death. And may the <u>good</u> Lord forgive me for this foolishness." Fern couldn't take her eyes off the <u>tiny</u> pig. "Oh," she whispered. "Oh, LOOK at him. He's absolutely perfect."

— Charlotte's Web, page 4.

White's novel is admired by everyone who knows it. His assertion that as a writer you should avoid using adjectives is simply absurd — visibly false in the light of his own excellent writing.

William Zinsser likewise asserts that most adjectives are 'unnecessary'.

How could he say this with a straight face when when he couldn't finish his sentence without the adjective *unnecessary*?

And Alistair Cooke, the brilliant author of 2,869 'Letter from America' broadcasts on BBC radio, thought that after drafting a script he would then 'beat the hell out of it, getting rid of all the adverbs, all the adjectives, all the hackneyed words.' (He didn't.)

Do these people even know what adjectives are?

Notice that under the traditional definition of 'adjective', where all determinatives and genitive pronouns are included, the adjective count in any prose is vastly higher:

There ... was the newborn pig. It was a white one. The morning light shone through its ears, turning them pink. "He's yours," said Mr. Arable. "Saved from an untimely death. And may the good Lord forgive me for this foolishness." Fern couldn't take her eyes off the tiny pig. "Oh," she whispered. "Oh, LOOK at him. He's absolutely perfect."

Clearly the people who claim they avoid adjectives cannot possibly also claim that they defend the traditional definition.

There is more than a little hypocrisy here. The very people who tell you not to are doing it more than you are.

Bertold Brecht commented on this nasty tendency in human beings:

Those who take the meat from the table
Teach contentment.
Those for whom the taxes are destined
Demand sacrifice.
Those who eat their fill speak to the hungry
Of wonderful times to come.
Those who lead the country into the abyss
Call ruling too difficult
For ordinary men.

