ADJECTIVES AND RELATIVE CLAUSE REDUCTION.
A BRIEF DESCRIPTIVE AND HISTORICAL VIEW

José Oro
Universidad de Santiago

Introducción

An examination of RR constructions may provide us with insights into basic linguistic operations, such as the permutation and deletion of constituents and the substitution of one constituent for antoher. This may lead us to the idea that, at least on some occasions, pre nominal adjectives were generated by the reduction of RR clauses. The postnominal position is the normal one for RR relatives which, in most occurrences show clear synonymy with attributive adjectives in the English language.

Ross (1967:35-41)[1] has argued that grammars contain *output conditions* which impose "an ordering upon the constituents which follow the verb of the sentence which contains them, and lowers the acceptability of sentences whose constituents are not arranged in accordance with this condition". *Output conditions* eliminate the necessity of restricting individual transformational rules to produce only an acceptable order of constituents.

Unacceptable sentences do not mean, however, ungrammatical or non-interpretable, and even though some groups of adjectives have taken up fixed positions in modern English, and, as Bolinger (1967)[2] has noted, they present semantic distinctions between prenominal and postnominal positions, this does not mean they should have a different origin. Needless to say, that as language develops constantly, these distinctions were not established in their origin; Wolfe (1976)[3] states that there is no semantic distinction between prenominal and postnominal adjectives in old English comparable to those existing in modern English, even though there may be a difference in emphasis in English.

Philosophical and linguistic reasons lead us to consider these two levels of language under the following parameters: Grammaticality, acceptability and interpretability.

Our aim is to account for the correct interpretation of the deletion rule in formation of adjectives through different variables indluding adjectival forms which possess or not a parallel relative clause counterpart, acceptable in the use of language and, to describe the variables which, under certain parameters, may discriminate or restrict the function or meaning of some constituents of this level of language.

Adjectival phrases and/or RR clauses

Whereas Bever and Langedoen (1972)[4] have postulated that reduction in RR clauses is necessary in order to explain the synonymy of such phrases as 1 and 2

1) The stars which are visible
2) The visible stars

and Jacobs and Rosenbaum (1985)[5] have noted that all adjectives modifying a noun can be derived from the underlying structure of RR clauses under the theoretical arguments marked by the whiz deletion rule, and thus, all the adjectives preceding a nominal head may be derived from RR clauses, Vendler (1968)[6] signalled that not all the adjectives premodifying a noun can be converted in RR clauses and he noted that the following pairs of examples (3/4 and 5/6) do not show a parallel semantic equivalence as the adjective has followed different connotations in the two positions: as premodifier or as postmodifier.

3) She is a good dancer
4) She is a dancer who is good
5) He is a boy scout in an Austin Reed Safari suit who somehow got lucky
6) He is somehow a lucky boy scout in an Austin Reed Safari suit

A change of class is needed in 4 in order to obtain an ideational semantic equivalence with 3 as in 7.

7) She is a dancer who dances well

In 5 and 6, on the other hand, the position of the adverbial also alters the meaning of the two utterances as there exists a different controller of the adverbial in both sentences.

If, then, we think of a succession of variables (X^1, X^2, X^3) for the same level of language and of two opposed variables for different levels of language $(X, Y,)$ we may, through hypothetical devices, reach the following assumption:

> What is true for X^1 may not be true for X^2 in all or in some conditions; what is true for X may sometimes be true for Y, though in very special situations only.

Thus, different fields and levels of language can be interrelated under certain parameters both in general contextualisation and in specific enactments.

Main Variables

Variable X^1

Semantically RR clauses are like adjectives rather than clauses in that in 1 'which are visible' is intepreted as a restrictive quality of the NP, acting as a controller of the relative clause. This way of restricting qualities of NPs are, then, to be considered as post-head modifiers in NP structure.

Due to the interrelated semantic behaviour showed by a large number of adjectival phrases and their RR clauses, this group will be referred to as the variable X^1 within this level of language as they may form part of a wider range of constructions. This class of adjectives is capable of

— functioning predicatively or attributively
— being premodifiers of postmodifiers
— having RR clauses counterparts
— being gradable

Thus, if we only take into account the variable X^1 in the study of this level of language we can easily be led to the hypothesis that all the adjectives are derived from RR clauses through the deletion rule, other variables, however, are to be considered.

X^2 variable

Some adjectives capable of predicative and attributive use, such as (mere, former), etc. do not allow corresponding sentences with adjectives in RR clauses, at least acceptable in the use of language

8) *He is a good dancer*
9) *He is a dancer who dances well*
10) *He is the former president*
11) *He is the president who is former*

X^3 variable

Some adjectival forms have been given special connotations in use and due to unknown restrictions are only acceptable in postmodifying positions or in premodifying positions: Thus we tend to say<a woman alone>and<a lonely woman>, <a man asleep> and< a sleepy man>.

Therefore the whiz deletion hypothesis comes to be quite suspicious under the variables X^2 and X^3 as they do not have as their counterparts an acceptable Y variable in use.

There is no strong evidence to believe, after observing variables X^2 and X^3, that adjectives are the result of RR clauses deleted in prenominal positions, but these variables X^2 and X^3 do not necessarily show strong evidence against this

hypothesis, if we consider that variables of type Y produced under these variables are not ungrammatical or interpretable but unacceptable.

The relationship between the two variables (the X and the Y type) in relation to the parameters (G,I,A) under which this level of lenguage is considered, can be seen in the following table

G.	I.	A.
X^1/Y	X^1/Y	X^1/Y
X^2/Y	X^2/Y	
X^3/Y	X^3/Y	

This table shows how these variables concerning pre-nominal adjectives and RR clauses stand under certain parameters in a=b identity in relation to *use*, *non-use* and *usage* of the languaje.

It is only under these three new parameters (i.e.*use, non-use* and *usage*) that we can undertake the arguments for and against on the formation of adjectives through deletion of RR clauses.

It is obvious that the arguments for the whiz deletion hypothesis are far out weighed by the arguments against it. And although both the data and some remarks made in literature seem to postulate that this hypothesis is highly suspect, there is a misrepresentation in the two arguments regarding the meanings of variables X, Y as they apply to a general descriptive conception of language. To demand, rigidly, a different semantic representation for variables X^1, X^2 and X^3 in relation to Y is to ignore the notions of grammatical(G), acceptable (A) or interpretable (I).

Thus, sentence[7] (10)

10) He is the former president
is grammatical and interpretable as is (12)
12) He is the man who is the former president
And so is (11)
11)* He is the president who is former

Although native speakers would not accept the third sentence in this group, Sentence (11), however, is certainly grammatical in that what we have is a restricted an NP, and within the clause an adjective which has lost in use its predicative properties. It is interpretable through contextual relations by exclusion of words with the same phonetic level It is, then unacceptable in form rather than in content for the intrinsic connotations given in *use* and *usage* to the adjectival form <former> (i.e.it is a case of lexical unacceptability.)

To say, then, that there is little evidence to state that all adjectives in prenominal positions are the result of RR clauses reduction is to ignore that interaction and crossing of functions and meaning and changes of functional

meaning have been produced in the daily use of grammatical constituents along the history of language.

In this sense the relationship between 3 and 4 and the interpretability and grammaticality of 4 can only be explained by the interactive meaning of the adverbial and adjectival forms good/well.[8]

13) He is a dancer who dances well.

Conclusion

It is difficult to see how non-acceptable sentences such as those produced under the variables X^2 and X^3 could be clear arguments against whiz-deletion in the formation of adjectives. Theoretical descriptive approaches on contemporary levels of the English language can not help us to decide whether or not all adjectives were the result of relative clause reduction as formulated by Ross (1967). Nor do they give evidence that such adjectives were not generated in prenominal position (either as adjectives or as restrictive relative clauses).

As Haimen (1974)[9] pointed out

> (...) independently motivated and formally unrelated rules in the
> grammar of a language may in a sense conspire to produce some kind
> of favourite surface structure peculiar to that language.

Therefore, interactive surface structure adjectives may only indicate that they took up certain positions according to different parameters of a particular level of language and in this way they can be included in one or another variable in *usage.*

Notes:

1. Ross, John Robert (1967) "Constraints in Syntax". Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, M.I.T. (Available through Indiana University Linguistics Club).
2. Bolinger, Dwight (1967) "Adjectives in English: Attribution and Predication", *Lingua,* 18,1-34.
3. Wolfe, S. (1976) "Relative Clauses in English". Unpublished Ph. D. Thesis (Available through U.M.I.).
4. Bever, T.G. and D.T. Langedoen. (1972) "The Interaction of Speech Perception and Grammatical Structure in the Evolution of Language". In Stockwell and Macaulay (1972) *Linguistic Clause and Generative Theory,* Bloomington Ind: Indiana University Press.
5. Jacobs, R. and P.S. Rosenbaum (1968) *English Transformational Grammar,* Walthan, Mass: Ginn (Xerox).
6. Vendler, Z. (1968) *Adjectives and Nominalizations,* The Hague: Mouton and Co.
7. See Bruce Fraser (1970) and Quang Phuc Dong (1969). Bruce Frase stated that some adjectives can only be explained adequately if they have adverbial sources. Quang Phuc Dong point out that some premodifiers referred to as 'quasi-verbs' do not have relative clauses counterparts.

<div align="center">
fucking
Drown that   cat
goddan
</div>

8. See Bruce Fraser (1970).
9. Haimen, John (1974) *Target and Syntactic Change.* The Hague: Mouton and Company.

* Means non-acceptable.