

Adjectives and their Attributives and Predicative Variations

Najeba Rashed mahamed

Northern technical university, Iraq, najebaahmed884@ntu.edu.iq

Abstract

It has been difficult for adjectives to be identified as a lexical category. This paper examines adjectives (attributively and predicatively) to locate points of challenge and difficulty. By employing a theoretical analysis depending on a number of previous studies. This procedure is applied to examine such studies. Perceptions about the aforementioned types of adjectives are carried out to ensure that sample of the study correspond to the aim of the study itself. However, other adjectives can have a solo function either as an attributives or predicatives. In this paper, an identification as well as a differentiation of adjectives as a lexical category is to be shown. However, this paper argues that the semantic treatment of attributive adjectives can denote to second-order identity-typed functions. This has a conceptual merit for a theory assuming that attributive adjectives signify properties. It is shown that the merits of analyzing the attributive adjectives as second-order identity-typed functions captivating nominal arguments. Moreover, it is apparent that both types function as properties of a type-shifting operator to derive the attributive use of adjectives from the predicative use.

Keywords: Adjectives, Variation, Attributives, Predicative, Class.

1. Introduction

The term 'Parts of Speech' and its identity has been continuously argued about in linguistic research. Over the years, this topic has gained more attention by specialists in the field of linguistic research. Adjectives as having their status as a possible category among the other parts of speech, which has also been investigated and debated by time. Therefore, specific issues concerning this category 'adjectives' will be certainly arisen while dealing with adjectives. Based on the assumption that adjectives are constituent part within the universal group "Parts of Speech" alike to other members of that group such as nouns and verbs. As a result, on one hand, the crosslinguistic and unpredictable position of adjectives could be challenging. Instead, by regarding adjectives as a concept relied on an emphasis on Indo-European languages, which have no real existence in other languages.

Thus, the situation gets more difficult for those items to be classified to be called adjectives.

Among the scholars who have commented on the category ‘adjectives’ is Givón (2018: 13) descriptively termed adjectives “a notorious swing-category in languages”, that places more concern on the debate on adjectives. To achieve the aim of this study, which is to create a clear identification of the category adjectives, one way will be approached concerning the aforementioned point of debate. This way is an employment of a theoretical approach to examine varied viewpoints given by specialists in the field of linguistics. This means that this study aims both to discover the challenging status of adjectives and regard lexical classes. One of the problems that cannot be away from ignorance within this study, is of terminology. Here, what categories of adjectives should traditionally belong to and be called? From this point, the available suggestions can be many such as ‘Parts of Speech’, ‘Word Classes’, ‘Lexical Categories’, and so on. Nowadays, there exists less consensus about this issue and specialists prefer categories to be termed after being preferred. The unfortunateness exists in the fact that as such vagueness causes confusion, it also sounds very descriptive of the indistinguishable identity of the category ‘adjectives’. As a term, ‘Lexical Categories’ will be applied as a reference to what is termed as ‘Parts of Speech’ or ‘Word Classes’.

2. Background

There have not been many attempts constitute the roles of adjectives attributively and predictively over the past forty or so years (Bache 1978, Warren 1984, Halliday 1994). Warren's *Classifying Adjectives* (1984a) is undoubtedly one of the most extensive and exhaustive studies to date, and it proposes to agree between adjectives is likely to demand identification, classification or description.

Practitioners in classifying and identifying adjectives often vary from those whose field is in describing them. That is to say, they are restricted to the scope of the head noun in some way. Semantic range is limited to indicating a sub-class, and reference is limited to indicating to a certain meaning or host of meanings that are related to class that is denoted by a noun. On one hand, to illustrate a common categorizer is ‘Siberian’ such as *She had few Siberian birds with her*, where *Siberian* identifies a division of the bird species. On the other hand, to illustrate a common identifier in ‘red’ such as *Give me this red book*, where ‘red’ choose which shirt in the class is the intended referent (or somewhat, from a specific set of books).

When describing nouns, it is said that such descriptors are viewed as supplemental, non-restrictive components that can be included. An illustration of a common description is loveable in She had few loveable bears, where the adjective just serves to further describe the bears in issue. Warren offers many methods for identifying each function. Here, considering morpho-syntactic behavior as adjectives that perform a particular role also exhibits certain morpho-syntactic characteristics. The distinction between descriptors and classifiers is that the former are gradable and predicating,

3. Objective of the Work or Research Problem Justification

It is said that adjectives can have different labels as they are called for example attributive adjectives and predicative adjectives. Therefore, it has been remarked that people frequently memorize information that are related to the reality of such a labels. Here, such a memorization can only be applied when it comes to the scientific side of the two types of adjectives. Having concluded that the lack of knowledge to learn the details of such a subclass of adjectives. Therefore, to either follow or adopt newly creations made by scholars that could facilitate this issue and make the whole process as enjoyable. Hence, to set a better way, the researcher intends to examine both types of adjectives to find out to what is the extent of applying them effectively while dealing with them.

4. Literature Review

Adjectives are always thought of grammatically as modifiers for nouns or pronouns. They serve to indicate a changed condition of the thing being referred to. In The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language, adjectives are characterized as expressions “that alter, clarify, or adjust the meaning contributions of nouns”, in order to allow for the expression of “finer gradations of meaning” than are possible through the use of nouns alone (Huddleston and Pullum 2002, p. 526).

4.1 Robert Malcolm Ward Dixon’s Work on Adjectives

This philological class as it may be termed a main class or not is as stated even so as a case that is widely discussed. English is a language that can be identified in a clear and enough way. Being considered as a distinct philological class, adjectives have the same distinction as nouns and verbs do have. Adjectives being as the third most elementary part of speech under debate, so to say that they ‘adjectives’ follow nouns and verbs. However, this is not a fair judgment that it not all languages show a category of adjectives. English when examined more closely, it has an obviousness that

properties can be well-expressed via the category ‘nouns’. Moreover ‘verbs’ are more commonly used for the previous purpose. In terms of construction and across languages, adjectives as a category have two types, which are attributively and predicatively. These two types are found in English. For an illustration as in the following two examples:

(1) (a) to be attributive, (b) to be predicative.

- A blue bus.

- A bus is blue.

As pointed out by Dixon (1999) an adjective refers to such a sort of a modification that comes as a head in a noun phrase, for example, a determiner, a demonstrative, a possessive pronoun and so on. However, identifying an adjective is to lay more emphasis on describing adjectives, which is the issue of this paper. Adjectives whether attributive or predictive as constructions that previously are referred to. English among the languages that appear to easily accept the existence of a category that can be marked as ‘adjective’. Nevertheless, in which manner this can be accounted for this category? This question is expressed in a cross-linguistic manner as divergent to nouns and verbs. Dixon (1999: 1) claims that the basic of any language demands to express the following:

- ❖ “a participant, e.g. a person, an animal, a thing”.
- ❖ “a property of a participant”.
- ❖ “an activity of a participant”.

For Creating A Three-Way word class distinction, and then most frequently, such linguistic necessities would match to verbs, nouns, and adjectives. As Dixon (1999) commented that a noun has a typical meaning, as well as an adjective, and verb categories, which are strong, however, fuzzy areas in between is likely to occur. The English male and female are a clear example for shown it in concepts that related to English language, which may occur as either a noun or an adjective, or even in a phrase like: ‘It doesn’t matter’ and ‘It isn’t important’, when joining adjectives and verbs (Dixon 1999). English has an obvious affinity, that tends to be found in all languages. That is to say, an adjective transpires via root more than a noun or a verb does. (Ibid: 1999).

In English language, to make such an argument too evident since there are so many original adjectives compared to those that are formed from nouns and verbs. Those derived, however, can once more be resulting out of further classes. Unlike with adjectives, such a modification does not come so regularly. According to the kind of a noun, it can modify its capacity to be applied in a more predicative manner, etc., derived and underived adjectives can be divided into

several categories. When dealing with which category of adjectives essentially is, it sounds important to take into account their syntactic structures. Dixon (1999) is of the argument that any linguist's task is to create classes of words to a certain language by applying the suitable grammatical standards to that specific language. For that reason, varied characteristics can make us mark items that are similar in category in different languages. However, and for Dixon (1999: 3) the cross-linguistic correlation as well as a philological class has to be determined "on semantic grounds". All languages as it is debated, various grammatical criteria can exist in identifying the main philological classes. The parallels and differences that occur between such classes demonstrate "considerable variation" as argued by Dixon (1999: 3). When comparing property terms to what Dixon refers to as "participants" and "activities," another problem with adjectives is their ambiguity.

In the first place, and according to Dixon (1999: 3) word properties that are used to describe something that is "relatively permanent". This is a characteristic that is shared with nouns, but not with verbs. Furthermore, a noun(s) can occupy the role as "the central topic of a discourse", which is a feature that can be applied in commenting on such a topic. This topic appears to be similar when it comes on verbs and adjectives.

Moreover, both adjectives and verbs have can be associated in terms of grammar with a noun, in one of these ways. To make it clearer in a form of an adjective or verb-3 to modify a noun as a head of a noun phrase (e.g., red vehicle and intriguing buddy); or in a form of predicate of relative clause, for example: (car that is red or moon that is brilliant) Dixon (1999). In addition to that, both adjectives and verbs serve in the before-said way of mentioning a noun(s) as a topic "The car is red and The car is red all the time". It is interesting as pointed out by Dixon (1999: 4)., that verbs and adjectives may function in this way. Yet, the initial constructions of the noun phrase (vehicle that is red) are more likely to contain adjectives whereas the latter topic-commenting construction is more likely to contain verbs (The moon shines every night during summer) this phrase, "follows from their semantic nature", that is obvious to call them 'properties' and 'activities'. This overall debate shows that the use of adjectives in association with nouns and verbs, Dixon (1999: 4) could classify them to into a five types of adjectival coding arguing that "almost all languages" appropriate. As shown in Table (1) that what is called as "odd exceptions", that is argued about to have two-part adjective class, the first to represent verbs and the second one to represent nouns.

Table (1) Five Main Groups of Property Expressions

Class	Open/Closed	Noun Aspect	Verb Aspect	Other
1	open	associate by figure, gender, situation with the head noun.	Verb to be is frequently needed when using the predicative.	
2	open	when used in the predicative, inflected after or similarly to the verb pattern		
3	open	identical inflections as nouns in NP	when used in the predicative, inflected after the verb form	
4	open	unlike the characteristics of nouns and verbs		
5	closed	additional property statements in the noun and verb classes, small class		

4.2 Leon Stassen's Views on Adjectives

In referring to predicative adjectives, Stassen (2008) says that, “items which predicate a property of a subject” (p: 1). As argued, such adjectives can be – in terms of typology – classified as they come as verbally or nonverbally:

It can be basically distinguished by such languages where predicative adjectives are equivalently set to predicative verbs. Moreover, such languages that are predicatively encoded in which adjectives and verbs come differently. (Ibid).

In addition to that, many languages get a mere style of encoding, while other languages mix the two. This is a characteristic feature, when it comes to differentiate between them. In this case, in a language such as English, an adjective(s) does not occur as verbs. Stassen's instances are exemplified in (3) - (4) respectively (2008: 1).

(2)

- ❖ Tom play-s.
- ❖ Tom is nice.
- ❖ *Tom nice-s.

The word for “tall” in item (b/4) has the same vocal cue as the word for ‘talk’ in item (a/4). What this means is (re). It may be inferred that both phrases are verbal as a result. Even if the distinction exists in other languages, it can be readily seen in the example languages. There are instances of the two sorts mixing in such a life. In order to deal with the encoding of predicative adjectives, Stassen wants to distinguish between the verbal and nonverbal meanings of these words. A set of criteria is needed to demonstrate this differentiation. Hence, a set of criteria must be used, as provided by Stassen in a three-

point scale, to distinguish between verbal and nonverbal encoding of adjectives.

Geography according to Stassen (2008) can be used to refer to the predicatively encoded adjectives. For him, it “has clear areal features” (p: 7). First of all, Stassen (2008) believes that nonverbal encoding might take place in two contexts, “all the languages of Europe, Central Asia and Siberia, India, the Middle East and northern Africa” (p:8). There are not many nonverbal behaviors associated with Stassen outside of this context. About spoken coding, where huge continuous focuses of spoken encoding are met in many countries of Africa, Asia, south and north America (2008). So, it is not unexpected to see mixed languages where verbal and nonverbal communication occurs, or vice versa.

4.3 Wetzer (1996)

In another study, Wetzer (1996) has investigated the predicative function performed by adjectives of that kind, demonstrating its problematic position. In addition, he has identified a prospective adjective class by demonstrating that adjectives cannot be seen as a general category of nouns and verbs. That is to say, according to Wetzer, both verbs and nouns can be arbitrarily recognized into a group of adjectives that are equivalent to what cannot be discovered. (1996: 3, 5, 15, et passim).

Therefore, it is – cross-linguistically – that it has been suggested that these disparities are too unclear to be thought of as category differences. Therefore, the bigger trends are such an adjective(s) that are one or the other “noun-like” or “verb-like” (Ibid, 1996: 36). This contrast is, in Wetzer’s method, highlighted as to be merely generalized as it comes to adjectives. Nouns and verbs as having the universal two-way distinction between them, seem to be considered as a class of adjectives is followed to distinguish the uniqueness of a philological class of adjectives (Ibid, 1996):

“grammatical behaviour of adjectivals cannot really be accounted for without making reference to the major word classes Noun and Verb. The observation that adjectival words, irrespective of their word class membership, tend to associate with the nominal or verbal system of a language, has recently led to the development of an alternative view on the grammatical relation between property concept words on the one hand and the major classes Noun and Verb on the other.” (p: 44).

Here, observing is likely to seem like a self-evident, in which the lack of nouns and verbs will certainly make adjectives disappear. Wetzer here remarks on as subjective by an Indo-European perspective. For Wetzer, the recognition of the way adjectives has features in common verb(s) and a noun(s) and in creating a new perception, that can exist

in the supposed “continuum hypothesis”, as being primarily proposed by Ross (1972, cited in Wetzer 1996: 44). Central to such a controversy, a stretching can be found in a continuity of unchanging classes of nouns and verbs. Figure (1) illustrates ‘adjectivals’ as referring to what corresponds to a likely lexical class of adjectives.

Figure (1) Wetzer’s Noun - Verb scale (1996: 44)

VERBS -----	ADJECTIVALS -----	NOUNS
decreasing verballity		
increasing nominality		

On this measure, adjectives could be considered as midway with archetypal nouns and verbs as extremely contradicting. (Wetzer, 1996).

Wetzer’s continuity, that is applicable in all languages, was used to highlight the similarities and differences between them. Wetzer’s goal is a three-part global class system, nevertheless. Broadly speaking, it has been shown that using adjectives in this way to distinguish between verbal and noun-like objects has led to what Wetzer labels as “nouny” and “verbal” adjectivals (1996: 49). On one hand, “nouny adjectivals” involve what Wetzer calls noun-like adjectives and adjectival nouns. On the other, “verby adjectivals” contain adjectival verbs and adjectives that sound like verbs. According to Wetzer (1996), nouns and verbs are continuous in different languages. A probable lexical class of adjectives is what this is. A class that solely depends on the language being studied can be found anyplace in the distribution.

4.4 Croft (2002, 2003)

Obviously, differentiating adjectives from other lexical classes is so essential to have a more or less obvious perspective on the way such classes are defined and their status to be known when it universality is questioned. It has been argued that the misperception on the identity of particular class such as adjectives. For Croft (2002), nearly all languages have been regarded as show three essential lexical classes: a noun, a verb, and an adjective. Such classes are often called universal ones. According to Croft (2002: 63), this is demonstrated in two rules that he argues are, which frequently considered as crucial base within syntax:

(3)

“Noun, verb, and adjective are universal (cross-linguistic) categories found in particular languages. But noun, verb, and adjective are not language universals—that is, not all languages possess the parts of speech noun, verb or adjective”.

An expression in (3) can be a bit unclear, when it comes to the two propositions that contrast with each other. Nevertheless, such a contrast looks to display Croft's aim as: traditionally, the three lexical classes are regarded to have universality. However, though this is a fact, that the deficit of languages that is appeared to be evidently contradicted. Croft has emphasized thus suggesting a too opposed approach to this universality. This is presented in (6) a-b: (2002: 63).

(4)

"Noun, verb, and adjective are not categories of particular languages. But noun, verb, and adjective are language universals—that is, there are typological prototypes...which should be called noun, verb, and adjective."

To draw a full picture of these examples, which are totally contradicted from a traditional view-point, we have to move back to what is mentioned as the way classes could be defined. In this regard, Croft states that a "semantic class definition" which is regarded "inadequate" is definitely so: nouns may have properties such as (whiteness) and activities as adjectives (sleeping) (2001: 63). It is then evident that morphosyntactic characteristics can lead to such a kind of generality when it deals with the possible semantic identity. However, for Croft (2002), any beneficial method does not exist as for how to carry out this in turn and the assumption that the mere morphosyntactic performance of a type of adjectives can particularly create parts of speech within a specific language. In this case, such parts of speech may be labelled as nouns, verbs and adjectives in a great number of the world's languages.

Chomsky (1993) in his "Generative Grammar" has employed a system of double characteristics to define classes. However, as pointed out by Croft (2002), an explanation has not been offered on the way lexical classes can be distinguished between in the stance. Accordingly, "it appears that there is no theoretically motivated set of criteria for establishing parts of speech in generative theory" (Croft 2002: 64).

As Croft sees it, lexical classes can be distinguished according to a specific language relying on the structures existed in that specific language. It is also impossible to closely differentiate the same classes in a different language. This is so, due to the varied ways that deal with grammar that will come across-linguistically. The issue that appears here and there is that, a scientist believes in the ability of making generalizations concerning lexical classes be (universal). Here, the real subject of their assumptions is instead constructions. Croft (2002: 85) states that "categories in a particular language are defined by the constructions of the language". Such an assumption cannot be used to differentiate some sort of universal classes. It also might look to have

a bold proposition. However, Croft argued on the view of some of the issues mentioned above. As an alternative of such form of classing, a more general method is proposed by Croft concerning universals. Such a method, “which finds an antecedent in Dixon’s seminal study of adjectives”.

5. Material and Methodology

The methodology followed in the current research is to resolve the unanswered questions; What is meant by attributive and predicative adjectives? And how can they be differentiated? To answer this study’s questions, a theoretical analysis is employed on a number of previous scholars’ works. Having applied this procedure to examine these works. Perceptions concerning the two types of adjectives are carried out to ensure that sample of the study correspond to the aim of the study itself. In addition to what was earlier stated, that fixed standard(s) was considered in examining archetypal adjectives along with its applications. For applying that fixed standard(s) to an amount of languages, varied languages by local speakers, some of which were specialized in the field of linguistics. The grammatical analyses are offered by the local speakers. Then, and according to such facts, analyzing conceivable adjectives may happen to come about.

5.1 An Attributive Adjective

The phrases attributional and predicative describe where an adjective appears in a word or a sentence. When an adjective precedes a noun, it is said to be attributional or to be employed attributionally to be related to a noun-phrase. Such terms might be referred to as Prenominals.

Instances:

- “She is a nice woman”. “the middle aged office-coworker was fired two days ago”.

Here, the adjective can have a prediction or its use can have a predicative role for coming right after verbs such as (be, seem, feel, look, turn ...etc.).

- “Your mother seems angry”.

Here, it can come immediately after the noun it modifies, to be termed as post-nominal: Even if it appears simple enough, there are several factors concerning English adjectives that need to be understood. The majority of adjectives may be used both as predicative and attributive words, however some can only come before nouns, while others can only come following copular or perceptual verbs. Certain adjectives have the ability to hold more than one position, yet their meanings

might vary based on where they are used. The current study focuses on adjectives that are solely employed in predicative and attributive contexts, as well as the significance of each context in which they are used. The word order of predicative and attributional adjectives is then discussed.

Getting into two distinct definitions of the term “attributive adjective” is evident. According to Geach’s definition of an attributive adjective referring to adjectives like ‘large,’ ‘little,’ and ‘alleged,’ an attributive adjective, once linked to a noun, has an irregular predicate. Adjectives like (good and evil), on the other hand, are functional dependent adjectives for the opposite description. Now, we might contend that the second one exhibits an actual logical characteristic of an adjective. There are two approaches to complete the assignment if the attributive characteristic is to be specified in accordance with inferential irregularity. The first is that an attributional adverb is only used when a complex predicate that it is attached to is inferentially irregular. According to Geach’s invention, an adjective is only predicative if a complicated predicate associated with it fails to “break apart logically”.

Creating predication irregularly from any adjective that could be comprehensibly connected with such nouns would be possible as they occur in the English language. In this situation, a class of adjectives may be established to express the property of something being “attributive” by using the definition provided to include all adjectives in the language. One alternative, however, allows for the existence of such nouns and affords the potential of the recommended definition of defining an adjective as ‘attributive’ irrespective of its rational status. Instead, claims the attributive role of an adjective is only when each compound predicate it is associated with is inferentially irregular. Because an adjective can logically combine with any noun, this definition will not have the previously described issue if an adjective produces an inferentially irregular compound predicate with that noun. This is true whether or not the noun depends on an adjective. Hence, an attributive adjective is an adjective that, unless some functions are adjusted, cannot be applied in making a full predication; or, to put it another way, it is an adjective that groups with functions to produce predicable ideas.

5.2 Adjectives of Attributive Position

It is crucial to emphasize up front that adjectives beginning with a-form open-class, with new items constantly exist supplementary to the ones previously included in dictionaries. Salkoff (1983, 300) claims that there are 139 terms in the (OED, 1989) that has an a + verb (from abask to ayelp). as illustrations of fresh forms that aren't listed in the OED.

Though predicative adjectives cannot occur prenominally, which is somewhat varies from the a few of 'a- words' usually found in the English grammar as having the predicative role. Such adjectives are normally 'afraid, alike, alive, alone, awake; often ashamed, aware. However, a small number of these come in prenominal point.

Grammarians have suggested that the distribution of stress in nominal groups may have an impact on the choice of premodifying adjectives, and that the opposition to the use of a- words as attributional markers may result from their accidental identification with the indefinite article, with a 'a-' being treated as a difficult recurrence with a sense of contradiction.

Peter Geach (1956) has distinguished between predicative and attributive adjectives. Though there has not been an acceptable explanation of what is meant by attributive adjectives. It is argued that throughout Geach's debate, two varied ways to comprehend these two can be proposed. For the attributive one, the adjective is called attributive if its predications when combined with noun, they fail to act in implications such as a rational combination of two distinct ones. While in for the predicative one, it is called attributive if it cannot be used in a truth-value-manner until it is linked to a noun.

5.3 Irregular Inferentiality

The notions "logically predicative adjective" and "logically attributive adjective" are described by Geach in the following ways: "We require, but are never given," according to Frank Sibley (1959). "Definition or Elucidation" of the phrases "logically predicative" and "logically attributive" is the title of an essay by Geach. When following Geach, the words 'logically' need to be removed from both the 'predicative' and the 'attributive' sides. Geach has also utilized the term 'prediction' in this context in a unique way. In his works, Geach applies the same idea for indicating a sentence/phrase to state that a predicate is used to mean anything, using the expression 'predicate' for what is termed a 'predication'. While the most recent application is further widely used since it is more widely followed.

As it is stated by Geach, where no particular definition of what it refers to a complicated predicate to "break apart logically" is provided. It may be argued that we choose what the concept contains. Of course, in order to achieve that, we must consider how the idea may be justified in terms of application. Geach has noticed makes the difference between predicative and attributive adjectives in this passage. He has discovered that the predictions of 'huge flea' and 'little elephant' cannot be rationally separated in this situation. He claims that if such assessments were accurate, a straightforward debate would

demonstrate that a large flea is a large animal and a tiny elephant is a little animal. Such a justification can be explained as follows:

1. The next debate looks invalid:

“(1.1) Whatever is a flea is an animal. (1.2) Therefore, whatever is a big flea is big animal. (4)”

2. Any argument of the following form is valid:

“(2.1) Whatever is an F is an A. (2.2) Therefore, whatever is an F and is B is an A and is B.”

3. Therefore, the first argument cannot have the same logical form as the second.

4. Therefore, ‘is a big flea’ does not split up, logically into a ‘is a flea’ and ‘is big’ and the same *mutatis mutandis* for ‘small elephant’.”

In the preceding instances, it was shown that a complex predicate could be presented and that it could be "broken apart logically" so that its application may have implications based on the same rules that apply to a combination of predications. This means that an adjective is predicative if its applications of compound predicates allow implications in the form of logical conjunctions, and it is attributive if its applications of compound predicates do not allow implications in this form.

5.4 Irregular Inferentiality: A Difficulty

Turning to Geach's debates that adjectives such as 'good' and 'bad' are attributive. Yet, inferential irregularity as a notion, is less supportive. Definitely, if Geach's debates are derived to depend on that notion, to look completely to be unsuccessful. His debates concerning the attributive role of 'good/and bad' are presented in brief. To being with, it is unclear on how Geach's view can be taken concerning 'bad' being 'something like' a strange adjective. Therefore, it is encouraging to understand it as inferring this argument: strange are considered as attributives; 'bad' is 'something like' a strange adjective. Thus, 'bad' as an adjective is an attributive one.

5.5 The Set Criteria

The standards were planned in differentiating adjectives as a typological model, their particular extensions, and language particular class boundaries in the selected languages. Table (1) shows the numbers to indicate the links to the criteria. To make it clearer, though they have numbers, this is not having any form of classified status. The standards can be divided into two portions according to what they examine. Although the other two were intended to look at potential expansions of these archetypal adjectives that are displayed by certain

languages, the first and second within the list meant to explore adjectives as typologically modeled.

The typological prototypes with matching standards can be marked as de-adjectival predicate nouns adjectives, adjectives, copulas, action reference, participles, relative clauses. The standards can be shown as follows, with (first & second) referring to prototypical adjectives, and (three & eight) referring to their potential extensions:

5.5.1 Comparative/Superlative Structure

One of the most important characteristics of prototype adjectives is their employment in comparative (or superlative) structures. The comparative structure was chosen as being straightforward because it has nothing to do with markedness, although superlatives should also function. There are two approaches to detect the comparative structure: morphologically (for example, bigger in English), or in a periphrastic way (for example: more important). If a structure of comparison is applicable to nouns or verbs as well, it should be organized differently for the case of adjectives.

5.5.2 Agreement and Noun in Attributive Position

According to both its number and gender, it is agreed with the noun that is being modified in this sentence. The adjective could make this clear. This is frequently referred to as one of the essential characteristics of adjectives. Moreover, it is considered to be one of the two primary markers for archetypal adjectives. Such an agreement falls within the scope of the prototype and is an example of what Croft (2003) refers to as "non-personal indexation" (p. 34).

In order to determine if languages have a prototype adjective class, these two criteria have been chosen. The adjective prototype was intended to be operationalized using the following criteria. Although they may be employed to make changes, they are of a more sophisticated nature when emphasizing the expansions of these prototypes.

5.5.3 Occurrence of a Copula in Predicative Role

As soon as predicting a feature, a copula is present to show that the archetypal category of adjectives is to be prolonged to a 'property predication'. The importance of such standard is found in Stassen's (2008) application to the distinct 'nonverbal' from 'verbal' 'adjectives'.

5.6 Difference between Attributive and Predicative Use

These two criteria have been used to assess whether languages possess a prototype adjective class. The following standards were supposed to be used to operationalize the adjective prototype. They

are of a more complicated nature when highlighting the expansions of these prototypes, even though they may be used to make alterations.

5.6.1 Participle / Relativizer

Comparatively speaking, the participle/relativizer requirement is more difficult. Although being so valuable, it also does not have a wide range of applications. It demonstrates the expansion of prototype adjectives to “action modifier” when the participle of an action verb may be applied to modify it. If this is not practicable, rephrasing is another technique to convey this. Two further choices exist: Nonetheless, if a relativizer is required in such restating for “action modifiers,” there is a distinction between them and unmarked adjectives.

5.6.2 The Attributive Use of Adjectives (Prenominal)

While certain adjectives may be used in predicatively, some may not. A few adjectives, such as “mere,” “out and out,” “sheer,” and “utter,” can function as adverbs of degree, more or less to refer to “complete” and can only be employed in the attributively:

☐ “Ken can’t be promoted. He is a mere boy/ an out and out rogue. What you say is sheer/ utter nonsense.” (Alexander, 2004: 113).

In English, writers seem to prefer pronominal, or attributive status for adjectives. Though several adjectives can occur in both places, certain ones can be termed as reference adjectives, which must occur pronominally. Eastwood et al, (2005: 250) argue

“that there are some adjectives that can only be used in attributive position, for example: chief, elder (= older), eldest (= oldest), eventually, former (=earlier), indoor, inner, lone, main, mere (a mere child = only a child), only, out door, outer, own, premier, principal (= main), sheer (= complete), sole (= only), upper, utter, (complete)”.

Certain adjectives that are exclusively used in attributive position and are connected to their adverbs are introduced by Leech, Leech and Svartvik (2002: 219):

a. “He worked as the previous boss.”

As an expression, (previous) may relate to an adverb (previously):

☐ “It was previously an annoying airport.”

There are further similar adjectives, according to Leech, Leech and Svartvik (ibid), who continue, “each example having an attributive-only meaning is followed by an example of its equivalent adverb:

Such eight-way adjectives which only come attributively are listed by Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman (1999: 382). (Bolinger 1967). They refer to these adjectives as “reference adjectives” (ibid.):

"1. Adjectives showing the reference of the head noun has already been determined:

☐ 'The same man I was looking.'

2. Adjectives showing the importance of the head noun:

❓ 'Their main faults'.

3. Adjectives showing the head-noun as distinct by law:

☐ 'The legal heir.'

4. Adjectives identifying the reference of the noun – they partially say what reference a noun has – their occurrence to preceded by the copula be.

☐ A medical doctor * a doctor is medical.

5. Adjectives qualifying the period of the noun.

❓ The coming manager. A previous headmaster.

6. Adjectives qualifying the spatial position:

☐ A southern gentleman the urban crisis

Bolinger also refers to two other groups, although he does not identify them specifically.

7. Adjectives intensifying or emphasizing the head-noun:

☐ A whole foreigner a simple kid.

8. Adjectives showing the rareness of a head-noun:

☐ A single fighter.

☐ A single candidate.

Premodifiers of other nouns are frequently used as nouns themselves. a buddy in occupational, scholar mediators, and the bus station. Greenbaum (1990: 131) states that they lack additional traits common to most adjectives. An absence of equivalent predicative role:

⌘ A train location. * A location is train.

❓ Here, very will not modify them:

*They very train location.

☐ Neither a comparison may occur: * The trainer location."

Several characteristics set these adjectives apart from others, such as difference in article (the train/a train), difference in quantity (one

train/two trains), genitively varied (a boy's writings), and premodification by an adjective, are just a few examples (the young students). The matching of a prepositional phrase with a noun(s) as complement, such as the house's tools, to a premodifying noun, such as garden in garden's equipment, demonstrates the premodifying noun's fundamentally nominal character. See the following for a better comparison:

☐ The town board ~ the board for the town.

☐ A rock fence ~ a fence (made) of rock/.

This likeness cannot occur attributively:

☐ A lengthy verse a dense fence.

☐ The town board warm climate". (ibid., 1990)

By describing another kind of these adjectives, Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman (1999: 385) complement the previous description of the adjectives that are solely employed as attributives. The whole adjectival measure phrases may precede a noun, but when they measure, the noun comes in singular irrespective of the cardinal figure represented, according to them (ibid.):

☐ I get a one- month child.

☐ She is a seven-foot man.

In reality, it's accurate for multiple measure phrases. The prenominal position of a noun that modifies another noun is unmarked for the number. Although it's a small matter, ESL/EFL students often make mistakes like this.

He wants an onion case. That bag stripe can do.

* He wants an onions carton. * That bag stripe will do.

5.6.3 The Predicative Use of Adjectives (Prenominal)

Adjectives may predicatively occur as (Sc.) after joining verbs (be, seem, look, feel):

☐ I feel sick.

An adjective can be predicatively applied as (Co.) immediately after verbs like (consider, find):

☐ It makes her sick to discover the way people misuse the liquid.

In the current study, a discussion is proposed concerning the adjectives that can be predicatively applied. As Leech, Leech and Svartvik (2002: 220) present few sets of adjectives to be predicatively applied only. Of them is, 'health adjectives' like (faint, ill, and well):

☐ “Oh doctor, I feel faint”.

There are certain adjectives that describe sentiments, such as "content," "happy," "pleased," "sad," like “far and near,” “apart from in places like the distant East” and “the nearby East,” are often employed solely predicatively, according to Radford (2004: 32):

☐ I’m very glad to meet you.

As stated by Stageberg (1981: 260) “when two or more adjectives modify a noun, they can occur after a noun”.

a. “A postwoman, tired and wet, tramped along in the bus.

b. “A man aged and skinny, raised at the window.”

A focus is to be laid on certain adjectives, such as "expert," "while extremely emphasized on the prefix, may also be met with as (expert at somewhat) in the predicate," insist on placing stress after the prefix. Examples include "content," "averse," and "president elect." Poldauf (1984, p. 47).

5.6.4 Meaning of Adjectives in Attribution and Predication

Although numerous adjectives can exist in both the attributive and predicative positions, as has been noted, there is a difference in meaning when there are few adjectives, and this is the problem that the current section seeks to address.

5.6.5 The different Meaning of Prenominal and Postnominal Adjectives

A post-nominal adjective that comes after a noun tends to express transient situations or particular events, but the attributive adjectives that precede them often have a semantic quality that is more permanent or distinctive, for instance:

a. The taken rings.
b. The rings taken .
c. The single pilotable river.
d. The single river pilotable .

☐ A shamefaced individual. (an individual, categorizing modifier of the people). (Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman, 1999: 388).

Alexander (ibid: 110) continues by elaborating on the distinction in sense and using other adjectives such (old, late, and heavy). When used to describe anything, these adjectives have different meanings. For example:

a. “Agatha Withers is very old now (i.e. in years- predicative)”.

b. “He is an old friend (i.e. I've known him a long time- attributive)”.

c. "Your suitcase is very heavy (i.e. in weight – predicative)".

d. "Peterson is a heavy smoker (i.e. he smokes a lot – attributive)".

5.6.6 The Predicative-only Meaning of Adjectives when applied Predictively and Attributively:

Some adjectives that are only used in predicates can be used in both directions to convey different meanings. A collection of these adjectives is mentioned by Alexander (2004: 110). With relation to health, adjectives like "faint," "sick," "poor," "well," and "unwell" are used predicatively:

❑ What is the matter with him? He's ill/ unwell. He feels faint.

Fine when is health-relating is considered as predicative. However, when it is applied attributively, it refers to be brilliant' (He was an annoying man). Adjectives such as sick and healthy can be attributively applied.

❑ Why are you shouting Miss. Suzan? I am feeling sick.

(Yet it's becoming more common to hear, "He's an unwell man") Swan (2005: 15) compares the meanings of a variety of adjectives when they are employed in both positions. She contrasts the (live) and (alive), attributive old and predicative old:

5.6.7 The Semantics of Attributive and Predicative Adjectives

Bolinger (1967) makes the claim that "most predicatives with be are essentially distinct from attributives" in a now-classic work (p:2). A house on fire, a guy dozing, and arms crossed are examples of "a-words," which he claims "have been constrained to predicative and post-adjunct position both by their adverbial origin and by their feeling of temporariness (the two causes are connected of course)" (p:12). Whereas characterisation, which he refers to as having "a defined meaning," is connected to adverbs of attribution (p:7). Consequently, according to Bolinger (1977), an adjective should be employed before the noun. This adjective shouldn't merely appear after the verb be; it also must be capable of characterizing the noun rather than just describe a fleeting condition. (p:18)

Kruisinga (1932) assumed that a word's meaning is mainly but does have to be completely hinders the attributive usage of such expressions 'a- words' for we see them so employed in compounds, i.e., where the word is less distinctively transitory, as in wide-awake, sound-asleep". (p: 122). According to Kruisinga and Erades (1953, 193), "the state is apt to be thought of apart from a particular instant" in situations like two "fast-asleep maids". Nevertheless, "being fast asleep" and "being just sleeping" differ from each other, though not temporarily Instead of focusing on the various levels of temporariness,

it looks more logical to talk about such attributes in terms of condition or quality. When a term with an implication of degree or method (such as *swift*) is used, the emphasis shifts from the state to the quality of the state or just the quality.

6. Results and Discussion

As set by previous researches and theorists, examining the types of adjectives in the English language is still imperfect. In general, the area of linguistics, some studies have been carried out to learn about the two types of adjectives. Theoretically speaking, such an examination will be according to the usage of these two types of adjectives. Therefore, it has been recently shown that the misuse of these two types have created a sense of confusion on the part of the learners. That is to say, studies have been previously carried out to widen the knowledge about these two types of adjectives. Therefore, this study will make a clearer understanding to the previously carried evaluations to the upgrading and usefulness of adjectives in the English language.

A large majority of experts use predicative adjectives while reviewing adjectives (i.e. Stassen 2008 and Wetzer 1996). While verbs and adjectives differ from one another in various situations, it is useful to study these differences inside the predication structures. Since the adjective class is being examined, it might be claimed that the identity of adjectives makes it somewhat irregular to analyze the predicative function. The attributive one, on the other hand, is completely disregarded, which is probably the least advantageous. According to Croft (2002), the key characteristic of this class of property words is the attributive function. As per Stassen's approach of (2008), which is concerned predicative adjectives as a very useful in many ways. However, it is not really successful to clarify the identity of adjectives. This is somewhat occurring due to its ignorance of the attributive function. We can infer that Stassen's goal is to divide "adjectives" according to their linguistic characteristics in his argument. Adjectives will therefore be considered as being completely similar to verbs while yet being identified as such if this strategy is used. As a result, predicating rather than property expressing is the topic of discussion. As a result, Stassen's list of criteria does not effectively distinguish between vocally decided and improperly worked adjectives. Regarding the identification of an adjective lexical class, a genuine sense of satisfaction does not truly emerge.

In contrast, Croft's framework from 1996 applies a development of newer and more real stand point of adjectives by offering an insightful and engaging solution in challenging the categorizing of adjectives respectively. Here, there may be a good reason for the variations in

the property phrases. To accept this stance, however, we must all agree that there is no distinct lexical class of adjectives. The more adjectives are researched, the more classification schemes may be developed, Dixon's efforts are quite helpful. This indicates that all of these lexical classifications are helpful for focusing on a key aspect of the ambiguous nature.

However, Dixon's previous work may be used, and it offers a fantastic viewpoint on property expressions from a typological standpoint. Previous efforts like employ Dixon's semantic classes, including (Wetzer 1996, and Croft 2002). It seems too difficult to believe in Wetzer (1996) that one or the other of the lexical class of adjectives has to be fully discarded or even that it can come universally. It is true that such standards cannot be steadily applied across languages due to the fact that they differ depending on the language. Finding a means that they could form a logical test for an adjective class is what makes it so challenging. So, each of the analyzed points of view has some merits worth considering and some concepts worth challenging. The most persuasive argument for a universal distinction between typological models and language-specific expansions and bounds to other lexical classes comes from Croft (2002). Dixon also points out that these classes need to be cross-linguistically connected in accordance with how they function semantically (1999).

7. Conclusion

Whether or not expressions of property may be viewed as belonging to an adjective category, academics have agreed on this. This piece illuminates a two-goal (i.e. to offer a hypothetical background on adjectives for designing standards to be applied for adjectives to be tested). The findings offer some illustrations for a better and a clearer understanding. This in turn enhances hypothesis that can be found. Adjectives can have a further class in term of function, (i.e. attributive adjectives, predicative adjectives). Adjectives as attributive or predicative cannot absolutely be used, and they are varied among individuals. Generally speaking, adjectives that are only attributive in position do not describe the noun rightly. For instance, 'an old colleague' (i.e. someone who was a colleague of mine). Here, the meaning is not about the person being 'old'. This means that 'old' is attributive adjective. Adjectives that are included in this group that needs a complementation. Thus, further studies can be carried out to differently expand and change the set criteria to be further motivated and examined on a different bigger sample. Here, the significant feature, which has not been taken into account, by which languages that have small closed classes of adjectives. However, similar studies

can be conducted to examine adverbs, and the role can be taken by them.

Bibliography

1. Alexander, L. G. (2004). Longman English Grammar Practice. UK: Longman Group Limited.
2. Bache, C. (1978). The order of premodifying adjectives in present-day English. Syddansk Universitetsforlag.
3. Bolinger, D. (1967). Adjectives in English: Attribution and predication. *Lingua*, 18, 1-34.
4. Bolinger, D., & Bolinger, D. L. M. (1977). Meaning and form (No. 11). Longman Publishing Group.
5. Chomsky, N. (1993). Lectures on government and binding: The Pisa lectures (No. 9). Walter de Gruyter.
6. Croft, W. (2001). Radical construction grammar: Syntactic theory in typological perspective. Oxford University Press on Demand.
7. Croft, W. (202). Typology and universals. Cambridge University Press.
8. Dixon, R. M. (2010). Where have all the adjectives gone? and other essays in semantics and syntax (Vol. 107). Walter de Gruyter.
9. Dixon, R.M.W. (1999). Adjectives. In: Brown, K & Miller, J. (eds.) *Concise Encyclopedia of Grammatical Categories*. Oxford: Pergamum, Amsterdam: Elsevier.
10. Eastwood, J., Dunton, T., & Kerr, J. (2005). Oxford learner's grammar: Grammar builder: [practice]. Oxford University Press.
11. Geach, P. T. (1956). Good and evil. *Analysis*, 17(2), 33-42
12. Geach, P. T. (1960). Ascriptivism. *The Philosophical Review*, 69(2), 221-225.
13. Geach, P. T. (1965). Assertion. *The Philosophical Review*, 74(4), 449-465.
14. Geach, P. T. (1972). *Logic matters*. Univ of California Press.
15. Givón, T. (2018). On understanding grammar. *On Understanding Grammar*, 1-321.
16. Greenbaum, S. (1990). *A student's grammar of the English language*. Pearson Education India.
17. Halliday, M. A. (1994). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold, 331.
18. Kruisinga, E. (1932). *A Handbook of Present-day English, Part II, V. 3*. P. Noordhoff.
19. Leech, G. N., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (2002). *A communicative grammar of English*. Pearson Education.
20. Pullum, G. K., & Huddleston, R. (2002). Adjectives and adverbs. *The Cambridge grammar of the English language*, 525-595.
21. Poldauf, I. (1984). *English word stress: a theory of word-stress patterns in English*. Janus Book Pub/Aleman Press.
22. Radford, A. (2004). *English syntax: An introduction*. Cambridge University Press.

23. Ross, J. R. (1972, April). The category squish: Endstation hauptwort. In Chicago Linguistic Society (Vol. 8, pp. 316-328).
24. Salkoff, M. (1983). Bees are swarming in the garden: a systematic synchronic study of productivity. *Language*, 288-346.
25. Sibley, F. (1959). Aesthetic concepts. *The philosophical review*, 68(4), 421-450.
26. Sibley, F. (2001). *Approach to aesthetics: Collected papers on philosophical aesthetics*. Clarendon Press.
27. Stageberg, N. C. (1981). *An Introductory English Grammar*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston. Inc. New York, 137-140.
28. Stassen, L. (1997). *Intransitive predication*. Oxford University Press.
29. Stassen, L. M. H. (2008). *Predicative adjectives*.
30. Swan, M. (2005). *Practical English usage* (Vol. 688). Oxford: Oxford university press.
31. Warren, B. (1984). Classifying adjectives. *Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis. Gothenburg Studies in English Goteborg*, (56), 1-318.
32. Wetzter, H. (1996). *The typology of adjectival predication*. de Gruyter.