

Jadwiga Linde-Usiekniewicz

*University of Warsaw*

## **A Position on Classifying and Qualifying Adjectives Revisited**

### **Abstract**

This work is sequel to my paper on the controversy concerning the appropriate syntactic and semantic account of the distinction between classificatory and qualifying adjectives in Polish (Linde-Usiekniewicz 2013). It develops the lines of inquiry suggested therein, mainly the claim that differences between the prenominal and postnominal attributive syntax can only be adequately explained when the lexical meaning of the head noun and the attribute are taken into account – specifically, in the case of relational adjectives, the actual semantic relation between the head noun and the adjective. The interplay between the lexical meanings and the meanings imposed by syntactic order is presented within Encoding Grammar, a multi-layered framework devised in Linde-Usiekniewicz (2012). In particular, postposing of lexically qualitative adjectives and preposing of relational adjectives is presented as a type of coercion, in which the meaning imposed by syntax overrides the lexical meaning of the adjective. The possibilities for and restrictions on the order of multiple adjectives occurring within a noun phrase is explained by proposing a distinction between adjectives that saturate argument positions of the head noun, as in *produkcja samochodowa* ‘car production’, and adjectives that correspond to adjuncts, as in *wycieczka samochodowa* ‘car trip’ (cf. Bosque and Picallo 1996). A more fine-grained hierarchy within each class is proposed to account for possible noun—adjective(s) permutations.

### **Keywords**

adjective order in Polish, classifying adjectives, relational adjectives, qualifying adjectives, coercion, Encoding Grammar

### **Streszczenie**

Artykuł stanowi kontynuację rozważań na temat polskich przydawek jakościowych i klasyfikujących i kontrowersji związanych z ich opisem (Linde-Usiekniewicz 2013). W szczególności rozwija jedynie naszkicowany w przywołanej pracy kierunek badań, a mianowicie postulat uwzględniania nie tylko znaczeń leksykalnych samych przymiotników i rzeczowników, ale także relacji między rzeczownikowym nadrzędnikiem i przymiotnikiem relacyjnym. W przedstawionym tu opisie wykorzystuję zaproponowany wcześniej aparat zwany *gramatyką kodowania* (ang. *Encoding Grammar*, Linde-Usiekniewicz 2012). W szczególności proponuję opisywać sytuację, w której przymiotnik jakościowy jest używany jako przydawka klasyfikująca (w postpozycji), i sytuację, w której przymiotnik relacyjny jest

używany jako przydawka jakościowa (w prepozycji), jako szczególne przypadki narzucania wyrażeniu znaczenia, nie w pełni zgodnego ze znaczeniem leksykalnym jednostek składowych, przez użycie nietypowej dla nich składni (ang. *coercion*). Wykorzystując rozróżnienie zaproponowane przez Bosque i Picallo (1996) dla przymiotników relacyjnych, a mianowicie odróżnianie we frazie nominalnej przymiotników odpowiadających pozycjom argumentowym rzeczownika, np. *produkcja samochodowa*, i przymiotników odpowiadających pozycjom nieargumentowym, np. *wycieczka samochodowa*, wprowadzam bardziej szczegółową hierarchię ról semantyczno-składniowych realizowanych przez przymiotniki relacyjne w grupie nominalnej. Hierarchia ta pozwala wyjaśnić możliwe permutacje szyku w obrębie grup nominalnych z wieloma przydawkami przymiotnymi, realizowanymi przez przymiotniki jakościowe i relacyjne.

### **Słowa kluczowe**

szyk przymiotników w języku polskim, przydawka klasyfikująca, przymiotnik relacyjny, przydawka jakościowa, reklasyfikacja, gramatyka kodowania

### **Introduction<sup>1</sup>**

The difference between pre-nominal and post-nominal adjective placement in Polish has been discussed quite extensively in the literature. Relatively recently, several important contributions have appeared in the ongoing discussion. One of them was the Classificatory Phrase Model (further on referred to as CPM), proposed by Rutkowski and Progovacs (2005) and further developed in Rutkowski 2009. This model was subsequently criticized by Cetnarowska, Pysz, Trugman (2011), who proposed a different account, based on Bouchard's (1998; 2002) relational model (this model for Polish will be referred to herein as CPT, and the paper introducing it as CPT 2011). In my own paper (Linde-Usiekniewicz 2013) intended as a response to CPT (2011), I argued that the controversy between CPM and CPT in fact stems from a fundamental difference in how the term 'classificatory' is understood. At the same time I suggested that neither account was fully satisfactory and sketched some directions which a further inquiry might take.

In her response to my paper, Szumska (2014) has explicitly addressed some of the questions I raised. She focused mainly on some marginal observations I made, usually those

---

<sup>1</sup> I wish to thank two anonymous SPL reviewers whose incisive remarks and suggestions have allowed me to refine a number of formulations and have brought some important works on the subject to my attention. I would also like to thank Daniel J. Sax for his help in preparing the manuscript.

criticizing CPT, and has criticized some of my remarks as not providing an adequate analysis of the phenomena in question. At the same time she has proposed some tentative explanations, lines of inquiry and a model that she deems more appropriate to the task. Some of the lines of inquiry she proposes are similar to those that underlie my own suggestions; some of her criticism addresses general issues surrounding research into adjective modification. Therefore in the present paper I propose not a detailed refutation, but an explicit account of some issues covered under a blanket term of ‘qualifying adjective/attribute’ vs. ‘classifying adjective/attribute’, though not exactly couched in the framework Szumska advocates.

The paper is organized as follows. Section **1** addresses some of the general problem concerning adjective modification that I wish to set aside. Section **2** briefly presents the framework I would like to apply. Section **3** focuses on relational adjectives. In particular, I will analyze the semantic relation between such adjectives and the corresponding nouns and the semantic relation between such adjectives and the nouns they combine with in nominal phrases. Section **4** presents my analysis of nominal phrases bearing a single adjective.

In section **5** I will extend the analysis to the relative linear order of multiple adjectives and, drawing from the analysis of Bosque and Picallo (1996), will propose a relative semantic hierarchy of adjectival modifiers combining with nouns. Lastly, I will show that the relative linear order of adjectives tends to follow this hierarchy, though there are some predictable instances where the hierarchy is overridden.

In some cases I will debate specific points made by Szumska (2014). For lack of space, this time I will not be contrasting my proposal against more recent work on the issue by Cetnarowska (2014, 2015a,b among others). In the final section (**6**) I will try to show that the framework briefly discussed in **2** provides a means for adequately describing the semantics and syntax of the ‘classifying’ vs. ‘qualifying’ distinction.

Because I am convinced that the issue at hand has been largely obscured by the very terms ‘qualifying’ and ‘classifying’, and more specifically by a tendency to equate ‘classifying modification’ with restrictive modification, the terms ‘qualifying’ and ‘classifying’ will be avoided herein, unless used when referring to already existing proposals. In that case the terms will be marked by single quotation marks, as above. It is also assumed that the basic distinctions between adjective types and adjective modification types are well-known and will not be dwelt upon, nor will references be given for such general questions.

### **1. Clearing the decks**

There are several phenomena, related to the order of adjectives in nominal phrases, which tend to cloud the issue and need to be dispensed with at the outset. First of all, it is generally recognized that adjectives in Polish may be used in focal contrast, with adequate intonation and with the order reversed in relation to what it would have been without the focal contrast. Examples abound, but here I will cite just two, one with an adjective that would otherwise be used pre-nominally, and one with an adjective that would otherwise be used post-nominally:

(1) (a) *To jest park dla samochodów CZYSTYCH.*

‘This is the parking for CLEAN cars (lit. cars CLEAN)’

(taken from Linde-Usiekniewicz (2008: 260)

(b) *Chodziło mi o NATURALNY logarytm (a nie dziesiętny)*

‘I meant the NATURAL logarithm (and not the common one)’

This is one of the reasons why the order of adjectives has to be analyzed separately in speech and in writing, something that both myself (Linde-Usiekniewicz 2013: 117-118) and Szumska

(2014: 143) have insisted upon, and why we both advocate caution when discussing examples drawn from the Internet, which although written, do tend to mirror speech patterns.

Secondly, adjectives may follow the head when used in a non-restrictive way, with parenthetical intonation added in speech, as would correspond to commas in writing.

(2) *drewniane wsuwki, szerokie i czerwone*

‘wooden hairpins, broad and red’ (Tabakowska 2007: 427)

Thirdly, in some contexts postnominal adjectives may not be modifiers, but rather depictives (Schulze-Berndt and Himmelmann 2004). Szumska (2014: 144) contrasts (3a) and (3b) but analyses (3b) as a postnominal modifier, while in fact it is a depictive:<sup>2</sup>

(3) (a) *Kelner podał nam zimną zupę.*

‘The waiter served us (the) cold soup.’ (modifier)

(b) *Kelner podał nam zupę zimną.*

The waiter served us the soup cold.’ (depictive)

Contrary to what Szumska claims, (3a) does not mean that the soup is supposed to be served and eaten cold, and is in fact underspecified as to the coldness of soup being expected or not; (3b) being a depictive is indeed more likely to be understood as referring to a soup getting cold due to incompetent service.

These and similar instances need not to confuse the major issue of prenominal and postnominal adjective modification.

---

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Pisarkowa 1965: 83 for a parallel contrast between *Znalazł chore dziecko* ‘He found a/the sick child’ and *Znalazł dziecko chore* ‘He found the child sick.’ I am indebted to anonymous Reviewer 1 for bringing this work to my attention.

## **2.Encoding Grammar and semantic structure<sup>3</sup>**

My own proposal to account for adjective order in Polish has little in common with either the generative frameworks discussed in Linde-Usiekniewicz (2013) or the cognitive proposals of Tabakowska (2001, 2007) and Szumska (2010, 2014). Instead, it falls within the framework presented in Linde-Usiekniewicz (2012), called Encoding Grammar. The basic premise of this framework is that many interesting surface (i.e. observable) linguistic phenomena, usually difficult to analyze, result from an interplay of possibilities and constraints present in natural languages. These possibilities and constraints are embodied in what I call the semantic structure and the syntactic structure of a language. While the semantic representation of an utterance (not to be confounded with the semantic structure of a language), i.e. what the speaker would like to encode, is relatively language independent, the semantic structure and syntactic structure are more language specific, though a reasonable degree of their similarity across languages is nowadays generally assumed, at least in most contemporary linguistic theoretical models.

The very idea of observable phenomena being the outcome of an interaction of independent entities comes from Frajzynger and Shay (2003), who show how phonological, morphological and semantic systems of natural language interact. In my proposal I substitute structures for systems and claim that this interplay covers not only positive interaction, i.e. one subsystem standing in for another, but also conflicts and necessary compromises between the exigencies of each of the structures mentioned above. These conflicts are resolved by the speaker, who, when faced with such constraints, decides what to explicitly encode within an utterance and by what means, and what to leave for the audience to infer or to retrieve from either previous or following utterances or clauses.

---

<sup>3</sup> This presentation draws partly on a similar presentation given in Linde-Usiekniewicz (in print).

As an illustration I generally use an example built upon a quote from Amanda Cross, *Sweet Death, Kind Death*, 1984, New York; Ballantine, p. 88. There a protagonist says:

(4) *I called my lawyer, in one of those midtown firms, and she said...*<sup>4</sup>

I argue that in (4) the English noun *lawyer* does not encode the gender (in contrast to Polish *prawniczka* ‘female lawyer’), nevertheless the gender is encoded in the utterance as a whole, and surfaces as a feminine pronoun co-referential with the noun. Yet the audience understands that the lawyer in question is female only when they apprehend the second clause of the utterance.

The Encoding Grammar framework is therefore explicitly process-oriented, though it falls short of being an actual model of utterance production. Here the framework differs radically not only from the Meaning↔Text Model (Mel’čuk 2012), from which it otherwise draws heavily, but also from Functional Discourse Grammar (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008). By the same token, and again in contrast to both MTM and FDG, the potential process of utterance understanding cannot be conceived as a simple reversal of encoding procedures.

The semantic structure of a language covers its lexicon, including functional words. Functional words are not devoid of meaning, neither are they seen just as some metaphorical mortar used to join the metaphorical lexical bricks together. A good example of a functional word with a very specific meaning is provided by the Russian preposition *iz-za* (Iordanskaya and Mel’čuk 2009: 183-184) as well as its Polish counterpart *przez*, both in their causal meaning. In my analysis (Linde-Usiekiewicz 2012, 70-71) both prepositions encode the information that the outcome is undesirable, which accounts for (5a) being normal and (5b) pragmatically bizarre:

---

<sup>4</sup> The example is truncated because what the lawyer said is immaterial to our analysis.

(5) (a) *Ivan pogib iz-za svoej rassejannosti* (Russian, Iordanskaya and Mel'čuk 2009: 183)

*Ivan zginął przez swoje roztargnienie* (Polish)

‘Ivan died because of his absentmindedness’

(b) *Ivan spassja iz-za svoej rassejannosti* (Russian)

*Ivan uratował się przez swoje roztargnienie* (Polish)

‘Ivan survived because of his absentmindedness’

though, as I have argued, the examples in (5b) would be acceptable when describing a situation in which Ivan had missed the plane he had intended to catch because of his absentmindedness, yet the plane he had been supposed to take had crashed.

Lexical units are equipped not only with their appropriate signifiers and their signifieds (meanings) but also with their syntactic properties, e.g. a number of participants (actants) a verb would require, and grammatical categories, such as tense, mood, case, gender, number, etc. Not only grammatical categories, but also syntactic properties may differ from one language to another even if the signifieds are the same. A good example is provided by verbs referring to substitution: in some languages, i.e. Polish verbs *zastąpić* and *zamienić* take the substituted entity as their direct object, and the substitute is presented as oblique, whereas in English the reverse occurs.

The semantic structure of a language is not limited to its lexicon. A language may possess what can be informally called ‘dedicated syntactic patterns’ which are also means of encoding. These would correspond to syntactically expressed semantic structure (Linde-Usiekiewicz 2012: 82-83). The two most obvious examples are the English auxiliary inversion in (6)



(6) *For no reason would Harry beat his wife.* (taken from Lakoff and Brugman 1987)

and Russian approximate syntax of numerals,

(7) (a) *Ivan pročitai dvadcat' knig.* (Zaroukian 2010)

'Ivan read twenty books'

(b) *Ivan pročitai knig dvadcat'.*

'Ivan read some twenty books'

('lit. Ivan read books twenty')

where inversion (7b) encodes a metatextual commentary that the speaker is not committing themselves to being completely sure about the amount named being exactly (Bogusławski 2014).

Yet another aspect of the semantic structure of a language is the degree of latitude it offers to coercion phenomena (see Lauwers and Willems 2011 for general overview). I have argued that the semantic structure of a language actually constraints the possible coercive patterns (Linde-Usiekiewicz 2012: 81-82). To use the distinction introduced by Lauwers and Willems (2011: 1224), within Encoding Grammar the 'systemic coercion' is no coercion at all, but a built-in element of the semantic structure or syntactic structure, and so called 'language-user coercion' is nothing but speakers making expert use of means provided by the language they speak to achieve the communicative goals they seek. Thus Encoding Grammar understands coercion as overriding some element of lexical meaning of an item by using syntactic means of encoding available in the semantic structure. An interesting example of such phenomenon is discussed in Escandell Vidal and Leonetti (2002), and concerns the

distinction between individual level predicates and stage level predicates, which in Spanish translates into the use of different copulas: *ser* for individual level predicates and *estar* for stage level predicates, e.g. *ser inteligente* ‘to be intelligent’ vs. *estar borracho* ‘to be drunk’ (Escandell Vidal and Leonetti 2002: 163). Yet, as they show, if an individual level predicate is used in stage level predicate constructions, such as captions, they acquire stage level predicate meaning. In that case the trigger for coercion is syntactic, and not pragmatic (Escandell Vidal and Leonetti 2002: 166).

This constitutes further evidence for coercion being a systemic, language bound phenomenon. Were it not so, there would be much fewer constraints on translating ‘coerced’ utterances from one language to another on the one hand, and on the other, translators would be free to introduce such coerced patterns into translations. To illustrate this point – the famous coercive example:

(8) *He sneezed the napkin off the table.*

cannot be translated into Polish as

(9) *\*Skichnął serwetkę ze stołu.*

while the quotative syntax available in Russian (Mel’čuk 1988: 339-356), Polish (Linde-Usiekiewicz 2012: 182-214) and Spanish (Suñer 2000) among others, of emotion verbs framing direct speech cannot be replicated in English:

(10) – *Jak śmiesz!* – *wybuchła Elena.* (adapted from Mel’čuk 1988: 355)

(11) \*‘*How dare you!*’ *exploded Elena.*

Encoding Grammar works on rather opportunistic principles. It claims that some parts of the semantic representation may not find any appropriate encoding means in the semantic-lexical structure of a language. Such parts may be encoded at the deep-syntax level if there is an adequate deep-syntactic pattern. A good example of such language specific pattern is that of pseudo-cleft sentences. Some languages, including French, German, Russian and Polish (Linde-Usiekiewicz 2006 and the literature quoted therein, among others) lack this pattern, though some of them do have straightforward cleft-sentence patterns. The absence of pseudo-clefts results in the semantic information (i.e. the topic–comment or the background–focus distinction, considered semantic within Encoding Grammar, Linde-Usiekiewicz 2012: 9, 118-121) being maintained as still unencoded and sent down (or rather ‘up’) to the surface-syntactic module where it can be encoded by linearization and possibly intonation. Similarly, coreferential nominal elements maintain the semantic value of co-referentiality, but the decision which of them would be encoded as a noun and which of them as a pronoun is delayed until after the linearization takes place, since (4) would not mean the same as (4’):

(4’) *I called her and my lawyer, in one of those midtown firms, said ...*

For the problem of adjective–noun ordering in Polish, it is the semantics which is of tantamount importance within the Encoding Grammar. As a consequence, my analysis makes a radical depart from CPM, which is purely syntactic, and might be seen as drawing closer to the representational model (CPT). Yet in contrast with the original CPT proposal, it does not claim that adjectives surface prenominally or postnominally due to their inherent feature of being either ‘classifying’ or ‘qualitative’. Just the contrary, it will be demonstrated that the observable ordering is the result of the semantic structure of Polish that allows it to explicitly encode the meaning of a resultant adjective(s) bearing nominal phrase. Such encoding occurs

within an isolated nominal phrase; and it is the encoded meaning of such phrase that enables its use in sentential contexts, and not vice-versa.<sup>5</sup> In addition, the issue of how other elements of nominal phrases, such as determiners, numerals, and non-adjectival (nominal or prepositional) modifiers and complements affect the relative order within such phrases, addressed by Bogusławski (2001), is left aside.<sup>6</sup>

### 3. Relational adjectives: what do they relate to?

Relational adjectives are generally described as adjectives that denote not properties but entities (Bosque and Picallo 1996: 351), being ‘semantic nouns’ (McNally and Boleda 2004: 181) or describing a relation between two nouns (Kallas 1998: 482).<sup>7</sup> They are also supposed to “saturate argument positions of the nouns they modify” (McNally and Boleda 2004: 181). However, as Bosque and Picallo (1996: 351-352) rightly observe, when combining with some nouns relational adjectives do not saturate argument positions, as in (12a), but instead correspond to adjuncts, as in (12b):

- (12) (a) *producción automovilística* (Bosque and Picallo 1996: 353)  
           ‘car production’
- (b) *excursión automovilística*  
           ‘car trip’

---

<sup>5</sup> That is why isolated nominal phrases are discussed in the text: contrary to what one of the anonymous reviewers suggests, this is not an oversight, but a conscious methodological decision.

<sup>6</sup> This work has been brought to my attention by anonymous Reviewer 2. Interestingly, both Rutkowski (2009) and I have independently defined what I call here ‘class-establishing adjectives’ similarly to Bogusławski (2001: 83). What distinguishes this account from Bogusławski’s is my claim that if an adjective is used prenominal, it no longer serves to establish a class, but describes a property. In addition, I address the issue of multiple adjective modification.

<sup>7</sup> See Morzycki (in press: 48-49) for an overview of other terms used.

The same distinction obtains for the Polish counterparts of (12a, b): *produkcja samochodowa* and *wycieczka samochodowa*.<sup>8</sup> The authors introduce a terminological distinction between cases like (12a), where they consider the adjective ‘thematic’, and (12b), where they consider the adjective ‘classificatory’.

In addition, the authors introduce yet another valid distinction among thematic adjectives: between those that denote Agents and those that denote Themes. The distinction plays an important role in the ordering of Spanish relational adjectives: when two thematic adjectives are combined, Theme precedes Agent, as seen the following minimal pair:

- (13) (a) *estudios rodoredianos femeninos*  
           ‘studies of Rodoreda by women’  
       (b) *estudios femeninos rodoredianos*  
           ‘studies of women by Rodoreda’

An exactly parallel contrast is not available in Polish. Yet the distinction between Agent and Theme can be observed when the same adjective combines with different nouns, e.g.

- (14) (a) *przewozy pasażerskie*  
           ‘passenger transportation’  
       (b) *pasażerskie skargi*  
           ‘passengers’ complaints’

---

<sup>8</sup> E.g.: *Na koniec roku polska produkcja samochodowa może sięgnąć 1,1 mln sztuk.*  
 ‘By the end of the year, Polish auto production may reach 1.1 million cars.’  
 ([http://www.gazetapodatnika.pl/artykuly/przejscioowy\\_spadek\\_produkcji\\_samochodow-a\\_7979.htm](http://www.gazetapodatnika.pl/artykuly/przejscioowy_spadek_produkcji_samochodow-a_7979.htm))  
*Jak przygotować się do wycieczki samochodowej?*  
 ‘How to prepare oneself for a car trip?’  
 (<http://www.podroze.pl/polska/jak-przygotowac-sie-do-wycieczki-samochodowej/1666/>)

The distinction was rightly noted in Szumska (2014: 145); her observation that adjectives referring to subjects might be preposed, while those referring to objects tend to be postposed, is valid, but needs to be seen within a larger picture.

To avoid the kind of terminological confusion already mentioned in the Introduction, I will maintain the distinctions made by Bosque and Picallo (1996), but substituting ‘argumental’ for their ‘thematic’, as in *produkcja samochodowa* and ‘non-argumental’ for their ‘classificatory’, as in *wycieczka samochodowa*. In order to distinguish the two cases presented in (14) I will refer to adjectives in (14a) as internal-argumental and to those in (14b) as external-argumental.

From what has been said so far, it follows that relative adjectives may but need not saturate an argument position of the noun they modify. In addition, the ‘argumental’ vs. ‘non-argumental’ distinction applies only to nouns that denote events or results of events, such as *produkcja, wycieczka, badania, przewozy*. In many cases the eventive character of the noun is obvious, since they are deverbal derivatives, while in others it is not. One example is that of *wycieczka*. Yet, relational adjectives may modify non-eventive nouns, e.g. *zegar elektryczny* ‘electric clock’ (taken from Bosque and Picallo 1996: 362), *adres internetowy* ‘internet address’, *drukarka laserowa* ‘laser printer’, and many others, amply attested in the literature. These nouns may or may not derive from verbs (*drukarka* does), but again their provenance is immaterial.

Interestingly enough, there seem to exist nouns which when modified by a relational adjective seem to re-acquire an eventive status: two telling examples are *sklep* and *zupa*, as in *sklep warzywny* ‘lit. vegetable shop, greengrocer’s’ and *zupa pomidorowa* ‘tomato soup’. These examples are particularly interesting in the light of Tabakowska’s (2001: 585, 2007: 424) examples concerning cheeses. Her claim is that while *ser biały* ‘lit. cheese white, cottage

cheese' or *ser żółty* 'lit. cheese yellow, hard cheese' would appear as product description, the reverse order, i.e. *biały ser, żółty ser* would be used when talking about the food actually served to people. Nevertheless, even in the most informal situation, when asked what is for dinner, people would still say *zupa pomidorowa* and not *pomidorowa zupa*. Similarly, one goes to a *sklep warzywny* and not to a *warzywny sklep*.<sup>9</sup> What I would like to argue here is that the *sklep* 'shop' refers to a specific participant (or actant) of an event of selling, and this event is evoked (to use Fillmore's (1985: 232) term) whenever this participant is mentioned. For this event the vegetables are the Theme and an internal argument of the verb *to sell*. A similar argument can be presented for soups, though here the event is that of cooking,<sup>10</sup> and tomatoes (or other vegetables) would again be an internal argument, either Theme or Patient, depending on the specific Theta-role model adopted.<sup>11</sup> Thus in the case of cheeses the property of being *żółte* 'hard' or *białe* 'soft' is not related to the event of their coming to being, while in the case of soups the property of being made of tomatoes is event-related. Interestingly, the feature of being made from tomatoes on its own does not impose the eventive status on other nouns referring to food: tomato juice is either *sok pomidorowy* or *pomidorowy sok*.

Adjectives considered relational, i.e. not denoting properties, tend to have their meaning rather vaguely associated with the noun they are supposed to derive from. The issue is further complicated by adjectives that seem to expand the association across the entire range of related nouns. Such is the case of *dentystyczny*, which though formally derives from *dentysta* 'dentist', is used to denote meanings only indirectly associated with the profession, and is semantically related to teeth: while *gabinet dentystyczny* 'lit. dentist's/dentistry office;

---

<sup>9</sup> Neither *biały* nor *żółty* are relational adjectives. I will come to the issue later on.

<sup>10</sup> A conceptually similar analysis has been proposed by Beard (1991).

<sup>11</sup> For example Stalmaszczyk (1996: 98) discusses the original proposal which restricts Theme to objects that are either moved or located somewhere, and defines Patient as "an entity that undergoes an action". Within this interpretation vegetables that are sold are a Theme, while vegetables that are chopped and cooked would be a Patient. When Theta-roles are represented in terms of features, Theme and Patient are no longer distinguished (Reinhart 2002). Theme as a Theta-role should not be confounded with the notion of 'Theme' as used in information structure studies.

dental office' can be understood as the place where a dentist works or where dentistry is performed, with the adjective maintaining the relation with the motivating noun, that is no longer the case in *nić dentystyczna* 'lit. dentist/dentistry thread; dental floss', which is used not in professional setting, but in a day-to-day dental care. This loss of semantic relation between the adjective and formally motivating noun occurs in loanwords, and can stretch to a case where there is no synchronically motivating noun: this is the case of *sanitarny* 'sanitary': the corresponding noun *sanitariat* refers to a bathroom only.<sup>12</sup>

An interesting twist can be found in apparently relational adjectives in which the formally motivating noun itself derives from a verb. The adjectives *opalowy* 'heating' and *napędowy* 'lit. driving, propelling' formally derive from *opalać* 'fuel' and *napędzać* 'propulsion' respectively, yet the nouns themselves are eventive in meaning, and nouns combining with the adjectives saturate the role of the argument of the motivating verb. *Napędowy* can combine with either an internal or external argument of this verb, as the motivating event can be either perceived as being propelled by something (*napędzany olejem* 'lit. oil-propelled') or as the referent of the noun being the propelling element, as in *śruba napędowa* 'propeller, lit. propelling screw'. In the case of *opalowy* the argument has to be internal (*opalać olejem* 'to heat with oil'). Another example of this kind is the adjective *spożywczy* 'alimentary, food', which straightforwardly derives from the verb *spożywać* 'to consume, to eat'. In *artykuły spożywcze* 'comestibles, lit. alimentary products' the noun *artykuły* saturates the internal argument position of the verb *spożywać*. Thus in all the cases discussed in the present paragraph, the semantic relation is the reverse of what happens in (12a). Such adjectives, since their semantic relation to the verb remains underspecified, can be used as ordinary relational adjectives, i.e. to modify nouns that apparently do not saturate argumental positions: thus we get *przemysł spożywczy* 'food industry', referring not to an industry that produces

---

<sup>12</sup> There is yet another meaning of *sanitarny* relating to health as in *punkt sanitarny* 'first-aid post'; this meaning is still retained in nouns like *sanitariusz, -ka* 'orderly'.



consumption, but to an industry that produces foods for consumption; *sklep spożywczy* ‘lit. alimentary shop, grocer’s’, again a shop that sells foodstuffs, etc. In such cases the adjective is used elliptically, with the intermediate element, i.e. the one that is semantically modified by the adjective, absent.

To sum up this section: the notion of ‘relative adjective’ is therefore extended to comprise not only adjectives that show some underspecified relation between the noun they derive from and the noun they modify, but also adjectives deriving either directly or indirectly from verbs. When such adjectives combine with nouns, the relation between the adjective and the semantics of its derivational base is further specified by the meaning of the noun. However, at first glance it appears that the specification is partly mediated by the real-life relation between the event (either evoked by the head noun or by the adjective) and the participant, again either identified by the head noun or by the adjective. As could be seen in the *nić dentystyczna* example our understanding of such phrases comes from extra-linguistic knowledge of what dental floss is and how people use it; there is nothing truly semantic blocking our understanding of the phrase as referring to some kind of suture used by dentists but not by other health professionals. Similarly, we do not understand *sklep kolonialny* ‘lit. colonial shop’ otherwise than as some kind of grocer’s selling imported food (incidentally, this term, labeled as obsolete in dictionaries, has been undergoing an interesting revival). Yet in the next section it will be argued that this semantic specification is more strongly geared to linguistic phenomena than it seems.<sup>13</sup>

#### **4. A noun meets a single adjective**

---

<sup>13</sup> Partly similar observations concerning Spanish adjectives appear in Fabregas (2007). His framework is adopted for Polish relational adjectives in Cetnarowska (2015b). Again for lack of space I will not discuss how our approaches differ.

What I would like to propose is an account of nominal phrases bearing a single adjective modifier that departs hugely from what has been proposed in the literature. In this approach there is no single mechanism responsible for ordering adjective and noun within a nominal phrase. The linear position of the adjective works in a rather intricate way, either to resolve the conflict between the semantic structure of the adjective and the semantic representation it is supposed to help to encode, or to help to encode the required semantic representation, adding some element of meaning that does not simply follow from the lexical meaning of either the noun or the adjective.

#### ***4.1. Property denoting adjectives***

Adjectives that denote properties, traditionally called ‘qualifying’, normally do just that: ascribe some property to the referent of the noun. In the literature concerning adjectives in general there is a tendency to distinguish between intersective adjectives and non-intersective ones, with the latter further divided into subsective ones and non-subsective ones (see Cabredo 2010 or McNally and Boleda 2004 for overview). However, while there are some adjectives that are lexically non-intersective and non-subsective, i.e. *rzekomy* ‘alleged’, normally many adjectives can be used both intersectively e.g. *falszywe zeznanie* ‘false testimony’ and non-intersectively, *falszywy prezydent* ‘false president’. Obviously, only adjectives used intersectively or subsectively can denote a property. In ordinary Polish syntax the three kinds of adjective modification are undistinguishable, in contrast to Romance (Cinque 2010; 2014; Demonte 2008). However, for non-intersective non-subsective modifiers there is one restriction: they can only be contrastively focalized by applying a specific intonation pattern (see **1**), while intersective adjectives and subsective ones accept both intonation-only focal contrast and postposition together with the appropriate stress pattern:

- (15) (a) *falszywy prezydent*  
*FAŁSZYWY prezydent*  
*\*prezydent FAŁSZYWY*
- (b) *falszywe zeznanie*  
*FAŁSZYWE zeznanie*  
*zeznanie FAŁSZYWE*

What I would like to concentrate on is intersective modification by property denoting adjectives. I would argue, same as I have in Linde-Usiekniewicz 2013, that such adjectives simply denote properties when pre-posed, and when post-posed, they establish a criterion according to which the referents of the nouns are classified. As I have argued in Linde-Usiekniewicz (2013: 122-123) the same property can be used to simply single out a subset of referents from those denoted by the noun, or to establish a specific class: the difference lies in the fact that a subset of N's having the property of x is established without pointing out the existence of some other N's having the property of non-x. That is why property denoting adjectives can be used tautologically as in *biały śnieg* 'white snow', which does not say anything about the putative existence of non-white snow. By contrast, if the same adjective is used post-nominally, it not only ascribes the property to the referent of the noun, but, at the same time, establishes the existence of at least two classes: the property-bearing one and the property non-bearing one. Moreover, since they are lexically primed to describe properties, post-posing them and encoding them as class-establishing ones can be seen as a type of coercion; as a result such patterns are seen as marked.

Thus to account for the difference between pre-posed and post-posed property describing adjectives there is no need to invoke the categorization hierarchy suggested by Szumska (2014: 147). In addition there is some evidence against the claim that pre-posed

adjectives reflect the fact that the feature they describe corresponds a higher-level categorization in comparison to the semantics of the noun. First of all, the so-called scalar adjectives (i.e. *high, low, big, small*, etc.) attribute the relevant feature not absolutely, but in comparison to something else. Irrespectively of the meaning of such adjectives being described in terms of reference sets or norms or in terms of being conspicuous or attracting attention (Bogusławski 1994: 329), the object has to be apprehended (i.e. categorized) first in order to decide if the adjective applies. For example, the same building may be a small bungalow but a large cottage (see Linde-Usiekniewicz 2000: 41-42 for more examples of the same kind). Secondly, some property denoting adjectives that are used mainly pre-nominally in Polish are in fact subsective, e.g. *utalentowana śpiewaczka* ‘talented (female) singer’. Again, in order to categorize somebody as talented, one needs to know the capacity in which such talent is shown.<sup>14</sup>

#### **4.2. Relational adjectives**

As could be seen in 3, the ordering of relational adjectives and nouns they modify is more complex and cannot be adequately described without addressing the issue of the semantic relation between the two elements of the noun phrase. The picture that emerges is as follows. Adjectives that modify a non-eventive noun can be used both pre-nominally and post-nominally, similarly to property denoting adjectives. However, they are not lexically ‘primed’ to denote properties: thus when used pre-nominally, they are coerced to act as if they were property-denoting. However, the property itself is not encoded, but left to inference. Thus *ciężarowy samochód* ‘lit. cargo car’ (taken from Cetnarowska 2014: 239) does not establish a class of *samochody ciężarowe* ‘lit. cars cargo, truck’ as opposed to *samochody osobowe* ‘lit. cars personal’ but encodes some property resulting from being a truck and not a car. In

---

<sup>14</sup> Subsectional adjectives are mentioned here, as an exception to what has been said above, only as evidence against Szumska’s claim.

Cetnarowska's original example about the truck being impossible to park this property is size. In other contexts the property might be having bulk capacity, or travelling at slower speed, or being more difficult to drive, or offering less comfort to passengers. This phenomenon actually underlies the traditional distinction between 'qualitative modifiers' (*przydawka jakościowa* in Polish) and 'kind/classifying modifiers' (*przydawka gatunkowa*). This has been rightly noted by Szumska (2010; 2014), but she associated it with the co-occurrence with evaluative adjectives, as in *piękne drewniane meble* (adapted from Szumska 2010). Even without the accompanying evaluative adjective (see 5.1), pre-posed relational adjectives encode the fact that the true-life relation between the referent of the head noun and the noun from which the adjective derives results in the object denoted by the head noun having a particular, albeit underspecified feature. That is why adjectives denoting materials and adjectives invoking adjuncts tend to appear pre-nominally if no class is being established: thus we get *stalowe/drewniane/plastikowe drzwi* 'steel/wood/plastic door', unless in product description (cf. Trugman pc quoted in Rutkowski 2009: 115)

The relative order of a relational adjective and eventive noun is more complex, and depends on the relation between the event described by the noun and the semantic role of the entity described by the adjective. The complexity arises from the fact that the post-position of the adjective first of all encodes its argumental, or even internal-argumental character. Thus we get the contrast between *kształcenie zawodowe* 'vocational training' and *zawodowe kształcenie* 'professional(-quality) training' (Linde-Usiekiewicz 2013: 119-120). Internal arguments generally do not appear pre-posed, unless in contrastive focus (see 1), because the post-nominal order actually encodes the internal-argumental meaning. Such nominal phrases remain underspecified as to the class-establishing issue. By contrast, adjectives corresponding to external arguments and adjuncts may appear pre-nominally to encode just that: the agentive

or externally argumental character as in *pasażerskie skargi* ‘passengers’ complaints’. This can be seen in the contrast between (16a) and (16b) and between (17a) and (17b), respectively:

- (16) (a) *prezydenckie wybory*  
‘presidential choices (i.e. made by the president)’
- (b) *wybory prezydenckie*  
‘presidential elections’.
- (17) (a) *nasza polityka europejska*  
‘our European policy (i.e. toward Europe)
- (b) *\*nasza europejska polityka*  
intended meaning ‘our, i.e. European, policy.’<sup>15</sup>

Thus the post-nominal order of a relational adjective modifying an eventive noun encodes the internal-argumental meaning of the adjective. Many expressions featuring an eventive noun and an adjective corresponding to its internal argument are restricted to a technical register. Some of the head nouns, e.g. *przewozy* (in plural), come from such a register. Moreover, in non-technical register the argument is not represented by a relational adjective but by a noun (in the genitive), e.g. *produkcja samochodów* ‘production of cars’, *przewóz pasażerów* ‘transport (sg.) of passengers’, etc.

In the case of an eventive noun modified by an adjective corresponding to an adjunct, there is no risk of ambiguity between external and internal argument and between any argument and adjunct. Thus the post-posed adjective encodes both the relation between the eventive noun and the adjunct and the class-establishing character of the modifier, while the pre-posed one encodes some underspecified property resulting from this relation, as is the

---

<sup>15</sup> Of course (17b) becomes acceptable if *europejska* is assigned contrastive stress or when used parenthetically.

case of non-eventive nouns modified by relational adjectives discussed below. Again, since the post-nominal syntax is associated with establishing a contrasting class, postposed modifiers tend to be used in all kinds of labels, lists, product descriptions and technical terms. That is why we get *naftowa lampa* and *lampa naftowa* ‘oil lamp’, *nocny autobus* and *autobus nocny* ‘night bus’, etc.

There is another interesting twist in the overall picture that may suggest that that invoking the argument-adjunct distinction may not in fact be the best approach to analyzing relational adjectives modifying eventive nouns. Namely, adjuncts corresponding to FrameNet’s core frame elements (Ruppenhofer et al. 2010: 18-21), be they syntactic arguments or syntactic adjuncts, or maybe those adjuncts corresponding to Mel’čuk’s semantic actants (as opposed to syntactic actants, Mel’čuk 2004a, b), tend to behave like internal arguments inasmuch that the adjectives corresponding to them tend to remain postposed.

In instances discussed in **3**, where the adjective corresponds to some event and the modified noun is the semantic argument, the adjective is almost obligatory post-posed, e.g. *olej napędowy*, *olej opałowy*, *artykuły spożywcze* discussed above.

To sum up this section: In the case of non-eventive nouns and eventive nouns modified by adjectives relating to adjuncts, post-nominal modification encodes the establishment of classes, as is the case with property denoting adjectives. Pre-nominal syntax coerces the relational adjective to be understood as referring to some property resulting from the relation. Thus the difference between non-argumental relational adjectives and lexical property denoting adjectives consists in the fact that the former are coerced into property denoting meaning when pre-posed, while the latter need to be coerced in order to establish classes by being postposed. By contrast, the event-internal argument relation that obtains between the noun and the adjective is encoded by post-nominal modification, irrespectively of

the distribution of the semantic features ‘event’ and ‘event participant’ between the noun and the adjective.

### 5. Adding another adjective to the mix

As attested in the literature, when another adjective is be added to a nominal phrase, or even more than one, several distinct patterns emerge: (a) all adjectives surface pre-nominally; (b) all adjectives surface post-nominally; (c) some of them appear pre-nominally and others do post-nominally.

#### 5.1.Prenominal pattern

First of all, all-prenominal modification occurs when all the adjectives in question are property denoting, with the adjective order reflecting the order of restriction, e.g.

(18) (a) *taki mały owalny koralik*

‘that small oval-shaped bead’

(adapted from Tabakowska 2007: 416, and there taken from Topolińska 1984: 376)

(b) *taki owalny mały koralik*

‘that oval-shaped small bead’

The order thus reflects the “communicative intention of the author of the text” (Topolińska 1984: 383 as translated by Tabakowska 2007: 461).<sup>16</sup> However, though such ordering may show some latitude with respect to adjective hierarchies (e.g. Scott 2002), the order is not free. The one presented in (19)

---

<sup>16</sup> There are alternative accounts of this phenomenon, including ones which invoke either comma intonation, or the distinction between hierarchical and parallel modification (Sproat and Shih 1991). However, Topolińska’s account is the most compatible with the Encoding Grammar approach.



(19) *dluga brązowa sztruksowa sofa*

‘a long brown corduroy sofa’

(Tabakowska 2007: 417)

is the only one acceptable. Its alternation would lead to encoding a non-restrictive meaning, independently of the actual use of a comma in writing or of appropriate intonation when speaking (Tabakowska 2007: 419-420).

Secondly, all-prenominal modification may occur if a relational adjective is coerced to denote a property. Adjectives accepting such coercion may appear prenominally in combination with a property denoting adjective. The coercion may be triggered, as Szumska (2013: 147-148) suggests, when the underspecified property expressed by the relative adjective is the basis of evaluation, as in *przepiękne renesansowe meble* ‘beautiful renaissance furniture’ (adapted from Szumska 2010), but it does not require an evaluative adjective as a necessary condition, e.g.

(20) *włoskie renesansowe meble*

‘Italian renaissance furniture’

Similarly, I would suggest that in:

(21) *Kupiłam nowoczesną laserową drukarkę* (Szumska 2013: 148)

‘I bought a modern laser printer’

there is no need to postulate an implicit evaluative reading of *nowoczesny* ‘modern’, as the property of being *laserowy* ‘laser’ itself serves as the basis for the printer to be evaluated as ‘state-of-the-art’. The true difference between (22a) and (22b)

- (22) (a) *nowoczesna drukarka laserowa*  
           ‘lit. modern printer laser’
- (b) *nowoczesna laserowa drukarka*  
           ‘lit. modern laser printer’

is that in (22a) *nowoczesny* picks out a subset of laser printers as opposed to other kind of printers (say, jet-ink ones, three-dimensional ones and other kinds technology may come up with), while in (22b) the nature of the printing process is simply a property of the printer.

### ***5.2. Postnominal pattern***

The pattern involving a sequence of adjectives all occurring post-nominally in restrictive modification (as opposed to non-restrictive modification, (see 1)) constituted the crux of CPT’s criticism of CPM. The syntactic rule postulated in CPM requires the ‘classificatory’ adjective to be unique. Yet, multiple post-nominal adjectives do occur, though mostly (here I agree with Rutkowski 2013) on labels, in product lists, and other technical documents. Unless a separate grammar for such textual genres is postulated, the analysis has to take into account both their attested occurrences and the fact that they are avoided in everyday speech.

The explanation I am proposing relies on the distinction between different types of post-nominal modification presented in 4. On the basis of the analyses presented there and other analyses of possible orderings not presented for lack of space, I would like to propose a preliminary hierarchy of potentially post-nominal modifiers, along the lines of:

(23) internal argumental > external argumental > adjunctive > class-establishing

though a more fine-grained hierarchy, involving different kinds of adjuncts may be necessary, as well as one distinguishing various class-establishing modifiers of non-eventive nouns. In particular, adjuncts corresponding to core frame elements should tend to precede non-core ones when modifying an eventive noun, while for non-eventive nouns that nevertheless evoke a frame, adjectives corresponding to core elements should tend to precede non-core ones. An appended version of (23) may take the form of (24):

(24) internal argumental > external argumental > core adjunctive > non-core adjunctive > core class-establishing > non-core class establishing

In accordance with (23) we get (25a) and (26a) and not (25b) and (26b) respectively:

(25) (a) *olej napędowy zimowy*  
 ‘lit. oil propelling winter’  
 ‘winter diesel fuel’

(b) \**olej zimowy napędowy*

(26) (a) *adres internetowy prywatny*  
 ‘lit. address internet private’  
 ‘private internet address’

(b) \**adres prywatny internetowy*

The more fine-grained hierarchy (as in 24) is observed in the contrast between (27a) and (27b):

- (27) (a) *drukarka atramentowa kolorowa*  
           ‘lit. printer ink-jet color’  
           ‘color ink-jet printer’
- (b) *drukarka kolorowa atramentowa*

While both are possible and attested on the internet, (27a) is about four times more frequent, and seems much more natural. This arises from the fact that although the noun *drukarka* ‘printer’ is non-eventive, it nevertheless evokes a frame of the event of printing. For such an event the medium or mode (ink-jet vs. laser) is a core element, while the feature of the printout (color vs. black-and-white) is not.

Yet (27b) does occur, as well as other examples apparently contradicting (24), which correctly predicts (28a), but not (28b); yet (28b) is nevertheless attested on the internet:

- (28) (a) *drewno opałowe iglaste*  
           ‘lit. wood heating conifer’  
           ‘conifer firewood’
- (b) *drewno iglaste opałowe*  
           ‘lit. wood conifer heating’

What happens in (28b) is that – for pragmatic reasons – the speaker uses the class-establishing adjective *iglasty* ‘conifer’ as the one introducing the first-order classification (conifer vs. broadleaf). At the same time, when separating the adjective *opałowy* from the noun, they

deprive it of the argumental character and *opalowy* is thus coerced into being a more general, class-establishing attribute, contrasting the conifer firewood with conifer wood used for woodwork. Similar examples comprise *przewozy pasażerskie lotnicze* ‘lit. transport passenger aerial’ vs. *przewozy lotnicze pasażerskie* ‘lit. transport aerial passenger’ quoted in CPT (2011). In cases like these and in other cases similar to (28b) the argumental character of the adjective is no longer syntactically encoded but remains to be inferred partly from its general meaning and partly through extra-linguistic knowledge (possibly mediated by relying on specific frames, which represent the combination of linguistic and non-linguistic expertise).

### 5.3. *Mixed pattern*

Since the all-postnominal order involves establishing a hierarchy of classes, it is not surprising that speakers tend to avoid encoding such hierarchies unless pragmatically compelled to do so. Thus in ordinary usage there is a tendency to coerce an otherwise class-establishing adjective into denoting properties (some examples of such a phenomenon were given in 4.2 and 5.1). One would expect the adjectives to show a graded resistance to coercion accordingly to the hierarchy proposed in (23) and (24). Evidently this is not the case, as we get all kinds of relational adjectives in pre-nominal patterns, including internal-argumental ones, e.g. *pasażerskie przewozy lotnicze* ‘lit. passenger transport aerial’. I would argue that what happens in such cases is that there is a conflict between the semantic representation the speaker wishes to encode and the semantic structure, of which (23) and (24) is a part. The speaker wants to establish, through encoding, the existence of a class of referents as opposed to another class and the adjective they choose is the one that best establishes such distinction. Thus in *atramentowa drukarka kolorowa* the class of color printers, as opposed to black-and-white-ones, is established and among all the possible members of this class a subset is established of those printers which use ink. By contrast in *kolorowa drukarka atramentowa*

the class of ink-jet printers, as opposed to laser ones, is established, and among all members of that class, a subset is established of those that give color printouts. In both cases the resulting phrase refers to the intersection of printers using ink and giving color printouts; it is not surprising that they tend to be regarded as synonymous.

What distinguishes the behavior of relational adjectives in mixed pattern from that in prenominal pattern is that in the former even the internal-argumental adjectives can be coerced into prenominal position, if another adjective needs to be used for class-establishing purposes. Thus while we are unlikely to get *\*iglaste opalowe drewno* and *\*opalowe iglaste drewno*, we still get *opalowe drewno iglaste*.

## 6. Summing up

From what was shown in 4 and 5, the same encoding mechanism is at work both in nominal phrases bearing a single adjective, and in phrases bearing multiple adjectives, yet it works differently in the two cases. In phrases with a single adjective (seen in 4), two different elements of semantic structure syntactically expressed are involved in ordering a single adjective in respect to the noun. Each of the elements operates in a different way and on different lexical items. For the first pattern to be applied, first of all either the noun or the adjective has to refer to an event. Secondly, the other element (again the adjective or the noun) has to refer to the internal argument of such event. In that case the adjective invariably follows the head. This fixed pattern encodes the semantic relation between the two entities featured in the noun phrase. For obvious reasons, the adjective that enters into such a pattern has to be a relational one. In such cases the order is fixed, because the reversed order would divest the noun phrase of the very meaning it encodes. Specifically, if the noun is eventive and the adjective refers to an event participant, the noun phrase would encode the participant as either a non-internal argument or an adjunct.

The second pattern involves the distinction between denoting a property and establishing class and applies both to eventive and non-eventive nouns on the one hand and to both relational and property denoting adjectives on the other. When following the head both kinds of adjective establish a class of entities, in contrast to yet another class. This class is construed on the basis of the property expressed by the adjective, as I have argued in Linde-Usiekniewicz (2013), or on the basis of the relation to the noun underlying the relational adjective, as was proposed by McNally and Boleda (2004). By contrast, when preposed, neither kind of adjective establishes a class. When used in restrictive modification, they further delimitate the set of referents of the noun phrase. An interesting feature of relational adjectives in the pre-nominal position is that they are thus coerced to encode some non-specified property resulting from the relation between the head and the adjective.

The same two elements of syntactic structure also act on phrases comprising several adjectives, though the picture is more complex and involves a hierarchy of adjective function, presented in (24). In particular, from the very nature of arguments it follows that in most cases there can be only one adjective corresponding to each argument, available for modification, of eventive nouns. By contrast there can be various adjunctive adjectives that may combine with the head noun; the range of potential adjunctive modifiers ‘waiting in the wings’ increase when one goes from core to non-core ones. All of them are at the same time class-establishing when used post-nominally. The range of class-establishing adjectives combining with non-eventive nouns is potentially even larger, because any relational adjective and many property denoting adjectives can be used for establishing classes.

Importantly, class-establishing is recursive: a class-establishing, i.e. post-nominal adjective may be followed by another class-establishing adjective to create a more detailed classification. In such case, the linear order of adjectives reflects nothing but the hierarchy of classes, as seen in (27a,b), where both adjectives retain their class-establishing function.

By contrast, the argumental adjective, and specifically the event-argument relation, can be encoded as such only when the adjective immediately follows the noun. Such structure can be combined with a class-establishing adjective in only one way, i.e. by sequencing the adjectives post-nominally, in accordance to (24), as seen in (28a), where the leftmost adjective again preserves its argumental character, while the rightmost one still establishes a class. However, the classification concerns the entities already restricted to those that are specified by the event-argument encoding, e.g. firewood in (28b). If, however, the classification needs to be established foremost and independently of this restriction, the class-establishing adjective immediately follows the noun and the adjective corresponding to the event-argument relation is relegated to the second-order class-establishing position, as in (28b), with the loss of encoded meaning already mentioned in 5.2.

Similarly, if post-nominal sequences of adjectives are undesirable for any reason, the conflict between encoding an argumental adjective and encoding a class-establishing adjective is resolved by coercing one of the adjective to appear pre-nominally. A relational adjective that would be class-establishing if used post-nominally loses its purely class-establishing character and is then coerced to encode some unspecified property, which again the audience infers from the context. An adjective that would encode the argumental relation if it immediately followed the noun suffers a similar coercion.

## **Conclusions**

An important similarity between CPT and CPM was that both approaches strived to elegantly reduce the relevant phenomena of adjective modification and adjective order to a single, uniform model: either the eponymous Classificatory Phrase or the relational model. In my opinion both models fail, because the interplay between adjective meanings, nominal meanings and their combination in Polish is not reducible either to a simple syntactic position



or to the distinction between ‘qualitative’ and ‘classifying’ adjectives being established by simple fiat (this, indeed, has been the crux of my line of argumentation in unpublished polemics with CPT).

In contrast to both CPT and CPM, Szumska (2010, 2014) focuses on semantic or pragmatic (i.e. functional) differences between different linearizations, without mentioning any underlining syntactic theory (her reference to Topolińska (1973) concerns the relation between context and specific meaning of a noun phrase). Tabakowska’s account is similar to the one proposed here inasmuch that she explains the eventual ordering in terms of the “speaker’s choice of a construal, [in which] iconic principles conspire (or are overridden) for optimum effect” (Tabakowska 2007: 411), which mirrors both the speaker’s perspective built into Encoding Grammar and the notion of different principles being at odds with one another. Yet she offers no explicit syntactic account of how the iconicity principle operates in grammar.<sup>17</sup>

Encoding Grammar, briefly presented above in **2**, offers a solution with adequate semantic specificity and an accompanying syntax. As already mentioned, its purpose is to give linguistic form, i.e. to encode the semantic representation of the utterance-to-be. The semantic structure of Encoding Grammar, the module mainly responsible for encoding, has two parts: the semantics of available lexical units and the means to encode meaning by special syntax, with the latter operating on the former, including through coercion. The lexical part of the semantic structure of Polish contains at least two different kinds of adjectives: adjectives denoting properties and relational adjectives. In the encoding process the lexical semantic structure and the syntactically expressed semantic structure may work in concert. One such instance is when a property denoting adjective is redundantly encoded as such, i.e. when it

---

<sup>17</sup> Tabakowska (2001) does talk of landmark–trajector reversal when explaining the fact that inherently classifying adjectives are used pre-nominally, though she fails to explain how to combine this theory with the fact that the trajector–landmark distinction is used to describe nominal modification in general, with the noun being invariably the trajector and the adjective being the landmark (Langacker 1987:486).

precedes the nominal head. The second instance is when a relational adjective is postposed. However, the semantic structure of Polish does even more. It not only allows a relational adjective to be encoded as class-establishing, but also enables a relational adjective to be encoded as entering into the event-internal argument relation with the head noun by means of reserving a special position in the linear order: the one immediately to the right of the noun. In addition, the event-argument relation is unique inasmuch as the relational adjective cannot be coerced into denoting a property on its own.

Yet, if a property denoting adjective needs to be used to establish a class, because the property it refers to serves as a basis of classification, the semantic structure syntactically expressed offers the postposition as an encoding means. Similarly, it allows a relational adjective to be encoded as underspecified property-denoting: the adjective has to appear to the left of the head noun. Since there is a mismatch in such cases between the lexical semantics of the adjective and the encoded meaning of the nominal phrase it is not surprising that such instances tend to be marked.

The same rules govern multiple relational adjectives (i.e. potentially class establishing or argument denoting ones) modifying the same noun, though the degree to which coercive patterns are available is larger than in the case of single relational adjective. A post-posed adjective retains its class-establishing character even when not immediately following the noun, while a potentially argumental adjective is deprived of this meaning when appearing elsewhere but immediately after the noun.

All this can be modeled and explained adequately in Encoding Grammar because of its very architecture, positing the existence of two levels of syntax (deep and surface) and the fact that when the semantic representation of the utterance-to-be passes through different levels of encoding, the hitherto unencoded elements of meaning remain available to subsequent levels of encoding. In the case of adjective modification, the modification (as

opposed to predication) is encoded by the deep-syntactic module; the semantic specifics of modification, i.e. property denoting, class establishing or saturating an internal argument of an event is left to be encoded in the surface syntax, i.e. by linearization.

## References

- BEARD Robert (1991). Decompositional Composition: The Semantics of Scope Ambiguities and ‘Bracketing Paradoxes’. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 9(2), 195-229.
- BOGUSŁAWSKI Andrzej (1994). Measures are measures. On the defense of diversity of comparatives and positives. In *Sprawy słowa/Word Matters*. 323-329. Warsaw: Vega
- BOGUSŁAWSKI Andrzej (2001). Szyk uzupełnień w polskich frazach imiennych. In Włodzimierz GRUSZCZYŃSKI, Urszula ANDREJEWICZ, Mirosław BAŃKO, Dorota KOPCIŃSKA (eds.), *Nie bez znaczenia... Prace ofiarowane Profesorowi Zygmuntowi Saloniemu z okazji jubileuszu 15000 dni pracy naukowej*. 79-86. Białystok: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu w Białymstoku.
- BOGUSŁAWSKI Andrzej (2014) Заметка о статусе инверсии в русских словосочетаниях с именами числительными. In Anna KOZŁOWSKA, Agnieszka ŚWIĄTEK (eds.), *Znaczenie – tekst – kultura. Prace ofiarowane profesor Elżbiecie Janus*. 17-26. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo UKSW.
- BOSQUE Ignacio, PICALLO Carme (1996). Postnominal adjectives in Spanish DPs. *Journal of Linguistics* 32, 349-385.
- BOUCHARD Denis (1998). The distribution and interpretation of adjectives in French: A consequence of Bare Phrase Structure. *Probus* 10(2),139-183.
- BOUCHARD Denis (2002). *Adjectives, number and interfaces: Why languages vary*. Oxford: Elsevier Science.

- CABREDO Hofherr Patricia (2010). Adjectives. An introduction. In Patricia CABREDO HOFHERR, Ora MATUSHANSKY (eds.), *Adjectives – Formal analyses in syntax and semantics*. 1-26. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- CETNAROWSKA Bożena (2014). On pre-nominal classifying adjectives in Polish. In Anna BONDARUK, Gréte DALMI and Alexander GROSU (eds.), *Topics in the syntax of DPs and agreement*. 100-127. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- CETNAROWSKA Bożena (2015a). The Linearization of Adjectives in Polish Noun Phrases: Selected Semantic and Pragmatic Factors. In Anna BONDARUK, Anna PRAŻMOWSKA (eds.), *Within Language, Beyond Theories (Volume 1: Studies in Theoretical Linguistics)*. 188-205. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- CETNAROWSKA Bożena (2015b). Categorial ambiguities within the noun phrase: Relational adjectives in Polish. In Joanna BŁASZCZAK, Dorota KLIMEK-JANKOWSKA, Krzysztof MIGDALSKI (eds.), *How categorial are categories? New approaches to old problems of Noun, Verb and Adjective*. 115-196. Berlin – Boston: de Gruyter Mouton.
- CETNAROWSKA Bożena, PYSZ Agnieszka, TRUGMAN Helen (2011). Accounting for some flexibility in a rigid construction: On the position of classificatory adjectives in Polish. In Piotr BAŃSKI, Beata ŁUKASZEWICZ, Monika OPALIŃSKA (eds.), *Generative Investigations: Syntax, Morphology, and Phonology*. 24-47. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishers.
- CINQUE Guglielmo (2010). *The Syntax of Adjectives. A Comparative Study*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- CINQUE Guglielmo (2014). The Semantic Classification of Adjectives. A View from Syntax. *Studies in Chinese Linguistics* 35(1), 1-30.

- DEMONTE Violeta (2008). Meaning-form correlations and adjective position in Spanish. In Louise McNALLY, Charles KENNEDY (eds.), *The semantics of adjectives and adverbs*. 71-100. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- ESCANDELL-VIDAL Victoria, LEONETTI Manuel (2002). Coercion and the *Stage/Individual* Distinction. In Javier GUTIÉRREZ REXACH (ed.), *From Words to Discourse*. 159-179. New York/Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- FABREGAS Antonio (2007). The internal syntactic structure of Relational Adjectives. *Probus* 19(1), 1-36.
- FILLMORE Charles J. (1985). Frames and the Semantics of Understanding. *Quaderni di Semantica* 6(2), 222-254.
- FRAJZYNGIER Zygmunt, SHAY Erin (2003). *Explaining Language Structure Through Systems Interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins
- HENGEVELD, Kees, MACKENZIE J. Lachlan (2008). *Functional Discourse Grammar. A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- IORDANSKAYA Lidia, MEL'CUK Igor A. (2009). Linguistic Well-formedness of Semantic Structures. In David BECK, Kim GERDES, Jasmina MILIĆEVIĆ, Alain POLGUÈRE (eds.) *MTT'09 Proceedings*. 177-187. Montreal: Observatoire de linguistique Sens-Texte.
- KALLAS Krystyna (1998). *Przymiotnik*. In. Renata GRZEGORCZYKOWA, Roman LASKOWSKI, Henryk WRÓBEL (eds.), *Gramatyka współczesnego języka polskiego. Morfologia*. 469-523. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- LAKOFF George, BRUGMAN Claudia (1987). The semantics of aux-inversion and anaphora constraints. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, San Francisco. <http://georgelakoff.files.wordpress.com/2011/04/the-semantics-of-aux-inversion-and-anaphora-constraints-lakoff-and-brugman-1986.pdf> (2011.12.13)

- LANGACKER Ronald (1987). *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar: Theoretical prerequisites*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- LAUWERS Peter, WILLEMS Dominique (2011). Coercion: Definition and challenges, current approaches, and new trends. *Linguistics* 49(6), 1219-1235. Retrieved 28 Jul. 2015 from doi:10.1515/ling.2011.034
- LINDE-USIEKIEWICZ Jadwiga (2000). *Określenia wymiarów w języku polskim*. Warsaw: Publications of the Faculty of Polish
- LINDE-USIEKIEWICZ Jadwiga (2006). On the relative depth of cleaving. In Hélène WŁODARCZYK and André WŁODARCZYK (eds.), *La focalization dans les langues*. 81-94. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- LINDE-USIEKIEWICZ Jadwiga (2008). O pewnych interesujących własnościach wybranych analitycznych konstrukcji leksykalnych. In Renata GRZEGORCZYKOWA and Krystyna WASZAKOWA (eds.), *Słowo – pojęcie – tekst*. 255-264. Warsaw: Wydawnictwa UW.
- LINDE-USIEKIEWICZ Jadwiga (2012). *From Conflict Through Compromise to Collaboration: Semantics, Syntax and Information Structure in Natural Languages*, Warsaw: Publications of the Faculty of Polish.
- LINDE-USIEKIEWICZ Jadwiga (2013). A position on classificatory adjective in Polish. *Studies in Polish Linguistics* 8(3), 103-126.
- LINDE-USIEKIEWICZ Jadwiga (in print). Cognitive environment and information structure.
- MCNALLY Louise, BOLEDA Gemma (2004). Relational adjectives as properties of kinds. *Empirical Issues in Formal Syntax and Semantics* 5. 179-196.
- MEL'ČUK Igor A. (1988). *Dependency Syntax: Theory and Practice*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- MEL'ČUK Igor A. (2004a). Actants in Semantics. *Linguistics* 42(1). 1-66.
- MEL'ČUK Igor A. (2004b). Actants in Syntax. *Linguistics* 42(2). 247-291

- MEL'ČUK Igor A. (2012). *Semantics. From Meaning to Text*. London: John Benjamins Publishing.
- MORZYCKI Marcin (in press). *Modification*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (draft retrieved from [https://www.msu.edu/~morzycki/work/papers/modification\\_book.pdf](https://www.msu.edu/~morzycki/work/papers/modification_book.pdf))
- PISARKOWA Krystyna (1965) *Preedykatywność określeń w języku polskim*. Wrocław: Ossolineum.
- REINHART Tanya (2002). The Theta System – An Overview. *Theoretical Linguistics* 28(3). 229-290.
- RUPPENHOFER Josef, ELLSWORTH Michael, PETRUCK Miriam R. L., JOHNSON Christopher R., SCHEFFCZYK Jan (2010). *FrameNet II: Extended Theory and Practice*. Retrieved from <https://framenet2.icsi.berkeley.edu/docs/r1.5/book.pdf>
- RUTKOWSKI Paweł (2009). *Fraza przedimkowa w polszczyźnie*. Warsaw: Publications of the Faculty of Polish.
- RUTKOWSKI Paweł (2013). "Is NA different from NAA?". A talk given at 44th Poznań Linguistic Meeting – PLM 2013 (30 August 2013, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań, Poland).
- RUTKOWSKI Paweł, PROGOVAC Ljiljana (2005). Classification projection in Polish and Serbian: The position and shape of classifying adjectives. In Steven FRANKS, Frank Y. GLADNEY, Mila TASSEVA-KURKTCHIEVA (eds.), *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The South Carolina Meeting 2004*. 289-299. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- SCHULTZE-BERNDT Eva, HIMMELMANN Nikolaus P.(2004). Depictive secondary predicates in crosslinguistic perspective. *Linguistic Typology* 8, 59-131.

- SCOTT Gary-John (2002). Stacked adjectival modification and the structure of nominal phrases. In Guglielmo CINQUE (ed.), *Functional structure in the DP and IP: the cartography of syntactic structures*. 91-120. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- SPROAT Richard, SHIH Chilin (1991). The cross-linguistic distribution of adjective ordering restrictions. In Carol GEORGOPOULOS and Roberta ISHIHARA (eds.), *Interdisciplinary Approaches to Language: Essays in Honor of S.-Y. Kuroda*. 565-593. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- STALMASZCZYK Piotr (1996). Theta roles and the theory of theta-binding. *Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics* 31, 97-110.
- SUÑER Margarita (2000). The syntax of direct quotes with special reference to Spanish and English. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 18, 525-578.
- SZUMSKA Dorota (2010). Szyk szyku, czyli dyskretny urok linearyzacji. Refleksje nad uporządkowaniem członów określających w wieloprzymiotnikowych grupach nominalnych. In Joanna DYBIEC, Grzegorz SZPIŁA (eds.), *Język polski: nowe wyzwania językoznawcze. Język a komunikacja* 27. 51-57. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Tertium.
- SZUMSKA Dorota (2014). Rozgraniczenie jako ograniczenie. Na przykładzie badań nad szykiem przydawki przymiotnej we współczesnej polszczyźnie. *LingVaria* X, 141-150.
- TABAKOWSKA Elżbieta (2001). O szyku wyrazów w obrębie wyrażen argumentowych przedmiotowych. *Prace Filologiczne* XLVI, 579-589.
- TABAKOWSKA Elżbieta (2007). Iconicity and linear ordering of constituents within Polish NPs. In Dagmar DIVJAK and Agata KOCHAŃSKA (eds.), *Cognitive Paths into the Slavic Domain*. 411-430. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter.



TOPOLIŃSKA Zuzanna (1973). Udział polskiej grupy imiennej w procesie aktualizacji tekstu.

*Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego XXXI*. 35-46.

TOPOLIŃSKA Zuzanna (1984). Składnia grupy imiennej. In Zuzanna TOPOLIŃSKA (ed.),

*Gramatyka współczesnego języka polskiego. Składnia*. 301–389. Warsaw: Państwowe  
Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

ZAROUKIAN Erin (2010). Expressing numerical uncertainty.

<http://elanguage.net/journals/index.php/lsameeting/article/viewFile/631/615>

(2011.12.13)

Uniwersytet Warszawski

Wydział Polonistyki

Katedra Językoznawstwa Ogólnego, Wschodnioazjatyckiego Porównawczego i Bałtystyki

Ul. Krakowskie Przedmieście 26/28

00-927 Warszawa

[jlinde@uw.edu.pl]