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## Abbreviations Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>accusative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>actor focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>allative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN</td>
<td>animate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUX</td>
<td>auxiliary verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUS</td>
<td>causative marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>noun class marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONT</td>
<td>continuous tense/aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>dative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>directional complement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF</td>
<td>definite form of the adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERG</td>
<td>ergative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>feminine gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GF</td>
<td>goal focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>imperative mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INC</td>
<td>inchoative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND</td>
<td>indefinite form of the adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>inanimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS</td>
<td>instrumental case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>locative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>masculine gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>neuter gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>nominative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>nominalising suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>object complement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART</td>
<td>participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAST</td>
<td>past tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRES</td>
<td>present tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REF</td>
<td>reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCL</td>
<td>restrictive noun class concord marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>topic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

This work is intended to be an exploratory study of a possible language universal. Limitations on time and resources did not allow a statistically valid sampling technique to be employed in collecting data for the study. Instead, a convenience sampling technique was used (Bell 1978: 123-56). The choice of languages in the study was influenced by my familiarity with them as well as by the availability of informants and recorded/published data. An attempt was made however, to select languages from as divergent genetic and geographic sources as the above mentioned restrictions allowed. The number of languages examined is skewed towards the I.E. family, also because of the limitations mentioned above. The examination of a larger sample of languages from the I.E. family proved to be useful as it illustrated the possible typology of formal expression of differences between adjectival categories and thus helped to identify these distinctions in less familiar languages.

The genetic families represented in this study include the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>English, French, Old Church Slavonic, Serbo-Croatian, Russian, Lithuanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger-Congo</td>
<td>Lam Nso', Igbo, Tupuri</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is a variation in the amount of descriptive details of the adjectival systems of languages in the study. In the case of Indo-European languages, grammatical descriptions of which are numerous and readily available, no attempt was made in the study to give detailed descriptions of their adjectival system, but rather the study focuses directly on the restrictive and non-restrictive categories within the system. Very little has been published on Lam Nso' and none on its adjectival grammar, so I provide a detailed outline of the adjectival system in this language before proceeding with the analysis of the restrictive and non-restrictive distinction. The adjectival system of Tagalog has been described in the grammars of Schachter and Otanes (1972) and by Ramos (1976). Again the study focuses directly on the restrictive and non-restrictive adjectives in Tagalog after a brief re-evaluation of the function of the noun markers in the language.

Data in the analysis of English, French, Serbo-Croatian, Russian and Tagalog comes both from the published sources and the informants. Data for the analysis of adjectives in Old Church Slavonic, Lithuanian, Igbo, Tupuri and Kuniyanti comes from published/recorded material. Analysis of adjectives in Lam Nso' is based on my work with the informants.
The sequence in which the chapters of the final draft were written is not that of this study. The Tagalog chapter, the last in this study, was written first, followed by some I.E. languages, then Lam Nso' and finally, English and Russian. The sequence of completing the chapters of the final draft may account for slight variations in emphasis and method of analysis. These variations were not great enough to justify altering them.

The method used to differentiate the two categories of adjectives in the study was applied to all languages where it was possible to have access to informants. Otherwise the presence of the distinction was assessed from descriptions of adjectival categories and examples provided in the previous works/publications.

My approach to the analysis of the distinction between restrictive and non-restrictive adjectives and the use of various terms in the analysis would be best illustrated by describing it for a familiar language like English. It is the topic of the first section in the first chapter.
1. Restrictive and non-restrictive adjectives in English

1.1 Previous works on adjectives in English

I will not attempt to find a cover term for my approach to the analysis of restrictive and non-restrictive adjectives, but perhaps it can be said that it has some elements of both pragmatics and psycholinguistics. Dependence of each category of adjectives on context, linguistic, extra-linguistic or cultural, and the relative importance of each category as essential or non-essential information in conveying the intentions of the speaker, are the main pragmatic aspects of the analysis.

The role of each adjectival category in identification or subcategorization of referents, temporarily or permanently, perhaps, represents the psychological element of the analysis.

Most works on adjectival categories in English are concerned with the syntax and semantics of these categories, that is with the relationship between lexically determined features of adjectives and their syntactic distribution. I will briefly survey two of the most important works.

Bolinger 1967 in 'Adjectives in English: attribution and predication' examines relationship between lexical features of adjectives and their syntactic occurrence. He also relates these features to two types of modification; referent and reference modification. In reference modification, the adjective occupies the 'kind of' slot as in

(1) Henry is a kind of policeman

kind of → rural, urban, regular, special ... (p. 17)
and functions as a determiner. In referent modification the adjective has, according to Bolinger, a predicative origin where it is joined to the noun by conjunction. He proposes the following derivation for the referent modification construction (p. 21).

(2) Henry is a policeman $\rightarrow$ Henry is a policeman and Henry is drowsy.

drowsy $\rightarrow$ Henry is a drowsy policeman.

According to Bolinger, the conjunction 'expresses the independent relationship of adjective and noun: his being drowsy has nothing to do with his being policeman' (p. 21). Adjectives occurring only in reference modification are almost exclusively attributive while adjectives occurring in referent modification may be only predicative or both predicative and attributive. This distribution is conditioned by the interaction between semantic features of the adjective and the modified noun.

Bolinger also notes the nominalizing potential of attributive only adjectives: 'a good case could be made for recognizing most instances of exclusively attributive adjectives as raw material for compounding' (p. 32). He ascribes 'most instances of the 'kind of+noun' generation (other than the good-bad ones), i.e. generation that has nothing to do with predication, to the level of word formation, i.e. to the lexicon, leaving referent modification as a genuine syntactic transformational source for attributive phrases that are not compounds, in addition to others that do become compounds.
partly through contextual stereotyping in the course of time: freshman, wet nurse, easy chair, single file, cold cream, silent partner, a likely story, a cool head. Compounds in this sense would cover the spectrum of freedom, all the way from a phrase like grammatical thinking which is almost free to one like heavenly host (p. 34).

Bolinger's article is a valuable contribution to understanding restrictive ('a kind of + noun') and non-restrictive (predicative source) modification as conditioned by the lexical features of adjectives, or according to my approach, the restrictive and non-restrictive distinction between the adjectives in English at the level of lexicon. My analysis attempts to examine this distinction both at the level of discourse and lexicon.

An example will illustrate a parallelism between the two levels: the reference modification (or what I term the restrictive modification at the level of lexicon), is, according to Bolinger, characterised by the 'kind of + noun' generation and is strictly attributive, for example, in:

(3) Henry is a rural policeman' (p. 15)

rural policeman is 'a kind of' policeman and it is not possible to use the adjective predicatively:

(4) *The policeman is rural.

This type of generation has a parallel generation in discourse:

(5) What kind of table are you looking for?

(6) I am looking for a round table / a round one.
round table in the above sentence is not an example of reference modification (or, in my approach, restrictive modification at the level of lexicon) since the adjective can also occur predicatively:

(7) The table is round

(compare it with ungrammaticality of (4) above)

But round table is 'a kind of' table and is an example of restrictive use of adjectives in English at the level of discourse.

A more recent study by Siegel (1980) is concerned with semantic-syntactic criteria differentiating the two categories of adjectives in English within the framework of Montague grammar. The adjective meanings are divided, according to interaction of their meaning with the meaning of the noun they modify, into intersective and non-intersective. Adjectives that are bound to the meanings of their 'common nouns' are non-intersective and those that are not bound-intersective. The meaning of a non-intersective adjective, according to Siegel, is 'always relative to that of the common noun it modifies' (p. 3). The non-intersective adjective meanings can always be separated by a test (see p. 4 of her work) while for the intersective readings 'we are left to rely on our intuitions as to what properties can be non-relative in order to identify intersective readings of adjectives'. (Siegel: 9-10)

In her analysis of English adjectives, Siegel claims that most adjectives will have both intersective and non-intersective
versions, while some will be either only intersective or non-intersective. The adjectives with 'double' readings occur both as CN/CN category (a term in Montague grammar - attributive adjectives, or 'things that combine with a common noun to make a new common noun by means of the semantic and syntactic rules,' for these see Siegel: 27) and t///e category (a verbal category, see Siegel: 22-31).

The CN/CN category is generated only prenominally, but it may modify the dummy CN in the predicate, in which case this dummy CN is deleted, with some exceptions.

t///e versions of adjectives are generated only in the predicate, but can be fronted by the relative clause reduction and fronting.

Siegel's analysis is an attempt to formalize within the framework of a particular syntactic theory, the relation between the lexical features of adjectives in combinations with nouns and their syntactic distribution. It is not concerned with pragmatic explanations for the duality of adjectives which are of greater interest to the present study.

The work that became a point of departure for this study is the analysis of English adjuncts in Jespersen's The Philosophy of Grammar' (1924).

Jespersen defines the function of restrictive or 'qualifying' adjuncts (including adjectives) as 'to restrict the primary, to limit the number of objects to which it may be applied; in
other words, to specialize or define it. Thus *red* in the *red rose* restricts the applicability of the word *rose* to one particular sub-class of the whole class of roses, it specializes and defines the rose of which I am speaking by excluding white and yellow roses' (1924: 108).

The non-restrictive adjuncts as in *my dear little Ann* are used, according to Jespersen, not to tell which among several Anns I am speaking of (or to) but simply to characterise her, they may be termed ornamental or parenthetical adjuncts' (1924: 112).

The recognition of an adjunct as restrictive or non-restrictive may be, according to Jespersen, ambiguous; however, the two uses of adjuncts 'may be made clear in the spoken language by the tone (intonation) and in the written language by a comma.' An example of a phrase with possible ambiguity between the restrictive and non-restrictive interpretation:

(8) **His first important poem** (Jespersen: 112)

This phrase generally means the first among his important poems, after 'he had written others of no importance' - the restrictive use of the adjective *important*. It may also mean 'the first he ever wrote and adds information that it was important' (p. 112) - the non-restrictive use of the adjective *important*.

The readings of this phrase by the native speaker of English convey the difference between the two uses of adjectives by
placing the emphatic prominence on the adjective in restrictive function.

(9) His first important poem.

The non-restrictive use of this adjective in the phrase above is marked by the absence of emphatic prominence on it and the presence of a pause between the first and the important in example (8).

The term 'emphatic prominence' is used throughout this study as defined by Liebermann (1967: 146-7). It occurs 'in instances where the distinctive feature (+Ps) produces extra prominence on the vowel or vowels of the word (and its consonants) apart from the stress (or tone - my addition) that the vowels of the word would have received from the phonological stress rules'. My addition to this definition is that the extra prominence is defined relative to the other words in the noun phrase, that is, the domain of the emphatic prominence is the noun phrase, and it appears to be independent of overall sentence intonation. The emphatic prominence is retained by the adjective irrespective of its position in a sentence or the type of sentence (interrogative, imperative, declarative). These statements and the recognition of either the presence or the absence of the feature 'emphatic prominence' are based only on perceptual judgements. The emphatic prominence is perceived as the 'loudness' of the adjective relative to other words in the noun phrase* (and

* In this study it is marked by ^ over the word.
not relative to the overall sentence intonation) when the speaker intends to use the adjective restrictively and the lack of 'loudness' of the adjective relative to other words in the noun phrase when the speaker intends it to be non-restrictive. This binary distinction in marking applies to the prototypical categories (Comrie 1981: 98-104) of restrictive and non-restrictive adjectives in English (and other languages where it is employed).

1.2 My approach to the analysis

Jespersen's definition of the distinction between the restrictive and non-restrictive modifiers emphasises the individuating, identifying and selective function of restrictive adjuncts (including adjectives) and the parenthetical function of non-restrictive adjuncts.

The restrictive and non-restrictive modifiers (including adjectives) also vary with respect to the relative importance of the information carried by either category. The modifier of the noun is the essential information in restrictive modification, without it the addressee would not be able to successfully identify the referent\(^1\) (Parisi 1976: 102); in non-restrictive modification the modifying adjective is only an additional information and may be omitted. This difference in the relative importance of information carried by the restrictive and non-restrictive adjectives again applies to prototypical examples of restrictive and non-restrictive
modifiers. There will be other cases where the concept of 'a degree of restrictiveness' will apply rather than binary categorization.

Restrictiveness of an adjective (or other modifiers) will depend on such factors as the lexical features of the adjective and the modified noun, information contained in the rest of the utterance and information in the preceding context. A demonstrative in English (and other languages) may have a certain degree of restrictiveness, it may contribute, to some degree, to the identification of a particular referent in terms of its location relative to the speaker. This appears to be the case below:

(10) What do you want?
(11) Give me that book!

Omission of this demonstrative and substitution of article in place of it is possible, but subtracts from the information necessary to identify the correct referent.

(12) Give me the book!
(11) ≠ (12) in information content

In the example above the referent is identified mainly in terms of properties, encoded by the noun with some contribution from the demonstrative. (The preceding text asks for identification minimally in terms of nominal properties)

The demonstrative may become fully restrictive and in this case it can not be omitted. The demonstrative is then
marked by the emphatic prominence (it lacks it in the example (11) above)

(13) Which book do you want?
(14) Give me that book/that one!

In this case the referent is identified in terms of its location relative to the speaker and other referents of the same kind are excluded. The nominal category is presupposed, i.e. it is known to the speaker and the addressee from the context (in this case it is given in the question). The presupposed noun may be omitted and substituted by one, which I will term a 'lexical pronoun'.

(15) Give me that one!

The lexical pronoun 'one' marks the cohesive relation on the lexicogrammatical level, it is a case of substitution (Halliday 1976: 89). The pronoun carries grammatical marking characteristic of the English noun - its number.

A demonstrative can also function non-restrictively and may be omitted (marked by bracketing):

(16) Do you know of anyone who could help me?
(17) There is (that) Mr Brown over on the other side of the street, you could ask him.

The demonstrative carries no emphatic prominence, as also in example below where it is also non-restrictive, and may be omitted as the proper name is sufficient to identify.

(18) Do you know where I can find any relevant information?
(19) Yes, there is (this)/a book by Prof. Brown.
The demonstrative here is superflous, the referent is adequately identified by the phrase by Prof. Brown.

A similar variation in the degree of restrictiveness, depending on the type of information contained in the context, linguistic and extra-linguistic, applies to adjectives. In sentences containing request, the adjective has a degree of restrictiveness (but carries no emphatic prominence).

(20) What do you want?
(21) Give me the/a blue biro.

The correct referent cannot be identified by the addressee unless the properties encoded by the adjective blue are taken into account.

However, in:

(22) What do you see from your window?
(23) I see the blue sky, the green fields and a big mountain in the distance.

The adjective blue (and other adjectives) is non-restrictive; it carries no emphatic prominence and may be omitted.

The same adjective may be used unambiguously restrictively in

(24) What kind of/which biro would you like?
(25) Give me a/the blue biro!

The adjective blue is marked by the emphatic prominence. The referent here is identified by the speaker in terms of properties encoded by the adjective; other referents of the
same kind with similar properties are excluded. The nominal category biro, encoding the class of the referent is presupposed, it is given in the question. The interrogative phrase what kind of when referring to adjectival modifiers is unmarked for the specification of the modified referent in the answer. This is indicated by the indefinite article.

'a' in (25) can also mark a specific referent. In this case it means 'one of the blue biros (there are sets of biros of different colours in view of the speaker).

The interrogative which requires the modified referent to always be a specific category. The presupposed noun in the example (25) may be omitted:

(26) Give me a/the blue one!

This combination of adjectives (or any other modifiers) and the lexical pronoun one is referred to in this study as a temporary nominalization of the adjective (or other modifier). The adjective functions temporarily as a nominal category and is used to identify the referent. This category is created only for the duration of discourse; it is dependent on the context (linguistic or extra-linguistic) for its interpretation. There are permanently nominalised adjectives in English (usually referring to people), e.g. blacks, the poor, the old, etc. which are independent lexical categories. This is indicated by the number marking attached directly to the adjective or by the definite article modifying
the adjective. Permanent nominalization of adjectives appears to be culture specific, the presupposed category is part of general knowledge.

The above discussion suggests a method of differentiating the two categories of adjectives in English (and other languages in the study). An adjective is unambiguously non-restrictive when it is used in the contexts where it does not contribute to the identification of the referent (as in examples (17) and (23) above).

This context is provided when one is required to identify a referent solely in terms of properties encoded by the noun, i.e. when one is required to identify the nominal class of the referent. The interrogative pronouns what and who require the referent to be minimally identified in terms of a nominal category, the adjective in this case is an additional information. So if the answer to the question:

(27) What is it?
also contains an adjective, it functions non-restrictively (except for the compound lexemes of adjective + noun, e.g. easy chair, black bird etc. which can be differentiated from non-restrictive adjectives by the emphatic prominence or stress (if it is a single word) falling on the adjective, while for non-restrictive adjectives there is no emphatic prominence).

The answer to above:

(28) it is a (short) dress. Brackets indicate optionality. An adjective is used unambiguously as a restrictive modifier
when it is necessary for the identification of a referent, when other referents in the set of the same class are excluded. There is also a provision that the number of referents in the set = 1. The referent (see definition of the term 'referent' in the footnote (1) at the end of the chapter) can be a generic or specific category.

The interrogative modifiers what kind and which require the referent to be identified in terms of properties encoded by the modifier (including adjectives). The nominal class is given in the question containing these interrogatives. Both interrogatives require a restrictive modifier in the answer; the modifier cannot be omitted.

In the case of what kind interrogative modifier, the set from which the referent is selected is usually (but not necessarily) a generic set:

(29) What kind of dress would you like?

(30) I would like a short dress/a short one.

However, a specific referent can be pointed out. In this case it is possible to use the definite article:

(31) I would like the short dress/the short one (accompanied by pointing).

In the case of which interrogative modifier the set from which the referent is selected is always a specific set.

(32) Which dress would you like?

(33) I would like the short dress/the short one.
It would be ungrammatical to answer this using the indefinite article:

(34) *I would like a short dress/a short one.

This method of identifying restrictive and non-restrictive use of adjectives by means of interrogatives was used in the study to establish the associations between the forms of adjectives and their restrictive and non-restrictive functions and thus identify restrictive and non-restrictive categories of adjectives in a language.

The method was employed only for the languages where it was possible to have access to informants.

Summary

Our test for distinguishing restrictive function of adjectives in English from their non-restrictive use in discourse indicates that prosodic features are important in describing these distinctions in the adjectival system of English. The restrictive category of adjectives is used in discourse to identify the referent in terms of properties encoded by the adjective and exclude others of the same kind; it is marked by the feature of emphatic prominence on the modifying adjective.

The emphatic prominence also indicates the presupposed status of the modified noun (when it is not ellipsed). When the modified noun is ellipsed the presupposed status of the
noun is marked by substitution with the lexical pronoun 'one'. The restrictive adjective retains the emphatic prominence. The restrictive adjective + one combination represents temporary nominalization of that adjective; this nominalization is created only for the duration of discourse and is marked by substitution. Permanent nominalizations of restrictive adjectives occur when the presupposed modified noun is permanently ellipsed and is part of general knowledge. The permanent nominalization is marked by ellipsis (in contrast to temporary one) and the number marking attached directly to the adjective, or the definite article modifying the adjective alone.

Non-restrictive adjectives do not carry the feature of emphatic prominence. These generalizations apply to prototypical categories of restrictive and non-restrictive adjectives.

1.3 Restrictive adjectives in English and nominalizations at the level of lexicon

So far we have discussed the restrictive function of adjectives in English mainly on the level of discourse. The examples (29) and (30) suggest that restrictive adjectives also have subcategorizing potential, i.e. they combine with the modified noun to form a subcategory of that noun. The subcategory short dresses in (30) has only a temporary status. The restrictive adjectives can also subcategorise the nouns on the level of lexicon. In this case we get
lexical compounds. The lexical compounds are permanent nominalizations of restrictive adjectives + noun. These nominalizations can be distinguished from the temporary nominalizations in discourse by the substitution test. In the temporary subcategory short dresses in (30) the noun can be substituted by the lexical pronoun 'one' - short ones. In compound lexemes this substitution is usually not possible in the same context.

e.g. easy chair - * easy one
blackboard - * black one
White House - * White one
dark room - * dark one
short bread - * short one

This test applies to the prototypical examples of lexical compounds. Other examples may not be compounded to the same degree e.g. madman may be substituted by the mad one, restricted zone (Lees 1968: 130) by the restricted one.

The test below demonstrates it:

(35) What kind of chair is it?
(36) It is an easy chair/*an easy one.
(37) What kind of house is it?
(38) It is the White House/* the White one.

But in:

(39) What kind of man is he?
(40) He is a mad one.
(41) What kind of zone is it?
(42) It is a restricted one.
In lexical compounds both the restricting, subcategorising adjective and the modified noun are essential information. In identification the subcategory can always be substituted by the supercategory, in which the subcategory is included. One can always identify:

the **easy chair** as the **chair**;
the **blackboard** as the **board**;
the **dark/room** as the **room**.

The compound lexemes in many cases are characterised by the shift in meaning: the meaning of the compound is not simply the sum of meanings of its components. The **black/board** is not simply any board which is black, it is a special kind of board for special use.

In the compound lexemes above the restrictive adjective component is marked by the stress (emphatic prominence becomes stress in fully compounded lexemes). However in compound lexemes where the adjective is lexically restrictive in combination with a particular noun, there is a tendency not to mark the adjective with the stress. Using one of Bolinger's examples: **rural policeman**, and some from Lees (1968: 130) **general store**, **polar bear**, **postal service**, **tidal wave**, **medical book**.

**Summary**

At the level of lexicon the restrictive adjectives have a subcategorizing function. The subcategory of restrictive
adjective + noun becomes a compound lexeme of varying degrees of stability. When lexically non-restrictive adjectives are used restrictively in the compound lexemes, they are usually marked by stress (emphatic prominence → stress). However, the lexically restrictive adjectives tend not to be marked by stress in the compound lexemes.
FOOTNOTES

1. The term referent as used here is based largely on Chafe's definition of it (1976:28): 'a referent is the idea a noun is used to express...we may have in mind a particular person and we may express our idea of this person on one occasion as Bob on another as the guy I bought the boat from, on another as he or whatever. The referent in all these is the constant idea of this person'. This definition is important as a linguistically rather than a philosophically based definition and allows the use of the term 'referent' for ideas that have no extralinguistic reality.

Givon (1978:293) prefers a linguistic definition of a related concept of referentiality to a philosophical one: 'the philosophers most often assume, I suppose erroneously, that the Universe of Discourse is somehow coexistent with the real world, but language is clearly concerned with the former, often in relative disregard of the latter'.

2. Presupposition. This term is used here without any connotations from its use in logic or philosophy, but purely in a linguistic sense, as used by Halliday (1976:3-9;14,17).

3. A similar method of differentiating categories by the use of interrogatives is employed by Dixon (1982:190-91). Classifiers in Yidiny are distinguished on the basis of use of an interrogative which required the referent to be identified in terms of properties encoded by the term for genus. Another interrogative required identification in terms of species.
1.2 Restrictive and non-restrictive adjectives in French

1.2.1. Adjectives in French and the word order

Adjectives in French usually occur either before or after the noun they modify. In Old French the position of adjectives relative to the noun they modified was much freer. Even colour adjectives, which in Modern French always follow the noun, could occur either before or after the noun.

e.g.

la *Rouge* Mer  'the Red Sea'
blanches mains   'white hands'
(Ewert 1933:147)

In Modern French the position of adjective either before or after noun depends on its semantic type: adjectives denoting colour, shape, nationality, religion, profession, social class, political persuasion, usually follow the noun they modify:

une robe jaune  'a yellow dress'
une table ronde  'a round table'
le parti socialiste 'the Socialist party'

Adjectives which are noticeably longer than the noun they modify also follow the noun. (Farrer 1974:156-7).
Adjectives which precede the noun are the adjectives most commonly used (Farrer 1975:156). These are:

- **petit** 'small'
- **grand** 'big/great'
- **gros** 'large'
- **jeune** 'young'
- **bon** 'good'

and a few others.

The compound lexemes also have adjectives preceding the noun, as in **un jeune homme** 'a young man, youngster'. In emotionally coloured descriptions adjectives precede the modified noun.

- **quelle merveilleuse sensation!**
  'what a marvelous feeling!'

Some adjectives occur before and after the noun they modify, with a change in meaning for each position. (This differentiation in meaning has been a gradual development - Ewert 1933:147).

- **un ancien roi** 'a former king'
- **un roi ancien** 'an ancient king'
un affreux homme  'a terrible man'
un homme affreux  'a horrible-looking man'
un simple soldat  'a private'
un soldat simple  'a simple-minded soldier'
un grand homme  'a great man'
un homme grand  'a tall man'
un nouvel effort  'a fresh effort'
un procédé nouveau  'a new procedure'
un méchant écrivain  'a bad, poor writer'
un écrivain méchant  'a evil, wicked writer'

There are adjectives which can occur in either order, without an obvious change in meaning. Some examples below:

un méchant homme vs un homme méchant
both mean 'a wicked, mean person'.

un bon homme vs un homme bon
'a good, simple man, a nice fellow'.

une mauvaise route vs une route mauvaise
'a poorly-paved road'
There are many studies on the position of the adjective with respect to the noun in French. A survey of these works can be found in Linda Waugh's study (1977) of the position of the adjective in French. This study examines the word order of adjectives and nouns within the framework of Jackobson's approach to linguistic analysis. A large sample of minimal pairs of adjectives preceding nouns and the same adjectives following the nouns were examined for the meaning differences. The conclusions she draws are summarised as follows:

'Any adjective in French in post-position modifies a preceding substantive just as it would modify any substantive in the language. An adjective in this position (minimally and invariantly) modifies the substantive qua substantive, i.e. as a part of speech and not as a substantive with a specific lexical meaning. This is what gives impression, for example, that there are objectively definable means of establishing the sense of an adjective in post-position. The combination of pauvre 'poor' in homme pauvre 'a poor man' does not differ significantly from that of pauvre in église pauvre 'a poor church'. The quality attributed to the substantive will be such that it might be found in any substantive. In poète heureux the poet is happy in the way any person might be happy'. (Waugh 1977:95).
Another important characteristic of modification with the adjective in post-position is that 'a comparison within the part of speech substantive to other substantives is implied' (p104).

In the case of pre-position the adjective 'modifies the substantive with a specific lexical meaning. In other words, the lexical distinctive features of the substantive must have already cumulated with the distinctive features of the part of speech substantive to form a particular lexical item before modification can take place in the marked word order' (p95). *Furieux menteur 'a compulsive liar' is concerned with particular liar-like qualities, un furieux mangeur 'a compulsive eater' directs our attention to distinguishably eater-like qualities. In any use of furieux in pre-position the distinguishing features singled out by the adjective are just those which are the salient characteristics of the substantive being modified' (p96).

She sums up the difference between the pre-position and post-position as related to the status of the substantive 'as deictically presupposed in the linguistic context: in pre-position it is invariably a combination of the part of speech substantive and its lexical meaning while in post-position it is (minimally) the part of speech substantive. The part of speech adjective and the nature of the modification process (intersection) remains constant' (p96-7).
1.2.2. Pre-position and post-position of adjectives and their restrictive and non-restrictive function

It is not my intention to provide here a critical review of Waugh's work on French adjectives (one can analyse adjectives in French with various theoretical approaches). I would like only to indicate some similarities and differences between our approaches to the analysis of adjectives.

Waugh's analysis of differences in meaning between post-posed and pre-posed adjectives in modification seems to be concerned with the difference in meaning at the level of lexicon; her analysis of examples of adjectives in pre-position and the semantics associated with this order correspond closely to my analysis of restrictive use of adjectives at the level of lexicon where the adjectives subcategorise the nominal category to form another subcategory, identified in terms of properties encoded by both the adjective and the substantive. This subcategory consisting of adjective + noun has a potential to become a compound lexeme (with frequent change in meaning, not simply the sum of its component meanings) and many examples of pre-posed adjectives in French suggest that they have become such compounds. Ewert (1933) suggests that changes in
meaning between the pre-posed and post-posed adjectives is often due 'to the tendency of adjective + noun to become more or less fused'.

un simple soldiér 'private' in contrast to
un soldiér simple 'simple minded soldier'

which is lexically non-restrictive.

un jeune hommẽ 'a youngster, a boy'
- a compound lexeme, in contrast to:

un hommẽ jeune 'a man still young'
- lexically non-restrictive.
(examples from Waugh 1977:185)

Other pre-posed uses of adjectives appear to be due to their lexical restrictiveness: e.g. adjective ancien in un ancien roi 'a former king' is lexically restrictive while in un roi ancien 'an ancient king' the adjective is lexically non-restrictive.

Waugh's approach appears to provide adequate explanations (within her theoretical framework) of semantics of post vs pre-position at the level of lexicon, where there are obvious changes in meaning associated with both
orders. However, for the adjectives which do not show any obvious changes in meaning (as minimal pairs) her explanation does not seem to be adequate, since the changes in meaning in these cases may become apparent only at the level of discourse, in full utterances rather than in minimal pairs. It may be the case that these changes are associated with the restrictive use of adjectives in pre-position and non-restrictive use in post-position (unfortunately, due to lack of time, it was not possible to check the use of these adjectives with an informant).

Her approach does not provide an adequate explanation of the adjectives occurring only in pre- or post-position. In cidre doux 'sweet cider' it is not clear why the postposed adjective cannot be analysed as 'a type of cider', in which case it would qualify for the semantics of the pre-position, or in une table ronde (which occurs only in post-position), the adjective may also be analysed as contributing to subcategorization, and thus having the semantics of pre-position.

My analysis of some adjectives of fixed position suggest that the semantics of word order as described by Waugh for a large number of minimal pairs are not applicable to the fixed position adjectives (except for compound lexemes) not having an alternative word order.
The adjectives in these positions can function both restrictively and non-restrictively, with restrictive use marked by the emphatic prominence on the adjective.

**Adjectives in fixed order used non-restrictively**

**Question:**

(1) Que voyez-vous?
'What do you see?'

**Answer:**

(2) Je vois une table brune, un petit cendrier et une assiette ronde.
'I see a brown table, a small ashtray and a round plate'.

**Adjectives in fixed order used restrictively**

(3) Quelle sorte de table / cendrier / assiette voyez-vous?

(4) Je vois un table brune / un petit cendrier / une assiette ronde.
This use of adjectives qualifies them for the semantics of pre-position, however the semantics associated with the particular word order are marked here prosodically.

1.2.3. Summary

I would like to suggest that the following tendencies are present in the Modern French in relation to restrictive and non-restrictive use of adjectives.

1. The word order appears to be important in differentiating restrictive (subcategorising) use of adjectives in French from non-restrictive (non-subcategorising) use of the same adjectives at the level of lexicon. The pre-position of the adjective marks the restrictive function, with frequent compounding between the adjective and the noun; the post-position of the adjective marks the non-subcategorizing function.

2. For a few adjectives having variable word order and no obvious differentiation in meaning associated with changes in it, the word order may be a significant marker of restrictive and non-restrictive function at the level of discourse.
3. For adjectives occurring in fixed order, either before or after the modified noun, the restrictive and non-restrictive use of the adjectives is marked by the emphatic prominence on the restrictive adjective.
1.3. **Duality of adjectival category in Old Church Slavonic**

1.3.1 **Old Church Slavonic and its origin**

Old Church Slavonic is the first literary Slavonic language. It is based on the South Slavonic dialect of Macedonia and was used in the ninth century by two Greek scholars, Constantine (Cyril) and Methodius of Thessalonica for missionary purposes in the Slav countries of Moravia and Pannonia (Nandriş 1969: 1). The linguistic unity of the Slavonic languages started breaking up only in the Middle Ages so OCS can be regarded as a close approximation to the Common Slavonic, a proto-language of the modern Slavonic languages.

1.3.2 **Adjectival categories in OCS**

Qualitative adjectives (as well as participles and, to some degree, ordinal numerals) appeared in two forms: short or nominal form and long or pronominal, with a pronominal suffix (Nandriş 1969: 91). The long form adjectives occurred almost exclusively as modifiers. The short forms had dual syntactic function: they occurred as modifiers and in the
predicate with the copula 'be'. The long form is also referred to as definite and the short form - indefinite.

(1) novū domū 'a new house'
   new-M-SG-NOM-IND house-M-SG-NOM

(2) novū + ji domū 'house, a/the new one'
   new-M-SG-NOM-DEF house-M-SG-NOM

(3) domū jestū novū 'The house is new'
   house-M-SG-NOM be-PRES-3P-SG new-M-SG-NOM-IND

'The house is new'

(Transcription is as in Nandriš, §1)

The short or indefinite forms of adjectives had declension identical to declension of nouns; the long forms had pronominal declension. The long form adjectives are thought to have derived from short forms by addition of an anaphoric/demonstrative pronoun:

- i/ji - for masculine singular
- ja  - for feminine singular
- je  - for neuter singular
1.3.3 Semantic distinction between the long and short forms of adjectives in OCS

The grammars of Old Church Slavonic describe the difference in meaning between the two forms with emphasis on various aspects of it: (i) presupposed status of the modified noun, (ii) the given-new status of the modifying adjective, (iii) the roles the long and short forms of adjective play in the identification of the referent of the noun.

Nandriš (1969: 113) sees the difference in meaning between the two categories as related to definiteness or the presupposed status of the noun: 'the first (short form) category has a general indefinite meaning ... the second refers to a certain, definite category'. He does not mention the role adjectives themselves contribute to the meaning differences.

Gorshkov (1963: 192-194) also suggests that 'pronominal (long) forms of adjectives were used when one was talking about definite, known person or object; the nominal (short) forms of adjectives were used when one was talking about an unknown person or object which was being mentioned for the first time.

According to Gorshkov, the short form adjectives usually occurred after the modified noun.
'A certain/one man had a grand feast'.

The long forms were most frequently found before the modified noun:

\[(5) \text{člověk} \text{u} \quad \text{jednů} \quad \text{sútvorí}
\]
\[\text{man-M-SG-NOM} \quad \text{one-M-SG-NOM} \quad \text{make - PAST}\]

\[\text{vecerjö} \quad \text{velikö}
\]
\[\text{feast-F-SG-ACC} \quad \text{grand-F-SG-ACC}\]

'The long forms were most frequently found before the modified noun:

\[(6) \text{vi} \quad \text{nepravěděněmů} \quad \text{žitií}
\]
\[\text{in} \quad \text{unholy-N-SG-LOC} \quad \text{life-N-SG-LOC}\]

'In unholy life'.

(Gorškov 1963: 192-193)

Haburgayev (1974: 229) describes the difference in meaning in relation to the given-new status of the short or long form of adjectives. The role of the long form is 'primarily to indicate or point out an individuated property, i.e. a property which, according to the speaker, is already known to the addressee as specific for the qualified referent. Because of this aspect of their meaning the long forms of adjectives were used only in modifying positions and as substantivised adjectives. The short forms, lacking any presence of definiteness,
used as modifiers only when indication of a quality or a property of the referent didn't require stressing it being known or specific, or simply when it was new information. Only short forms were used in the predicate since the predicate has the role of presenting new information to the addressee!

Lunt (1955: 125) also sees the difference between the two forms as related to the given-new status of the modifying adjective. 'The juxtaposition of a short form adjective and a substantive denotes that the combination is presented as a new one ... The long form adjective presents the quality as one already known and specifically known to belong to the particular substantive it modifies'.

Yolkina's definition (1960: 140-141) of differences between the two forms is a much broader one and focuses not only on the presupposed status of the modified noun, but also emphasises the role the short and long forms of adjectives themselves play in contributing to the difference in meaning:

'Short and long forms of adjectives in modifier (attributive) function indicated the differences in definiteness of the modified noun. Besides that, the long form indicated that the person or object to which it
referred was selected from a set of referents of the same kind, possessing similar kinds of properties; it indicated that the referent was individuated and was seen as one of a kind, distinct from many others, identical in kind. The short form of adjectives most frequently simply indicated that a referent had some quality or property, without giving any other additional information.

According to Seliščev (1952: 127) the pronominal forms of adjectives were substantivised adjectives, e.g. malyi = 'a small one, a child.' He also points out another characteristic of the long forms: 'they emphasise a quality or a property of a referent which distinguishes it among other referents possessing the same kind of property or quality; they indicate the speaker's emphasis on this particular characteristic of the referent.'

Krivčik and Možejko (1974: 121-124) also see the difference in meaning between the two forms as primarily associated with the role of each adjectival form in identification of a referent: 'the short form adjective only indicates a quality or a property of the referent and does not characterise it any further; the long form adjective qualifies the referent and, at the same time, selects it from a number of referents of the same kind.'
These interpretations of differences in meaning between the long and short forms of adjectives in OCS suggest that the differences in meaning associated with the long and short forms were related to their restrictive and non-restrictive functions. In restrictive modifications the modified noun is presupposed (or 'definite') and the referent is identified or individuated in terms of properties, encoded by the adjective, from a set of present or potential referents with the same kind of quality; in non-restrictive modifications the adjective simply ascribes the quality to the referent; it is a comment about it.

1.3.4 The long form adjectives and nominalization

The long form adjectives, according to Seliščev, were 'substantivised adjectives', i.e. they had potential to be used as nouns as they were marked for the presupposition of the nominal class of the referent, which they subcategorized. This subcategorization potential is the property of restrictive adjectives.
1.3.5. The short and long forms of adjectives in other Slavonic languages

OCS reflects more fully than any contemporary Slavonic language the nature of the relationship that existed between the short and long forms of qualitative adjectives. The original meaning differences associated with these forms are also sufficiently clear (Yolkina 1960:140). The morphological distinction between the two categories existed in all genders.

The presence of two morphologically distinct adjectival forms was characteristic of all Slavonic languages in their early history (Yolkina 1960:140). However, not all of them retained this type of distinction. The West Slavonic languages almost completely lost the short form and generalised the long form for all functions, retaining only a few adjectives with dual forms. This is the case in Czech and Polish (de Bray 1951:473, 639). In the East Slavonic group the short form was retained in Russian only in the predicate use and does not occur in the modifier position. The long form was generalised for all modifier functions and even moved into predicate (the use of long form in the predicate was very restricted in OCS and still is in Serbo-Croatian). In Ukrainian most adjectives exist
in the long form. Just a few adjectives retain the short form ending in a consonant for the masculine singular only. This form is used mostly predicatively, but it also may be used attributively (de Bray 1951:99). Only the South Slav group has languages which still retain, though only partially, the long and short forms. These languages are Serbo-Croatian and Slovenian. According to de Bray, the two adjectival categories in Slovenian differ morphologically 'only in the Nominative and (inanimate) Accusative singular masculine, their endings being otherwise identical. Most adjectives distinguish the definite from the indefinite form by intonation' (de Bray 1951:401). In Serbo-Croatian the long and short forms of adjectives are also retained only partially. The situation in Serbo-Croatian will be discussed in detail in the next section.

The disappearance of the morphologically marked distinction between adjectival categories during the development of Slavonic languages does not, however, indicate that the original semantic categories associated with the dual forms have disappeared as well. Analysis of two Slavonic languages Serbo-Croatian and Russian suggests that the original restrictive and non-restrictive distinction associated with the long and short forms respectively is preserved in these languages but carries
a different marking. In the case of Russian the long form was generalised for both functions in modifier position and the difference between the two functions is marked by the emphatic prominence on the adjective when it is used as a restrictive modifier. The existence of a contrast between the short and the long form in the predicate for many adjectives appears to be a particularly Russian development. This could be a result of a linguistic change at work: the long form moving in to replace the short form in the predicate also. This development is discussed more fully in the section on Russian adjectives.
1.4 Restrictive and non-restrictive adjectives in Serbo-Croatian

1.4.1 Formal expression of the distinction between adjectival categories in Standard Literary language and in the speech of my informant

Grammars describing the distinction between adjectival categories in Serbo-Croatian refer to it as indefinite-definite (Partridge 1964, Stevanović 1975). The existence of two adjectival categories in Serbo-Croatian represents a continuation of a distinction found in Common Slavonic (as Old Church Slavonic data suggests). In Old Church Slavonic this distinction was marked morphologically (Nandris 1969: 113-115). In Contemporary Serbo-Croatian we find a mixture of morphological and prosodic features employed to differentiate between the two categories.

Most of the masculine adjectives (modifying masculine nouns) mark this distinction morphologically in the nominative and accusative singular (for inanimate nouns) and prosodically in all other cases and in the plural. There are some exceptions, e.g. colour adjectives even in the masculine nominative and accusative singular (for inanimates) have only definite forms and the distinction between the two semantic categories is carried by the feature of emphatic prominence¹ (Liebermann 1968: 144-146).
Feminine and neuter adjectives (modifying feminine and neuter nouns) in singular and in plural mark the distinction between the two functions only prosodically.

The type of formal characteristic employed to differentiate the two categories of adjectives varies according to the speaker's dialect of Serbo-Croatian. According to Stevanović (1975: 261-264) the usage of indefinite forms in the oblique cases in eastern dialects (including Belgrade) is becoming rare, but is still the norm for predicative use. This however does not mean that the semantic difference between what are traditionally termed categories of indefinite and definite adjectives in Serbo-Croatian is disappearing, it is rather the case of a morphological distinction being replaced by a prosodic one. (This change will be discussed fully in the following section). In the central dialects, including Bosnia, the nominal declension of indefinite adjectives is often used in the spoken language. My analysis of Serbo-Croatian definite and indefinite adjectives is based on work with a native speaker of an Eastern dialect, in particular that of Belgrade. The following three tables compare the formal distinction between definite and indefinite adjectives for masculine, feminine and neuter genders, for all cases and numbers, in the standard literary language (SLL) as quoted by Stevanović and in the dialect of my informant (Inf).
Table 1

Declension of masculine indefinite and definite adjectives in the standard literary language (SLL) and in the dialect of my informant (Inf).

The four accents are marked as follows:
- \( \circ \) long falling
- \( \backslash \) short falling
- \( \circ \) long rising
- \( \backslash \) short rising
- marks the long vowel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>Definite</th>
<th>Indefinite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SLL</td>
<td>INF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>zeleni</td>
<td>zeleni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rúžan/rúžni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>zelenog (a)</td>
<td>zelenog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rúžnog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* DAT</td>
<td>zeleni (IN)</td>
<td>zeleni/rúžni (IN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>zelenog (AN)</td>
<td>zelenog/rúžnog (AN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>zeleni</td>
<td>zeleni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rúžni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>zeleni</td>
<td>zeleni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rúžnimi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS</td>
<td>zeleni</td>
<td>zeleni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rúžnimi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL</td>
<td>zeleni</td>
<td>zeleni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rúžnimi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| PLURAL  |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|
|          | SLL | INF | SLL | INF |
| NOM     | zeleni | zeleni | zeléni | zeleni |
|         |       | rúžni |       | rúžni |
| GEN     | zelenih | zelenih | zelénih | zelenih/rúžnih |
|         |       | rúžnih |       | rúžnih |
| DAT     | zeleni | zeleni | zelénim | zeleni/rúžnym |
|         |       | rúžnim |       | rúžnim |
| ACC     | zeleni | zeleni | zelene | zelene/rúžne |
|         |       | rúžni |       | zelene/rúžni |
| VOC     | zeleni | zeleni | zeleni | zeleni/rúžnim |
|         |       | rúžni |       | zeleni/rúžnim |
| INS     | zeleni | zeleni | zeleni | zeleni |
|         |       | rúžnim |       | rúžnim |
| LOCAL   | zeleni | zeleni | zeleni | zeleni |
|         |       | rúžnim |       | rúžnim |
| * DAT   | zelenóm | zelenóm | zelénu | zelenóm |
|         |       | rúžnom |       | rúžnom |
Table 2

Declension of feminine indefinite and definite adjectives in the Standard Literary language (SLL) and in the dialect of my informant (Inf).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>Definite SLL</th>
<th>Definite INF</th>
<th>Indefinite SLL</th>
<th>Indefinite INF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>zèlenà</td>
<td>zèlena</td>
<td>zèlena</td>
<td>zèlena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ružna</td>
<td></td>
<td>ružna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>zèlenè</td>
<td>zèlene</td>
<td>zèleñë</td>
<td>zèleñë</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ružne</td>
<td></td>
<td>ružne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>zèlenôj</td>
<td>zèlenoj/ružnoj</td>
<td>zèlenôj</td>
<td>zèlenoj/ružnoj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>zèlenù</td>
<td>zèlenu</td>
<td>zèleñù</td>
<td>zèleñu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ružnu</td>
<td></td>
<td>ružnu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>zèlenà</td>
<td>zèlena/ružna</td>
<td>zèleñà</td>
<td>zèlena/ružna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS</td>
<td>zèlenôm</td>
<td>zèlenom/ružnom</td>
<td>zèleñôm</td>
<td>zèlenom/ružnom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>zèlenôj</td>
<td>zèleno/ružnoj</td>
<td>zèlenôj</td>
<td>zèleno/ružnoj</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>Definite SLL</th>
<th>Definite INF</th>
<th>Indefinite SLL</th>
<th>Indefinite INF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>zèlenè</td>
<td>zélene</td>
<td>zèleñe</td>
<td>zèleñe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ružne</td>
<td></td>
<td>ružne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>zèlenih</td>
<td>zèlenih</td>
<td>zèleñih</td>
<td>zèleñih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ružnih</td>
<td></td>
<td>ružnih</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>zèlenîm</td>
<td>zèlenîm</td>
<td>zèleñîm</td>
<td>zèleñîm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>zèlenè</td>
<td>zèleñe</td>
<td>zèleñe</td>
<td>zèleñe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ružne</td>
<td></td>
<td>ružne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>zèlenè</td>
<td>zèleñe</td>
<td>zèleñè</td>
<td>zèleñè</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS</td>
<td>zèlenîm</td>
<td>zèlenîm</td>
<td>zèleñîm</td>
<td>zèleñîm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>zèlenîm</td>
<td>zèlenîm</td>
<td>zèleñîm</td>
<td>zèleñîm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

Declension of neuter indefinite and definite adjectives in standard literary language (SLL) and in the dialect of my informant (Inf).

SINGULAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Definite</th>
<th>Indefinite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>zeleno</td>
<td>zeleno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>zelenog</td>
<td>zelenog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>zelenom</td>
<td>zelenom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>zeleno</td>
<td>zeleno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>zeleno</td>
<td>zeleno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS</td>
<td>zelenim</td>
<td>zelenim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>zelenom</td>
<td>zelenom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SLL</th>
<th>INF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>zeleno</td>
<td>zeleno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>zelenog</td>
<td>zelenog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>zelenom</td>
<td>zelenom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>zeleno</td>
<td>zeleno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>zeleno</td>
<td>zeleno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS</td>
<td>zelenim</td>
<td>zelenim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>zelenom</td>
<td>zelenom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLURAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SLL</th>
<th>INF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>zelenâ</td>
<td>zeleno/rûžna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>zelenih</td>
<td>zelenih/rûžnih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>zelenîm</td>
<td>zelenim/rûžnim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>zelenâ</td>
<td>zeleno/rûžna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>zelenô</td>
<td>zeleno/rûžno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS</td>
<td>zelenîm</td>
<td>zelenim/rûžnim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>zelenîm</td>
<td>zelenim/rûžnim</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion of the Tabulated Data

Masculine Declension

SLL maintains a morphological distinction between definite and indefinite adjectives for all cases in the singular, except INS and LOC. The distinction is marked by variations in the forms of the endings. In INS and LOC the definite category is marked (for this particular adjective) by the short rising accent on the first vowel of the stem and the indefinite category by the short rising accent on the second vowel of the stem. In the plural, there is no morphological distinction, the difference between the categories is marked by variations in the accentual pattern as in INS and LOC singular.

In the dialect of my informant (Inf) the definite form has been generalised for oblique cases of both definite and indefinite paradigms as well as for the Nominative case for colour adjectives. The final vowel of the definite form is not lengthened. The adjective rūzan 'ugly' does have definite and indefinite forms in the Nominative, with alternative use of indefinite form marked by prominence in the definite function. This pattern of alternative use of the indefinite form marked by the emphatic prominence as the definite category in the Nominative is followed for the majority of adjectives possessing dual forms in the dialect of my informant, with some exceptions, such as colour adjectives and a few others. These exceptions are discussed in greater detail.
in the later section. In the plural, the definite and indefinite categories are differentiated by the presence of emphatic prominence on the adjective in the definite category (in Inf).

In the Accusative case, for both SLL and Inf, in definite and indefinite singular paradigms the adjective modifying an animate noun has the form identical to Genitive case and one modifying an inanimate noun has the form identical to the Nominative.

In the Vocative case for both SLL and Inf there is no difference in form between the definite and indefinite paradigms, and it is the definite form that is generalised for this case. The use of the definite form in the Vocative will be discussed in a later section.

Feminine Declension

In SLL definite forms are marked by the long final vowel in NOM and ACC (where the form ends in a vowel). Indefinite forms are marked by the short final vowel in these cases. There are also differences in the position of the stem accent. Definite forms have the short rising accent on the first syllable of the stem and the indefinite ones - on the second.
In other cases there are no differences in the length of the vowel of the ending and the two forms differ only in the position of the short rising accent, in the way described for NOM and ACC (this does not apply to VOC). The difference in the position of the accent between the two paradigms is relevant here only to the particular adjective in the table, there may be different patterns of accentuation for other adjectives.

According to Stevanović (1975:267-70) variations in accent of an adjective may be conditioned by its gender, whether it is a definite or indefinite category, as well as, to some degree, by the number of syllables in the adjective. Monosyllabic adjectives are more likely to have the accent changes conditioned by changes in gender or definite or indefinite function. Some monosyllabic adjectives, however, retain the same accent in all genders and for definite or indefinite category; fin 'fine' has long falling accent in all genders and in both definite and indefinite categories. (It may be a loan word).

Some disyllabic adjectives, as

\[
\begin{align*}
måli & \ 'small' \\
råni & \ 'early'
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
jåri & \ 'spring' \\
sînji & \ 'bluish-grey'
\end{align*}
\]

(Stevanović 1975:268)
have only definite forms and preserve the long falling accent in all genders and both in indefinite and definite categories.

Some monosyllabic adjectives with the long falling accent in the masculine, indefinite form in NOM change it to the long rising in oblique cases and in feminine and neuter genders (Stevanović 1975:268).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Indefinite</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Neuter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Masculine</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom</td>
<td>sův 'dry'</td>
<td>sůva</td>
<td>sůvo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>sůva</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat</td>
<td>sůvu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other adjectives

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom</td>
<td>mlâd 'young'</td>
<td>mláda</td>
<td>mládo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pust</td>
<td>pûst 'empty'</td>
<td>pûsta</td>
<td>pûsto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jak</td>
<td>jâk 'strong'</td>
<td>jáka</td>
<td>jáko</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For other monosyllabic adjectives the long falling accent in the NOM masculine gender (indefinite category) changes to short rising in oblique cases in the same gender and in the feminine and neuter gender of the same
adjectives. The definite form in all genders of these adjectives is characterised by the short falling accent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Neuter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>bôs 'barefoot'</td>
<td>bôsa</td>
<td>bòso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom</td>
<td>bôsi</td>
<td>bôsā</td>
<td>bôsō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Def</td>
<td>gô 'naked'</td>
<td>gôla</td>
<td>gôlo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>bôsa</td>
<td>gôla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat</td>
<td>bôsu</td>
<td>gôlu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Stevanović 1975:268)
These changes from the long falling accent in monosyllabic adjectives to short rising or short falling for the same adjectives when the number of syllables is increased (due to the endings in oblique cases and in feminine and neuter genders) may be seen as phonotactically conditioned. This phonotactic conditioning cannot be written as a general rule for all adjectives as there are adjectives which do not change their long falling accent, irrespective of gender, case or indefinite or definite paradigm. This also applies to some monosyllabic adjectives with the short falling accent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Neuter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ind zdrav 'healthy'</td>
<td>Ind zdrava</td>
<td>Ind zdravo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Def zdraví</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind slab 'weak'</td>
<td>Ind slaba</td>
<td>Ind slabo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Def slabí</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind čist 'clean'</td>
<td>Ind čista</td>
<td>Ind čisto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Def čisti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind tih 'quiet'</td>
<td>Ind tiha</td>
<td>Ind tiho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Def tihí</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These are but a few examples of the complexity of variations in accentual patterns of adjectives in Serbo-Croatian. No attempt will be made here to work out any conditioning factors or offer any explanations for the variations as this lies outside the scope of the present work. A more detailed discussion of the changes in the accent may be found in Stevanović 1975:267-72.

In the dialect of my informant (Inf) the difference between the definite and indefinite categories in the feminine gender is marked by the presence of emphatic prominence on the adjective in definite category. There is no difference in the endings between the two categories or in accentual patterns (for the data collected). The lengthening of the final vowel (if ending on a vowel) for the definite Nominative and Accusative forms as claimed by Stevanović for SLL is not present in the dialect of my informant. Partridge (1964:61) also claims that the distinction in length between the two categories in the feminine and neuter is disappearing in contemporary Serbo-Croatian. In Inf the identity of segmental form extends to all oblique cases in both definite and indefinite categories, with difference being marked by prominence on the adjective of the definite category.
Neuter Declension

In SLL the difference between definite and indefinite adjectives is marked by the increase in length of the final vowel for definite forms in Nominative and Accusative, in both singular and plural, as well as by variations in the accentual patterns for the adjective in the table. Oblique cases in the singular paradigm (except INS) are differentiated by variations in the forms of endings as well as by variations in the stem accent patterns between the two categories. In INS singular the distinction is carried by variation in the stem accent pattern only. Oblique cases in plural are also marked by variations in the stem accent pattern.

In Inf the difference between definite and indefinite adjectives is marked only by emphatic prominence on the adjective in definite category, for all cases and numbers, with SLL definite segmental forms generalised for both indefinite and definite functions in the singular.

In the plural for all genders the segmental forms are identical in SLL and Inf for both definite and indefinite paradigms. In SLL the definite category differs from the indefinite one in accentual pattern. In Inf - by the presence of emphatic prominence.
Summary

This discussion of differences between the definite and indefinite categories in SLL and in the dialect of my informant can be summarised as follows:

SLL has segmental and/or accentual distinction between the categories for all cases (except VOC) in all genders and numbers;

Inf (for adjectives in the table) has segmental distinction between the categories only in the masculine singular Nominative and Accusative (inanimate) cases. For oblique cases the SLL definite segmental form was generalised for both categories. The difference between the categories in the oblique cases in the masculine singular, in all cases in masculine plural as well as in all cases and numbers in the feminine and neuter genders, is carried by the presence of emphatic prominence on the definite category and the lack of it on the indefinite category. There is no difference in the accentual pattern between the categories. The nature of the accent is not changed by the feature of emphatic prominence, i.e. the short rising accent remains the short rising accent in the definite category, except that it is, together with the rest of the segments in the word, marked by the perceived increase in loudness relative to other words in the phrase.
1.4.2. Function of Indefinite and Definite Adjectives

M. Stevanović (1975:249) illustrates the difference in function between the definite and indefinite adjectives with the following examples.

(1) u mladosti bez roditelja
in youth-F-SG-LOC without parents-GEN-PL

i siromašan ni imao
and poor-M-SG-NOM-IND not have-PAST-3P-M-SG

prilike da redovno
opportunity-FEM-ACC-SG particle regularly

ući školu i
study-PRES-3P-SG school-F-SG-LOC and

zadugo je ostao
for a long time be-AUX-PRES-3P-SG remain-PAST-3P-M-SG

nepismen ali je
illiterate-M-SG-IND but be-AUX-PRES-3P-SG

kasnije sam naučio čitati
later self learn-PAST-3P-M-SG read-INF

i pisati pa je
and write-INF and be-AUX-PRES-3P-SG
In his youth, without parents and poor (indefinite) he didn't have an opportunity to go to school regularly and for a long time remained illiterate (indefinite). But later on, through hard work, he taught himself to read and write and that poor (definite) and recently illiterate (definite) boy became a conscientious (definite) fighter for the rights of the working class.
The difference between the functions of the two forms of adjectives is seen by Stevanović as 'not connected with the type of quality the adjectives encode, but represents another distinction: in the first case the adjectives 'poor' and 'illiterate' indicate the characteristics of a person who has not been mentioned previously but about whom one is talking at the moment of utterance. In the second case, the same adjectives 'poor' and 'illiterate' indicate characteristics of the person already mentioned. This is why the adjectives in the first form are called indefinite and in the second - definite. (Stevanovic 1975:249).

The semantic distinction Stevanovic draws between the two functions of adjectives is based on the presupposed status of the modified noun. In the case of indefinite adjectives the noun is new information in discourse, in the case of definite adjectives the modified noun encodes presupposed information. The terms definite and indefinite as used by Stevanovic and other grammarians, describing adjectival categories in Serbo-Croatian strictly speaking, apply to the modified noun rather than to the modifying adjectives.

The definite versus indefinite status of the modified noun is only one aspect differentiating two types of
modification involved. The role the adjectives themselves play in both types of modification has not been, to my knowledge, sufficiently explored in the works on definite-indefinite adjectives in Serbo-Croatian. Stevanović makes the following comment about the function of indefinite adjectives:

'Qualitative adjectives are used only in indefinite form when they encode temporary attributes or when they are added to the noun as a later, incidental comment, as in

(2) svež i odmoran
fresh-M-SG-NOM-IND and rested-M-SG-NOM-IND

on se bacio na
he reflexive pron throw-PAST-3P-M-SG at

svoj novi posao

'Refreshed and rested, he threw himself at his new job'.

(3) srdit Marko niz Kosovo
angry-M-SG-NOM-IND Mark-NOM across Kosovo-ACC

jezdio
ride-PAST-3P-M-SG

'Angry Mark rode across the Kosovo field'.
Stevanović suggests that adjectives used in indefinite form have 'predicative' character and can be paraphrased by sentences where they are a part of predicate. (p252).

In (2), svež i odmoran
refreshed rested

is equivalent to

budići svež i odmoran
being refreshed rested

and (3) is equivalent to (4)

(3) srdit Marko niz Kosovo jezdio
angry across rode

(4) kad je bio
when be-AUX-PRES-3P-SG be-PAST-3P-M-SG

srdit, Marko je
angry-M-SG-IND Mark be-AUX-PRES-3P-SG

jezdio niz Kosovo
ride-PAST-3P-M-SG across

'When Mark was angry he used to ride across the Kosovo field'.
Stevanovic's explanation of the function of indefinite adjectives corresponds to our definition of the non-restrictive function of adjectives, when the adjectives are used as a comment about the referent of the noun rather than play a role in identifying it. As the term non-restrictive is concerned with the function of adjectives in this type of modification rather than the presupposed status of the modified noun, it is more appropriate to use it to refer to this category of adjectives rather than the term 'indefinite'. In this study the term 'indefinite' will from now on apply only to the segmental form of the adjective and not to its function. Its function will be referred to as non-restrictive.

This dissociation between the form and the function is justified on the grounds of an increasing tendency in contemporary Serbo-Croatian (data from my informant) to use indefinite form marked by emphatic prominence as an alternative to the definite form in restrictive function.

Partridge (1964:62) explains the difference between the use of definite and indefinite adjectives in Serbo-Croatian also mainly with reference to the new or presupposed status of the noun they modify. This, as mentioned earlier, is relevant to the distinction between
the two categories, but again does not constitute the main feature differentiating the two, as it does not explore the role adjectives themselves play in two kinds of modification. Partridge suggests that distinction between the use of definite or indefinite adjectives is 'similar to the distinction made in English between the uses of the definite and indefinite articles'. She adds, that 'this parallel does not hold invariably (p62). She gives no further explanation of the type of similarity involved and a question arises, in what way are they similar? Jespersen (1924:109) identifies the function of the definite article in English as being restrictive or individuating:

'In the rose rose is restricted to that one definite rose which is at this very moment in my thought and must be in yours too because we have just mentioned it or because everything in the situation points to that particular rose' (p109).

The adjuncts, and adjectives in particular, are seen by Jespersen to have similar function and the use of an article with restrictive adjuncts is seen by him as 'logically superfluous, not only in English but in other languages. In cases like the English king (the King of England), the eldest boy, the boy who stole
apples, etc., the adjuncts are in themselves quite sufficient to individualize'. (Jesperson 1924:104).

Halliday (1976:70-1) comments on the restrictive function of the definite article in English: 'Essentially, the is a specifying agent, serving to identify a particular individual or subclass within the class designated by the noun'.

While the definite article and restrictive adjuncts do have this similarity in function, there are differences between the two. The definite article by itself does not contain any asserted information which can be used to identify the referent of the noun, it marks presupposition, that the speaker assumes the addressee can identify the referent of the noun phrase. This presupposed information is recoverable from the text, extralinguistic context or is common knowledge. Restrictive adjuncts on the other hand do themselves contain explicit, asserted information necessary for the identification of the referent of the noun, such as its proximity (in the case of restrictive demonstratives), qualities or other properties. It is this identifying potential of restrictive adjuncts and adjectives in particular that is seen here as that distinctive characteristic which justifies the use of the term restrictive rather than definite when referring
to the distinction between functions usually associated with the prototypical uses of indefinite and definite forms as modifiers in Serbo-Croatian.

There is another aspect in which the use of the restrictive and non-restrictive adjectives in Serbo-Croatian differs from the uses of definite and indefinite articles in English. The restrictive adjective in definite form in the example below (context: in a men's wear shop, selecting a coat - kaput)

(5) daj mi zeleni
give-IMP I-DAT green-M-SG-ACC-DEF

'Give me a/the green one'.

may be translated, using either the definite or indefinite article. The Indefinite article is used in translation when there are a few green shirts among the shirts of other colours; the definite article is used when there is only one green shirt among the shirts of other colours. (The use of articles here is certainly not superfluous). There is then no one-to-one correspondence between the uses of the definite form in Serbo-Croatian and the definite article in English.
The presupposition associated with the use of the definite form in the above example is on the lexico-grammatical level (Halliday 1976:145): the definite form here marks the presupposition of class of the referent designated by the lexical nominal category, the grammatical features of which are given: they are its gender, number and case. The definite article does not provide any grammatical features of the referent.

Our choice of the term restrictive rather than definite is based on factors differentiating the function of restrictive adjectives from the definite article in English rather than on any similarity between them. (The definite article itself is a restrictive modifier and it would seem inappropriate to extend the name of a subcategory to another subcategory rather than adopt the term of the supercategory). As in the case of indefinite adjectives the term definite from now on will refer only to the form, morphologically distinct from the indefinite form.
1.4.3. The association between the indefinite and definite forms of adjectives and restrictive and non-restrictive functions of adjectives in Serbo-Croatian.

To establish the association existing between the two forms and the restrictive and non-restrictive functions it was necessary to obtain the following data from the informant:

(a) The form used in non-restrictive function in modifier position and in predicate with the copula;

(b) The form used as restrictive modifier.

1.4.3.1. Definite and indefinite forms in the predicate with copula 'to be'.

As mentioned previously, adjectives used in the predicate with the copula in non-equative type of sentences (Lyons 1977:185, 201) have a function of ascribing a quality or property to the referent and are not intended by the speaker to have identifying or individuating function. This function of the adjective is similar to the function of non-restrictive adjectives
modifying a noun. For masculine adjectives in my data possessing dual forms, it is the indefinite form which is used in the predicate.

(6) ovaj kaput je
    this-M-SG-NOM coat-M-SG-NOM be-AUX-PRES-3P-SG

suv<u><i>i</i></u>še kratak
too short-M-SG-NOM-IND

'This coat is too short'.

The use of the definite form is ungrammatical here (for this adjective).

(7) *ovaj kaput je suviše
    this-M-SG-NOM coat is too

kratki
short-M-SG-NOM-DEF

'The coat is too short one'.

(8) on je nizak
    he be-AUX-PRES-3P-SG short-M-SG-NOM-IND

za svoje godine
for REF.POSS-ACC-PL year-F-PL-ACC

'He is short for his age'.

Again, the use of the definite form is ungrammatical.

(9) *on je nizki za svoje
    he is short-M-SG-NOM-DEF for REF.POSS

    godine
    year

*'He is the short one for his age'.

The use of the definite form in the predicate is very limited and restricted to the equative type of sentences. The definite form marks presupposition of the nominal class from which the referent is selected. A possible context: after having bought two coats, a short one and a long one, the buyer is handed on the parcel. He then asks:

(10) ovo je koji?
    this be-AUX-PRES-3P-SG which-M-SG-NOM

'Which one is this?'

And receives the reply:

(11) ovo je kratki
    this be-AUX short-M-SG-NOM-DEF

'This is the short one'.

The adjective in this case is used to identify the referent and the referent of ovo 'this' is identified with the referent of kràtki 'the short one' in the equative type of sentence.

The short form adjective 'kràtak' can't be used to identify the referent, it is unmarked for presupposition of the nominal class of the modified noun. It's use is ungrammatical in the answer to the above question.

(12) *ovo je kràtak
    this be-AUX short-M-SG-IND

However, in the context, where the referent is ascribed a property not relative to the other items in the presupposed nominal class of the referent, but on the basis of some other criteria, only the short form is grammatical. Example below and examples (6) and (8).

(13) ovaj kàpùt je kràtak
    this-M-SG-NOM coat-M-SG-NOM be-AUX short-M-SG-IND

'This coat is short' (for me).
There are adjectives which have only a definite form and this is used predicatively (Lyons 1977:185) as well as to identify a referent in equative type sentences. These adjectives are: (Stevanović 1975:250)

bojni 'agressive'  žarki 'hot'
järki 'bright'  mali 'small'
sini 'grey'  sudni 'fatal'
susti 'essential'

(This is also the case in Inf)

Adjective veliki 'big, large' also tends to occur in definite form in the predicate. It is more usual to say:

(14) on je  veliki
he be-AUX-PRES-3P-SG  big-M-SG-NOM-DEF

'He is big'. (Stevanović 1975:250)

Rather than:
For masculine adjectives with dual forms (segmental) it is possible to associate the indefinite form with both ascriptive function in the predicate with copula 'be' and with non-restrictive function in modifier position. The definite form can be associated with identifying function in the equative type of sentence and with restrictive function in modifier position.

For feminine and neuter adjectives the formal distinction between two types of function in the predicate in the speech of my informant is marked by ellipsis of the presupposed noun in the equative type of sentence predicate and lack of it in non-equative type.

Non-equative sentence

(16) ova marama je
this-F-SG-NOM shawl-F-SG-NOM be-AUX-PRES-3P-SG

kratka
short-F-SG-NOM

'This shawl is short'.
equative sentence

ova marama je kratka. Ø

'This shawl is the short one'.

The identifying use of the adjective is marked here only by ellipsis of the presupposed noun. Similarly, for neuter adjectives.

(17) ovo odelo je
this-N-SG-NOM blanket-N-SG-NOM be-AUX-PRES-3P-SG

kratko
short-N-SG-NOM

'This jacket is short'.

And identifying use is again marked by ellipsis of the modified noun:

(18) ovo odelo je
this-N-SG-NOM blanket-N-SG-NOM be-AUX-PRES-3P-SG

kratko Ø
short-N-SG-NOM

'This jacket is the short one'.

And identifying use is again marked by ellipsis of the modified noun:

(18) ovo odelo je
this-N-SG-NOM blanket-N-SG-NOM be-AUX-PRES-3P-SG

kratko Ø
short-N-SG-NOM

'This jacket is the short one'.

And identifying use is again marked by ellipsis of the modified noun:
1.4.3.2 Adjectives in restrictive and non-restrictive function in modifier position and the formal representation of the distinction.

To examine the association existing between the form of adjectives and their function the following method was used:

Method: The function of a modifying adjective is non-restrictive in the contexts where it provides non-essential information about the referent and can be omitted as it is not necessary for its identification. The adjective also plays no role in the subcategorisation of the referent, when the referent is not a discourse item, but an item of the lexicon, a citation form.

The informant was asked to identify the referent in terms of properties encoded by the noun, but also using an adjective as a modifier. This was prompted by asking a question with an interrogative pronoun šta 'what' which requires the referent to be minimally identified in terms of properties encoded by a noun (inanimate). Only a simple modification construction was used.
Question:

(19) šta je visišo
what-NOM be-AUX-PRES-3P-SG hang-PAST-N-3P-SG

na vratima?
on door-F-PL-SG

'What was hanging on the door?'

Answer:

(20) (kràatak) kàpùt
short-M-SG-NOM-IND coat-M-SG-NOM

je visio na
be-AUX-PRES-3P-SG hang-PAST-N-3P-SG on

vratima
door-F-PL-LOC

'A short coat was hanging on the door'.

or the above answer can be reduced to

(21) kàpùt 'a coat'
The adjective kràtak 'short' has indefinite form and is used non-restrictively.

The function of an adjective is unambiguously restrictive when it is used to identify the referent in terms of properties encoded by the adjective and to select it from the set of present or potential referents of the same kind. The number of items in a set may be 1. The nominal category, encoding the referent is always presupposed. The adjective in this case is an essential information and cannot be ellipsed. Adjectives in restrictive function also play a part in subcategorisation of the referent in terms of adjectival categories at the level of lexicon.

An unambiguous example of an adjective used restrictively was obtained by asking a question containing a given nominal category. The addressee was to identify a member of this category in terms of properties encoded by the adjective. This was prompted by using the interrogative pronoun kakav 'what kind' as a modifier of the nominal category in the question. The nominal category here presupposes a generic set of referents. It is also possible to use the interrogative koji 'which' in the question. The nominal category in this case presupposes a specific set of referents.
Question:

(22) kakav/koji kàpùt
what kind/which-M-SG-NOM coat-M-SG-NOM

je visio
be-AUX-PRES-3P-SG hang-PAST-PAPT.-M-SG

na vratima?
on door-F-PL-LOC

'What kind of / which coat was hanging on the door?'

Answer: (both interrogative pronouns allow the alternative use of definite or indefinite forms in the answer)

(23) kràtki / kràtak kàpùt
short-M-SG-NOM-DEF/IND coat-M-SG-NOM

je visio
be-AUX-PRES-3P-SG hang-PAST-PAPT-M-SG

na vratima
on door-F-PL-LOC

'A / The short coat was hanging on the door'.
The above answer can be reduced to

(24) kratki  'a/the short one'
short-M-SG-NOM-DEF

but not to

(25) *kratak  'short'
short-M-SG-NOM-IND

The adjective in restrictive modification is an essential information and cannot be omitted.

In restrictive function both definite and indefinite form of the adjective can be used when the modified noun is present. The indefinite form must be marked by the emphatic prominence. However, when the answer is reduced to an adjective only, only definite form is possible. In the speech of my informant the pattern of alternative usage of definite and indefinite forms in restrictive function described above for the adjective kratki/kratak 'short' appears to be conditioned by the semantic type of an adjective. HUMAN PROPENSITY adjectives (Dixon 1982:16), AGE, PHYSICAL PROPERTY as well as VALUE adjectives tend to occur in the indefinite form marked by the emphatic prominence when used restrictively. However, when the modified noun is omitted, the definite form is preferred.
The forms of these adjectives: 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ind</th>
<th>Def</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>srećan</td>
<td>srěčni</td>
<td>'happy'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tůžan</td>
<td>tůžni</td>
<td>'sad'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lěnj</td>
<td>lěnji</td>
<td>'lazy'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pohlěpan</td>
<td>pohlěpni</td>
<td>'greedy'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pâmekan</td>
<td>pâmekni</td>
<td>'clever'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>čùven</td>
<td>čùveni</td>
<td>'famous'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dőbar</td>
<td>dőbri</td>
<td>'kind, good'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>divan</td>
<td>divni</td>
<td>'beautiful'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>růžan</td>
<td>růžni</td>
<td>'ugly'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lêp</td>
<td>lépi</td>
<td>'nice'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mlâd</td>
<td>mlâdi</td>
<td>'young'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stàr</td>
<td>stàri</td>
<td>'old'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hlâdan</td>
<td>hlâdni</td>
<td>'cold'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vrûč</td>
<td>vrûčni</td>
<td>'hot'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For DIMENSION and SPEED adjectives the alternative use of definite forms or indefinite ones marked by the emphatic prominence in restrictive function was judged equally acceptable by my informant. The forms of these adjectives:
Variations in form described above occur only for masculine singular adjectives in the Nominative and Accusative (in Accusative when modifying inanimate nouns).

There are a few adjectives which do not have dual forms and occur only in the definite form in all functions. (syntactic and pragmatic) in the dialect of my informant.

The restrictive and non-restrictive functions of these adjectives are differentiated by the presence of emphatic prominence on the adjective in restrictive function and the absence of it when the adjective is used non-restrictively. These adjectives include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ind</th>
<th>Def</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kratak</td>
<td>kratki</td>
<td>'short'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nizak</td>
<td>nizki</td>
<td>'low/short'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visok</td>
<td>visoki</td>
<td>'tall'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sirok</td>
<td>siroki</td>
<td>'wide'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uzak</td>
<td>uski</td>
<td>'narrow'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brz</td>
<td>brzbi</td>
<td>'fast'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spor</td>
<td>spori</td>
<td>'slow'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

vēliki 'big'  žârki 'hot'  
mâli 'small'  járki 'bright'
COLOUR adjectives do have dual forms in the masculine but their distribution is syntactically conditioned: indefinite forms occur only in the predicate while only the definite forms occur in modifier position. As with the adjectives listed above, the two modifier functions, restrictive and non-restrictive, are differentiated by prominence.

**non-restrictive function**

(26) Šta je visilo
what-NOM be-AUX-PRES-3P-SG hang-PAST PAPT-N-SG

na vratima?
on door-F-PL-LOC

'What was hanging on the door?'

(27) (zeleni) kapid
green-M-SG-NOM-DEF coat-M-SG-NOM

je visio
be-AUX-PRES-3P-SG hang-PAST PART-M-SG

na vratima
on door-F-PL-LOC

'A green coat was hanging on the door'.


restrictive function

(28) Kakav kapūt je
what kind-M-SG-NOM coat-M-SG-NOM be-AUX-PRES-3P-SG

visio na vratima
hang-PAST PART-M-SG on door-F-PL-LOC

'What kind of coat was hanging on the door?'

(29) zeleni kapūt je
green-M-SG-NOM-DEF coat-M-SG-NOM be-AUX

visio na vratima
hang on door

'A green coat was hanging on the door'.

In the predicate, however, the short form is used (in non-equative sentences).

(30) kapūt je zelen
coat-M-SG-NOM be-PRES-3P-SG green-M-SG-NOM-IND

'The coat is green'.

This pattern of usage is true for other colour adjectives in my data (in the masculine).
So far we have examined the association existing between forms of adjectives and their function only for adjectives modifying masculine singular nouns in the nominative. The same method as used for these categories was used to establish associations between the forms of adjective and restrictive and non-restrictive functions for other cases of masculine adjectives in the singular as well as for all cases of feminine and neuter adjectives in the singular. The data is summarised as follows:

Data

**Non-restrictive function**

**Nominative case**

**Question:**

(31) šta je visilo

what-NOM be-AUX-3P-SG hang-PAST PART-N-SG

na vratima?

on door-F-PL-LOC

'What was hanging on the door?'

**Answers:**

M - (krátak) kaptút visio
F - (krátka) marama je visila na vratima
N - (krátko) odélo visilo

'A (short) coat/shawl/jacket was hanging on the door'.

( ) indicates that the adjective may be omitted.
Genitive case

Question:

(33) ispod čega je
from under what-GEN be-AUX-PRES-3P-SG

virio?
peer-PAST PART-M-SG

'From under what was he peering?'

Answers:

(34) (kràtkog) kàpûta
virio je ispod (kràtko) màrame
(kràtkog) odéla

'He was peering from under a (short) coat/shawl/jacket'.

Dative case

Question:

(35) ka čemu je
towards what-DAT be-AUX-PRES-3P-SG

ona prišla
she approach-PAST PART-F-SG

'What was she approaching?"
Answers:

(36) (kràtkom) kàputu
ona je prišla ka (kràtkoj) màrame
(kràtkom) odélu

'She was coming towards the (short) coat/shawl/jacket'.

Accusative case

Question:

(37) šta je on doneo?
what be-AUX he carry-PAST PART-M-SG

'What was he carrying?'

Answers:

(38) (kràtak) kàput
on je doneo (kràtku) màramu
(kràtko) odélo

'He was carrying a (short) coat/shawl/jacket'.

For masculine adjectives modifying animate nouns in the Accusative, the form of the adjective (and the noun) is the same as in Genitive.
**Instrumental case**

**Question:**

(39) čime se pokrio?  
what-INS self cover-PAST PART-M-SG

'What did he cover himself with?'

**Answers:**

(40) pokrio se (krátkim) kàputom  
(krátom) màramom  
(krátkim) odélom

'He covered himself with a (short) coat/shawl/jacket'.

**Locative case**

**Question:**

(41) u čemu je ključ?  
in what-LOC be-PRES-3P-SG key-M-SG-NOM

'Where is the key?'
Answers:

(42) ključ je u (krâtko) mârami (krâtkom) odêlu

'The key is in the (short) coat/shawl/jacket'.

Answers to all above questions, in all cases, may be reduced to the nominal category, identifying the referent, e.g. (42) above may be reduced to:

(43) u käputu / mârami / odêlu.

'In the coat/shawl/jacket'.

Restrictive function
Nominative case
Question:

(44) kakav/koji käput visio
kakva/koja màrama je visila na vratima?
kakvo/koje odêlo visilo

'What kind/which coat/shawl/jacket was hanging on the door?'
Answers:

(45) kratâk/krâtki kâpût visio
krâtka mârama je visila na vratima
krâtko odêlo visilo

'A/The short coat/shawl/jacket was hanging on the door'.

(both interrogative pronouns can have alternative definite or indefinite form of the adjective in the answer).

Genitive case

Questions:

(46) kakvog/kojeg kâpûta
ispod kakve/koje mârame je virio?
kakvog/kojeg odêla

'From under what kind of/which coat/shawl/jacket was he peering?'
Answers:

(47)  
krâtkog (kâpûta)  
ôviro je ispod krâtko (mârame)  
Ôkrâtko (odéla)  

'He was peering from under a/the short (coat/shawl/jacket)'.
one'.

Dative case

Questions:

(48)  
kakvol/kojem kâpûtu  
kakvoj/kojoj màrami je ona prišla?  
kakvol/kojem odélu  

'What kind of/Which coat/shawl/jacket did she approach?'

Answers:

(49)  
ôkrâtkom (kâputu)  
ôona je prišla ka krâtko (mârami)  
Ôkrâtkom (odélu)  

'She came up to a/the short (coat/shawl/jacket)'.
one'.

Questions:

(48)  
kakvol/kojem kâpûtu  
kakvoj/kojoj màrami je ona prišla?  
kakvol/kojem odélu  

'What kind of/Which coat/shawl/jacket did she approach?'

Answers:

(49)  
ôkrâtkom (kâputu)  
ôona je prišla ka krâtko (mârami)  
Ôkrâtkom (odélu)  

'She came up to a/the short (coat/shawl/jacket)'.
one'.
Accusative case

Questions:

(50) kakav/koji  kàpūt
kakvu/koju  màramu  on  doneo?
kakvo/koje  odélo

'What kind of/Which coat/shawl/jacket did he carry?'

Answers:

(51) kratak/kratki  (kàpūt)

on  je  doneo  krâtku  (jàramu)
krâtko  (odélo)

'He carried a/the short (coat/shawl/jacket)'.
one'.

Instrumental case

Questions:

(52) kakvim/kojim  kàpūtom
kakvom/kojom  màramom  se  pokrio?
kakvim/kojim  odélon

self cover-PAST PART-M-SG

'What kind of/Which coat did he cover himself with?'
Answers:

(53) pokrio se krátkom (máramom)
krátkim (odélem)

'He covered himself with a/the short (coat/shawl/jacket)'.

Locative case

Questions:

(54) kakvom/kojem kàpútu
u kakvoj/kojoj màrami je kljuc' 
kakvom/kojem odéle
be-PRES key-M-SG-NOM

'In what kind of/Which coat is the key?'

Answers:

(55) kljuc' je u krátkoj (marami)
krátkom (odéiu)

'The key is in a/the short (coat/shawl/jacket)'.

one'.
All the above answers may be reduced to just the adjective identifying the referent, e.g. (55) above may be reduced to:

(56) у коротк/короткоj/коротком

'in the short one'

The answers in the Nominative and Accusative (inanimate) may be reduced to the definite form of the adjective.

Vocative case

It was not possible in this case to apply the method used for other case to establish the association between the forms of adjectives and their restrictive or non-restrictive functions. A noun and its modifier in Vocative are not used to identify a referent, but to address or 'call' it, they perform a different function.

(57) драги пријателju,
dear-M-SG-VIC-DEF friend-M-SG-VOC

молим те отговори mi
ask-PRES-SG you-ACC answer-IMP me

'Dear friend, please answer me'.
Only definite forms of adjectives are used in the Vocative case in both SLL and Inf. The Vocative provides an environment where the restrictive and non-restrictive distinction between the adjectives, modifying nouns is irrelevant, it is neutralised. The appearance of the morphologically marked definite form in this environment is puzzling and I have no explanation for it.  

Discussion of the data

The method used separated two distinct functional categories of adjectives in the dialect of my informant by means of identifying interrogative sentences. The interrogative pronoun šta 'what' in all cases required the referent to be minimally identified by a nominal category; the interrogative pronouns kakav/kakva/kakvo 'what kind?' and koji/koja/koje 'which' as modifiers require the referent of the given set to be minimally identified by an adjective. In the first type of identification the modifying adjective is non-restrictive, in the second - restrictive. These two types are prototypical examples of restrictive and non-restrictive categories, representing unambiguous examples
of restrictive and non-restrictive adjectives. They are the extreme points of a continuum. The intermediate points along this continuum will be represented by adjectival modifiers of various degrees of restrictiveness. The variations in degree of restrictiveness, or minimal possible identification in terms of properties encoded by an adjective, can be conditioned by various factors: syntactic, lexical and, perhaps, others. Our data provides an example of a syntactic factor affecting the restrictiveness of an adjective. In the case of identification of a referent with restrictive adjective in unreduced sentential answers, the modified noun can be freely omitted in all cases except the Nominative. This optionality was indicated by bracketing the words that can be omitted. However, in the Nominative case (for all genders) the omission of the modified noun was judged by the informant to be less acceptable (but possible) than in other cases, except in explicitly contrastive sentences.

(59) kakav kaput je visio
what coat be-AUX hang-PAST PART

na vratima?
on door

'What kind of coat was hanging on the door?'.

'The short one was hanging on the door'.

However, it is fully acceptable in explicitly contrastive sentences:

(60) kratki je visio na vratima, a dugacki - na zidu
short one-DEF be-AUX hang-PAST PART on door-LOC and long one on wall-LOC

'The short one was hanging on the door and the long one - on the wall'.
(in reference to kaput 'coat')

However, when the answers to the questions as one above are not sentential but are reduced to adjectives only, they are fully acceptable for all cases including Nominative. The reduced answers were preferred to full replies.
Another factor affecting the possible use of adjectival category only to identify a referent, is a lexical one. It depends on the degree of compounding between the adjective and the modified noun, whether they form a new nominal lexical item. If the item is fully compounded it will not be possible to identify a referent in terms of properties of the constituent adjective only. (For further discussion see the following section).

The formal (both segmental and prosodic) distinctions existing between restrictive and non-restrictive categories of adjectives in the dialect of my informant can now be summarised in a table. The summary applies to the category of singular. In the plural distinctions for all genders are marked only prosodically, by emphatic prominence on the adjective in restrictive function.

This analysis of adjectival categories in Serbo-Croatian confirms our earlier suggestion that in the Belgrade dialect of my informant the difference in meaning between the two categories cannot be associated with morphological distinctions only (segmental forms).
Associations between the forms of qualitative adjectives and their functions in Inf.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>gender</th>
<th>semantic type</th>
<th>marking of restrictive function</th>
<th>marking of non-restrictive function</th>
<th>the form of adjectives in the predicate (non-equative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>all types except COLOUR</td>
<td>DEF/IND +Em Pr (NOM &amp; ACC (IN.)) DEF + Em Pr (oblique cases)</td>
<td>IND (NOM &amp; ACC (IN)) DEF (oblique cases)</td>
<td>IND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>COLOUR</td>
<td>DEF + Em Pr (all cases)</td>
<td>DEF (all cases)</td>
<td>IND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>others (veliki, jarki, etc.)</td>
<td>DEF + Em Pr (all cases)</td>
<td>DEF (all cases)</td>
<td>DEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F and N</td>
<td>all types</td>
<td>IND (no lengthening of the final vowel) + Em Pr (all cases)</td>
<td>IND (all cases)</td>
<td>IND</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations used:

DEF - definite form  
Em Pr - emphatic prominence  
IND - indefinite form  
NOM - Nominative case  
IN - inanimate  
ACC - Accusative case  
Inf - informant dialect
The apparent formal arbitrariness of the association of any single segmental form with a particular functional meaning (as was shown for masculine adjectives in the Nominative, when both definite and indefinite forms can be used in restrictive function in full sentences) is not limited to variations within or between genders, or between nominative and oblique cases. There is also variation, seemingly arbitrary, between semantic types, as well as syntactic functions. Masculine colour adjectives have generalised the definite form for both restrictive and non-restrictive functions in modifier position. However, in the predicate with copula, only the indefinite form is possible. Some dimension, size and a few other adjectives have generalised the definite form for all modifier functions as well as for the use in the predicate.

The adjectival system of the contemporary dialect of Belgrade appears to be in the process of a linguistic change. Two opposing tendencies appear to be at work: the first tendency is to generalise the indefinite form for all modifier functions (in masculine Nominative singular). The indefinite form is also used as a citation form. The second tendency, so far limited to one semantic type - COLOUR adjectives is to generalise the definite form for all modifier functions, retaining the indefinite form for the use in the predicate. For a small group of
adjectives the change has taken them even a step further: the definite form is also used in the predicate. The definite form has been generalised for all oblique cases in masculine and neuter genders. The second change involving colour adjectives appeared to have happened quite recently. Stevanović gives both indefinite and definite forms in modifier position for the colour adjective зеленi 'green'. (1975:258) For my informant, this colour adjective as well as most others occur only in the definite form in modifier position.

This conflicting tendencies in the dialect of Belgrade may also be due to the dialect mixing. As a capital of Yugoslavia, Belgrade attracts population from regions of various dialects. As mentioned previously, the indefinite form is widely used for all cases in the spoken language of the central dialects, including Bosnia, while in the Eastern dialects the indefinite form is increasingly restricted to the use in the predicate. (Stevanović 1975:261-264).

It is not possible to predict at this stage which tendency will become a norm for the dialect of Belgrade.
Partridge (1964:62) claims that 'the indefinite form is gradually disappearing as also the length of the final vowel of the definite form'. However, in the dialect of my informant, the indefinite form is very much alive in the masculine Nominative singular and tends to replace the definite form in all modifier functions.

These observations about the Belgrade dialect of Serbo-Croatian are not meant as definitive statements, as they are based on the work with one informant only. A larger, statistically acceptable sample of informants would be needed to verify my observations.
Nominalisation and the restrictive adjectives in Serbo-Croatian.

Nouns are usually used to name or categorise the referents. These lexical items are permanently associated with these referents. It is also possible to name or identify a referent using other parts of speech, e.g. adjectives. These can be used to subcategorise an already known nominal class into a subclass differentiated and identified in terms of properties encoded by the adjectives. There are three possible outcomes of this process of subcategorisation:

1. The new subcategory of adjective and the modified noun, with the usual omission of the presupposed noun, becomes a temporary subcategory, created for the duration of the discourse. The adjective without the presupposed noun is temporarily nominalised.

(61)  

\[ \text{kàpùt 'coat' - presupposed information} \]
ja imam kràtki
I have-PRES-1P-SG short-M-SG-ACC-DEF

\[ (\text{kàpùt) a on dùgački} \]
coat-M-SG-ACC and he long-M-SG-ACC-DEF

'I have the short coat and he - the long one'.

'Ja imam kratki kaput.

(a on dugacki coat-M-SG-ACC and he long-M-SG-ACC-DEF)

'I have the short coat and he - the long one'.
kràtki, kapùt 'the short coat' is a temporary subcategory of the presupposed category kaput 'coat'. This is not a permanent compound, which is evidenced by the possibility of omitting the noun and identifying the referent by the adjective only: kràtki (with the noun omitted) and dùgački are examples of temporary nominalisation of restrictive adjectives, their definite form marks the presupposition of the nominal.

2. The second outcome of subcategorisation of referents in terms of properties encoded by the adjective results in formation of a nominalised adjective with ellipsis of the modified noun. This adjective has a permanent association with the referent, and is usually characterised by invariability of gender, in contrast to the temporarily nominalised adjectives, which have variable gender, depending on the noun they modify. This process of forming new nominal categories from adjectives appears to be culture specific; the presupposed noun is part of general knowledge and is usually a human category. The nominalised adjectives have either nominal or adjectival declensions, often with alternative use of both (Stevanović 1975:265). Some examples of these adjectives:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mlâdi</td>
<td>the young (ones)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stâri</td>
<td>the old (ones)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mlâda</td>
<td>bride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mlâdo</td>
<td>young of an animal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nicknames and first names are also included in this category:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cêni</td>
<td>the Black one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blâgi</td>
<td>the Mild one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tîxi</td>
<td>the Quiet one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drâgi</td>
<td>the Dear one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stâri</td>
<td>the Old one - a nickname for Tito.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slâvna</td>
<td>the Famous, the Glorious</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(used as a first name for women)

3. The third outcome of subcategorisation of referents results in formation of a compound nominal category; the referent is categorised both in terms of properties encoded by the adjective and the properties encoded by the noun. The adjective (restrictive) and the noun form a semantic unit. Neither the adjective nor the noun can be omitted.
Question:

(62) sta je to?
what-NOM be-PRES-3P-SG that-N-SG-NOM

What is that?'

Answer:

(63) kiselō mlēko
sour-N-SG-NOM milk-N-SG-NOM

'youghurt'

(64) *mlēko or *kiselō

Question:

(65) gde ona ide?
where she go-PRES-1P-SG

'Where is she going?'

(66) u Novi Sad

'To "New Garden".'
(67) *u Novi or *u Sad

Novi Sad - a single unit, the name for a place.

Question:

(68) kada je tvoj
when be-PRES-3P-SG your-3P-SG-NOM

rođendan?
birthday-M-SG-NOM

Answer:

(69) za vreme bele nedelje
during time white-F-SG-ACC week-F-SG-ACC

'during Halloween'

(70) *za vreme bele

(71) *za vreme nedelje

As is the case with many compound lexemes, the meaning of the compound is not simply the sum of the meanings of its components.
These compound lexemes, consisting of restrictive adjectives and nouns occupy the central point on the continuum between the prototypical case of restrictive modification, when the modified noun may be omitted and the prototypical case of non-restrictive modification when the modifying adjective may be omitted. Other modification constructions with various degrees of compounding map themselves on to all other points of the continuum.
FOOTNOTES

1. The term 'emphatic prominence' as used in this study has been defined in the section on English adjectives. From my observations, the emphatic prominence does not alter the position or the nature of the accent on the adjective. It only increases the perceived loudness of the whole word relative to other words in the phrase.

2. My informant (age 27) has been a resident of Belgrade since her birth. She is a teacher of English at the Institute of Foreign Languages in Belgrade. Both her parents are Serbian.

3. Accent in Serbo-Croatian, according to Lehiste (1970:85-6) is 'a composite of stress and pitch'.

4. The accents in this section are marked by me for the dialect of my informant and may vary from those in SLL. The accents are marked only on adjectives and the modified nouns.

5. There is another environment in the language where only a definite form may occur: after the demonstratives taj 'that' and ovaj 'this'. This co-occurrence restriction may have developed due to the frequent restrictive use of an adjective after a demonstrative.
1.5  **Restrictive and non-restrictive adjectives**

in Russian

1.5.1.  **The long and short forms of adjectives**

in OCS and Old Russian

As mentioned in the section on OCS the original long form of qualitative adjectives has been generalised for all modifier functions in Modern Russian and the short form is restricted to predicate position only. The use of the long form has extended also to the predicate for many adjectives. This long form in OCS did not occur in the predicate (with some exceptions).

The definite (long) and indefinite (short) forms were used as modifiers in Old Russian and their use, according to Matthews (1975:132-33) 'arose from a desire to identify and emphasize'. By the eleventh and twelfth centuries the contrast between the forms in modifier position began to disappear (Matthews:133) and the distribution of forms became as it is found in Modern Russian: the long form was used both attributively and predicatively while the short form was used only in the predicate.
1.5.2. Previous works on the long and short forms of adjectives in Modern Russian.

There are numerous works which discuss the syntax and semantics of the long and short forms in Russian. I will mention one of the more recent ones. Isačenko (1963) is concerned only with the syntactic aspect of occurrences of the long and short forms of adjectives in Russian and proposes a transformational origin for many surface structures in which the long form occurs. This approach offers very little insight into how the long and short forms are used in Modern Russian and as such is of little interest to this study. However, his comments on traditional explanations of semantic differences between the long and short forms found in many works in this field are of interest. He quotes an explanation found in many traditional grammars of Russian about the differences between the uses of long and short forms of adjectives in the predicate as related to the differences in meanings of these forms. The short form is said to occur in predicate when the quality is predicated of the subject as being its basic, main quality: as in:

(1) on krasnorečiv
   he-NOM articulate-M-SG-IND (short)

'He is articulate'.
Isačenko questions this explanation of the use of the short form and claims that this quality is no less basic or characteristic when the long form is used:

(2) on krasnorečivýj
he-NOM articulate-M-SG-NOM-DEF (long)

The short form, according to other explanations, is preferred when the quality is viewed as associated with the subject temporarily, by accident; as in the example below:

(3) ves' etot den'...
all-NOM this-M-SG-NOM day-M-SG-NOM
druz'ja i tovarišči
friends-M-PL-NOM and comrades-M-PL-NOM
Rostova zamečali, čto
Rostov-M-SG-GEN notice-PAST-3P-PL that
on ně skučen ně
he not bored-M-SG-IND (short) not
s'erdit, no molčaliv,
angry-M-SG-IND (short) but silent-M-SG-IND (short)
zadumčiv, sosredotočen
contemplating-M-SG-IND (short) pensive-M-SG-IND (short)

'All through the day... the friends and comrades of Rostov could see that he was neither bored or angry, but silent, contemplative, pensive'.
The use of these short forms is said to be conditioned by the occurrence in the sentence of temporal phrase 'all day'. Isačenko quotes a counter-example where the quality cannot be said to be temporarily associated with the subject, but the short form is used:

\[(4) \quad \text{on vsegda molčaliv} \]
\[\text{he-NOM always silent-M-SG-IND (short)}\]

'He is always silent'.

According to Isačenko, the long form can also be used in the same context, with 'limiting temporal phrases':

\[(5) \quad \text{po večeram on takoj} \]
\[\text{on evenings-M-PL-DAT he such-M-SG nekrasivýj}\]
\[\text{ugly-M-SG-NOM-DEF (long)}\]

'During the evenings he is so ugly'.

It is often quoted that the long forms in the predicate characterise the literary usage. Isačenko quotes Švedova's work on this subject which satisfactorily demonstrated that the difference associated with the
The lack of clear cut semantic distinction associated with the uses of the long and short forms of adjectives in the predicate, apart from cases, where there is an obvious semantic distinction between the two forms, seems to suggest that this confusion in usage may be a result of a linguistic change at work: the long form is moving in the predicate and is replacing the short form in many constructions, and in many of its functions. There is evidence of it in constructions of the type:

(6) on hodíl hmuryj
he walk-PAST-SG cross-M-SG-NOM-DEF (long)

'He walked around looking cross'.

In the same type of construction the short form was used in the XIX century.
(7) ja vernuls'a domoj
   I-NOM return-PAST-SG-REF home

   ugrum i
   brooding-M-SG-IND (short) and

   serdit
   angry-M-SG-IND (short) (M. Lermontov)
   'I returned home brooding and angry'.

This suggests that the long form is replacing the short form in this type of construction and there is no change in meaning associated with the use of the long form. Substitution of the short form is possible in (6) (if archaic) without a change in meaning.

We will now examine the pairs of sentences below, with the context of occurrence given

(9) T'ebе' on pronravils'a?
   you-DAT he like-PAST-3P-SG-REF

   'Did you like him?'

(10) Da, on očen' krasiv / krasivyj
   yes, he very handsome-short form / -long form

   'Yes, he is very handsome'.
There is no difference in meaning associated with the use of these forms in my judgement as a native speaker of Russian. (In my speech, the long form is preferred). Similarly, in:

(11) T'eb'e on ponravils'a?

'Did you like him?'

(12) n'et, on sliškom vysok / vysoki

no he too tall-short form / tall-long for

'No, he is too tall'.

Again, both forms are acceptable to me and there is no difference in meaning.

(13) Tan'ja rabotajet?

Tania work-PRES-3P-SG

'Is Tania working?'

(14) N'et, ona očen' leniva / lenivaja

no she very lazy-short form / lazy-long for

'No, she is very lazy'.

In this example the long and short forms do not contrast in meaning. (I prefer to use the long form).

The examples above seem to suggest that both adjectives in the constructions above have ascriptive, predicative function (Lyons 1977:183), particularly since it is possible to use intensifiers očen 'very' and sliškom 'too, excessively' with both forms. It is often suggested that the long form adjective in this construction is to some degree substantivised and the noun is presupposed. However, the intensifiers cannot occur with substantives.

(15) *on očen' krasav'ets
    he very handsome man

    'He is a very handsome man'.

(16) *on sliškom rabotn'ik
    he too worker

    'He is too much of a worker'.

These restrictions seem to indicate that the Russian long form is not substantivised, since it allows the use of intensifiers. In OCS, as mentioned earlier,
the long form, with the modified noun ellipsed was always substantivised and the ellipsed noun presupposed. The substantive nature of the long form in OCS would not have allowed the use of intensifiers. The change in co-occurrence restrictions for the long form in the predicate in Modern Russian suggests that this form cannot be unambiguously associated with the semantics of the long form which characterised it in OCS and Old Russian. The break of association between the form of an adjective and the semantics usually associated with it, as a result of a diachronic change was also described in this study for Serbo-Croatian. The intrusion of the long form into the predicate constructions in Russian is not uniformly distributed through these constructions. Some constructions and some semantic types of adjectives have allowed replacement of the short form by the long form, as in examples with the verbs of motion:

(17) on hodit pečal'nyj
    he walk-PRES-3P-SG sad-M-SG-NOM-long form

'He goes around looking sad'.

while other constructions allow alternative use of both forms (Examples (10), (12), (14)). Some constructions have resisted the change and the long form is ungrammatical in these:
1.5.4. **Restrictive and non-restrictive functions of adjectives in Russian.**

As mentioned earlier, the long form of adjectives was generalised for all modifier functions in Russian. In OCS the restrictive modification was marked by the use of the long form of adjective and the non-restrictive one by the use of the short form. The change that has taken place in Russian does not mean that this distinction has disappeared but suggests that the restrictive and non-restrictive distinction is no longer marked morphologically. To discover the marking of this distinction the method described in the section on English adjectives was used.
(a) non-restrictive function

Question

(20) što on kupil?
what he buy-PAST-SG

'What did he buy'.

Answer

(21) on kupil [krasnuju]
he buy-PAST-SG red-F-SG-ACC-long form
rubahu [brackets mark optionality]
shirt-F-SG-ACC

'He bought a [red] shirt'.

The referent of rubaha 'shirt' can be minimally identified in terms of properties encoded by the noun; adjective is not essential information and may be omitted.

(b) restrictive function

Restrictive function of adjectives is identified with the help of interrogative modifiers kakoj 'what kind' and kotoryj 'which'. Interrogative kotoryj is used when the referent is selected from a specific, given set of referents. Interrogative kakoj is unmarked for this type of specification of the set.
The answer to the question with interrogative kotoryi receives replies identical to (23) and (24). (In English, the definite article will be used in place of the indefinite one).
The data above suggest that the restrictive function of an adjective is marked in Russian by the emphatic prominence on the adjective when both the adjective and the noun are used and by the ellipsis of the noun when only the adjective is used. The adjective agrees with the noun in gender, case and number.

1.5.5. **Restrictive adjectives in Russian and nominalisations**

In contexts where the modified noun is presupposed the restrictive adjective is temporarily nominalised. The temporary nominalisation is marked by the ellipsis of the modified noun:

(25) ty kakoje jabloko
you-NOM what kind-N-SG apple-N-SG

hočes'?
want-PRES-3P-SG

'What kind of/which apple do you want?'

(26) daj mne krasnoje ø
give-IMP I-DAT red-N-SG apple

'Give me the red one'.


These nominalisations occur at the level of discourse. Permanent nominalisations of restrictive adjectives at the level of lexicon are very widespread. Many adjectives have become permanently nominalised in Russian and the process is productive. In the case of permanent nominalisation there is no grammatical ellipsis involved. The nominal class of the referent is part of general knowledge and as such is culture specific. Permanently nominalised restrictive adjectives in Russian are characterised by belonging to a single gender, which is a characteristic of nouns. Adjectives have variable gender, depending on the noun they modify (Meščaninov 1978:247).

Compare:

- **stolovaja** 'dining room'
  - feminine gender (invariable)

while in

- **stolovyj noz'** 'table knife'
  - masculine gender

- **stolovaja loz'ka** 'table spoon'
  - feminine gender
stolovoje bel'jo
'table clothes'
- neuter gender

A few more examples:

portnoj' 'tailor'
niščij 'beggar'
pešij 'a pedestrian'
s1'esarnaja 'fitter's workshop'
buločnaja 'a bakery, a cake shop'

This process is very productive in Russian.

Nicknames and names for animals are also examples of nominalised restrictive adjectives at the level of lexicon (the referent is identified in terms of properties encoded by the adjective).

Seryj 'Grey' (horse's name)
Vernyj 'The Faithful' (dog's name)
Kosolapyj (nickname for a bear)

This process is also very productive in Russian.
Compounding does not appear to be as productive in Russian as it is in English, where restrictive adjective + noun combinations are always 'a raw material for compounding'. The most obvious examples of these are names of places, e.g.

Černoje Mor'e 'The Black Sea'

This aspect of Russian needs further investigation.

1.5 Summary

1. During the change from Old Russian to Modern Russian the definite (long form) appears to have lost the original meaning associated with this form. The loss of the meaning originally differentiating its use from the short form, allowed the long form to move into positions originally occupied only by the short form - the predicate. For the constructions examined in this section, there were no meaning differences associated with the use of either form in the predicate.

2. The original semantic distinction associated with the uses of short and long forms in the modifier position is now marked by the feature of emphatic prominence on the adjective (long form) in restrictive function and
the lack of it on the adjective (also long form) in non-restrictive function. As it was pointed out in discussion of English adjectives, this applies to prototypical categories of restrictive and non-restrictive adjectives.

3. Discourse created, temporary associations of restrictive adjectives and referents in Russian result in temporary nominalisations of these adjectives, marked by the ellipsis of the modified noun.

Permanent nominalisations in Russian belonging to the level of lexicon are marked by the adjective acquiring invariance of gender.
1.6 Two categories of adjectives in Lithuanian

Lithuanian, a member of the Baltic subbranch of I.E. family and closely related to the Slavonic subbranch, has two morphologically distinct categories of adjectives. These categories are usually termed definite and indefinite.

In general, the definite form of an adjective is obtained by adding the appropriate case of the 3rd person pronoun to the form of the indefinite adjective (Dambriunas 1966:226).

\[
\begin{align*}
báltas + jís & \rightarrow \text{baltàsis} \\
\text{white-M-SG-IND} + \text{he} & \rightarrow \text{white-M-SG-DEF} \\
baltà + jì & \rightarrow \text{baltòji} \\
\text{white-F-SG-IND} + \text{she} & \rightarrow \text{white-F-SG-DEF}
\end{align*}
\]

The presence of the pronominal element in the form of the definite category suggests that it has a cohesive function (Halliday 1976:89). The cohesive relation involved here is substitution and it operates on the lexicogrammatical level. The anaphoric element in the definite adjective marks the presupposed status of the modified nominal lexical category, as well as its
grammatical features: gender, number and case. Presupposition of the modified nominal category is one of the aspects characterizing restrictive modification.

There is another aspect which suggests that definite adjectives in Lithuanian are restrictive modifiers. In discourse they are used to identify and select a member of a specific (or generic) set of similar referents in terms of properties encoded by the definite adjectives. Dambriunas (1966:228) comments on this aspect of definite adjectives: 'if we wish to point out some particular object in a group of similar objects we can use the definite form of the adjective.'

(1) krautuveje yrà daug
store-LOC are many

lémpu - geltónų,
lamp-F-PL-GEN yellow-F-PL-GEN-IND

raudónų bałtyų máń
red-F-PL-GEN-IND white-F-PL-GEN-IND I-DAT

daugiau patińka ta baltońi
more like that-F-SG-NOM white-F-SG-NOM-DEF

'In the store there are many lamps, yellow, red, white. I prefer (that) the white one'.
The indefinite adjectives in the above example function non-restrictively: they are not used to identify the referents, the referents are identified in terms of properties encoded by the noun *lempos* 'lamps'. The indefinite adjectives function as an added comment and, as non-essential information, may be omitted. The definite adjective *baltóji* functions restrictively, it is a necessary information for the correct identification of the referent. The modified noun may or may not be omitted. The omission of the modified noun results in temporary nominalization of the definite adjective.

These are the characteristics of restrictive adjectives at the level of discourse in Lithuanian.

At the level of lexicon the adjectives may also function restrictively: they take part in the subcategorization of the referent in terms of properties encoded by the adjective. The subcategorization results in a new nominal category, a lexical compound - a permanent nominalization of restrictive adjectives. The definite adjective in Lithuanian has this subcategorizing function:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{in} & \text{juodas} \\
\text{black-M-SG-NOM-IND} & \text{gandras} \\
\text{stork-M-SG-NOM} \\
\end{array}
\]

'a black stork'
the indefinite form plays no part in subcategorization, it functions non-restrictively, it merely informs that the stork 'happens to be black' (Dambriunas 1966:228). However in
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{juodasis} & \text{gandras} \\
\text{black-M-SG-NOM-DEF} & \text{stork-M-SG-NOM}
\end{array}
\]

the definite adjective subcategorises the category 'stork' into a new subclass - black storks (similar to English blackbird).

The same subcategorising process involving restrictive modification applies to compounds which are names of places, e.g.
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Naujój} & \text{Zelándija} \\
\text{New-F-SG-NOM-DEF} & \text{Zealand-F-SG-NOM}
\end{array}
\]

'New Zealand' (p228)

Summary

Our brief survey of the grammar of Lithuanian definite and indefinite adjectives suggests that the distinction between these two categories is associated with their use as restrictive and non-restrictive modifiers.
This distinction is present in the adjectival systems of all Indo-European languages in this study, taking various forms, from a largely prosodic one in English to a purely morphological one in Lithuanian. This distinction may be thought of as genetically determined, characterising languages of the I.E. family.

However, the discovery of a similar distinction during my work on Lam Nso', a language geographically and genetically unrelated to the I.E. family, suggested a hypothesis that this distinction may be universal and led to this exploratory study.

A detailed examination of the adjectival system of Lam Nso' and the restrictive and non-restrictive distinction within that system is the subject of the next chapter.
2. Restrictive and non-restrictive adjectives in Lam Nso'

Introduction

Lam Nso' is spoken by about 300,000 people in the Northwest province of Cameroon. Larry M. Hyman (1980: 248-249) classifies Lam Nso' as a member of the Ring group of the Grassfields Bantu languages. Very little has been published on Lam Nso', two articles on syntax and one on verbal tones, all by two SIL linguists Winnifred and Carl Grebe who worked in the area for 10 years and helped to devise the writing system for the language. My analysis of Lam Nso' adjectival system is based on work with two Lam Nso' informants John and Marianna Fondzenyuy, who stayed in Canberra for 2 years, between 1981-1983.

There are tone distinctions in Lam Nso'. The data collected by me do not mark these distinctions. Limited access to the informants restricted my transcription to segmentals only. This does not in any way affect my analysis, as distinction between restrictive
and non-restrictive adjectives is not marked by variations in tone. Examples from the Lam Nso' Primer and the extracts from Appendix II by Grebe are marked for tone variations. 1

Lam Nso' is a noun class language. Noun class membership is marked by suffixes and prefixes on nouns. There is also a system of concordial prefixes (and suffixes in the case of restrictive adjectives) on modifiers and verbs.

As there has been no grammar of Lam Nso' published yet, I will give an outline of adjectival system in this language before proceeding with discussion of distinctions within this system. I'll also define the category 'adjective' in Lam Nso' and give reasons for including participles into this extended category.

2.1 Adjectival Parts of Speech in Lam Nso'

Universal semantic types of adjectival concepts as described by Dixon (1982) are expressed in Lam Nso' by verbs, participles and a closed set of adjectives. Their distribution differs: verbs occur only in
predicate positions, while participles and adjectives occur as noun modifiers and in predicate with copula dzə 'to be'. In the predicate position only what I will call 'non-restrictive' adjectives occur freely, instances of occurrence of restrictive adjectives and participles are marked and, according to my informants, not possible at all for some constructions, particularly with pronominal subjects. 2

(1) Adjective Participle

* Wu dzə wotsəm
  he/she be RCL-short
  'He is the short one'

* Wu dzə woku'un
  he be RCL - big -NS
  'He is the big one'

But for non-pronominal subjects, particularly if they are modified by a demonstrative, the use of restrictive adjectives is possible; the sentences they occur in are of equative type (Lyons 1968: 389)

(2) kifu  kin  kidza  kebiki
  CLI-medicine  CLI-this  CLI-be  RCLI-bad-CLI

  'This medicine is the bad one'.

Restrictions on the use of restrictive adjectives and participles in the predicate can be explained by their basic
function as referring, rather than predicative expressions (for more detailed discussions of this distinction see Lyons 1977: 185). The participles are formed by the addition of a nominalising suffix -\textit{in} to verbal forms. The shape of the suffix is conditioned by the preceding environment in the following way:

- \textit{in} $\rightarrow$ V, n/V, _
  \begin{itemize}
    \item e.g. ku'+ -\textit{in} $\rightarrow$ ku'un \\
    \quad to be big NS 'big'
  \end{itemize}

- \textit{in} $\rightarrow$ nen/n-
  \begin{itemize}
    \item fun + -\textit{in} $\rightarrow$ funnen \\
    \quad to snatch NS 'snatched'
  \end{itemize}

- \textit{in} $\rightarrow$ n/v
  \begin{itemize}
    \item ra + -\textit{in} $\rightarrow$ ran \\
    \quad to be cold NS 'cold'
  \end{itemize}

- \textit{in} - elsewhere
  \begin{itemize}
    \item bor + -\textit{in} $\rightarrow$ borin \\
    \quad to be soft NS 'soft'
  \end{itemize}

This derivational process represents the first stage in nominalisation of verbs. The participles function as noun modifiers.

(3) moo yen shinan shiku'un
I-past see CL3-birds CL3-to be big - NS

'I saw a/the big bird'
The second stage of nominalization of verbs is represented by restrictive participles.

(4) mta' sa-Ø (yi)naan
    I-want fish-CL5 CL5-cook-NS

'I want (some) cooked fish'

The restrictive participles can be further nominalised by omission of the modified noun, but this is a context dependent temporary nominalization, the identity of the noun is presupposed (this is discussed in greater detail in the later section).

(5) moo yen shinan sheku'unshi
    I-past see CL3-bird RCL3-to be big-NS-CL3

'I saw the big bird'

(6) Moo yen sheku'unshi
    I-past see RCL3-to be big-NS-CL3

'I saw the big one' (bird)

The second stage of nominalization process also applies to the closed set of adjectives:
(7) Moo yen shinən sheterishi
I-past see CL3-bird RCL3-small-CL3

'I saw the young/small bird'

Nominalization stages can be summarised as follows:

Verbs
↓
1st stage of nominalization
(Verb stem + / - in/)
↓
participles
(non-restrictive)
2nd stage of nominalization or subcategorization
(restrictive concord marker-X-noun class marker)
↓
X = participle, adjective, noun
restrictive participles
restrictive adjectives

The X slot can also be occupied by a noun. The noun then functions restrictively and subcategorises other nouns, typically the nouns of time and place (Grebe,
personal communication) by combining with them to form what appears to be a new compound noun.

kishiy kelůŋki
kire kebůmki

'day which today'
'place which backside'

(examples and glosses by Grebe)

2.1.1 Universal adjectival semantic types and their part of speech association in Lam Nso

Universal adjectival semantic types (Dixon 1976) and their part of speech association are now examined in more detail. The table below shows the distribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic Type</th>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Participle</th>
<th>Verb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HUMAN</td>
<td>vifi</td>
<td>fi</td>
<td>dorin</td>
<td>dor - 'to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPENSITY/</td>
<td>'intelligence'</td>
<td>'sensible'</td>
<td>'tired'</td>
<td>be tired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYSICAL STATE</td>
<td>vijung</td>
<td>'intelligent'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'happiness'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vibi</td>
<td>'sad'</td>
<td>dorin</td>
<td>'to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'sadness'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tired'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'greedy'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>njo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sick'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic type</th>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Participle</th>
<th>Verb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>teri</td>
<td>'young, small'</td>
<td>dzānin 'old (in age)'</td>
<td>dzān 'to be old'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mva</td>
<td>(of certain duration, as in 'old friend')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fongu</td>
<td>'former'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLOUR</td>
<td>fevir</td>
<td>'light'</td>
<td></td>
<td>feri 'to be light'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sanir</td>
<td>'dark'</td>
<td></td>
<td>sāni 'to be dark'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bar</td>
<td>'red'</td>
<td></td>
<td>bangi 'to be red'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALUE</td>
<td>jung</td>
<td>'good, beautiful'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bi</td>
<td>'ugly, bad'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYSICAL PROPERTY</td>
<td>baymin</td>
<td>'horrible'</td>
<td></td>
<td>baymi 'to look horrible'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lumin</td>
<td>'hot'</td>
<td></td>
<td>lum 'to be hot'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ran</td>
<td>'cold'</td>
<td></td>
<td>rā 'to be cold'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tavin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tav</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic type</td>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>Participle</td>
<td>Verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIMENSION / SIZE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>big/wide</td>
<td>ku 'un</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'to be big, wide'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small</td>
<td>dorin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'to be small'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tall/long</td>
<td>darin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'to be tall/long'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>short</td>
<td>ts'am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'to be short'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>round</td>
<td>karin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'to rotate'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fat</td>
<td>fangin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'to be fat; to grow fat'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Serna nti c type Noun Adjective Participle Verb

SPEED expressed by adverbs e.g. slow = moving slowly

2.1.2 Discussion of semantic groupings

Human propensity/physical state

There is an overlap between semantic types for some adjectival forms in this grouping. Adjective bi- 'sad', can also mean 'bad' or 'ugly' and is also included in the VALUE type grouping. Concept 'happy' is expressed in Lam Nso' as a noun derived from value adjective jung - 'good, beautiful' by the addition of an invariable class 2 prefix vi - (the choice of this prefix for abstract concepts is discussed in a later section).

(8) Myu vijung
    I - feel CL2 - happiness as in (31)
    'I feel happiness / I am happy'

(9) Vijung viyi wo atav
    CL2 - happiness CL2 - make you to be healthy, strong.
    'Happiness makes you healthy'

A similar process of attaching invariable noun - class
prefix to a participial form is used to form adverbs. The prefix in this case is ki - (CL1) (Grebe 1983: 5, appendix II).

\[(10) \text{Wù lé'} \quad \text{ki-tavin} \]
\[\text{he run CL1 - strong, hard} \]

'He is running fast'.

Participial form dorin is shared by two semantic groupings: the HUMAN PHYSICAL STATE, where it means 'tired' and DIMENSION/SIZE group where it means 'small'.

Kam 'greedy', njo 'lazy', ngan 'quiet' are adjectives and do not have verbal forms.

AGE

Only one concept, dzänin - old (in age) has verbal and participal forms, others are adjectival only.

VALUE

Jung 'good/beautiful' is an adjective and has no synonymous verbal form. Bi, an adjective, usually means 'bad' but can also mean 'ugly'. The verb bir, on the other hand, usually means 'to be ugly' but in certain contexts can also mean 'to be bad'. The two examples below are seen
by the informants as contrastive in meaning:

(11) Wu  
He/she  
dzə  
be  
bi  
bad  

'He/she is bad' - a comment about his/hers character.

(12) Wu  
He/she  
bir  
He/she to be ugly

A similar association of external qualities of a person with more verbal, predicative form and internal qualities with adjectival form which usually occurs as a modifier can also be found in Russian (for the same adjectives). The long form of an adjective possessing dual forms occurs both as a modifier and in the predicate. The short form occurs only in the predicate.

The long form

(35a) Ona  
She-NOM  
xorošaja  
good-F-SG-NOM  
devuška  
girl-F-SG-NOM  

'She is a good girl'

and

Ona  
She-NOM  
xorošaja  
good-F-SG-NOM
'she is (a) good (girl)'

The short form

(14) Ona xoroša
    she-NOM beautiful-F-SG-NOM

'she is beautiful'

(13b) contrasts with (14)

This association of internal qualities of a referent with more nominal adjectival form and external qualities with more verbal, predicative form can be explained perhaps by the tendency of the speakers of a language to perceive internal (invisible) qualities as having certain stability of reference across occasions of use, as being associated with the referent independently of the context of the speech act, such as the presence or absence of an observer-reporter, the time of the speech act or the position of the referent relative to the observer-reporter. The external qualities, on the other hand, are perceived as not having stability of reference and as being dependent on the speech context.

A similar distinction appears to exist between the colour adjectives and corresponding verbal forms in Russian. In the example below, belyj 'white' is an adjective.
In (b) belel is a verb. It is difficult to give a precise English translation. It is usually translated as 'to show white'.

When the adjectival form is used, the property it encodes is perceived by the speaker as having a stability of reference independent of the observer-reporter or the time of the speech act, or the position of the referent relative to the observer-reporter. When it is asserted in (a) that the sail was ne belyj 'not white' it is usually presupposed that it is now of a different colour.
However when it is asserted in (b) that the sail ne belejet 'does not show white' it is usually presupposed that it is because the boat has moved out of sight of the reporter-observer rather than that the sail is now of a different colour, it still remains white. It is therefore possible to say:

(c) Belyj parus uže ne belejet not white-M-SG-NOM sail-M-SG-NOM already white-PRES-3P-SG

'The white sail does not show white any longer'.

A similar semantic distinction appears to exist between the COLOUR adjectives and the corresponding verbal forms in Lam Nso.'

Colour

There are three colour terms in Lam Nso'. (This corresponds to stage II in Berlin and Kay's (1969) system of evolution of colour terms). The term colour which generally implies stability of reference is applicable only to one lexical item in Lam Nso' bar, which is the term for red, pink, bright yellow and orange. It is an adjective. The synonymous verb bangi 'to show red' does not appear to derive from it.
The forms *sanir* 'dark' and *fəvər* 'light' can be analysed as either participles irregularly derived from the synonymous verbs *san* 'to be dark, to show dark' and *fər* 'to be light, to show light' by the addition of a suffix -ir instead of the usual -in or as non-derived adjectives. The second analysis is preferred as the suffix -ir is usually used for the opposite derivational process, to derive verbs from adjectives, e.g. bi 'bad', bir 'to be bad'; *tsəm* 'short', *tsəmir* 'to be short'; -ir is also used as the causative suffix when added to verbal forms; *njəm* 'to be sharp, *njəmir* 'to make sharp, to sharpen.' Derived verbs like *tsəmir* 'to be short' do not add the causative -ir but change the tone of the suffix vowel.

Adjectives *sanir* 'dark' and *fəvər* 'light' indicate shade as well as colour.* These two concepts are based on a different system of discrimination. Variations in shade are the correlates of variations in light intensity or concentration of light energy while variations in colour have correlates in variations in wavelength or frequency of light, characteristic

*The term colour would be applicable to the use of adjectives when referring to pure white or pure black items, i.e. when they 'have stability of reference across informants and occasions of use'. (Berlin & Kay 1969:6)
for each band of light spectrum. The term sənər 'dark/black' applies to black, brown green and blue colours. Fəvir 'light/white' applies to white, very light blue, pale yellow and very pale green. Interpretations of these two terms as representing shade as well as colour is supported by their relativity: the same item can be referred to as fəvir 'light' or sənər 'dark' depending on the shade of the item in juxtaposition. A very light blue material is fəvir 'light' when viewed next to dark blue material but sənər 'dark' in juxtaposition to white. Examples below illustrate the relativity of synonymous verbs fəri and səni.

(16a) Wu
    he
(a black man)
fəri
    to be light
bi
    because
kivər
CLI - dirt/dust

'He is light with dirt'. Dirt/dust is lighter in contrast with black skin, but in:

Wu
    he
(a white man)
sənər
    to be dark
bi
    because
kivər
CLI-dirt
'He is dark with dirt'. Dirt/dust is darker in contrast with the light skin.

Berlin and Kay (1969) do not discuss the relativity of terms for light and dark in stages one and two of evolution of colour term. In a recent work by SIL, Australia as part of a colour term research project directed by Berlin and Kay, some of the data collected indicate that in identifying the only 3 colour terms in Kuku-Yalanji, an Australian Aboriginal language of North Queensland, several participants appeared to name chips as light and dark in comparison with the frame around them or in comparison with the chip just shown to them previously (Hargrave 1982: 208) i.e., they applied the terms for light and dark relatively.

Physical Property

All concepts, except two are associated with verbal forms. Loorsin 'smooth' is a participle, but has no original verb in the contemporary Lam Nso'. Ha 'rough' is an adjective, the verbal form associated with the same concept as harə. Adjective ko 'raw' has no corresponding verbal form.
Dimension, Size

All concepts in this group, except one are associated with verbs and participles. The exception is tsəm 'short' and the verbal form tsəmir is derived from it.

Summary

The distribution of semantic types between various parts of speech in Lam Nso' can now be summarised in a table.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of speech</th>
<th>Semantic Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human propensity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers in the table represent the number of items in the data associated with each part of speech ('verb' includes participial forms).

The table can be viewed as a two dimensional continuum of
variation in verbal properties between and within each semantic type. The proportion of verbal forms within each type increases from left to right. HUMAN PROPENSITY has two items which are associated with verbal forms or 20% of items in the group. The AGE group also has 20% of items as verbal forms. In the VALUE and COLOUR groups - 50%. In the PHYSICAL PROPERTY group - 81% and in DIMENSION - 85%.

Dixon (1982: 54-55) sets up two typological dimensions in his cross-language study of universal tendencies associated with adjectives. The first dimension places a language in a closed or open adjectival class. The class membership is established on the basis of associations existing between all adjectival semantic types and a form, either verbal or adjectival (open class) or on the basis of exclusive or predominant association of some adjectival types with adjectival form and others either with verbal or nominal forms (closed class).

Lam Nso' is closest to the closed class system. Two of its types HUMAN PROPENSITY and AGE are predominantly associated with the adjectival form. Other types have varied proportions of adjectives and verbs. The second typological dimension in Dixon's classification deals with a language having either verbal or adjectival domination. According to Dixon, strongly adjectival languages have all seven semantic types exclusively associated with the adjective class and strongly verbal languages have the marked pole in adjectival oppositions realised as verb and the unmarked pole as an adjective or a
noun, depending on whether the language has open or closed adjective class. Neutral languages have a few adjectival oppositions, with the marked pole realised as a verb. For most oppositions, however, both poles are associated with adjectival forms (Dixon 1982: 55).

This classification represents extremes: individual languages can be mapped on to a continuum joining the extremes (Dixon 1982: 55). Lam Nso' does not neatly fit into any category but is closest to the strongly verbal domination type.

Some PHYSICAL PROPERTY types in Lam Nso' have the unmarked pole associated with the adjective and the marked one with the verb - the A/V syndrome.

adjective verb (participle)
ko 'raw' naan 'cooked'
ha 'rough' loorsin 'smooth'

Markedness of one member of the pair is not always associated with a state resulting from an action (Dixon 1982: 50). It can also be associated with changes in states or properties acquired through a process. The A/V syndrome extends to a pair in each AGE and DIMENSION type in Lam Nso'.

adjective verb (participle)
teri 'young' dzenin 'old'
tsøm 'short' darin 'tall/long'

All other oppositions in the PHYSICAL PROPERTY and DIMENSION types have both poles associated with verbal forms.
2.1.3. Lam Nso' adjective - the extended category

Participles and adjectives in Lam Nso' display a very close similarity in their grammatical behaviour: both have identical restrictions on co-occurrence with certain affixes, such as causative, inchoative and tense (except for tense marking on participles in relative clauses); both occur in the predicate with the copula dza 'to be' and, as modifiers, both participles and adjectives can be used restrictively or non-restrictively, and these functions are marked identically for both. Examples below will illustrate this similarity.

(a) Restrictive and non-restrictive functions

(i) restrictive participles

(17) Moo yen ngvəv-si**
I-PAST see chicken-CL6

seku'unsi
RCL6-be big - NS-CL6
'I saw the large chickens'

** - si → 0 / _ # si-
se-

(ii) restrictive adjectives

(18) Moo yen ngvəv-si**
I-PAST see chicken-CL6

seterisi
RCL6-young-CL6
'I saw the small chickens'
(iii) non-restrictive participles

(19) Moo yen ngvav-si** siku'un
    I-PAST see chicken-CL6 CL6-be big-NS
'I see large chickens'

(iv) non-restrictive adjectives

(20) Moo yen ngvav-si** siteri
    I-PAST see chicken-CL6 CL6-small
'I see small chickens'

(b) Participles and adjectives in the predicate with the copula

(i) participles

(21) kikabar kidze kiku'un
    CLI-leaf CLI-be CLI-be big-NS
'The leaf is big'

(ii) adjectives

(22) kibabar kidze kiteri
    CLI-leaf CLI-be CLI-small
'The leaf is small'

(c) Restrictions on occurrence with verbal affixes:

Inchoative affix

(i) verb

(23) Wu sifangi
    he/she INC-to be fat - CONT
'He is becoming fat'
(ii) participle

(25) *Wu  
  he/she  
  sidzə  
  INC-be  
  fangin  
  fat-NS  

(iii) adjective

(26) *Wu  
  he/she  
  sitsəm  
  INC-short  

'He/she is getting short' (about an old person)

Causative affix

(i) verb

(27) Wu  
  She  
  darir  
  to be long - CAUS  
  ndzəy-ə  
  dress-CL5  

'She is lengthening the dress'

(ii) participle

(28) *Wu  
  She  
  darin-ir  
  to be long-NS-CAUS  
  ndzəy-ə  
  dress-CL5  

*Wu  
  She  
  dzə-ir  
  be-CAUS  
  darin  
  be long-NS  
  ndzəy-ə  
  dress-CL5  

'She is lengthening the dress'

(iii) adjective

(29) *Wu  
  She-PAST  
  ngan-ir  
  quiet-CAUS  
  wun  
  him  

'She is making him quiet'
Past tense affix

(i) verb

(30) kibabar
CLI-leaf

kiiku'
CLI-PAST-be big

'The leaf was big'

(ii) participle

(31) *kibabar
CLI-leaf

kiiku'un
CLI-PAST-be big - NS

(iii) adjective

(32) *kibabar
CLI-leaf

kiiteri
CLI-PAST-small

but both are grammatical with the tense marked copula dzə 'to be'.

(33) kibabar
CLI-leaf

kiidzə
CLI-PAST-be

kiku'un
CLI-be big-NS

'The leaf was big'

(34) kibabar
CLI-leaf

kiidzə
CLI-PAST-be

kiteri
CLI-small

'The leaf was small'
Participles in the relative clauses

As mentioned earlier, the relative clauses are the only environment where participles carry tense marking directly (Evans 1981), adjectives in this environment occur with the nominalised copula dzə and the tense marking is carried by the copula.

(i) participle

(35) kici ke kiigbun yooni
    CLI-tree RCLI CLI-PAST-fall yesterday

kishwi
CLI-burn-CONT
'The tree that fell yesterday is burning'

(ii) adjective

(36) Moo yung se-Q yie
    I-PAST buy fish-CL5 ye

yiidzen
CL5-PAST-be-NS
ko raw

'I bought the fish which was raw'

The dual nature of participles in the relative clauses may be explained by the duality of syntactic function of relative clauses: they are clauses and as such have variable time reference, but at the same time they are modifiers and
thus members of NPs. This duality of syntactic function is reflected in the morphology of participles when they occur in predicative function within a relative clause. They are marked for tense and at the same time carry a nominalising suffix.

In the following discussions of restrictive and non-restrictive adjectives, the category 'adjective' in Lam Nso' will be extended to include participles which in spite of their verbal origin behave and are used in the same way as adjectives in all environments, except for relative clauses where there are special conditioning factors.

2.2 Noun class markers in Lam Nso' and their functions

The two adjectival categories in Lam Nso' are differentiated by the shape and the distribution of morphemes marking the noun class concord on these adjectives. One of the adjectival categories has prefixes, the other prefixes and suffixes. Since the distinction between the adjectival categories is carried by the noun class markers, the noun class system of Lam Nso' is examined in some detail.

2.2.1 Noun classes in Lam Nso'

The terms 'noun class' and 'gender' as used here follow the convention of usage established in the literature describing these categories in the languages of the same area as Lam Nso', mainly in the works of the Grassfields Bantu working
The noun class membership is determined on the basis of similarities of morphemes on the nouns themselves or on the similarity of concord on modifiers when the noun itself lacks the formal expression of the noun-class (or more precisely, when the marking is $\emptyset$).

This analysis of the noun class membership is based on purely formal criteria. A noun class could include nouns in singular or plural or mass and abstract nouns. However, the grouping of nouns into gender classes is done on a semantic basis. Two nouns of different noun class membership are combined in the same gender on the basis of recognition that they refer to the same kind of entity and differ only in number or countability (for major gender groupings).

Lam Nso' nouns in my data can be grouped into 8 noun classes. This is to be taken only as a provisional classification since it is based only on a small sample. The nouns are grouped into these classes on the basis of their form and the concord forms found on their modifiers.
# TABLE 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>Prefix/suffix on the noun</th>
<th>Concord - prefixes/suffixes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A₁</td>
<td>A₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ki-</td>
<td>ki-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>vi-</td>
<td>vi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>shi-</td>
<td>shi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>mi-</td>
<td>mi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td>yi*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-si**</td>
<td>si-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ø-</td>
<td>yi*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>a-</td>
<td>vi-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* often omitted or reduced to (i) **si→Ø / # si-

A₁ and A₂ - two types of adjectives
e.g.

- kibabar
- CLI-leaf

\{ \begin{align*}
  & \text{kiteri} \\
  & \text{CLI-small} \\
  & \text{keteriki} \\
  & \text{RCLI-small-CLI}
\end{align*} \}

' a small leaf / the/a small leaf'

D - demonstrative 'this'

- kibabar
- CLI - leaf

' this leaf'
AP - anaphoric pronoun 'that'

kibabar
CLI - leaf
keeshooy
RCLI - that

'that leaf'

IP - interrogative pronoun 'which'

kibabar
CLI - leaf
kiniki
CLI - which - CLI

'which leaf'

N - numeral (cardinal)

kibabar
CLI - leaf
kimo' on
CLI - one

'one leaf'

vibabar
CL2 - leaf
vitar
CL2 - three

'three leaves'

M - many

vibabar
CL2 - leaf
vimin
CL2 - many

'many leaves'

There are three irregular nouns in my data:

wan  'child'  won  'children'
wiy  'woman'  vikiy  'women'
lumen  'man'  vilum  'men'
These nouns are assigned to classes on the basis of agreement markers on modifiers. The nouns in the singular are assigned to class 7 and in the plural to class 8.

2.2.2 Genders in Lam Nso'

The nouns in Lam Nso can be grouped into 4 major genders: 1/2, 3/4, 5/6 and 7/8 (examples of nouns in these major groupings are given in the later part of this section). There is one minor gender group (for my sample) 7/6:

Ø - koy
CL7 - arm
koy-si
arm - CL6

koy 'arm' has been assigned to class 7 on the basis of its agreement markers.

There are some single class genders in my data. These are:

CL1
kitan 'poverty'
kidzer 'coolness'

CL2
vijung 'happiness'
vitse'e 'darkness, night'
vifi 'intelligence'

The gender grouping in Lam Nso originally, perhaps had a semantic basis. Denny and Creider (1976: 1-19)
propose the following system for Proto-Bantu noun class semantics:

Count nouns

configuration

kind

solid figure

outline figure

animate

artifact

unit

collection

human

animal

non-extended extended

extended

non-extended

unit collection

Mass nouns

Mass

cohesive
disperse

solid

liquid

homogeneous
differentiated

This system appears to fit some gender distinctions in my data:

ki/vi - gender (configurational, outline figure; ki-unit, vi-collection) kibay 'lake', kighi 'finger nail', kibabar 'leaf', kikwiyy 'a blade of grass', kiwoh 'hand', kighvar 'bone', kibam 'a bag (small)', kiykwa 'a shredder', kikun 'bed', kinsaa 'comb', kiban 'shed', kiwar 'a bean plant', kimbom 'a building', kibin 'enclosure',
kiren'eri 'bamboo branch', kigati 'big woven basket'.
(changing ki- prefix to vi- gives the plural).

shi-/mi- gender (configurational, solid figure; also mass nouns; shi - unit, mi- collection)

shinster 'louse', shinen 'bird', shishuy 'rabbit',
shintsəh 'a drop of blood', mintsəh 'blood in general',
shindzəv 'a drop, a quantity of water', mindzəv 'water in general',
shiluu 'a drink in a container such as calabash, miluu 'drinks in general', shikara 'a fritter',
mikara 'fritters', meyka 'firewood'.

Ø/a - gender (kind, animals and artifacts; Ø-unit, a- * collection) lumen 'man', wiw 'woman', wan 'child, taata 'grandfather', yaaya 'grandmother, mother', tar 'father',
nta 'chair', nton 'cooking pot', bar 'cup', baa 'leopard',
kan 'monkey', ngar 'gun', kunnyam 'pig'.
* except irregular nouns

-Ø/-si gender (not obvious, appears to be a mixture of semantic distinctions, -Ø-unit, -si-collection) ngvəv 'chicken', wuy 'fur/hair', lav 'house', kov 'forest',
sii 'eye', səf 'fish', tan 'cap', juy 'dog', song 'tooth/teeth', njam 'axe', bvəy 'goat', biy 'beans', sum 'farm',
shuu 'mouth', kun 'beans', shum 'drum'.

These are only provisional semantic groupings, based on a small sample. The gender distinctions usually
represent differences in inherent, natural configurational or 'kind' properties of the referents. It is difficult to say whether the present day speakers of Lam Nso' associate gender groupings with particular semantic distinctions as described above for Proto-Bantu.

It would be possible, perhaps, to verify whether gender classes have any distinct connotations for speakers of Lam Nso' by using method described by Ervin (1962). This method tested connotations of gender for native Italian speakers. Artificial words were created bearing masculine and feminine endings. A list of attributes was given and the informants were asked to associate these attributes with a gender. The results indicated strong correlations between certain attributes and gender classes for native speakers of Italian.

Similarly, nonsense words marked by gender classes in Lam Nso' could be tested for gender connotations by associating them with such attributes as outline figures, solid figure, human, artifact etc.

The borrowings from English seem to indicate that the semantic basis for gender distinctions is not fully functional in the language. The semantic cues for individuating a referent of a noun, encoded by the gender markers, are being replaced by the purely auditory, linguistic cues based on phonetic similarities in the initial segment of the nouns.
Some loan words are put into classes according to this type of similarity:

- shibun - mibun
- 'spoon' - 'spoons'
- shiker - miker
- 'skirt' - 'skirts'
- shikur - mikur
- 'school' - 'schools'

This resembles the gender distinctions found in some languages where only humans and some animals are classified according to natural gender (ie sex) distinctions, while the nouns encoding the inanimate referents are placed into gender classes on the basis of analogy of their forms with the natural gender classes.

There are some borrowings from English which appear to be placed into genders on a semantic basis:

- table - atable - 'table - tables'
- radio - aradio - 'radio - radios'
- motu - amotu - 'car - cars'

These are placed into gender 7/8 which contains artifacts. Other two borrowed nouns lamp-Ø - lampsi 'lamp - lamps' chor-Ø - chorsi 'church - churches', are placed into 5/6 gender. The semantic criteria for placing these and other nouns into this gender is not obvious.

2.2.3 Countability and number

Variations within gender classes are conditioned by contingent properties such as countability and number. The countability
distinction was first described by Hjelmslev (1956) as related to characteristics of human perception which divides things into unlimited, shapeless, spreading - expansive and things that are shaped, limited, formed - concentrated. This distinction can be seen in terms of a feature \( ^{\dagger} \) concentrated / \( ^{\dagger} \) compact. Hjelmslev saw it as an area where differences between gender and number are neutralised, conflated.

T. Thrane (1980: 78), however, feels justified in introducing another linking category between gender and number, which he terms 'countability'. He defines it as 'a systematic linguistic means of individuation in terms of contingent properties' (p. 78).

Countability is not to be confused with number, though it could have the same formal distinctions e.g. in English, distinctions between 'whiskey' in:

(37) 'He drinks whiskey' (as opposed to other drinks)
    and 'whiskies' in:
(38) 'Two whiskies, please'.

is not that of number, but countability. In (37) whiskey is (-) individuated in terms of contingent properties such as shape and in (38) whiskies is (+) individuated in terms of the shape of the container. The countability distinction can also be lexicalised in English (Thrane 1980: P. 80):

(39) sheep vs mutton
    laugh vs laughter
In some languages, countability distinctions are marked by gender. e.g. Danish common and neuter gender forms can also mark countability distinctions (Thrane 1980: P. 79).

(40) den Øl de brygger er god
common gender

and

(41) det Øl de brygger er godt
neuter gender

Glosses:

(40) 'The beer they brew is good'.
(as opposed to other labels of beer)

(41) 'The beer they brew is good'.
(where the beer is viewed as a substance, whichever sample of it is taken, it is good)

In Lam Nso', countability and number distinctions are marked by the same forms of noun-class markers:

(a) **Individuation in terms of a distinct shape**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- distinct shape</td>
<td>+ distinct shape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minën</td>
<td>shinën number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'birds'</td>
<td>'a bird'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mi/shi-</td>
<td>shishuy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
<td>a hare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mishuy</td>
<td>'hares'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Variations within ki-/vi- and shi-/mi- genders, i.e. a change from vi- to ki- and mi- to shi- marks a change from perceiving referents as a shapeless, unindividuated collection to perceiving them as units with a distinct shape. It seems natural that single noun class gender items like viitsë 'darkness', vijung 'happiness', vifi 'intelligence' will be in the grouping which is characterised by the lack of a distinct shape.

Individuation in terms of distributional properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>unit</th>
<th>collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ compact</td>
<td>- compact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seh-Ø</td>
<td>sehshi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'a fish'</td>
<td>'fish'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lav-Ø</td>
<td>lavsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'a house'</td>
<td>'houses'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ngvøv-Ø</td>
<td>ngvøvsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'a chicken'</td>
<td>'chickens'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ntsay-Ø</td>
<td>ntsaysi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'soil, ground'</td>
<td>'particles of'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>soil, loose dirt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
wuy - Ø -
'fur, hair'

nyong - Ø -
'hair on the head'
song - Ø -
'tooth/teeth inside the mouth'

wuysi
'separate bits of fur, hair, e.g. dogs hair on a chair'

nyongsí
'bits of hair e.g. cut off hair on the ground'
songsí
'teeth on a comb separated by spaces'.

(b) Variations within -Ø/si gender, i.e. a change from -Ø to -si marks a change from perceiving a referent as (+) compact, undivided unit to perceiving it as a collection of scattered, individuated parts. Lav 'house' refers to a single, compact unit, lavsi refers to a collection of houses, scattered around, not close together. For houses in close proximity there is another lexical item la - 'a compound'. A single fish is perceived as a compact unit while a group of fish is perceived as compositionally much less compact. Ntsay 'dirt, ground' refers to (+) compact, undivided soil, ground while ntsaysí refers to loose dirt, pieces of soil. Similarly nyong 'hair' refers to hair on the head, perceived as (+) compact while nyongsí refers to scattered hair, e.g. when the hair has been cut off and is lying on the floor.

(c) Individuation in terms of plurality only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>unit</th>
<th>collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nta</td>
<td>anta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'chair'</td>
<td>'chairs'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'pot'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0/-a-</td>
<td>yaaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'grandmother'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>baa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'leopard'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) Variations within this gender mark only number distinctions, i.e. 1 referent = singular; more than 1 = plural.

**Summary**

This discussion of semantic distinctions between and within genders in Lam Nso' is intended only as a tentative explanation of these distinctions, based on a small sample of nouns.

If these semantic distinctions are still viable for most nouns in contemporary Lam Nso' then the function of noun class markers can be seen as giving additional information to that provided by the nominal root. The noun class markers add information about the invariant properties, such as natural shape or composition (outline figure or solid figure) or 'kind' (animal, artifact) as well as about contingent properties, such as countability and number.

However, if for the speakers of contemporary Lam Nso' the noun class markers on most nouns carry no additional semantic information associated with any properties, then the function of various noun markers is purely grammatical: the nouns are
grouped into classes on the basis of phonetic similarities of their forms and the forms of concord on the modifiers. It is also possible, that these tendencies are present to varying degrees in different genders.
2.3 Concord markers and their functions

2.3.1 Concord markers on adjectives

As mentioned earlier there are two categories of adjectives in Lam Nso'. One of the categories has prefixes only marking the agreement between the nouns and adjectives. The other category marks the agreement by a prefix and a suffix. The shape of these agreement markers for each noun class is tabulated in table 3.

The initial consonants of the prefixes in both categories of adjectives are identical, except for CL7, where the prefixed category has (y) and the prefixed-suffixed- (W). The vowels of the prefixes differ: the category with prefixes only concord markers has the vowel (i), the prefixed-suffixed category lowers the vowel to (e), again with the exception of CL7, where the vowel is (o). The forms of suffixes on the prefixed-suffixed category are identical to noun-class markers on nouns with the exception of CL8.

Distribution of the two categories of adjectives differs. Adjectives with the prefixed concord markers occur both as modifiers and in the predicate construction with the copula dzə 'to be'.
The prefixed-suffixed category is ungrammatical in this construction.

(42) Njey-(si) sin sidzø sidorin
dress-(CL6) CL6-this CL6-be CL6-be-small-NS

fo mo
for I si → ₀ / - # si

'This dress is small for me'

The predicate in this type of construction encodes a comment about the referent and does not play a part in identifying it. The prefixed-suffixed category can be used in the predicate only in equative sentences, where the referent of the subject noun phrase is identified with the referent of the predicate.

(43) * Njey-(si) sin sidzø sedorinsi
dress-(CL6) CL6-this CL6-be RCL6-be small-NS-CL6

fo mo
for I

*This dress is the small one for me'

This sentence can occur only in very specific context, when the identity of the referent encoded by the prefixed-
suffixed adjective has already been established. The use of the prefixed adjective is not limited by the context the same way.

According to the informants, the prefixed-suffixed category of adjectives is used when a referent is selected from a group of referents of the same kind.

(45) Mo yen kibabar
I see CLI - leaf

keku'unki
RCLI-be big-NS-CLI

'I see the large leaf'

(The set of leaves contains other leaves of various sizes). The prefixed category is used, according to the informants, when the adjective serves as a comment about the referent. The predicative nature of the prefixed adjective is captured in the paraphrases used by the informants.

(46) Mo yen kibabar
I see CLI-leaf

kiku'un
'I see a big leaf'

Paraphrases:

'I see a leaf and it happens to be big'
or
'I see a leaf which happens to be big'
Informants intuitions about the differences in meaning between the categories of adjectives suggest that the prefixed-suffixed form is used restrictively and the prefixed form - non-restrictively. The distribution of these forms parallels that of restrictive and non-restrictive adjectives in Serbo-Croatian and Old Church Slavonic. To confirm these intuitions of the informants, the method used in the analysis of Serbo-Croatian adjectives, to differentiate between the restrictive and non-restrictive functions of adjectives and to establish the forms associated with these functions, was also applied to the analysis of Lam Nso' adjectives.

2.3.1.1 Non-restrictive adjectives

The function of an adjective is unambiguously non-restrictive when the speaker does not intend it to be an essential information in identifying a referent. The adjective in this function may be omitted.

The informants were asked to identify a referent in terms of properties encoded by the noun but also use an adjective as a modifier. The question asked contained the interrogative pronoun *ka* 'what' which requires the referent to be minimally identified in terms of properties encoded by a noun. The modifying adjective functions as an added comment.
Question

(47) Wo yen ka ?
you see what

'What do you see?'

Answers

(48) Mo yen sum-0
I see farm/field-CL7
(yiku'un) 'I see a (large) farm/field'
CL7-be big-NS

or

(49) Mo yen kibabar
I see CLI-leaf
(kiteri)
CLI-small

'I see a (small) leaf'

or

(50) Mo yen shishuy
I see CL3-hare
(shiku'un) 'I see a small hare'
CL3-be big-NS

Brackets indicate that the adjective may be omitted. As the examples above show, it is the prefixed category that is used non-restrictively.
2.3.1.2 **Restrictive adjectives**

The function of an adjective is unambiguously restrictive when it is used by the speaker to select and identify a referent in terms of properties encoded by the adjective. The adjective in this case is essential information and cannot be omitted. The adjective plays a part in subcategorisation of the referent in terms of adjectival properties. Unambiguous examples of adjectives used restrictively were obtained by asking two types of questions. One contained the interrogative word *le* 'what kind' and the other the interrogative word *ni* 'which'. These interrogatives carry agreement markers, indicating the class of the modified noun. The agreement markers take the form of a prefix for *le* 'what kind' (identical in form to the prefixes on restrictive adjectives) and in the form of a prefix and suffix for *ni* 'which'. The form of the prefix and suffix is identical to noun class concord on non-restrictive adjectives (except for the classes 7 and 8 where it is *vθ* - Ø and *vi* - i respectively).

The *le* interrogative is used when the referent is to be identified in terms of properties encoded by the adjective. The set from which the referent is selected is usually the generic set encoded by the modified noun.

The *ni* interrogative is used when the referent is to be identified in terms of properties encoded by the
adjective. However, the set from which the referent is selected is a specific set of referents encoded by the modified noun.

Both interrogatives require identification of a referent in terms of modifier properties and selection of the referent from a set of other referents of the same nominal class, i.e. both require the answer to be a restrictive modifier.

(51) Wo yen ɕ-sum wole?
you see CL7 - farm RCL7 - what kind

'What kind of farm do you see?'

(52) Mo yen ɕ-sum woteri-ailability
I see CL7 - farm RCL7 - small - CL7

'I see a small farm'

(53) Wo yen ɕ-sum vēni-ailability
you see CL7 - farm CL7 - small - CL7

'Which farm do you see?'

(54) Mo yen ɕ-sum woteri-ailability
I see CL7 - farm RCL7 - small - CL7

'I see the small farm'

The adjectives used in the restrictive function are in the
prefixed-suffixed form. These adjectives will be referred to as restrictive adjectives.

An example of the use of a restrictive adjective in a text:

(55) Jwi - Ø yeku'un - Ø
dog - CL5 RCL5 - be big - NS - CL5

jum e ghar fo kitu
chase and grab by CL1 - head

∂-wan jwi - Ø ghar fo kun
CL7-child dog - CL5 grab by tail - CL?

Grebe 1980: 143

'The big dog chased it (the monkey) and grabbed it by the head, the puppy (child dog) grabbed it by the tail'.

The preceding text had established that the reference set involved two dogs, a large one and a puppy, who were taken hunting. The restrictive adjective yeku'un 'big' identifies which dog out of two chased and grabbed the monkey by the head.

2.3.2 Other functions of the concord markers on adjectives

2.3.2.1 The prefixed concord markers on non-restrictive adjectives

The prefixed concord markers have other functions apart from marking non-restrictive use of adjectives. The
markers also have a cohesive function (Halliday 1976: 1-30). The type of cohesive relation involved here is nominal substitution, with the concord markers acting as substitutes (Halliday 1976: 88-91). Substitution is a grammatical relation providing textual cohesion which in this case is a link between the modifier and the modified. In this sense the concord markers are potentially anaphoric. The cohesive function of this form of prefixes is not limited to non-restrictive adjectives. Identical prefixes (with the exception of CL7, which has wu-) mark subject agreement on the verbs. This is also a case of nominal substitution and the prefixes have anaphoric function. This anaphoric relation is not limited to textual cohesive function, the prefixes can be also used referentially as the third person pronouns.

(56) ki dz∅ kidorin
    CL1 - it be CL1 - small

'it is small' (in reference to a leaf)

(57) Wu dz∅ fangin
    CL7 - he be be fat - NS

'He is fat' (in reference to a man)
2.3.2.2. **The prefixed-suffixed concord markers on restrictive adjectives and in other constructions**

The prefixed-suffixed concord markers marking restrictive function on adjectives also have other functions. This section will examine these functions as well as the function of similar markers in other constructions.

The suffixed concord markers are identical in form to the prefixed concord markers on non-restrictive adjectives (except for classes 7 and 8). These markers also have a cohesive function and act as nominal substitutes. This analysis is supported by the semantics of restrictive modification, which requires the nominal set of the modified category to be presupposed. The anaphoric relation marked by the suffixed concord is at the lexicogrammatical level (Halliday 1976: 89), as for the prefixes on non-restrictive modifiers.

The suffixed noun class markers occur also in a number of other structures. The examples of some of these structures given by Grebe in the extracts from Appendix II seem to suggest that the suffixed noun class markers mark presupposed relations: either created in discourse or part of general knowledge or anaphoric relation at the lexicogrammatical level (as in the case of restrictive adjectives). Some examples of these structures:
Indefinite demonstrative (Grebe's term)

(58) Ø - taata yun kibam
CL7 - grandfather buy CL1-bag

kimo'ki (example from Grebe 198:52)
CL1-one-CL1

'Grandfather is buying another bag'

In the above sentence the indefinite demonstrative (Grebe) 'another' is marked by the suffixed noun class marker. This marker marks the presupposition of the knowledge (by both the speaker and the addressee) that there exists a set of items - 'bags' to which the new item is added.

Conjoint NPs (Grebe's term)

Data in the primer suggests that there are three kinds of conjoint NP structures in Lam Nso': one of the structures is not marked by the noun class suffix, the other two are. The structures marked by the suffix appear to contain presupposition of a certain relationship existing between the referents of the NPs in the construction. The examples below will illustrate the difference between the three structures:

(a) Conjoint NPs unmarked by the noun class suffix

(59) A Ø - wan yi kiban
and CL7 - child eat CL1 - fufu

wun Ø - kan
with/and CL7 - monkey

'The child and/with the monkey eat the fufu'
Conjunction *wun* appears to mark independent relationship between the conjoin NPs. Conjoin NPs in dependent relationship are marked by *wun a*; the nature of this relationship is presupposed and marked by the noun class suffix on the dependent NP. Examples of these are below.

(b) **Conjoint NPs marked by the noun class suffix**

(60) Wu yi kiban
he eat CL1 - fufu
wun a kibaki
with CL1 - skin - CL1

'He eats fufu with the skin'

The nature of the presupposed relationship here is obvious: the skin marked by the noun class suffix is a part of fufu.

Another example:

(61) Ø - wan yi kun - Ø
CL7 - child eat beans - CL5
wun a kibanki 'The child eats beans
with CL1-fufu-CL1 with the fufu'

As above, the noun class suffix appears to mark presupposed relationship between the conjoined NPs, the relationship is that of parts to a whole - both beans and fufu are part of one meal.

Dependent conjoined NPs with the verbs of motion appear to use a different conjunction (or preposition).

(62) Wiyka wiy e kibanki
Wiyka come with CL1 - fufu - CL1

'Wiyka comes with the fufu'
'brings the fufu'
The dependent NP marked by noun class suffix is included in the actor's action, the nature of which is presupposed.

Preposition (or conjunction) e in the above construction marks not only conjoined NPs where it means 'with'; it also marks the goal of motion / location. It is distinguished from the conjoined NPs construction by lack of noun class suffix on the NP, referring to the goal of motion.

**Goal of motion**

(63) Wi-yka du e way
Wiyka go to CL? - market

'Wiyka goes to the market'

**Location**

(64) Binka ker kiy - e way
Binka have fireplace-CL5 at market - CL?

'Binka has a fireplace at the market'

Aghem, another language of the same subgroup as Lam Nso', has a locative marker which can also mark an instrument, accompaniment or recipient (Hyman 1979:45). The accompaniment and recipient are distinguished from locative and instrument functions by the use of Out of Focus suffix (Hyman 1979:56). The function of this suffix appears to parallel that of noun class suffix in Lam Nso'. It appears to mark some type of presupposed relations.
Noun class suffix and the inclusive relationship

In the constructions examined above - indefinite demonstrative, restrictive adjective, conjoined NPs, all marked by the noun class suffix the most common presupposed semantic relation is that of inclusion. Types of inclusive relationships observed are:

(a) inclusion of the subcategory formed by the restrictive adjective and the modified noun in the lexical category of the modified noun - a lexicogrammatical inclusion

kinsaa kefiyki - 'a new comb'

CL1-comb RCL1-new-CL1

CLASS - 'combs' a new comb

(b) inclusion of one item with another item in a part-whole relationship - extra-linguistic inclusive relation (examples 60 and 61).

(c) inclusion of the referent of the dependent NP in the action of the actor - also extra-linguistic inclusive relation (example 62).

There is another construction in Lam Nso' where the noun class suffix marks inclusive relationship - a syntactic kind.

(d) object incorporation

(65) Wu du sə (si) sekeensii
he go fish-CL6 RCL6 - catch - NS - CL6

'He goes fish-catching/fishing'
So far we have discussed the function of suffixed noun class marker on restrictive adjectives and in other constructions.

The prefixed concord marker on restrictive adjectives, apart from marking restrictive function, also has a partially cohesive function. Only the initial consonants on the prefixes (except for class 7) have the same form as the prefixes on the non-restrictive adjectives. (This analysis is in line with the approach adopted in this study according to which the linguistic categories may be differentiated, not so much on the basis of either category possessing certain features or lacking them, but on the basis of categories having more or less of these features).

The change in the vowel of the concord prefixes from (i) to (e) (except for class 7) indicates a change in the function of these prefixes from marking textually anaphoric relations on non-restrictive modifiers to marking restrictive modifiers (including restrictive adjectives) with potentially independent referential function (restrictive adjectives alone can be used to refer; non-restrictive adjective cannot be used without the modified noun as referring expressions).

2.4 Other restrictive and non-restrictive modifiers

Adjectives are not the only modifiers in Lam Nso' that can be used restrictively and non-restrictively, but they are the only category where this distinction is expressed by changes
in the forms of suffixes and prefixes. This distinction exists largely at the level of discourse and has only limited occurrence at the level of lexicon. Other modifiers have lexicalised either restrictive or non-restrictive function, i.e. they are restrictive or non-restrictive at the level of lexicon. In discourse, some lexically non-restrictive categories can become restrictive. The restrictive function in this case is usually marked by emphatic prominence.

Other non-restrictive modifiers (marked by non-restrictive concord prefixes)

(1) Demonstratives

(66) kifu
CL1 - medicine

kin
CL1 - this

kidz Θ
CL1 - be

kibi
CL1 - bad

'This medicine is bad'

- as a possible answer to a question 'What is bad?'

Demonstrative here functions non-restrictively, it is not used to identify the referent but simply to indicate its location relative to the speaker, there is no implication of a selection of the referent from a set of other present or potential referents; the demonstrative may be omitted.

The demonstrative may also be used restrictively. Its
restrictive use is marked by the feature of emphatic prominence, associated with the demonstrative in this function.

(2) **Cardinal numeral**

(67) Wu ker vikum viba-a
    he have CL2-shirt CL2-two

'He has two shirts'

The cardinal numeral always functions non-restrictively in Lam Nso'. It does not identify the referents, but indicates their number.

**Other restrictive modifiers**

Other restrictive modifiers are usually marked by the restrictive concord prefixes only and do not carry suffixed concord markers (as is the case with restrictive adjectives). This is due to the tendency in these modifiers to lexicalise the presupposition contained in the suffixed concord marker on adjectives, since the lexical semantics of adjectival stems do not contain this presupposition.

(a) **Anaphoric demonstrative**

(example from Grebe 1980:70)

(68) Ø - yaàya' ker Ø - súm
    CL7 - grandmother have CL7 - farm

    a Biy lim Ø - súm wooshooy
    and " work CL7 - farm RCL7 - that

'Grandmother has a farm and Biy works that farm'
The referent (farm) is identified in terms of properties encoded by the anaphoric demonstrative. The demonstrative lexicalises the presupposition of the previous knowledge of the lexical class of the referent. Grebe (1983, Appendix II) glosses the demonstrative as: 'the one/thing mentioned before'.

(b) Ordinal numerals

These lexicalise a presupposition that there is a set of referents encoded by the nominal lexeme. The ordinal numeral identifies and selects a member of this set in terms of sequential properties encoded by the numeral.

(69) Mtaŋ ngwēy-ŋ yēmbiy
    I - want chicken - CL5 RCL5 - first

'I want the first chicken'

(c) Collective numerals

These numerals lexicalise not only the idea of a group of referents but also the presupposition that the lexical class of the referents has been given (text, extralinguistic context, culturally). English has only one numeral which has the corresponding collective (lexical). This is the collective numeral both, as in:

(70) Both men were wearing masks. The men are identified here in terms of properties encoded by the numeral. It is also presupposed that the noun, encoding the referents, has been mentioned in the preceding discourse or is obvious from the context. The category of collective numerals is also
present in Slavonic languages.

A Lam Nso' example:

(71) Wun yen bve'y(si)
he - PAST see goat - (CL6)

sesitar RCL6 - CL6 - three

'He saw three of the goats'

Possessive pronouns

These modifiers are also restrictive at the level of lexicon. In discourse the restrictive function is marked by emphatic prominence on the pronoun. The possessive pronouns lexicalise the presupposition of the possessor and, when marked by the ellipsis, of the item possessed. They have a potential to be doubly anaphoric (Halliday 1976:54-5).

(72) Fo mo kibam kem
give me CL1-bag RCL1-my

'Give me my bag'

2.5 Summary

The Lam Nso' modifiers in non-restrictive function are marked by the noun class concord prefixes of the (i) form (ki-, vi-, etc.). These prefixes also have cohesive function within the modification construction and are potentially anaphoric. The non-restrictive adjectives by themselves can't be used to refer, or to identify a referent. The non-restrictive
adjectives occur both in predicate and in the modifier position.

Modifiers in restrictive function are marked by the restrictive noun class concord markers and in the case of adjectives also by the noun class suffixes.

The prefixes also have partly cohesive function within the noun phrase (there is only partial formal identity between the noun class markers on nouns and adjectives).

The suffixes on restrictive adjectives and in other constructions have a cohesive function. The most common semantic relation between the items in cohesive relation is that of inclusion. The restrictive adjectives may be used to refer (with ellipses of the modified noun).

Restrictive adjectives occur almost exclusively as modifiers. They may occur in the predicate with the copula dze 'to be' in very restricted contexts, in equative type of sentences.

The above discussion may be summarised in a table.
Table 4: Noun class and noun class concord markers on nouns and modifiers and their functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun class markers on nouns (as lexemes)</th>
<th>Noun class markers on nouns in other functions (e.g. conjoint NPs)</th>
<th>Noun class concord markers on non-restrictive modifiers</th>
<th>Noun class concord markers on restrictive modifiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form: suffixes/prefixes</td>
<td>Function: mark dependent, inclusive relation between NPs.</td>
<td>Function: prefixes - (i) form cohesivene (on lexicog-grammatical level)</td>
<td>Function: prefixes - (e) forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function: identify a referent in terms of invariant properties of gender (if gender distinction are functional in Lam Nso') as well as in terms of contingent properties of number/countability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If gender is not functional in Lam Nso' - grammatical gender distinctions only.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suffixes</td>
<td></td>
<td>prefixes - (i) form</td>
<td>prefixes - (e) forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. cohesive (only partly)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. identify a referent in terms of properties encoded by the modifier and exclude others of the same class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Subcategorise the referent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suffixes (on adjective only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. cohesive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. mark inclusive relations between the new subcategory of noun + restrictive adjective and the category of the noun.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.6 Restrictive adjectives in Lam Nso and nominalization

The inclusive relationship between the category of the modified noun and the new subcategory of the noun formed by the restrictive modification explains the nominal character of the restrictive adjectives - the membership in the nominal category is always implied when the adjectives are used to refer and the modified noun is omitted. The nominal category is recoverable from the linguistic or non-linguistic context or is part of general knowledge.

(a) temporary nominalization in discourse occurs when the restrictive adjective is used alone and the implied noun is recoverable from the context. The new subcategory exists only for the duration of discourse.

An example of temporary nominalization can be found in the text below:

"it is woteri 'the young one' (The story told by the informant)."

(73)  
Yii - dzə  
PAST - be  
ghan (si)  
time - CL6  
simo'si  
CL6 - one - CL6  

a  
kfy - Ø  
and  
family - CL5  
yimo'o  
CL5 - one - CL5
Once upon a time there lived a family of father, mother and three children. They were happy and loving. The eldest child had a large stomach, the one in the middle had a small mouth and the young one had short legs.
(b) permanent nominalizations of restrictive adjectives at the level of lexicon (with ellipses of the noun and in compounds).

The permanent nominalization of restrictive adjectives with omission of the modified noun does not appear to be a very productive process in Lam Nso (as compared with Russian). My informant could think of only a few, mainly nicknames, e.g.: wotsam 'shortie'

RCL7 - short

Compounding of restrictive adjective and modified noun also occurs in Lam Nso:

- mingver
  CL4 - oil

- mebarmi
  RCL4 - red - CL4

'red oil' - a type of oil used in cooking

It is ungrammatical to refer to the oil using non-restrictive adjective:

(74) * Fo mo mingver mibar
      give me CL4 - oil CL4 - red

'give me (some) red oil'

The types of chickens can also be referred to by compounds with restrictive COLOUR adjectives (non-restrictive ones are ungrammatical in this case).

- ngva -Ø
  chicken-CL5

- yesyniri
  RCL5 - dark - CL5

'dark chicken or black chicken'
It is difficult to say whether the above category has the same degree of compounding as English blackbird.

Bolinger (1967) suggests that for exclusively attributive adjectives in English 'a good case can be made for recognizing most instances of these as a raw material for compounding'. The same could be said about restrictive adjectives in Lam Nso which are almost exclusively attributive. This process of compounding Bolinger relegated 'to the level of word formation or to the lexicon' (p. 33).

**Summary**

Restrictive adjectives in Lam Nso are readily nominalisable (with ellipses of the modified noun) in discourse. This process (for the available data) appears to be unproductive at the level of lexicon.

Compounding between the restrictive adjectives and the modified nouns appears to be a productive process in Lam Nso.

The next section will examine two other African languages of the same family. The discussion of possible non-restrictive-restrictive contrast in the adjectival systems of these languages is based solely on published data.
2.7 Adjectives in Igbo (a Kwa sub-branch of Niger-Congo family)

William and Beatrice Welmers describe (1968) a closed class of adjectives in Igbo as consisting of the following:

- ómá 'good'
- ójóó 'bad'
- ójíí 'dark, black'
- ōca 'white, light'
- ukwu 'large'
- ńtà 'small'
- ọhụụụ 'new'
- ọcyè 'old'

These adjectives are characterised by a particular semantic feature which the Welmers call 'the category membership'. The modified noun is 'a member of a category which is good, black and so on' (p. 321), i.e. the referent is identified and subcategorised in terms of properties encoded by the adjectives as opposed to other members of the class with similar properties. This definition of the function of the set of adjectives above suggests that they function restrictively.

(1) ėrērē ńtà
Plate small - saucer

'a small plate'

'one of a category of small plates, perhaps a salad plate or a saucer, as opposed to a dinner plate' (p. 321).

These Igbo adjectives appear to have a function which is similar to restrictive function of adjectives in compounding described for other languages in the study. The compound lexemes form a new subcategory, of varying stability.

The examples given in the Welmers data suggest the
restrictive function of the closed set of adjectives at the level of lexicon. It would be interesting to investigate if these adjectives also function restrictively at the level of discourse and can be temporarily nominalised.

The apparent restrictive (lexically) nature of the closed set of Igbo adjectives in the compound lexemes contrasts with the non-restrictive nature of a related or homophonous noun in a relative clause' (p. 322). (It is not clear why it is not considered to be the same adjective).

**Restrictive**

(2) ãgâjì ãkwù
spoon large spoon of a type, as a tablespoon
(adjective)

this contrasts with:

**Non-restrictive**

(3) ãkumè dì ãkwù
stone to be describable in terms of
'a large stone'

(4) ãròmà ñtà
orange small
'a lime' (a small orange)

(adjective)

this contrasts with:

(5) ãkumè dì ñtà
stone to be describable in terms of
'a small stone'

(noun)
There is another verb in Igbo which means 'to be identified as' (p. 319); it occurs in equative type of clauses, in contrast to the verb di above which occurs in ascriptive type (Lyons 1977: 469-70)

(6) Ọ́bú ọ́kú it to be identified fire 'It is fire' as

it contrasts with:

(7) Ọ́dí ọ́kb fire 'It is hot'

If the closed set of adjectives can be analysed as restrictive adjectives, as the Welmers data suggests, the translation of:

(8) ?? ụkúme ụbú ntà́ this stone to be identified small as (adjective)

should read as an equative clause with temporarily nominalised adjective:

'This stone is the small one' in contrast to:

(9) ụkúme ụdí ntà́ 'The stone is small'

2.8 Adjectives in Tupuri (Adamawa subgroup of Niger-Congo family)
The adjectives in Tupuri exist as independent class.
They can function as predicates (without copula). (Hagege 1974:130)

(1) wíl n kíI child this little 'This child is little'
In modifier position these adjectives occur in two types of constructions:

(a) adjective following the noun without any marker between them:

(2) \( w^l(1) \quad k^lI \quad 'a \ little \ child' \)

child  little

According to Hagege, the noun in this construction is taken as indefinite, as opposed to:

(b) adjective following the noun with a marker between them:

(3) \( w^l(1) \quad m^a: \quad k^lI \quad 'the \ little \ child' \)

child  who  little

where the noun is taken as definite and 'the notion of definiteness implies selection and exclusion (p. 130).

This analysis suggests that the marked (b) category of adjective functions restrictively while the (a) category is non-restrictive, it does not imply 'selection and exclusion'.

(4) \( h^o:le^\quad m^a: \quad br^a:de^\quad 'the \ sour \ food' \)

food  sour

(5) \( h^a:ri^\quad m^a: \quad gl^fle^\quad 'the \ light \ faggot' \)

faggot  light

(6) \( k^o: \quad ^\quad m^a: \quad kl^u: \quad 'the \ big \ tree' \)

These examples, according to Hagege, stand in opposition
Summary

The data suggests that the difference between (a) and (b) types of functions of adjectives in Tupuri is analogous to the difference between non-restrictive and restrictive modification in other languages in the study. It is not possible to say (due to insufficient data) if the same marking is used to differentiate restrictive and non-restrictive function both at the levels of discourse and lexicon.
Footnotes

1. I was not able to obtain the articles published by the Grebes. (According to Grebe, they would have been of little relevance to me). However, Karl Grebe sent me a few pages from the Appendix II of his yet unpublished work which contained some relevant information.

2. Restriction on the use of pronominal subjects in the equative type of sentences with restrictive adjectives in the predicate may be due to the insufficiency of information contained in the sentence since both the subject and the predicate are anaphoric and their identity can be established only with reference to prior context.

3. There is a change in tonal pattern of the nominalizing suffix -in in this construction. (Grebe, Appendix II)

4. The term 'noun class' has varied application in the literature discussing noun classes. Greenberg, (1978) uses the term 'noun class' as a superordinate term which includes gender system (also sex gender) as well as numeral classifiers and possessive classifiers. This term 'gender' applies to distinctions found in languages like Bantu and also to sex correlated gender. Dixon (1982) uses the term 'noun class' to refer to distinctions of the type found in the Bantu languages and uses the term 'gender' in application to sex correlated gender. 'Gender' is viewed by him as a particular instance of 'noun class'.

5. Grassfields Bantu working group is involved in multinational effort to document the linguistics of the North West and the South West provinces of Cameroon.

6. Grebe (Appendix II) lists 10 classes for Lam Nso'.

7. This discussion of Hjelmslev's approach is based not on the original work (in Danish) but on discussions of it in Thrane (1980: 78-9). The title of Hjelmslev's original work is: Hjelmslev, L. 1956, 'On numerus og genus', in Festskrift to Christen Moller, Copenhagen: Bergen.

8. There are changes in the tones of the prefixes (Grebe, Appendix 2).
CHAPTER THREE
AUSTRALIAN FAMILY

3. Restrictive and non-restrictive modifiers in Kuniyanti

3.1 Introduction

Kuniyanti is an Australian Aboriginal language spoken by about 100 people in the Southern Kimberley region of Western Australia. It is a non-Pama-Nyungan language (Wurm 1972). Pama-Nyungan is the largest genetic grouping in the continent. All information about the language and the data for the analysis are based on an unpublished paper entitled 'Notes on the Kuniyanti noun phrase' by Bill McGregor. The paper forms a part of his PhD thesis (University of Sydney) and the material from it is reproduced here with his kind permission.

Kuniyanti as described by McGregor is a partly ergative language. The marking of ergativity is optional and takes the form of a postposition bound to the noun phrase. There are other NP functions (McGregor does not use the term 'case'): Locative, Dative, Allative and
Ablative. These functions are also marked by postpositions. The subject and object functions are cross-referenced in the verb.

According to McGregor, noun and adjective in Kuniyanti are not clearly distinguishable if purely formal criteria are used. However, they may be distinguished on the basis of co-occurrence restrictions: adjectives cannot occur with classifiers. In contrast to nouns, they cannot be specified. There are also some derivational processes that differ in both categories. Dixon (1980:274-5) notes that a similar situation exists in many Australian languages. For languages that lack formal criteria for differentiating nouns from adjectives he suggests that semantic criteria 'can be brought in to distinguish adjective from noun'.

As mentioned earlier, my analysis of restrictive and non-restrictive modification in Kuniyanti is based solely on the material from McGregor's paper. It was not possible to obtain any additional data from an informant to clarify any uncertainties. As a result, the analysis below is to be taken only as an exploratory sketch.
3.2 Restrictive and nonrestrictive demonstratives in Kuniyanti

Data involving the use of demonstratives, and McGregor's descriptions of their functions, suggest that the demonstratives in Kuniyanti can be used restrictively and non-restrictively. The difference between restrictive and non-restrictive functions appears to be marked by the word order. (McGregor also notes that emphatic prominence may be more relevant as a marker of restrictive use of demonstratives.) A demonstrative used restrictively usually follows the head. Some examples of restrictive use of demonstratives.

Question:

(1) kampa warangkinyja? water you are holding it

'Do you have any water?'

(2) yuwu kampa ngirntaji ngurlukpa yes water this you drink it

'Yes, you drink this water'.

The nominal lexical category encoding the referent has
been established in the question. The addressee in his reply identifies a particular item of this category in terms of properties encoded by the demonstrative, i.e. the proximity of the referent to the addressee. Other present or potential items of the same category are excluded. Another example of a restrictive demonstrative:

(3) ngunyiŋ ngirntaji narangkila tinayawu
tobacco this I hold it dinner-ALLAT

'I keep this tobacco till dinner'.

In this case the nominal lexical category is given by the extra-linguistic context. The demonstrative identifies a particular member of the set in terms of its proximity to the speaker and excludes other items of the same kind.

This analysis of the role of restrictive demonstrative in identification of referents is supported by the use of a non-linguistic gesture of pointing which accompanied the utterance. The demonstrative in the above example is, according to McGregor 'narrowing the meaning from all potential possibilities to just one'.

When used non-restrictively, a demonstrative usually precedes the head. However, if restrictive modifiers are
marked, as McGregor suggests, by emphatic prominence and by a tendency to attach postposition to the adjective, the restrictive modifiers may also precede the noun. It appears to be the case in the example below:

(4) ngurru-ngka yuwulu kartpini
    that -ERG man he hit him

'That man hit him'.

The restrictive and non-restrictive use of demonstratives in Kuniyanti (and all other languages in the study) occurs at the level of discourse. A demonstrative used restrictively may be temporarily nominalised by ellipsis of the modified noun. This nominalised category is associated with the referent only for the duration of discourse. Adjectives, on the other hand, have a potential to function restrictively both at the level of discourse and at the level of lexicon (singly or in compound lexemes).

3.3 Restrictive and non-restrictive adjectives in Kuniyanti

For the available data it was difficult to separate examples of restrictive use of adjectives in discourse from those at the level of lexicon.
Examples of restrictive adjectives modifying nouns with resultant combination acquiring a specific meaning (not simply the sum of component meanings) are clearly prototypical compound lexemes. English can provide some examples of these: darkroom, blackboard, drydock, blackbird, easy chair.

Kuniyanti compounds:

**jikinya**  **marla**  'finger'
**little**  **hand**

This is an example of restrictive use of adjectives at the level of lexicon, to subcategorise a nominal category in terms of properties encoded by the adjective.

The reversal of the word order produces a non-restrictive use of the same adjective, (at the level of lexicon) when the adjective does not subcategorise the noun in

**marla**  **jikinya**  'a little hand'
**hand**  **little**

The lexically non-restrictive construction above may become restrictive in discourse and carry emphatic prominence.
Another example of what appears to be a lexically restrictive adjective in a compound:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>thiwa</th>
<th>kurnpu</th>
<th>used in reference to a white woman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>red</td>
<td>woman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Colour adjectives can also play no part in subcategorization of the noun they modify, i.e. they are used non-restrictively. The order of adjective and noun is reversed in this case.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>jika</th>
<th>lapawu</th>
<th>'a white flower'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>flower</td>
<td>white</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This lexically non-restrictive adjective may become restrictive in discourse and to be marked by emphatic prominence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>lamparti</th>
<th>saddle</th>
<th>'jockey saddle'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>little</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This example is also a case of lexically restrictive, subcategorising function of adjectives in Kuniyanti, while

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>saddle</th>
<th>lamparti</th>
<th>'a small saddle, not a specific one for jockeys'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>small</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
is the same combination of the adjective and the noun, with lexically non-restrictive use of the adjective.

These are the examples of compound lexemes. It appears that in a fully compounded adjective + noun, the noun cannot be omitted, e.g. one cannot refer to an easy chair as an easy one or to a blackboard as a black one, but it is possible to use a supercategory to refer to a subcategory. One can refer to an easy chair as a chair, to a blackboard as a board.

It is not possible to estimate the degree of compounding in the Kuniyanti examples above without checking with an informant whether it is possible to omit the noun. There are examples in Kuniyanti which indicate that the restrictive adjective + noun combination has a low degree of compounding at the lexical level. In these examples the noun, according to McGregor, may be omitted in discourse (as a presupposed item) and the adjective temporarily nominalised.

mirri  thikiya  'at short sun, or at sunset'
sun    short-LOC
marla  tumu-ngka  'with a fist'
hand  shut-ERG
3.4 Nominalisations of restrictive adjectives in Kuniyanti

The discussion above provided some examples of nominalisations of restrictive adjectives both in compound lexemes and in discourse (with the omission of the noun).

There are some examples of permanent nominalisations of restrictive adjectives alone, with adjectives attaining independent nominal status. Adjective thiki 'short' when nominalised means 'bit, piece', as in thiki-yurruru

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{thiki-yurruru} & \text{karntiwire} & \text{nganti} \\
\text{short-dual} & \text{two} & \text{beef}
\end{array}
\]

'two bits/pieces of beef'

This is an example of permanent nominalisation of a restrictive adjective at the level of lexicon. The same adjective can be temporarily nominalised at the level of discourse. According to McGregor, in this case it means 'a short thing, or a short one'.

Another adjective that can be thought of as a permanently nominalised restrictive adjective is jikinya 'little one/child'. The nominal item presupposed here is not context dependent but is part of general knowledge.
3.5 Summary

The available data and the analysis of it above suggest the following:

1. The word order in Kuniyanti noun phrase consisting of an adjective and a noun tends to be significant for differentiating between restrictive and non-restrictive use of adjectives only at the level of lexicon. Restrictive, subcategorising adjectives in fully compounded items tend to precede the modified noun, as in jikinya marla 'finger' while non-restrictive adjectives, playing no part in subcategorisation of the modified noun tend to follow the noun, as in marla jikinya 'a little hand'.

2. At the level of discourse the word order appears to play no part in distinguishing restrictive from non-restrictive adjectives. The restrictive function of adjectives is marked by emphatic prominence. There is also a tendency to attach the postposition to the adjective in restrictive function (rather than to the noun).

These suggestions need to be verified by an additional data from a native speaker of Kuniyanti.

4.1 Noun markers in Tagalog and their function

In Tagalog nominal functions are marked by noun markers *ang*, *ng*, *sa* for common nouns and *si*, *ni* and *kay* for proper nouns (Ramos 1975: 19-20). The referents of the nominal expressions marked by these markers are identified in terms of their semantic and syntactic roles, properties encoded by the lexemes and their pragmatic status.

The following examples will illustrate the functions of the noun markers.

(1) Magbibigay *ng* mangga *sa*
    AF - give OC mango DC
    bata ang baba
    child T woman

'The woman will give the mango to the child'.

(2) Ibibigay ng babae ang mangga
GF - give AC woman T mango
sa bata
DC child

'The woman will give the mango to the child'.

(3) Bibigyan ng babae ng mangga
give - LF AC woman OC mango
ang bata
T child

'The woman will give the mango to the child'.

For all the above examples I have selected a situation where all three referents encoded by the nouns are presupposed, i.e. the speaker and the addressee know the identity of all three referents. This condition is imposed to demonstrate more clearly the pragmatic function of the noun phrase marked by ang and usually referred to as 'topic'.

Most Tagalog verbs are marked for what is usually termed as focus. The marking on the verb usually takes the form of a suffix or a prefix. These indicate the agreement between the verb and one of its arguments.
marked by ang. The verbal affixes vary in form depending on the semantic role of the ang phrase. These semantic roles could be that of: actor, goal, benefactive, instrument and locative (Ramos 1975: 21-22). In the examples above, (1) is an actor focus construction marked by mag - prefix on the verb and ang noun marker on the actor babae; (2) is the goal focus construction marked by i - prefix on the verb and ang marker on the goal mangga; (3) is the locative focus, marked by - an suffix on the verb and ang on the noun bata.

All three above sentences are translated by the same English gloss. This, naturally, raises a question of how they differ in communication situation and why the speaker chooses one of the three variants. Schachter (1976: 497) ask the same question: 'When a sentence contains more than one noun phrase whose referentiality is presupposed, it is not always clear why one of these noun phrases rather than the other is chosen as topic. This is a matter that requires further investigation.' My work with the native speaker of Tagalog suggests that for an unmarked declarative sentences, as for examples above, the selection of one of the 3 variants is conditioned by the speakers choice of what noun phrase
he/she wants to present as new information. This noun phrase is then marked by ang. The (1) example will be used when the noun marked by ang, the actor, is the new information. The question that can be asked in this case is:

(4) Sino ang magbibigay ng mango
   who T AF - give OC
   mangga sa bata?
   mango DC child

'Who will give the mango to the child?'

Sentence (1) is a reply. It is also possible to reduce the full reply to just ang babaé 'the woman'.

Similarly in examples (2) and (3) the new information is marked by ang and the questions that can be asked will be: for (2)

(5) Ano ang ibibigay ng babaé
   What T GF - give AC woman
   sa bata?
   DC child

'What will the woman give to the child?'

Again the full reply (2) can be reduced to ang mangga 'the
For (3) the question is:

(6) Sino ang pagbibigyan ng babaeg mangga?
    who T give - LF AC woman

OC mango

'To whom will the woman give the mango?'

The reply (3) can be shortened to ang bata 'the child'.

As indicated earlier, the referents of all three nouns in the above examples 1-3 are presupposed and this presupposition is not a sufficient criterion for the selection of a noun phrase to be marked by ang. The noun phrase marked by ang must also be selected by the speaker as new information (for unmarked sentences). The noun phrase marked by ang, however, is obligatorily presupposed while noun phrases marked by ng and sa are not.

In example (1) both mangga 'mango' and bata 'child' do not have to be presupposed.

In relation to discourse, it is possible to distinguish two levels of presupposition (see also discussion of it
in the introduction). This valuable distinction between
the two levels of presupposition was made by Kuno (1972:
271-272). The first level of presupposition (he does not
use this term) refers to the presupposed status of the
referents, encoded by the nouns at any point of time in
discourse and is not dependent on the speaker's choice of
distribution of information between given and new within
a sentence. The items are treated as presupposed at this
level on the basis of the following criteria:

1. They are known to both the speaker and the addressee
   as generic nouns referring to an individual or a
   thing as representatives of particular classes of
   referents, e.g. the linguist in

   (7) The linguist would approach this problem from a different
   angle.

2. They are known to both the speaker and the addressee
   because they refer to unique items, e.g. the sun, the moon.

3. The items are anaphoric, i.e. known to the speaker and
   the addressee from: a) previous discourse
   b) non-linguistic situation

This level of presupposition Kuno terms 'the registry of
discourse.'
The second type of presupposition is involved in the distribution of information within a sentence between given or presupposed and new. The information presupposed in the first sense can be treated by the speaker as new information on sentential level, it is 'pulled out' of the registry of discourse and presented as new. An example from Kuno will illustrate the difference between the two levels of presupposition.

(8) a) Among John, Mary and Tom, who is the eldest?
    b) Tom is the eldest. (Kuno 1972: 271-272)

Tom in a) is presupposed in the first sense, as lexical item in the registry of discourse, a noun of unique reference, known to both the speaker and the addressee. In b) Tom is presented as new information at the level of the distribution of sentential information, but remains presupposed information as the lexical item in the registry of discourse, a noun with unique reference for the participants of discourse. This brings us now to the function of ang marker in Tagalog at the two levels of presupposition discussed above.

Ang marks a noun phrase that is obligatorily presupposed information in the first sense, i.e. as an item in the registry of discourse. However, at the second level of presupposition, ang usually marks new sentential informa-
tion with the rest of the sentence presented by the speaker as presupposed, given information.

When the whole of the sentence is new information, ang marks the actor.

(9) Ano ang balita?
What T new

'What is new?'

Possible answers:

(10) Dumating ang kapatid ko
AF - come T brother I

'My brother came'.

(11) Nasanog ang palengke
burn T market

'The market burned down'.

'My brother' and 'the market' are treated by the speaker as presupposed information of the first type, as items of unique reference and general community knowledge respectively.

From the point of view of presupposition at the level of a sentence, both nouns marked by ang are part of new informa-
tion which in this case constitutes the whole sentence.

Nouns marked by sa can also function as new information. Unlike the noun phrases marked by ang, the nouns marked by sa may or may not be presupposed. Sa nouns are unmarked for presupposition, but are marked for a particular semantic-syntactic roles, usually that of a locative noun phrase or directional complement.\(^2\)

(12) Bumili ako ng libro sa tindahan
AF-buy I-T OC book LOC store

'I bought the book at a/the store'.

This sentence would be an acceptable answer to a question:

(13) Saan mo binili ang libro
Where you GF-buy T book

'Where did you buy the book?'

The answer (12) can be reduced to:

(14) sa tindahan
LOC store

'In the store'.

\(^2\)
Nouns marked by ng can also carry new information in a sentence. Ng, however, does not contribute to the pragmatic status of a noun. The new information may be carried by the noun itself, without the noun marker ng contributing anything to the pragmatic status of the noun.

(15) Gusto ko ng libro
    want I-AC OC book

'I want a book'.

This could be an answer to a question:

(16) Ano mo ang gusto/ano ang
    What you T want what T

gusto mo?
want you-AC

The answer (15) can be reduced to:

(17) libro - 'a book'
    book

and not:

*ng libro
It is often stated that *ng marks indefinite noun phrases. This is often the case; however, *ng can also mark presupposed noun phrases (our examples 1-3). The *ng marker is non-committal as to the presupposed status of the noun it marks. In (15) it is the only sentence frame that can be used to convey indefinite meaning as opposed to:

(18) Gusto ko ang libro
want I T book

'I want the book'.

In answers to identifying questions of the type 'What is it?', the answer may be ang libro 'the book' - a particular book or simply libro - 'a book', but not *ng libro.

The above discussion of various functions of noun markers may seem irrelevant to the topic of restrictive and non-restrictive adjectives. However, it is necessary for explaining why it is the ang marker that is chosen to mark citation forms of nominalised restrictive adjectives. These will be discussed in the following section.

Summary of noun markers in Tagalog and their functions

Ang - marks a noun which in unmarked sentences has independent pragmatic status as new information; it is
obligatorily presupposed at the level of item in the registry of discourse and is unmarked for syntactic or semantic roles.

sa - marks a noun which can have independent pragmatic status as new information, but is unmarked for presupposition (as registry of discourse item). It is syntactically marked as directional complement (for verbs like 'give') or a locative NP.

ng - marks a noun which is unmarked for pragmatic status as given - new information as well as for presupposed status as an item in the registry of discourse. It is syntactically marked as verbal complement.

Ang marker qualifies to mark citation forms of nominalised restrictive adjectives due to its role as a marker of nouns which are semantically and syntactically unmarked, have obligatory presupposed status as items in the registry of discourse and have independent pragmatic status. Within a sentence these nominalised adjectives can be marked by other noun markers.

4.2 Restrictive and non-restrictive modifications in Tagalog

The distribution of information in unmarked Tagalog clauses is from general to particular (Naylor 1975: 56-58).
The initial verb encodes general information: the type of action, the participants involved as well as the semantic role (agent, goal, etc.) of the noun phrase in focus. The noun phrase marked by *ang* particularises this information at the lexical level. A similar distribution of information from general to particular holds also for the distribution of information within a noun phrase between the restrictive modifier and the modified: the restrictive modifier usually follows the head.

Modification relationship between modifiers and their heads is usually marked in Tagalog by the ligature/linker *na/ng*: *na* occurs between the modifier and the modified or vice versa, *na* changes to *ng* if the first member of the modification construction ends in a vowel or *-n*.

4.2.1 Restrictive modification (marked NPs)

The function of restrictive modifiers is to identify the referent of the noun in terms of properties encoded by the modifier (Lyons 1977: 761), out of a set including other present or potential referents of the same nominal class. The set encoded by the noun is always presupposed (at different levels of presupposition - anaphoric, generic or unique reference).
The restrictive modification in Tagalog is marked by word order: the modifier follows the head. This can be illustrated with examples of restrictive modification involving noun + noun, noun + demonstrative and noun + adjective.

**Noun + linker + noun**

(19) Kalang laruan
    stove toy

'a toy stove'

(Schachter & Otanes: 120)

(20) taong bayan
    people town

'townfolk, towns people'

The first noun indicates the class of the referent and the second noun restricts it (or subcategorises) to a subset of this class. It is a process of compounding by means of which new lexical nominal categories can be formed. In many cases, however, the combination of restrictive modifier and the head does not acquire an independent status of a new lexical category, which is always the case for restrictive modification involving demonstrative and for most cases of adjectives.
Noun + linker + demonstrative

(21) Mahal ang damit na ito expensive T dress linker this-T

'This dress is expensive'.

(Schachter and Otanes 1972: 120)

The demonstrative restricts the reference to a particular member of subset of dresses, the subset being individuated in terms of its spatial characteristics and the particular member of it in terms of its proximity to the speaker.

In Tagalog there is a 3 member subset: ito - 'this one', iyan - 'that one' (far) and iyon - 'that one' (yonder). The restrictive demonstrative can carry contrastive meaning, (21) can be contrasted with (22):

(22) pero mura ang damit na iyan but cheap T dress linker that

'but that dress is cheap'.

(Schachter and Otanes 1972: 120)
The restrictive use of demonstrative does not have to be contrastive, in:

(23) Gusto ko ang damit na iyan
    want I T dress linker that

'I want that dress'.

The referent here can be identified in terms of its location only, without implication of contrast with another dress, as is the case when the set of referents = 1 member.

The demonstrative can be used restrictively in complex modification constructions.

(24) Gusto ko ang hinog na
    want I T ripe linker

manggang ito
mango - linker this

'I want this ripe mango'.

As mentioned above, in restrictive modification involving all cases of demonstratives, the new subset of noun + linker + demonstrative does not become permanently nominalised, it does not gain permanent status as an independent nominal
category. It can only be temporarily nominalised for the duration of the discourse.

(25) Gusto ko ito
want I this one

'I want this one'.

The spatial properties encoded by demonstratives are variable depending on the location of the speaker and any referent cannot be permanently associated with these properties. Adjectival properties, however, can be invariably associated with a referent and be used to refer, becoming permanent nominal categories, e.g. Tagalog ang mga itim plural black

and English 'blacks'.

Noun + linker + adjective

Restrictive modification involving an adjective as restrictive modifier follows the same pattern as modification involving nouns and demonstratives. P. Schachter and F. Otaines suggest that in positions where noun + linker + adjective is marked by a noun marker, the order adjective + linker + noun or noun + linker + adjective does not have 'any apparent difference in meaning' (p. 122). This is true when the sentence with such noun phrase is considered in isolation, outside
context, when it is not part of discourse. When a sentence is part of discourse, the relative order of noun and adjective in a modification construction does contribute to a difference in meaning. My work with the informant suggests that restrictive modification involving an adjective follows the same pattern as noun + noun and noun + demonstrative - the restrictive adjective follows the head.

(26) Gusto ko ang itog
want I T this-linker

manggang
mango-linker

hinog
ripe

'I want this ripe mango'.

The set of referents in this situation is 'mangoes', the speaker identifies or selects a member of the subset 'ripe mangoes', as opposed to green, unripe ones. The set encoded by the noun is presupposed.

The new subcategory 'ripe mango' does not have a permanent nominal status. Only temporary nominalization results:

(27) Gusto ko ang hinog
want I T ripe

'I want the ripe one'.

The above example may be an answer to a question: 'What kind of/which mango do you want?' and not 'What do you want?' which is a further evidence of the temporary categorical status of the nominalised adjective.

Other examples of restrictive adjectives:

(28) Bumili sila ng bahay na maliit
buy-AF they-T OC house linker small

'They bought a small house'.

(Schachter & Otanes 1972: 122)

According to my informant, this would be an answer to the question: 'What kind of/which house did they buy?' and not 'What did they buy?' The nominal set 'houses' is presupposed.

(29) Gusto ko ang barong pulang
want I T dress-linker red

'I want the red dress'.

Similarly, (29) would be an answer to a question: 'What kind of/which dress do you want?' rather than 'What do you want?'
The above sentence is spoken in the context of someone trying to get through a very narrow door.

The presupposed set of referents here is encoded by the generic noun 'men'. The speaker identifies or selects a member of a subcategory of the category 'man' in terms of properties encoded by the adjective. (30) is an answer to the question, 'What kind of a man can get through this door?' A non-restrictive reading, when the adjective can be omitted in an answer to the question 'Who can get through this door?', is not possible in this context. Tao 'a man' is not sufficient information. But it is possible to answer the same question with taong mapayat 'a thin man'. The restrictive adjective in this case combines with the noun to form a temporary compound, created only for the duration of the discourse. Both the adjective and the noun are essential information.
In the case of non-restrictive modification the preferred order for my informant is modifier + linker + noun. This applies to non-restrictive modification involving noun + linker + noun, demonstrative + linker + noun and the adjective + linker + noun.

nouns + linker + nouns

(32) laruang kalan toy stove

'a toy stove'.
This will be an answer to a question: 'What is it?', but not 'What kind of/which stove is it?' laruang 'toy' here functions as a classifier. It does not subcategorise, but simply adds an additional information about the referent (in contrast to compounding, when the modifier is essential information).

**Demonstrative + linker + noun**

(33) Mahal itong damit
    expensive this-linker dress

'This dress is expensive.'

(Schachter and Otanes: 120)

This sentence can be contrasted with:

(34) Pero mura itong sombrero
    but cheap this-liner hat

'But this hat is cheap.'

**Adjective + linker + noun**

(35) Mahal ang hinog na mangga
    expensive T ripe linker mango

in the context of 'but this green papaya is cheap'.
It is a possible answer to a question, 'What is expensive?' and not 'What kind of/which mango is expensive?'

Non-restrictive modifiers function as a comment by the speaker about the referent, this comment attributes some properties to the referent. The referent is identified or selected in the cases of unambiguous non-restrictive modification only in terms of properties encoded by the noun. The added adjectival comment may or may not be helpful in identifying the referent. Non-restrictive modifiers are usually not an essential information and may be omitted. In the examples (33) and (34) the demonstrative and the adjective respectively can be omitted and the addressee still will be able to identify the referent (of course for (33), ang marker will have to be used if the demonstrative is omitted).

More examples of restrictive and non-restrictive adjectives:

(36) sa palengke nakakita kami ng
LOC market saw we-T OC

mga puti itim at abushin na
plural white black and greyish linker

manok. Bumili kami ng isang puti
chicken AF-buy we-T OC one white
dahil ang mga itim ay masyadong
because T plural black IM too

maliliit
small

'At the market we saw white black and greyish chickens. We bought a white one, as the black ones were too small.'

Adjectives puti, itim and abuhin, preceding the noun manok 'chicken' are examples of non-restrictive adjectives. The adjectives may be omitted. The underlined marked noun phrases, containing adjectives only are examples of temporary nominalization (for the duration of discourse) of restrictive adjectives. These adjectives temporarily subcategorise the class 'chickens' into subcategories, identified in terms of adjectival properties, i.e. their colour. The presupposition of the modified noun is marked by ellipsis.

(37) Sa lumang bayan ng Los Banos
LOG old-linker town GEN 4
minsan ay may magandang dalaga
once IM there is beautiful-linker maiden
na nagngangalang Maria Makiling
linker named-linker
'In the old town of Los Banos there once lived a beautiful maiden named Maria Makiling'.

(From the Legend of Mount Makiling as told by Amy Kempis, my informant).

The underlined NPs contain examples of non-restrictive adjectives, they are not essential information for identifying the referent and may be omitted.

Ramos (1971: 124-125) contrasts the restrictive and non-restrictive adjectives in the form of minimal pairs (she does not use the terms restrictive and non-restrictive):

**Non-restrictive**

\[ A + L + N \]

(38) lumang kalan
'old stove'

(39) magandang dalaga
'beautiful girl'

(40) maputik na sahig
'muddy floor'

**Restrictive**

\[ N + L + A \]

kalang luma
'stove which is old'

= old stove

dalagang maganda
'girl who is beautiful'

= beautiful girl

sahig na maputik
'floor which is muddy'

= muddy floor
Ramos translates the post-posed adjective by restrictive relative clause in English. This indicates the restrictive function of the post-posed adjective, rather than suggest that it is a relative clause. A more precise translation would indicate that the restrictive adjective in English is marked by prominence.

4.3. Unmarked NPs with adjectives as modifiers

So far, we have discussed modification involving noun phrases marked by noun markers. According to Schachter and Otanes (1972: 121) 'decided word order preferences obtain with adjectives as modifiers only when we have an unmarked noun phrase, i.e. it is in predicate.' The discussion above has indicated that this is not limited only to unmarked noun phrases in the predicate, but also holds true for marked noun phrases.
According to Schachter and Otanes, the noun + linker + adjective order in unmarked NP is preferred when the whole NP is new information. Their examples:

(43) Doktor na bantog ang ama
doctor linker famous T father

ni Juan
POSS

'Juan's father is a famous doctor.'

doctor na bantog - is all new information.

But in:

(44) Bantog na doktor ang ama
famous linker doctor T father

ni Juan
POSS

'Juan's father is a famous doctor'.

bantog na doktor is the preferred order when only 'famous' is new information.

(43) would be an answer to a question 'What is Juan's
father?' and (44) 'What kind of doctor is Juan's father?'

Both unmarked noun phrases are not part of the predicate in an equative type of sentence, i.e. they are not used referentially; these noun phrases are a part of a predicate in an ascriptive type of sentence. An equative sentence is used to identify 'the referent of one expression with the referent of another' while an ascriptive sentence 'ascripts to the referent of the subject expression a certain property'. 'The subject and the complement of equative but not ascriptive sentences are freely permutable'. (Lyons 1977: 471-473).

This variation in function between the marked noun phrases with adjectives modifying nouns and unmarked noun phrases of the same type, plays a part in conditioning the relative word order in both types of phrases. In marked noun phrases, the preferred relative word order of adjective and noun is conditioned by the role the adjective plays in identification of a referent.

In an unmarked noun phrase, the preferred relative word order of adjective and noun appears to be conditioned by the relative status of adjective or noun as given or new information.
In marked NPs both restrictive and non-restrictive adjectives can be either new or given sentential information.

New information

Non-restrictive

(45) Nakita ko ang kanyong magandang
saw I T his/her pretty-linker

kapatid
sister

'I saw his pretty sister'.

This is an answer to the question: 'Who did you see there?'

Restrictive

(46) Nakita ko ang kanyong kapatid
saw I T his/her sister

na maganda
linker pretty

^ 'I saw his pretty sister'.
It is a possible answer to the same question as for the above non-restrictive case.

In (45) *magandang* 'pretty' is a part of new sentential information. It is non-restrictive, it is a comment about his sister and plays no role in identification of the referent. It may be omitted. There is also no implication of a set of referents from which the selection is made, i.e. that he has other sisters.

In (46), *maganda* is also a part of new sentential information; the adjective here is used restrictively: the referent is identified in terms of properties encoded by the adjective out of a set of other referents of the same class. In other words, it is implied here that the addressee knows that the referent has other sisters, who are not pretty. The noun here is given or presupposed as an item in the registry of discourse, but which is, at the same time, the new sentential information.

**Given information**

**Non-restrictive**

'Where is the black book?'
The black book is on the table.

Restrictive

Where is the black book?

The black book is on the table.

In (47) *itim 'black* is a part of given information, the non-restrictive adjective may be omitted and the referent identified in terms of properties encoded by the noun and the marker *ang*. There is no implication that the referent is selected out of a set of other books.

In (48) *itim 'black* is also a part of given information. It is restrictive, the referent is identified or selected in terms of properties encoded by this adjective, out of
a set of other referents of the same class that are present. There is an implication that there are other books which are not on the table. The above discussion can be summarised in a table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function of adjective</th>
<th>Marked NP</th>
<th>Unmarked NP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N L+A</td>
<td>A+L+N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictive</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non_restrictive</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referential (as part of NP)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascriptive (as part of sentence predicate)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given sentential information</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ (whole NP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New sentential information</td>
<td>✓ (whole NP or adjective only)</td>
<td>✓ (whole NP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N - noun    L - linker    A - adjective
4.4. Nominalization of restrictive adjectives in Tagalog

Nominalization is a very productive process in Tagalog. Verbs, adjectives, demonstratives, adverbs can all be nominalised. (T. Ramos 1975: 81-82)

Nominalised items are marked by noun markers. For most of these cases the nominalization is a temporary one, dependent on the linguistic or non-linguistic context. Only very few items involving restrictive adjectives result in the restrictive adjective alone, or restrictive adjective and the noun it modifies, becoming a new lexical nominal category.

In Tagalog the temporary and permanent (when the nominalised adjective acquires the categorial status of a noun) stages are not formally differentiated (unlike English, 'the black ones' and 'the blacks'). The citation forms of nominalised adjectives are always marked by ang, the choice of this noun marker rather than the others was discussed earlier in this chapter. (pp. 225)

The nominalised adjectives (both temporary and permanent) can carry nominal plural marker mga and in my informant's speech, the plurality must also be, where possible, indicated on the adjectival form by reduplication.

Underlined noun phrases in sentence (36) are examples of temporary nominalization of the restrictive adjectives.
Restrictive Adjectives, lexicalised as nouns

(49) ang mga mahihirap

nominal plural poor - REDUP

'm the poor ones/the poor'

ang mga kabataan

young

'm the young ones/the young'

ang mga matatanda

old-REDUP

'm the old ones/the old'

ang mga itim

black

'm the black ones/the blacks'

ang mga puti

white

'm the white ones/the whites'
A number of adjectives borrowed from Spanish also can be nominalised when used restrictively.

(50) ang probinsiyana (o)  
'a country girl (boy)'

ang kolehiyala  
'a coed'

ang nobisiyada  
'a convent girl/novice'

Restrictive adjectives, compounded with nouns they modify

When both the adjective and the noun are necessary information in identification of a referent, a lexical compound results. As in other cases of restrictive modification in Tagalog, the adjective follows the noun.

(51) ang taong dilaw  
man-linker yellow  
'the yellow man/Chinese'

ang taong itim  
man-linker black  
'the black man'
(52) Lito! Lito, ani Aling Luz. Po! Ano po iyon?
Lito! Lito! said Aling Luz. 'Yes, what is it'?

Lito, pumunta ka sa tindahang sarisari
store-linker varied, different kinds


'Lito, go to the variety store of Aling Paz. Buy some bread, - said Aling Luz'.

(Bowen 1968: 59)

Tindahang sarisari is an example of compounding, involving a restrictive adjective (marked by post-position to the noun) and the noun it modifies.

Summary

Tagalog, an Austronesian language, was found to distinguish between the restrictive and non-restrictive functions of adjectives. This distinction is marked by the relative order of the adjective and the noun it modifies. When the adjective in marked NP is used restrictively, the preferred order is for it to follow the modified noun;
when it is used non-restrictively - to precede it. For unmarked NPs the reverse applies. 5

In Tagalog, temporary nominalization of restrictive adjectives may be marked (a) by ellipsis of the modified noun, with the adjective retaining the noun markers, (b) by the temporary 'compounding' of the adjective and the noun as in example (46). In both cases the referent of the noun is presupposed at the level of an item in the registry of discourse. (a) occurs most frequently when the noun is given sentential information and adjective - new, (b) when both the adjective and the noun are new sentential information - a less frequent occurrence (for marked NPs). Similarly, permanent nominalizations of restrictive adjectives in Tagalog are also marked by ellipsis of the modified noun or by compounding.

Permanent nominalisations result in new nominal lexical categories. It appears that in Tagalog, compounding is a more productive source of these rather than restrictive adjectives marked by ellipsis.
FOOTNOTES

1. I am indebted to my informant, Amy Kempis of Los Banos, for her extremely perceptive explanations of pragmatic function of ang marker. Her intuitions about other aspects of Tagalog adjectives were also very helpful.

2. The function of sa marker was pointed out to me by Bill Foley.

3. Restrictive and non-restrictive distinction applies also to the adjectives in unmarked noun phrases. In this case the distinction is made at the generic and not specific level. In the unambiguously restrictive modification, the referent is identified as belonging to a subclass of a generic category subcategorized in terms of adjectival properties. In unambiguously non-restrictive modification, the referent can be minimally identified as belonging to a generic category encoded by the noun, with the adjective functioning as an added comment.

4. GEN marks here the type of construction Schachter calls 'ng phrases of specification' (Schachter and Otanes 1972: 148).

5. In relation to the reversal of word order marking restrictive and non-restrictive distinction in unmarked NPs, I would like to draw attention to the possible function of emphatic prominence acting independently of the word order changes. In this study, only word order changes were taken into account. However, it is possible that the reversal of the word order in unmarked NPs is accompanied by the emphatic prominence marking the restrictive adjective.
CONCLUSION

As the study did not employ statistically valid sampling techniques in collecting data and was intended to be only an exploratory study, no conclusive statements about the universality of the distinction between the restrictive and non-restrictive adjectives can be made here. However if the distinction is found to be universal (for languages with adjectives), it will have the same features as described for the languages in the study. These features are listed below.

1. **Formal typology of the distinction between restrictive and non-restrictive adjectives**

   The typology of marking this distinction varies between and within the languages in the study.

   (a) **Prosodic marking**

   Emphatic prominence, the domain of which is the noun phrase, marks the restrictive function of adjectives in English, Russian, French (at the level of discourse), Serbo-Croatian (when the short form is used restrictively as an alternative to the long form), Kuniyanti (at the level of discourse) and, possibly, Tagalog (in phrases without noun markers).
(b) morphological marking

In Old Church Slavonic, Lithuanian, Serbo-Croatian (only partly, in masculine singular nominative and inanimate accusative) and Lam Nso' suffixes and prefixes are used to differentiate between the two categories of adjectives, with restrictive adjective bearing these markings.

(c) syntactic marking

(i) word order

Changes in relative word order within a noun phrase are used to distinguish the two categories in French (at the level of lexicon), Kuniyanti (also at the level of lexicon) and in Tagalog (at both levels, discourse and lexicon).

(ii) particle/verb

Tupuri distinguishes what appears to be the restrictive function of an adjective by a particle mà: preceding the adjective.

Igbo has a closed set of what appear to be lexically restrictive adjectives; the non-restrictive function is marked by the use of the adjective in the relative clause with the verb di.
2. **Pragmatic difference between the two forms of adjectives** (as prototypical categories)

In all languages in the study the restrictive form of an adjective is used when the speaker intends to identify the referent, the lexical nominal category of which is presupposed, in terms of properties encoded by the adjective and exclude other referents of the same kind.

Information carried by the adjective is the essential information and cannot be omitted.

The non-restrictive form is used when the speaker does not intend to identify the referent in terms of properties of the adjective. It is then non-essential information and may be omitted.

3. **Restrictive adjectives and categorisation**

Restrictive adjectives in all languages in the study play a role in subcategorisation of referent, while the non-restrictive ones do not.

In discourse restrictive adjectives subcategorise the referent for the duration of discourse.
At the level of lexicon the restrictive adjective may combine with the modified noun to form a new subcategory, a compound lexeme, where neither constituent is optional.

The relation between the subcategory formed that way and the category of the modified noun is that of inclusion. The inclusive relation may be marked: by the stress on the adjective, as in English blackbird (compare also with object incorporation as in bird watching); by a suffix, as in Lam Nso'; by word order as in French, Kuniyanti and Tagalog and by ellipsis in Russian.

4. Restrictive adjectives in nominalisations

Temporary nominalisations of restrictive adjectives occur at the level of discourse and result in an adjectival category of a temporary nominal status. This category is usually marked by ellipsis (Russian, Serbo-Croatian, Lithuanian, French, Tagalog) or substitution (English - 'one', Lam Nso' - suffixed concord). The created category is associated with the referent only temporarily.

Permanent nominalisations occur at the level of lexicon and may be marked by the restrictive adjective acquiring nominal markers characteristic of nouns.
invariant concord marker in Lam Nso' and noun marker in Tagalog).

In permanent nominalisations the adjective is permanently associated with the referent.

All above statements apply to the prototypical categories of restrictive and non-restrictive adjectives. These categories may be viewed as the end points of a continuum. Other categories of varying degrees of restrictiveness will occupy the intermediate points on this continuum.
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