

# OLD ENGLISH DITRANSITIVE ADJECTIVES<sup>1</sup>

## Abstract

This article describes Old English ditransitive adjectives, that is, adjectives that license two complements and which may therefore be considered as three-argument predicates. One argument always surfaces as a nominative noun phrase functioning as clausal subject. The other two arguments are complements of the adjective and are realized as inflected noun phrases, prepositional phrases or clauses. The number of Old English adjectives that may be considered to be ditransitive is small, as is also the case in Present-Day English. They denote such concepts as “gratitude,” “generosity and abundance,” “forgiveness,” “obedience,” “guilt and responsibility,” “deserving,” “agreement,” and “similarity.” I provide a hopefully complete list of these ditransitive adjectives, describe their semantic (argumental) and syntactic (complementational) patterns, contrast them with those of synonyms or of semantically- and lexically-related adjectives, and show how this grammatical and semantic information may be encoded in a lexicon of adjectival complementation.

**Keywords:** adjective, argument, case, complement, complementation, ditransitive, lexicography, Old English, role, semantics, syntax, transitive.

## Resumen

Este artículo describe los adjetivos ditransitivos del Inglés Antiguo, es decir, los adjetivos que admiten dos complementos y que, por lo tanto, pueden considerarse como predicados con triple argumento. Un argumento se presenta siempre como un sintagma nominal en caso nominativo cuya función es la de sujeto oracional. Los otros dos argumentos son complementos del adjetivo y se realizan como sintagmas nominales marcados, sintagmas preposicionales u oraciones subordinadas. El número de adjetivos que pueden considerarse ditransitivos es reducido, tanto en Inglés Antiguo como en Inglés Contemporáneo. Se refieren a conceptos como “gratitud”, “generosidad y abundancia”, “perdón”, “obediencia”, “culpa y responsabilidad”, “merced”, “acuerdo” y “similitud”. El artículo muestra una lista de estos adjetivos que aspira a ser completa, describe sus patrones semánticos (argumentales) y sintácticos (complementación), los contrasta con los patrones de adjetivos sinónimos o adjetivos relacionados semántica o sintácticamente, y muestra cómo esta información semántica y gramatical puede ser codificada en un lexicón de complementación adjetiva.

**Palabras clave:** adjetivo, argumento, caso, complementación, complemento, ditransitivo, inglés antiguo, lexicografía, rol, semántica, sintaxis, transitivo.

---

<sup>1</sup> I express my gratitude to my anonymous referees for many corrections and suggestions for improvement, and to Dr. Belén Méndez Naya and Dr. María José López Couso of the Universidade de Santiago de Compostela for their encouragement and wise criticism at the 18th SELIM Conference in Málaga, where I delivered a preliminary version of this article. Naturally, all errors remain solely mine. I also acknowledge the financial support provided by the Universidad de Jaén and the Junta de Andalucía for a research period at the Centre for Medieval Studies (University of Toronto) in 2006, which has enabled me to further my investigation on Old English adjectives. Last, but not least, I also wish to convey my sincere gratitude to Prof. Antonette di Paolo Healey, for allowing me to use the facilities and resources of the Dictionary of Old English Project, and to Dr. Ian McDougall and Dr. David McDougall for valuable commentaries on many examples cited and not cited in this article.

## INTRODUCTION

### OBJECTIVES

This article has a twofold objective. On the one hand, it purports to give a fairly complete list of Old English (OE, henceforth) adjectives which are used as predicates in combination with a verb (*bēon* “be,” *weorþan* “be, become”, *standan* “stand,” *wunian* “remain,” ...) and which can be considered as ditransitive, together with a detailed description of their semantic and syntactic configuration.

On the other hand, it shows how the information resulting from this analysis may be recorded in a dictionary of adjectival complementation in OE. These two objectives are intertwined throughout the article and complement each other, since the analysis I posit for these adjectives is put to use as a major classifying parameter of adjectives and entry sections in the dictionary. To my knowledge, neither of these aims has been the subject of any monographic research in OE linguistic and lexicographic studies.<sup>2</sup> This lexicon<sup>3</sup> organizes

---

<sup>2</sup> The two main dictionaries of Old English — the 19th century *Dictionary of Anglo-Saxon* (Bosworth & Toller, henceforth) and *Dictionary of Old English in Electronic Form* (DOE, henceforth) — either do not provide information on the syntactic potential of adjectives or on their argumental structure, or do so indirectly, or in different sections and at different levels within the entries. For example, the DOE does not systematically and explicitly distinguish between the predicative and the attributive (noun-modifying) usage of the adjective, a type of information which is only gathered from reading the examples, but which should — in my opinion — be stated explicitly for each headword or sense. As for the *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED, henceforth), it provides longer definitions, sometimes in combination with translation equivalents. However, one single definition often covers all the different meanings of the adjectives, irrespective of the fact that, depending on the meaning, the adjective may show different argumental and syntactic requirements. In short, not all complementational patterns are illustrated for each major period in the history of English. For example, *s.v. guilty*, the definition provided in the OED for sense 1 (the only one that goes back to the OE period) reads “That has offended or been in fault; delinquent, criminal. Now in stronger sense: That has incurred guilt; deserving punishment and moral reprobation; culpable”. However, only one example corresponding to the OE period is included, and it does not have a complement. I therefore believe that a dictionary or lexicon dealing exclusively with adjectival complementation in OE is pertinent and certainly needed.

entries at three levels: syntactic function of the adjective (attributive, postpositive or predicative), sense, semantic frame and syntactic structure. One major feature of this lexicon is that it provides synonyms, quasi-synonyms and antonyms for each sense of an adjective in order to facilitate quick comparison between the adjectives belonging to the same lexical class. It also provides definitions worded in a paraphrase-like manner.<sup>4</sup> The reason why I have included in this article a sample dictionary entry along these lines for one adjective per semantic class of ditransitive adjectives is to demonstrate the practical value of my analysis of OE three-place or ditransitive adjectives.

I will first define ditransitive adjectives (section 1), the case labels I have used (section 2), and show the different structures of the complements (section 3). I then present the various semantic classes and their members (section 4). Each of the following sections (5–6) contains a detailed analysis of one representative adjective of the class, a sample dictionary entry, a comparison of the semantic and syntactic properties of different adjectives of the class (secondary or side issues are briefly dealt with in notes), and tables summarizing their complementational patterns and the realization of the arguments. Finally I present an overall summary and my conclusions in section 7.

#### 1.- INTRANSITIVE, TRANSITIVE AND DITRANSITIVE ADJECTIVES

---

<sup>3</sup> A similar project was recently published for Present-Day English: Herbst's (2004) valency dictionary, which, however, does not include argument labels and deals with other word-classes as well.

<sup>4</sup> Thus, unlike the *DOE* or Bosworth & Toller, which *s.v. cystig*, say "charitable, generous, munificent, liberal, bountiful" and "munificent, benevolent, bountiful, liberal, generous, good", respectively, I propose the following definition "willing to give and share things", while the PDE adjectives would still be included in a special field for translation equivalents.

---

It is first necessary to define the terms *intransitive*, *transitive* and *ditransitive* in order to delimit the type of adjectives described in this article.<sup>5</sup> *Intransitive* adjectives are those which are semantically self-sufficient and require no complementation, such as *academic*, *neuter*, *bald* or *enormous*. The vast majority of OE and PDE are intransitive since they do not require a complement to complete their semantic potential.

A *transitive* adjective is one whose semantic reading is vague and has to be restricted by means of a complementing structure, that is, adjectives which are not semantically full and which syntactically need a complementing structure, no matter whether this complement is a noun phrase (NP), a prepositional phrase (PP) or a clause, such as *anxious*, *delighted*, *devoid*, *fond*, *keen*, *mindful*, *proud* or *worth*. The surface realization of the non-subject argument may be obligatory or optional. Thus, *georn* “ready and willing” has a THEME argument which is syntactically obligatory, there being no tokens without a complement in the *TOEC*. Other adjectives also have this argument in their semantic structure, but its appearance in the surface does not seem to be compulsory. This is the case of *ofergytol* “forgetful”, which is found with and without a complement representing the THEME argument; see example (1)<sup>6</sup>. Transitive adjectives must therefore be seen as a divalent or two-argument predicates. The other argument in example (1) is an EXPERIENCER, realized by the syntactic subject.

- (1) gecwomun **ðegnas his**<sup>Sub</sup> [...] **ofergeotole** weron **þæt hia hlafas**  
**onfengon**<sup>Comp</sup>  
(came his disciples [...] forgetful were that they loaves had taken) (MtG1 (Li)  
16.5)

---

<sup>5</sup> See Comesaña-Rincón, 1986: 276, 287 and ff., 1998: 194, 2001a: 35 and ff. for the application of these terms to adjectives. As terms applied to verbs, see Bolinger and Sears 1981: 85, Quirk *et al.* 1985: 1176 and ff., 1220 and ff., Trask 1993: 284, Biber *et al.* 2002: 47, and Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 218–219, 542–543).

<sup>6</sup> All my examples are excerpted from citations in the *Dictionary of Old English Corpus (DOEC, henceforth)*. I offer word-by-word translations, except when too literal a rendering would hinder comprehension or be too conspicuously ungrammatical.

Transitive adjectives may be subdivided further into *mono-transitive*, which have only one complement, as in the above example, and *ditransitive*, which have two complements, such *accountable* or *responsible*. However, in this article the term *ditransitive* does not refer to the obligatory presence of two complements in the syntactic structure, but to the potential surfacing of either or both complements. Thus example (2) contains two complements, but (3) contains none. Yet, both are ditransitive, for it is the presence in the semantic structure of two arguments that is meant, whether overt or covert. In other words, ditransitive adjectives are trivalent or three-place adjectival predicates.

- (2) **him**<sup>Comp1</sup> **ealra**<sup>Comp2</sup> **wæs** **ara**<sup>Comp2</sup> **este ælmihtig god**<sup>Sub</sup>  
(to them in all favours was generous almighty God) (GenA,B 1503)
- (3) Beoð **þancfulle** (*Be thankful*) (ÆCHom I, 39, 606.18)

Comesaña-Rincón (*ibid.*) also identifies *pseudo-intransitive* adjectives, which have a non-surfacing argument, such as *ambitious* or *identical*, corresponding to *gelic* “similar” in example (4); and *pseudo-transitive*, which are accompanied by a complement-looking structure which does not actually belong to the semantic argument frame of the adjective, such as *likely*, *acceptable*, or *difficult*, corresponding to the adjectives *toward* “imminent”, *andfenge* “acceptable”, and *earfoþe* “difficult” and *eape* “easy” in examples (5) to (8), respectively. I do not wholly agree with Comesaña-Rincón concerning pseudo-intransitive and pseudo-transitive adjectives. I believe that the dative NP *him* in example (6) is an argument (EXPERIENCER) of the adjective that optionally surfaces as its complement. Likewise, the infinitive clauses, *to understandenne* “to understand” and *to slidenne* “to fall” in examples (7) and (8) also belong to the semantic structure of the adjective (SCOPE) and must be seen as complements of the adjective. What is more, I believe that there are grounds to consider some of these adjectives, such as *gelic* (or even *eape*), as ditransitive adjectives, as we shall see further down (and in note 23). However, it is necessary first to define the meaning of the arguments, cases or semantic roles that I will be using in my description.

- 
- (4) **Ures Drihtnes dæda and þæs deofles**<sup>Sub</sup> [...] ne beon **gelice**  
(Our Lord's works and the devil's [...] are not similar) (ÆHom 4 200)
- (5) **se þe on þysne middeneard toward is to cumene**<sup>Comp</sup>  
(he who to this earth near is to come) (Notes 21 (Warn) 7)
- (6) **se þe ondræt hyne 7 wyrð rihtwisnyse**<sup>Sub</sup> **andfencge** ys **him**<sup>Comp</sup>  
(he who fears him & does justice acceptable is to Him) (LibSc 59.4)
- (7) Swa wæs **seo ealde .æ.**<sup>Sub</sup> swiðe **earfoðe** and **digle to understandenne**<sup>Comp</sup>  
(So was the old law very difficult and obscure to understand) (ÆCHom I,12, 188.6)
- (8) Forlæten we [...] æghwylce synne þissum gelice þa<sup>Sub</sup> **þam lichoman**<sup>Comp</sup>  
**bið eape in to slidenne**<sup>Comp</sup>  
(Let us abandon [...] all sins to these similar which [for] the body are easy to fall in) (HomU 15.1 (Scragg) 126)

## 2.- SEMANTIC ROLES

In order to identify the different participants involved in the predication I will use a set of case labels, which have been current in the linguistic literature ever since they were originally proposed by Fillmore (1968). The definitions I offer for the cases I use are almost standard now, but they mainly draw on Cook (1998: 10–18), Comesaña-Rincón (2001b), and, in the case of the SCOPE, Tucker (1998).

### AGENT

This is the case label for the participant which produces the action or process conveyed by the adjective predicate. The referent of this participant is normally personal, but it may also be inanimate, thus including other cases, such as INSTRUMENT, FORCE or CAUSE, which I will not use in this article. Examples:

- (9) And ðonne age we mycle þearfe þæt **we**<sup>Sub=AGENT</sup> [...] a **wære** beon **wið deofles costnunga**

(*And then it is very necessary that we [...] always vigilant be against the devil's temptations*) (LitBen 7.8 (Ure) 20)

Although *agency* is a concept usually associated with verbs and the actions they denote, there is a strong case for labelling as AGENT the argument of adjective predicates liable to be considered as process or action predicates, which often happens when the verb — the copula — is in the imperative mood, or if there is a participant affected by the action, whether actual or implied. In other words, the subject actively engages in an action. Thus, the meaning of the adjective predicate in example (10) is “*act with clemency / leniently.*”

- (10) Þonne byð **us god**<sup>Sub=NP=AGENT</sup> **milde**, and **blipe** (HomM 7  
(*Then will be [to] us God mild and clement*) (KerTibC 1) 34)

#### THEME

This argument basically refers to the participant described, an entity which is involved, consciously or unconsciously, in the state of affairs. In example (11), the THEME surfaces as subject and is untainted by other meanings. However, in example (12), “*se ende*” may be seen as both as AGENT and THEME, since it is the participant being described and also the participant producing some kind of effect upon another participant. Finally, the THEME may also manifest itself as a complement (example (13)).

- (11) **Eustachies wif**<sup>Sub=THEME</sup> **swiðe fæger** wæs  
(*Eustace's wife very beautiful was*) (LS 8 (Eust) 165)
- (12) **Him**<sup>Comp</sup> **se ende**<sup>Sub=THEME/AGENT</sup> wearð **earn** and **þrealic**  
(*To him the end was miserable and woeful*) (Seasons 17)
- (13) **Sefa**<sup>Sub</sup> wæs þe **glædra þæs þe heo gehyrde**<sup>Comp=THEME</sup>  
(*Spirit was the gladder [on account of] that which he [had] heard*) (El 955)

#### EXPERIENCER

This is the participant that experiences a sensation, an emotion or a cognitive process. It can surface as the subject of the clause (example (14)) or as the complement of the adjective (example (12) above).

- (14) *Donne* **he**<sub>Sub=EXPERIENCER/THEME</sub> *wæs* **hungrig** **ȝ þurstig**, *heo hine estlice gefylde*  
(*When he was hungry & thirsty, she him generously filled*) (LS 22 (InFestisSMarie)  
113)

With “sensation” adjectives, the subject may be both the EXPERIENCER and the THEME (example (14) above), where “*he*” is at the same time the entity described and the entity affected by the meanings conveyed by the adjectives. However, since *hungrig* and *þurstig* are inherently experiential, the participant experiencing these sensations are best labelled as EXPERIENCERS.

On the other hand, with “emotion” and “cognition” adjectives, the THEME is a complement and it expresses the content of the experience. This complement is optional for “emotion” adjectives, that is, the argument may be covert (example (15)) or overt (example (16)). However, it is obligatory with “cognition” adjectives (example (17)).

- (15) *ne beo* **ge**<sub>Sub=EXPERIENCER</sub> **dreorige**: *ne afyrhte*  
(*don't you be distressed nor afraid*) (ÆCHom I, 29, 432.29)
- (16) *Þa wæs* **heo**<sub>Sub=EXPERIENCER</sub> [...] *swiðe* **gedrefed** **bi swelcum**  
**witedome**<sub>Comp=THEME</sub> **ȝ forht geworden**  
(*Then was she [...] very frightened on account of such prophecy and troubled became*) (Bede 4 26.352.29)
- (17) **ægþer þara folca**<sub>Sub=EXPERIENCER</sub> *wæs* **þæs gefeohtes**<sub>Comp=THEME</sub> **georn**  
(*both peoples were for the fight eager*) (Or3 8.67.11)

#### BENEFICIARY

This is the participant, always personal, that is affected positively or negatively by the emotion felt or the behaviour or attitude shown by the AGENT towards it. This AGENT may also be considered as EXPERIENCER, insofar as it is the participant that experiences the emotion towards the



BENEFICIARY and acts accordingly. However, since this emotion (e.g., gratitude, generosity, forgiveness or obedience) is normally expressed through some kind of active or willing behaviour, I prefer to keep the label AGENT. The BENEFICIARY normally surfaces as a dative NP, as in example (18):

- (18) **heo**<sup>Sub=AGENT</sup> her [...] **his ðrowunge ⁊ his eadmodnesse**<sup>Comp1=THEME</sup> [...] **him**<sup>Comp2=BENEFICIARY</sup> **þoncfulle** wæren  
*(they here [for] his suffering & his humility [to] him thankful were)* (HomU 2 (Belf 11) 116)

SCOPE

This case specifies the extent to which the meaning conveyed by the adjective is valid. Although debatable, I believe it must be included in the semantic frame of adjectives whose meaning is too general or vague to be left without any further specification for the proposition to make sense. In fact, the more general the meaning, the more necessary it seems to be. Thus, in example (19) the meaning of *genōh* is semantically incomplete without the SCOPE, and the infinitive *tō healdenne* should be seen as an optional complement realizing this argument. The same might be said of the *anhydig* in example (20).

- (19) **twyðæglic fæsten oðþe þreodæglic fæsten**<sup>Sub=THEME</sup> is **genoh to healdenne**<sup>Comp=SCOPE</sup>  
*(two-day-long fast or three-day-long fast is enough to hold)* (Bede 4 26.350.31)
- (20) þær **se halga þeow**<sup>Sub=THEME</sup> **elnes**<sup>Comp=SCOPE</sup> **anhydig** eard weardade  
*(there the holy servant [of] courage resolute the land guarded)* (GuthA,B 894)

LOCATIVE

This is the entity where the state of affairs exists. Not many adjectival predicates contain this argument in their semantic structure (and with many of them it is figuratively that we must understand it): only those referring to spatial relations (*andweard* “present,” *feor* “far,” *gebende* “near,” *neah* “near”) and

those expressing lack or abundance of something (*full* “full,” *genyhtsum* “abundant,” *rūmgifol* “abundant,” *rūmlīc* “abundant,” *spēdig* “abundant,” *wana* “lacking,” *welig* “abundant”).

In the case of the “proximity” adjectives, both the subject and the complement can be considered as THEME and LOCATIVE at the same time. In fact, the participants may exchange their syntactic functions, with no semantic alteration of the proposition, apart from the focus. Example (21) can be rewritten as (22).<sup>7</sup> As for the “abundance” adjectives, the THEME and the LOCATIVE can both surface as either subject or complement; see examples (23) and (24).

- (21) **He**<sub>Sub=THEME/LOCATIVE</sub> **wæs** **gehende þam scipe**<sub>Comp=THEME/LOCATIVE</sub>  
*(He was near [to] the ship)* (Jn (Nap) 6.19)
- (22) \***Þæt scip**<sub>Sub=THEME/LOCATIVE</sub> **wæs** **him**<sub>Comp=THEME/LOCATIVE</sub> **gehende**  
*(The ship was [to] him near)*
- (23) Hit is **welig þis ealond**<sub>Sub=LOCATIVE</sub> **on wæstmum ȝ on treowum**  
**misenlicra cynna**<sub>Comp=THEME</sub>  
*(It is fruitful this island in fruits & in trees [of] different kinds)* (Bede 1  
 0.26.2)
- (24) **eower lufu**<sub>Sub=THEME</sub> is **betweoxn eow**<sub>Comp=LOCATIVE</sub> **suiðe genyhtsumu**  
*(your love is between you very abundant)* (CP 32.213.7)

### 3.- TYPES OF SYNTACTIC COMPLEMENTS

The different types of structures that adjectival complements adopt are the following:

- a. A **genitive NP** (*georn deadra manna feos* “eager [for] dead men’s property”, HomS 14 (BIHom4) 70), a **dative NP** (*Azarias [...] dædum georn* “Azariah [...] [in] deeds ardent”, Az 1), and in a few instances an **accusative NP** (*ælc þera wita wyrðe* “[to] each of the fines entitled”,

<sup>7</sup> The asterisk in this article indicates that the example is not attested, but made up for illustrative or comparison purposes.

LawlAtr 1.14)) or an **instrumental NP** (*þy hāde [...] wyrðne* “[of] the office [...] worthy”, Bede 4 2.260.3).

- b. A **Prepositional Phrase** (*georne [...] ymbe godra manna þearfe* “diligent [...] about good men’s need”, Bo 7.18.16).
- c. A **clause**, whether **finite** (*georne ne gewilnigende þæt þine deda halige gesæde beon ær hi halige gewurðan* “eager nor desirous that your actions holy should be called before they holy become”, Conf 1.4 (Logeman) 68) or **non-finite (inflected or simple infinitive)** (*geornful to witanne þette ær wes* “eager to know what before was”, Solil 2 63.24); *georn [...] geseon sigora frean* “eager [...] [to] gaze upon the Lord of victories”, Guth A,B 1077).

## 5.- THE OE DITRANSITIVE ADJECTIVAL PREDICATES

### THE ADJECTIVES

There are around 50 adjectives in OE which may be considered to be ditransitive. They can be grouped semantically into eight classes. Table 1 includes all those adjectives which I consider to have a three-place argument structure and which are used with either or both arguments as complements. The italics in the adjectives at the bottom of each group indicates that there are no attested examples in which both non-subject arguments surface at the same time. Translation equivalents are taken from the *DOE (Dictionary of Old English)*, Bosworth & Toller, and/or the *OED (Oxford English Dictionary)*.

Table 1. List of adjectives and semantic classification<sup>8</sup>

GRATITUDE	<b>þancful</b> “thankful,” <b>uncūþfull</b> “ungrateful,” <b>unþancfull</b> “ungrateful,” <b>unþancol</b> “ungrateful.”
GENEROSITY/ ABUNDANCE	<b>cystig</b> “generous,” <b>ēste</b> “liberal,” <b>genyhtsum</b> “plenteous,” <b>rūmgifol</b> “generous,” <b>rūmheort</b> “generous,” <b>rūmmōd</b> “generous,” <b>spēdig</b> “generous,” <i>fæsthafof</i> niggardly,” <i>rēcelēas</i> “parsimonious,” <i>beamol</i> “parsimonious,” [ <i>fulgenyhtsum</i> “very abundant,” <i>ungenyhtsum</i> “insufficient,” <i>wana</i> “lacking”],

<sup>8</sup> The adjectives enclosed in square brackets semantically belong with the others, but are not ditransitive.

	[ <i>ælmesgeorn</i> “charitable”].
FORGIVENESS	<i>ārfull</i> “compassionate,” <i>forgyfen</i> “forgiving,” <i>forgyfende</i> “forgiving,” <i>unforgyfend</i> “unforgiving.”
OBEDIENCE	<i>ēaþmōd</i> “submissive,” <i>gehýrsum</i> “obedient,” <i>ungehýrsum</i> “disobedient.”
GUILT/ RESPONSIBILITY	<i>fāh</i> “stained,” <i>forscyldigod</i> “guilty,” <i>forworht</i> “condemned, guilty,” <i>gyltig</i> “guilty,” <i>scyldig</i> “guilty,” <i>sinnig</i> “guilty,” <i>þurhscyldig</i> “very guilty,” <i>unscyldig</i> “innocent,” [ <i>āfyled</i> “defiled,” <i>bilewit</i> “innocent,” <i>clāne</i> “clean,” <i>unsinnig</i> “not sinful,” <i>unwemme</i> “undefiled,” <i>weorþ</i> “guilty”].
DESERVING	<i>medeme</i> “entitled,” <i>unmedeme</i> “not entitled,” <i>weorþ</i> “worthy,” <i>unweorþ</i> “unworthy,” <i>unweorþlic</i> “unfitting,” [ <i>weorþfull</i> “deserving,” <i>weorþig</i> “deserving,” <i>weorþlic</i> “suitable”].
AGREEMENT	<i>ānrād</i> “one-minded, agreeing,” <i>geþwære</i> “agreed,” <i>ungerād</i> “discordant,” <i>ungeþwære</i> “disagreed.”
SIMILARITY	<i>gelic</i> “like, similar,” <i>anlic</i> “like, similar,” <i>ungelic</i> “unlike.”

I think that the meaning of these adjectives is not complete if at least two arguments — I insist, other than that surfacing as subject — are not taken into account. One may understand this through paraphrases: one is *thankful* to somebody for something, *generous* to something in something, *obedient* to somebody in something, *forgiving* of something to someone, *deserving* of something on account of something, *responsible/guilty* to somebody for something, *agreed* with somebody in something, *similar* to somebody/ something in something.

The adjectives contained in Table 1 are not always monosemous and therefore each sense section in the dictionary will state the differences in the number and nature of the arguments and in the type of syntactic complementation. Figure 1 below is a tentative entry of the adjective *þancful*,

where three basic meanings are explained according to what has been said so far, although it is only in sense 3 that *þancful* is ditransitive.<sup>9</sup>

ADJECTIVES OF “GRATITUDE”

Adjectives denoting “gratitude” are in principle liable to take three arguments: somebody [AGENT] is thankful to somebody else (BENEFICIARY) for something (THEME). This pattern will be illustrated with a sample dictionary entry (Figure 1) for the adjective *þancful*.<sup>10</sup> The AGENT always surfaces as subject; the BENEFICIARY — an optional complement — is always found as a dative NP; and the THEME — optional — is always found as a genitive NP.

Figure 1. Dictionary entry of *þancful*<sup>11</sup>

<b>ÞANCFUL</b>	
①	feeling or expressing gratitude to somebody for something ♦ <i>grateful, thankful</i> ≠ <i>uncūþful, unþancfull, unþancol</i> ♦ PREDICATIVE (C <sub>S</sub> ) ♦ AGENT, BENEFICIARY, THEME
②	S+V+Adj+C <sup>1</sup> +C <sup>2</sup> ; [V = Cop <i>bēon/wesan</i> ] [S = pers; NP; AGENT] [C <sup>1</sup> = pers; NP <sup>dat</sup> ; BENEFICIARY] [C <sup>2</sup> = abst; NP <sup>gen</sup> ; THEME] • <i>wesað þancfulle þon Hælcende</i> C1=NPdat=BENEFICIARY <i>eoweres andleofan</i> C2=NPgen=THEME ( <i>be thankful [to] the Saviour [for] your sustenance</i> ) (LS 12 (NatJnBapt) 151) • <i>heo</i> Sub=NP=AGENT [...] <i>his ðrowunge 7 his eadmodnesse</i> C2=NPgen=THEME <i>mid worde 7 weorcum him</i> C1=NPdat BENEFICIARY <i>þancfulle wæren</i> ( <i>they [...] [for] his suffering &amp; his mercy with word and</i>

<sup>9</sup> The dictionary entry in Figure 1 contains some additional fields which, in my opinion, ought to be included in a lexicon of adjectival complementation, such as fields for synonyms, semantically related adjectives and antonyms (symbols =, = and ≠, respectively) and labels for different types of referents (personal, abstract, action...). I do not include the fields recording collocational patterns (that is, adjectives frequently used in coordination with the headword or found in its immediate vicinity, such as *na georn ne gewilnigende* “neither eager or willing” (Conf 1.4 (Logeman) 68), and frequent nouns in subject function, such as *synnful + cild / folc / gæst / man / wif* “sinful + child / folk / spirit / man / woman”.

<sup>10</sup> *þancful* has other senses, not presented here, namely, “causing pleasure to somebody (on account of something)” and “feeling satisfied with something.”

<sup>11</sup> The order in which the various elements appear in the Semantic Frame and Syntactic Pattern boxes does not reflect the actual syntagmatic order in which the different elements are found in the examples.

*works [to] him thankful were*) (HomU 2 (Belf 11) 116) ② **S+V+Adj+(C<sup>1</sup>)+C<sup>2</sup>**: [V = Cop *bēon/wesan*] [S = pers; NP; AGENT] [(C<sup>1</sup>) = pers; BENEFICIARY] [C<sup>2</sup> = pers/abst; NP<sup>gen</sup>; THEME] • **þæt folc**<sup>Sub=NP=AGENT</sup> wearð ða swa fagen **his cystignessa**<sup>C2=NPgen=THEME</sup> and swa **þancful** (*The people became then so joyful [for] his generosity and so thankful*) (ApT 10.14) ③ **S+V+Adj+(C<sup>1</sup>)+(C<sup>2</sup>)**: [V = Cop *bēon/wesan*] [S = pers; NP; AGENT] [(C<sup>1</sup>) = pers; BENEFICIARY] [(C<sup>2</sup>) = pers/abst; THEME] • Beoð **ðancfullc** (*Be thankful*) (ÆCHom I, 39, 606.18)

The adjective has three antonyms: *unþancful*, *unþancol* and *uncūþ*, roughly translatable as “ungrateful.” The patterns seen in the extant examples of these adjectives are shown in Table 2, together with those of *þancful* (in sense 3), for contrast.

Table 2. Syntactic complementation patterns of adjectives of “gratitude”

	S+V+Adj+C+C	S+V+Adj+C+(C)	S+V+Adj+(C)+C	S+V+Adj+(C)+(C)
<i>þancful</i>	+	–	+	+
<i>uncūþful</i>	+	–	–	–
<i>unþancful</i>	+	+	–	–
<i>unþancol</i>	+	–	+	–

Since all the patterns, except that with only C<sup>1</sup> (BENEFICIARY) surfacing, have been illustrated in Figure 1, I provide just one here, with *unþancful*:

- (25) **þu**<sup>Sub=NP=AGENT</sup> wære swa **ungeþancfull** **þinum drihtne**<sup>C1=NPdat=BENEFICIARY</sup>  
*(you were so ungrateful [to] your Lord)* (HomU 37 (Nap 46) 235)

As for the different types of structure that the complements of the four “gratitude” adjectives take, there is a neat correlation between argument and structure: the argument BENEFICIARY is always realized by a dative NP (C1), while the THEME is always genitive NP (C2).

#### ADJECTIVES OF “GENEROSITY” AND “ABUNDANCE”

Adjectives of “generosity” and “abundance” take three arguments, AGENT, BENEFICIARY and THEME. I will illustrate the dictionary entry for adjectives of this group with *cystig* (see Figure 2 below). The AGENT is obligatory and

surfaces as subject, while the other arguments, BENEFICIARY and THEME, are optional. I have found no examples in which they co-occur, unlike *þancful*. However, this should not rule out the need for its inclusion in the group of ditransitive adjectives. Since some of the synonyms (*ēste*, *genyhtsum*, *rūmmōd* and *spēdig*) are indeed found with two overt complements, one may safely presume that the same holds for *cystig*, despite the lack of evidence in extant texts.

Figure 2. Dictionary entry of *cystig*

<p><b>CYSTIG</b>  <b>willing to give and share things</b> • <i>generous, liberal, munificent. ≈ genyhtsum, rūmgifol, rūmbeort, rūmmōd ≠ fæsthafof</i> • PREDICATIVE (C<sub>S</sub>) • <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">AGENT, BENEFICIARY, THEME</span>  <b>①</b> <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">S+V+Adj+C<sup>1</sup>+C<sup>2</sup></span>: [V = Cop <i>bēon/wesan</i>] [S = pers; NP; AGENT] [C<sup>1</sup> = pers; NP<sup>dat</sup>; BENEFICIARY] [(C<sup>2</sup>) = -anim; THEME] • <b>He</b><sup>Sub=NP=AGENT</sup> <i>wæs cystig wæddlum and wydewum</i><sup>C1=NPdat=BENEFICIARY</sup> swa swa fæder (<i>He was generous [to] orphans and widows as father</i>) (ÆLS (Edmund), 22) <b>②</b> <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">S+V+Adj+(C<sup>1</sup>)+C<sup>2</sup></span>: [V = Cop <i>weorþan</i>] [(C<sup>1</sup>); pers; BENEFICIARY] [C<sup>2</sup> = -anim; PP: <i>on</i>; THEME] • Þa wearð <b>se cynincg Oswald</b><sup>Sub=NP=AGENT</sup> [...] <b>on eallum þingum</b><sup>C2=PPon=THEME</sup> <i>cystig</i> (<i>Then became king Oswald [...] in all things generous</i>) (ÆLS (Oswald), 83) <b>③</b> <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">S+V+Adj+(C<sup>1</sup>)+(C<sup>2</sup>)</span>: [V = Cop <i>bēon/wesan</i>] [S = pers; NP; AGENT] [(C<sup>1</sup>); pers; BENEFICIARY] [(C<sup>2</sup>); -anim; THEME] • <b>Hordere</b><sup>Sub=NP=AGENT</sup> si gecoren of gegæderunge wis [...] na <i>cystig</i> ac atodrædenne (<i>The janitor [must] be chosen by the congregation wise [...] not liberal but fearful</i>) (BenRGl 31.61.4)</p>
--

Examples (2), with *este*, and (27), with *genyhtsum* illustrate the syntactic pattern with overt BENEFICIARY and THEME, while example (28), with *spēdig*, illustrates a the pattern with a covert BENEFICIARY and an overt THEME.

- (26) Forþon þu<sup>Sub=NP=AGENT</sup> drihtyn wynsum ȝ milde eart ȝ **genihtsum on mildheortnyse**<sup>C2=PPon=THEME</sup> **eallum gecigyndum**<sup>C1=NPdat=BENEFICIARY</sup>  
*(Because you, Lord, sweet & mild are & plenteous in mercy [to] all calling on you)* (PsGlc (Wildhagen) 85.5)
- (27) Forðon þu drihten wynsum ȝ biliwite þu<sup>Sub=NP=AGENT</sup> eart ȝ **spedig on mildheortnesse**<sup>C2=PPon=THEME</sup> **eallum gecigendum þe**<sup>C1=NPdat=BENEFICIARY</sup>

(Because you, Lord, pleasant & amiable you are & generous in mercy [to] all calling on you) (PsGL (Lindelöf) 85.5)

- (28) on ælmesdædum<sub>Comp=THEME</sub> he<sub>Sub=AGENT</sub> wæs rūmgiful  
(in alms-deeds he was generous) (ÆLS (Oswald), 83)

The extant examples of some antonyms of *genyhtsum* “generous”, such as *fæsthafol*, *beamol* and *rēcelēas* “niggardly, parsimonious,” only illustrate their use with two arguments, an AGENT (subject) and a THEME (surfacing as a genitive NP complement), but not with an BENEFICIARY. Yet, I believe that an BENEFICIARY argument ought to be included in its semantic frame; see example (29).

- (29) for hwi wære þu<sub>Sub=NP=AGENT</sub> swa fæsthafol minra goda<sub>C2=NPgen=THEME?</sub>  
(Why were you so parsimonious [with] my good [things]?) (HomS 40.1 (Nap 49) 165)

Table 3 summarizes the different syntactic patterns of the “generosity/abundance” adjectives.

Table 3. Complementation patterns of “generosity” and “abundance”

	S+V+Adj+C+C	S+V+Adj+C+(C )	S+V+Adj+(C)+C	S+V+Adj+(C)+(C )
<i>cystig</i>	–	+	+	+
<i>ēste</i>	+	+	–	–
<i>genyhtsum</i>	+	+	–	–
<i>rūmgiful</i>	–	– <sup>12</sup>	+	+
<i>rūmheort</i>	–	+	+	+
<i>rūmmōd</i>	+	+	+	–
<i>spēdig</i>	+	–	–	+
<i>fæsthafol</i>	–	–	+	–
<i>beamol</i>	–	–	+	–

<sup>12</sup> Note, however, that there exists an example for this pattern with the corresponding noun: *be*<sub>Sub</sub>. [Oswald] wæs eallum<sub>C1=NPdat=BENEFICIARY</sub> rungeofa ge æðelum ge unæðelum<sub>C1=NPdat=BENEFICIARY</sub> (Bede 3 12.194.31) (he [Oswald] was to all [a] liberal [one], both to high [ones] and low [ones]).



<i>rēcelēas</i>	-	-	+	-
-----------------	---	---	---	---

The boundary between both the meanings of “generosity” and “abundance” is often blurred: “having abundance of something” being a necessary condition for “acting with generosity”, but not *vice versa*. Not all adjectives belonging to this semantic class qualify to their inclusion among ditransitive adjectives. For example, *spēdig* is ditransitive in (27) above, but if the subject has inanimate reference (and materializes a LOCATIVE instead of an AGENT argument), the semantic frame cannot contain an BENEFICIARY; see example (30). The same is true of *fulgenyhtsum* “very abundant” and *wana* “lacking”.<sup>13</sup> However, the antonym *ungenyhtsum* “insufficient”, in its unique occurrence in the *DOEC*, has a different semantic frame (overt THEME and SCOPE, covert BENEFICIARY).<sup>14</sup>

- (30) Ic **his cynn**<sup>Sub(Obj)=NP=LOCATIVE</sup> gedo [...] **wæstmum**<sup>C=NPdat=THEME</sup>  
**spedig**  
*(I his kin will make [...] in fruits plentiful)* (GenA,B 2801)

- (31) Gif soþlice **seo tid**<sup>Sub=NP=THEME</sup> **eal þis to gefremmanne**<sup>C=-</sup>  
*enne*<sup>InfClause=SCOPE</sup> **ungenihtsum** beo [...]  
*(If indeed the time all this to perform insufficient should be [...])* (ThCap 2  
(Sauer) 29.351.12)

Table 4 shows the different structures used by the complements of the adjectives of this group. C1 (BENEFICIARY) correlates with a dative NP and with PPs headed by *ofer*, while C2 (THEME) correlates with a genitive NP and

<sup>13</sup> Besides, these adjectives are used in impersonal constructions, which cannot contain more than two arguments, either because the subject is clausal or because it is a subjectless clause. Examples: *Genoh is munuce*<sup>C=NPdat=EXPERIENCER</sup> and *fulgenihtsum, þæt he bæbbe twa cugelan and twegen syrcas for þære nihtware*<sup>Sub=þætClause=THEME</sup> (Enough is [for a] monk and sufficient, that he have two cows and two for the night-ware, BenR 55.91.2); *þam buse*<sup>C1=NPdat=LOCATIVE</sup> *ne bið wana þæs bealican leobtes*<sup>C2=NPgen=THEME</sup> ([to] that house shall not be lacking [of] sublime light, ÆLS (Thomas), 66) (or take *wana* as a noun).

<sup>14</sup> I justify this analysis further down. See example (45) and note 23.

with a PP headed by *on*, *fram* and *of*, with very few examples with a dative NP, in poetry.

Table 4. Formal realization of the complements of “generosity and abundance” adjectives

	Dative NP		Genitive NP		Prepositional Phrase		Infinitive Clause	
	C <sup>1</sup>	C <sup>2</sup>	C <sup>1</sup>	C <sup>2</sup>	C <sup>1</sup>	C <sup>2</sup>	C <sup>1</sup>	C2 (SCOPE)
<i>cystig</i>	+					<i>on</i>		
<i>ēste</i>	+			+				
<i>genyhtsum</i>	+					<i>on</i>		
<i>rūmgifol</i>	+					<i>on</i>		
<i>rūmbeort</i>	+	+						
<i>rūmmōd</i>	+			+	<i>ofer</i>	<i>on</i>		
<i>spēdig</i>	+					<i>on</i>		
<i>ungenyhtsum</i>								+
<i>fæsthafof</i>				+				
<i>heamul</i>				+				
<i>rēcelēas</i>				+				

#### ADJECTIVES OF “FORGIVENESS”

Adjectives of “forgiveness” have three arguments (AGENT, BENEFICIARY and THEME). Unlike the adjectives of the semantic classes seen so far, they are never found with the two non-AGENT arguments used at the same time. From a semantic point of view, the arguments are obligatory, but syntactically they are deletable and must be recovered from the context. The dictionary entry in Figure 3 illustrates the adjective *forgyfen* “forgiving.”<sup>15</sup>

Figure 3. Dictionary entry of *forgyfen*

<p><b>FORGYFEN</b>  ready to show mercy and grant forgiveness to somebody for something ♦  <i>merciful, forgiving, compassionate = ārful, forgyfende ≠ unforgyfende</i> ♦ PREDICATIVE (C<sub>S</sub>)</p>
---

<sup>15</sup> Past participle of *forgyfan* “to forgive” used as an adjective, with an active sense; see the *DOE*, s.v. *forgyfan* D.3.f.ii.a.

<p>♦ AGENT, BENEFICIARY, THEME ① S+V+Adj+C<sup>1</sup>+(C<sup>2</sup>): [V = Cop <i>bēon/wesan, weorþan</i>] [S = pers; NP; AGENT] [C<sup>1</sup> = pers; NP<sup>dat</sup>; BENEFICIARY] [(C<sup>2</sup>); abst; THEME] • <i>hie</i><sub>Sub=NP=AGENT</sub> [...] <i>him callum</i><sub>C1=NPdat=BENEFICIARY</sub> <i>wurdon to milde ȝ to forgiƿene</i> (<i>they [...] [to] them all became very mild &amp; very forgiving</i>) (Or4 3.87.17)</p> <p>② S+V+Adj+(C<sup>1</sup>)+C<sup>2</sup>: [V = Cop <i>bēon/wesan, weorþan</i>] [S = pers; NP; AGENT] [(C<sup>1</sup>); pers; BENEFICIARY] [C<sup>2</sup> = abst; NP<sup>dat</sup>; THEME] • <i>sie god ælmihtig</i><sub>Sub=NP=AGENT</sub> [...] <i>callum cowrum synnum</i><sub>C2=NPdat=THEME</sub> <i>forgifen</i> (Conf 9.5 (Först) 7) (<i>let God almighty [...] be forgiving [of] all your sins</i>)</p>
---

There follow a few examples with other adjectives of the group:

- (32) *Se*<sub>Sub=NP=AGENT</sub> *arfull* vel mild bið *callum unrihtwisnyssum þinum*<sub>C2=NPdat=THEME</sub>  
*(He merciful and mild will be [to] all your iniquities)* (PsGlc (Wildhagen) 102.3)
- (33) *He*<sub>Sub=NP=AGENT</sub> wæs swa heard ȝ *unforgyƿende þam forwyrhtum*<sub>C1=NPdat=BENEFICIARY</sub>  
*mannum*  
*(he was so hard & unforgiving [to] the guilty men)* (GDPref and 4 (C) 37.319.24)
- (34) And *þu*<sub>Sub=NP=AGENT</sub> hælend Crist sy [...] *forgifende* [...] *mine synna and mine*  
*giltas*<sub>C2=NPacc=THEME</sub>  
*(And you, healing Christ, be [...]forgiving [...] [of] my sins and my guilts)* (Conf 4 (Fowler) 18.71)<sup>16</sup>

The patterns found in the *DOEC* citations are summarized in Table 5.

Table 5. Complementation patterns of adjectives of “forgiving”

S+V+Adj+C+C	S+V+Adj+C+(C)	S+V+Adj+(C)+C	S+V+Adj+(C)+(C)

<sup>16</sup> I analyse the structure *bēon forgyƿend* (example (34)) as “copula + adjective”, even though this interpretation may be debatable, for various reasons: a) the form may also be used attributively (*forgyƿendre miltse* (ArPrG1 1 (forgiving mercy, Holt-Campb) 27.19)); b) its antonym *unforgyƿende* is necessarily an adjective (example (33)), since there exists no such verb as \**unforgyƿan*; c) the verb is in the imperative mood, which is semantically incompatible with a progressive interpretation (see Quirk & al. 1985: 827); and d) even though in (34) the complement (THEME) is in the accusative, which is the expected inflection as object of the verb (see the *DOE*, s.v. *forgyƿan*, sense D.3.d), examples with a genitive form are also found, in which I consider the participial form to be adjectival: *bið he*<sub>Sub=NP=AGENT</sub> [...] *forgyƿende ura synna*<sub>C2=NPacc=THEME</sub> (he shall be [...] forgiving [of] our sins, HomS 8 (BlHom2) 95). See in this respect Visser (1963–1973: 1931), Mitchell (1985: I 272–280), Denison (1993: Chapter 13) and Fischer and Van der Wurff (2006: 135 and ff.).

<i>ārfull</i>	–	–	+	–
<i>forgyfen</i>	–	+	+	–
<i>forgyfende</i>	–	–	+	+
<i>unforgyfende</i>	–	+	–	–

The formal realizations of complements of adjectives of “forgiving” are shown in Table 6. Again, C1 (BENEFICIARY) is always realized by a dative NP, while C2 (THEME) may be a genitive, an accusative, or a dative NP.

Table 6. Formal realization of adjectives of “forgiving”

	Genitive NP		Accusative NP		Dative NP	
	C <sup>1</sup>	C <sup>2</sup>	C <sup>1</sup>	C <sup>2</sup>	C <sup>1</sup>	C <sup>2</sup>
<i>ārfull</i>						+
<i>forgyfen</i>					+	+
<i>forgyfende</i>		+		+		
<i>unforgyfend</i>					+	

#### ADJECTIVES OF “OBEDIENCE”

Adjectives of “obedience” also require BENEFICIARY and THEME arguments, apart from the AGENT: one is obedient to somebody in something. The adjective *gebyrsum* is used in all four syntactic patterns, while the antonym *ungebyrsum* lacks a surviving example with simultaneous surfacing of the two non-subject arguments. I am aware that the paraphrase used (“be obedient to somebody in something”) is misleading, since it would seem that the argument I call THEME here is in fact SCOPE, that is, it fences in the extent of one’s obedience. However, I think it is not. The fact that a PP is used for C2 should not bias us against choosing the label THEME for this argument. This is borne out by a comparison of the referents of C2 in the examples of the entry for *gebyrsum* in Figure 4. We can readily see that they are of the same nature and, whether the syntactic pattern is C1+C2 or (C1)+C2, what the AGENT is compliant with is still an order or a wish. Figure 4 shows the dictionary entry of *gebyrsum*.

Figure 4. Dictionary entry of *gebyrsum*

<p><b>GEHYRSUM</b>  <b>feeling or expressing obedience to somebody in something</b> ♦ <i>obedient, submissive</i> =  <i>ēaþmōd</i> ≠ <i>ungeþýrsum</i> ♦ PREDICATIVE (C<sub>S</sub>/C<sub>O</sub>) ♦ <b>AGENT, BENEFICIARY, THEME</b> ❶  <b>S+V+Adj+C<sup>1</sup>+C<sup>2</sup></b>: [V = Cop <i>bēon/wesan</i>] [S = pers; NP; AGENT] [C<sup>1</sup> = pers; NP<sup>dat</sup>;  BENEFICIARY] [C<sup>2</sup> = abst; PP<sub>æt/in/on/tō</sub>; THEME] • gif <b>ge</b><sup>Sub=NP=AGENT</sup> <b>æt þissum</b>  <b>þreom þingum</b><sup>C2=PP<sub>æt</sub>=THEME</sup> <b>me</b><sup>C1=NP<sub>dat</sub>=BENEFICIARY</sup> <b>hyrsume</b> beon willað (<i>if you</i>  <i>in these three things [to] me obedient will be</i>) (Bede 2 2.102.10) ❷ <b>S+V+Adj+C<sup>1</sup>+C<sup>2</sup></b>:  [V = Cop <i>bēon/wesan, weorþan</i>; Intr <i>wunian</i>] [S = NP; pers; AGENT] [C<sup>1</sup> = pers;  NP<sup>dat</sup>/PP<sub>tō</sub>; BENEFICIARY] [C<sup>2</sup> = abst; (C); THEME] • <b>ge ðeowan</b><sup>Sub=NP=AGENT</sup>.  beoð <b>gehyrsume cowerum hlafordum</b><sup>C1=NP<sub>dat</sub>=BENEFICIARY</sup> (<i>you servants, be</i>  <i>obedient [to] your masters</i>) (ÆCHom II, 21, 186.216) • <b>He</b><sup>Sub=NP=AGENT</sup> sceal beon  [...]<b> hersum to ælcum men ȝ to Gode</b><sup>C1=NP<sub>tō</sub>=BENEFICIARY</sup> (<i>He must be [...]</i>  <i>obedient to all men &amp; to God</i>) (HomS 2 (ScraggVerc16) 185) ❸ <b>S+V+Adj+(C<sup>1</sup>)+C<sup>2</sup></b>:  [V = Cop <i>bēon/wesan</i>] [S = pers; NP; AGENT] [C<sup>1</sup> = pers; BENEFICIARY] [C<sup>2</sup> =  NP<sup>dat</sup>; abst; THEME] • <b>ðu</b><sup>Sub=NP=AGENT</sup> wære <b>gehyrsum ðines wifes</b>  <b>wordum</b><sup>C2=NP<sub>dat</sub>=THEME</sup> (<i>you were obedient [to] your wife's words</i>) (ÆCHom I, 1,  18.12) ❹ <b>S+V+Adj+(C<sup>1</sup>)+C<sup>2</sup></b>: [V = Cop <i>bēon/wesan, bēon/wesan geworden</i>] [S =  pers; NP; AGENT] [(C<sup>1</sup>); pers; BENEFICIARY] [(C<sup>2</sup>) = abst; THEME] • <b>Læcedemonie</b>  <b>þære byrig</b><sup>Sub=NP=AGENT</sup> siþþan <b>gehiersume</b> wæron (<i>The Lacedemonians of that city</i>  <i>afterwards obedient were</i>) (Or3 1.55.9)</p>
---

The adjective *ēaþmōd*, when used predicatively, is never found with a THEME argument. However, there is one example, (35), in which it is used attributively and has one such argument, but no BENEFICIARY.<sup>17</sup>

(35) he on Brytene her **eaðmode** him **eorlas**<sup>Sub(Obj)=NP=AGENT</sup> funde **to godes**  
**willan**<sup>C2=PP<sub>tō</sub>=THEME</sup>

<sup>17</sup> Another example of *ēaþmōd* which is somewhat misleading is the following: *wite be eac, þæt he*<sup>Sub=NP=EXPERIENCER?/AGENT?</sup> *swa micle eaðmodra beon sceal on regoles underþeodnesse*  
<sup>C2=PP<sub>on</sub>=THEME/SCOPE?</sup>, *swa miclum swa he furðor forlæten is* (let him also know that he must be all the more submissive/humble in [to?] the obedience of the rule the more he is allowed [in the service], BenR 62.111.20)). *Ēaþmōd* also means “humble, meek.” If we consider that this is the sense it has in the previous example, then the PP *on regoles underþeodnesse* could be labelled SCOPE. But if we consider that it is the sense “obedient” that is being conveyed, then the PP is a THEME. This would also alter the type of argument surfacing as subject: EXPERIENCER in the former interpretation, AGENT in the latter.

(*he in Britain here obedient [for] himself earls found to God's will [≈ he found himself law-abiding earls]*) (Men 95)

Table 7 shows the different complementation patterns of the two adjectives.

Table 7. Complementation patterns of adjectives of “obedience”

	S+V+Adj+C <sup>1</sup> +C <sup>2</sup>	S+V+Adj+C <sup>1</sup> +(C <sup>2</sup> )	S+V+Adj+(C <sup>1</sup> )+C <sup>2</sup>	S+V+Adj+(C <sup>1</sup> )+(C <sup>2</sup> )
<i>gebýrsum</i>	+	+	+	+
<i>ēapmōd</i>	–	+	–	+
<i>ungebýrsum</i>	–	+	+	+

The formal realizations of complements of adjectives of “obedience” are shown in Table 8. C<sup>1</sup> (BENEFICIARY) can be either a dative NP or a PP headed by *tō* or *wiþ*. C<sup>2</sup> (THEME) can be dative or genitive NP or a PP with *æt*, *in*, *on*, *tō*.

Table 8. Formal realization of adjectives of “obedience”

	Dative NP		Genitive NP		Prepositional Phrase	
	C <sup>1</sup>	C <sup>2</sup>	C <sup>1</sup>	C <sup>2</sup>	C <sup>1</sup>	C <sup>2</sup>
<i>gebýrsum</i>	+	+			<i>tō</i>	<i>æt, in, on, tō</i>
<i>ungebýrsu</i> <i>m</i>	+	+		+		
<i>ēapmōd</i>	+				<i>wiþ</i>	<i>on, tō</i>

#### ADJECTIVES OF “GUILT AND RESPONSIBILITY”

This group of adjectives is semantically heterogeneous: not all of them have the same meaning components and some of them present great complexity in their denotations. This can be illustrated by means of paraphrases: one can be accountable for something (e.g., a crime or a sin) and, if found out, be liable to judgement, and if convicted, be liable to a sentence (that is, the punishment), while being responsible to somebody for the crime or sin committed. Naturally, we are not going to find more than two of these complements used at the same time. However, two arguments may surface in the same element.

For example, in Sense 1 of *scyldig* (see Figure 5), the subject is both AGENT, insofar as he is the doer of the action, and EXPERIENCER, since he is liable to undergo a punishment. Besides, the semantic frame would contain two THEME arguments, one of which should perhaps be given a more specific case label, such as CAUSE. This contingency — the presence of two THEMES — actually only happens with very few adjectives and does not invalidate our choice of argument labels. It should be considered as an idiosyncratic feature of the adjective *scyldig* itself. However, for the sake of consistency, since I have used the term CAUSE for no other adjective, I will refer to this argument as THEME, and distinguish between the two THEMES by means of superscript numerals. Sense 2 of *scyldig* also involves two arguments, though they are different from those it has in sense 1. Here we have an AGENT surfacing as subject, an EXPERIENCER and an optional THEME, which is always the *price* the subject referent must pay to compensate for his crime or sin.

Figure 5. Dictionary entry of *scyldig*

SCYLDIG	
①	<p><b>responsible or convicted for a crime AND liable to punishment</b> ♦ <i>guilty, convicted, liable</i> ≈ <i>weorþ</i> ♦ PREDICATIVE (C<sub>S</sub>) ♦ [AGENT/EXPERIENCER, THEME<sup>1</sup>, THEME<sup>2</sup>]</p> <p>① <b>S+V+Adj+C<sup>1</sup>+C<sup>2</sup></b>: [V = Cop <i>bēon/wesan</i>] [S = pers; NP; AGENT/EXPERIENCER] [C<sup>1</sup> = pers; PP<sub>for</sub>; THEME<sup>1</sup>] [C<sup>2</sup> = abst; PP<sub>tō</sub>; THEME<sup>2</sup>] •</p> <p><b>Scyldig he</b><sub>Sub-NP-AGENT/EXPERIENCER</sub> <b>wæs to hellicere susle</b><sub>C1-PPtō=THEME1</sub> <b>for his mandædum</b><sub>C2-PPfor=THEME2(CAUSE)</sub> (<i>Guilty he was to hellish torment for his crimes</i>) (ÆCHom II, 5, 45.131)</p>
②	<p><b>responsible to someone AND liable to punishment</b> ♦ <i>guilty, liable</i> ≈ <i>weorþ</i> ♦ PREDICATIVE (C<sub>S</sub>) ♦ [AGENT, EXPERIENCER, THEME]</p> <p>① <b>S+V+Adj+C<sup>1</sup>+C<sup>2</sup></b>: [V = Cop <i>bēon/wesan</i>] [S = NP; AGENT] [C<sup>1</sup> = pers; NP<sup>dat</sup>/PP<sub>wiþ</sub>; EXPERIENCER] [C<sup>2</sup> = abst; NP<sup>gen, dat, acc</sup>/PP<sub>wiþ</sub>; THEME] • And gif hit hwa gedon hæbbe, beo <b>he</b><sub>Sub-NP=AGENT</sub> [...] <b>wið þone cyninge</b><sub>C1-PPwiþ=EXPERIENCER</sub> <b>scyldig ealles þæs, þe he age</b><sub>C2-NPgen=THEME</sub> (<i>And if somebody should have done it, let him be [...] against the king guilty [of] all that which he may own [i.e., liable to pay compensation]</i>) (HomU 40 (Nap 50) 178) • <b>Twegen gafolgylderas</b><sub>Sub-NP-AGENT</sub> <b>wæron feoh</b><sub>C2-NPacc=THEME</sub> <b>scyldige sumum massere</b><sub>C1-NPdat=EXPERIENCER</sub> (<i>Twelve tribute-payers were [to] money liable [to] some merchant</i>) (ÆHomM 12 (Brot 1), 163) • <b>þu</b><sub>Sub-NP=AGENT</sub> <b>eart wið mec</b></p>

<sup>C1=PPwip</sup>EXPERIENCER **deape**<sup>C2NPdat</sup>THEME **scyldig**, forþon ealle mine brōðor [...] wæron ofslegene (*you are liable against me [to] death, because all my brothers [...] were killed*) (Bede 4 23.328.24) • And se ðe rihte lage 7 rihtne dom forsace, beo **se**<sup>Sub=NP</sup>AGENT **scyldig wið þone þe hit age**<sup>C2=PPwip</sup>THEME: swa **wið cyninge**<sup>C1=PPwip</sup>EXPERIENCER **CXX scyllinga**<sup>C2=NP</sup>THEME, swa **wið eorl**<sup>C1=PPwip</sup>EXPERIENCER **LX scyllinga**<sup>C2=NP</sup>THEME (*And he who disregards rightful law & rightful judgement, he shall be guilty against him [to whom] he owes: against the king [for] 120 shillings, against the earl [for] 60 shillings*) (LawIICn 15.2) ② **S+V+Adj+C<sup>1</sup>+C<sup>2</sup>**: [V = Cop *bēon/wesan*] [S = NP; AGENT] [C<sup>1</sup> = pers; NP<sup>dat</sup>/PPwip; EXPERIENCER] [(C<sup>2</sup>) = abst; THEME] • [...] **us sylfe**<sup>Sub(Obj)=NP=AGENT</sup> **scyldige þe**<sup>C1=NPdat</sup>EXPERIENCER (*[...] ourselves guilty [against] you*) (HyGl 3 (Gneuss) 12.3) • **Ælc man þe yfel deþ mid yfelum willan**<sup>Sub=NP=AGENT</sup> is **scyldig wið God**<sup>C1=PPwip</sup>EXPERIENCER (*Each man who evil should do with evil will is guilty against God*) (ÆLS (Exalt of Cross), 170) • Ic [...] **me**<sup>Sub(Obj)=NP=AGENT</sup> **scyldigne dyde wið þe**<sup>C1=PPwip</sup>EXPERIENCER (*I [...] myself guilty made against you*) (Conf 9.3.2 (Logeman) 32)

③ **responsible to someone for something** • *guilty* ≠ *unscyldig* • PREDICATIVE (C<sub>S</sub>) • AGENT, EXPERIENCER, THEME ① **S+V+Adj+C<sup>1</sup>+C<sup>2</sup>**: [V = Cop *bēon/wesan*] [S = NP; AGENT] [C<sup>1</sup> = pers; PPwip; EXPERIENCER] [C<sup>2</sup> = abst; NP<sup>gen</sup>; THEME] • we [...] ðæt witon se esne ðe ærendað his woroldhlaforde wifes, ðæt **he**<sup>Sub=NP=AGENT</sup> **bið diernes gelires**<sup>C2=NPgen</sup>THEME **scyldig wið God**<sup>C1=PPwip</sup>EXPERIENCER (*we [...] that know, the servant who acts as messenger for his lord's wife, that he shall be [of] fornication guilty against God*) (CP 19.143.1)

Some other meanings of *scyldig* have not been included in the preceding figure given the impossibility to recover a covert argument. In (36) below, where *scyldig* means “guilty of a crime or sin”, just one argument surfaces, THEME2. Which is the missing argument? The EXPERIENCER (the person against whom one is guilty, e.g., God) or the THEME1 (the punishment, e.g., hell)?<sup>18</sup>

<sup>18</sup> One particular meaning of *weorþ* in legal texts is synonymous with the second part of senses 1 and 2 of *scyldig*, that is, “liable to punishment”. For this reason, unlike *scyldig*, its semantic frame contains only an EXPERIENCER (subject) and an optional THEME (complement), which refers to the punishment. Thus, even though *weorþ* belongs to the “deserving” class, it is not ditransitive in this case. Example: *Hwæt hæfð þes*



- (36) Nu synd **þa Iudeiscan**<sup>Sub=NP=AGENT</sup> [...] **Cristes deaðes**<sup>C2=NPgen=THEME2</sup> **scyldige**  
*(Now are the Jews [...] [of] Christ's death guilty)* (ÆLS (Exalt of Cross), 176)

Likewise, should an extra argument really be supplied in example (37), where *scyldig* means “liable to conviction and sentence,” and a new syntactic (C<sup>1</sup>)+C<sup>2</sup> pattern be added to Sense 2 in Figure 5?

- (37) se ðe man ofslihð, **se**<sup>Sub=NP=EXPERIENCER</sup> bið **domes**<sup>C1=NPgen=THEME1</sup> **scyldig**  
*(he who a man kills, he shall be [to] judgement liable)* (ÆHom 16 125)

The following examples illustrate some of the other adjectives of the group, their complementation patterns being shown in Table 9:

- (38) **he**<sup>Sub=NP=AGENT</sup> biþ **leahtrum**<sup>C2=NPdat=THEME</sup> **fah wið**  
**wuldorcýning**<sup>C1=PPwith=EXPERIENCER</sup>  
*(he shall be [of] crimes guilty against the glorious King)* (Whale 62)
- (39) **þa**<sup>Sub=NP=AGENT</sup> wæron synfulle menn, and bysmorlice **forscyldgode on**  
**sceamlicum dædum**<sup>C2=PPon=THEME</sup>  
*(who [the Sodomites] were sinful men and disgracefully guilty in shameful deeds)*  
 (ÆHom 19 65)
- (40) **he**<sup>Sub=NP=AGENT</sup> bið [...] scyldig wið God, 7 **wið his**  
**hlaford**<sup>C1=PPwith=EXPERIENCER</sup> eallenga **forworht**  
*(he shall be [...] guilty against God & against his lord utterly guilty)* (CP 19.143.1)
- (41) Ic wat [...] **me sylfne**<sup>Sub(Obj)=NP=AGENT</sup> **forworhtne wordes and**  
**dæde**<sup>C2=NPgen=THEME</sup>  
*(I know [...] myself sinful [in] word and deed)* (WPol 2.1.1 (Jost) 57)
- (42) **ic**<sup>Sub=NP=AGENT</sup> wille beon **þyses mannes blodes**<sup>C2=NPgen=THEME</sup> **unscyldig 7 his**  
**deapes**<sup>C2=NPgen=THEME</sup>  
*(I wish to be [of] this man's blood guiltless & [of] his death)* (HomS 24 (ScraggVerc1) 187)

---

*rihtwisa man [...] gefremod. þæt he*<sup>Sub=NP=EXPERIENCER</sup> **rodebengene**<sup>C=NPgen=THEME</sup> *wurþe sy?* (What has this righteous man [...] done, that he [of] crucifixion deserving should be?) (ÆCHom I, 38, 596.1).

Table 9. Complementation patterns of adjectives of “guilt and responsibility”

	S+V+Adj+C+C	S+V+Adj+C+(C)	S+V+Adj+(C)+C	S+V+Adj+(C)+(C)
<i>fāb</i>	+	-	+ (?)	- (?)
<i>forscyldigod</i>	-	+	+	-
<i>forworbt</i>	-	+	+	+
<i>gyltig</i>	-	+	+	+
<i>scyldig1</i>	+	-	-	-
<i>scyldig2</i>	+	+	-	-
<i>scyldig3</i>	+	-	-	-
<i>synnig</i>	-	+	-	-
<i>þurbscyldig</i>	-	-	+	-
<i>unscyldig</i>	-	+	+	+

The complements of the adjectives of “guilt and responsibility” take the realizations shown in Table 10: C1 (EXPERIENCER) correlates with dative and with a PP headed by *wiþ*, while C2 (THEME) is normally realized by a genitive NP or a PP headed by *mið*, *on* or *þurh*.<sup>19</sup>

Table 10. Formal realization of adjectives of “guilt and responsibility”

	Dative NP		Genitive NP		Prepositional Phrase	
	C <sup>1</sup>	C <sup>2</sup>	C <sup>1</sup>	C <sup>2</sup>	C <sup>1</sup>	C <sup>2</sup>
<i>fāb</i>		+			<i>wiþ</i>	
<i>forscyldigod</i>					<i>wiþ</i>	<i>for</i> , <i>mið</i> , <i>on</i> , <i>þurh</i>
<i>forworbt</i>	+			+	<i>wiþ</i>	<i>mið</i> , <i>þurh</i>
<i>gyltig</i>	+			+	<i>wiþ</i>	<i>on</i>
<i>scyldig1</i>					<i>for</i>	<i>tō</i>
<i>scyldig2</i>	+	+		+	<i>wiþ</i>	<i>wiþ</i>
<i>scyldig3</i>				+	<i>wiþ</i>	
<i>synnig</i>				+	<i>wiþ</i>	
<i>þurbscyldig</i>						<i>for</i>
<i>unscyldig</i>				+	<i>ætforan</i> , <i>wiþ</i>	<i>fram</i> , <i>of</i>

<sup>19</sup> A few adjectives semantically or lexically related adjectives cannot be considered ditransitive for they only have one non-subject argument in their semantic frame: *afþiled*, *bilewit*, *clæne*, *unsynnig* and *unwemme*.

ADJECTIVES OF “DESERVING”

Adjectives of “deserving” are also ditransitive, insofar as one is worthy or deserving of something on account of something. The three arguments which make up the semantic frame of these adjectives are an EXPERIENCER, which always surfaces as subject, and a THEME and a SCOPE, which are realized by complements and never appear simultaneously. Figure 6 illustrates the dictionary entry of *medeme*.

Figure 6. Dictionary entry of *medeme*<sup>20</sup>

<p><b>MEDEME</b>  <b>having sufficient worth or merit in a certain respect to deserve having or receiving something</b> ♦ <i>deserving, entitled, fit, worthy</i> = <i>weorþ</i> ♦ PREDICATIVE (C<sub>S</sub>/C<sub>O</sub>) ♦ EXPERIENCER, THEME, SCOPE ❶ <b>S+V+Adj+C<sup>1</sup>+C<sup>2</sup></b>: [V = Cop <i>bēon/wesan, weorþan</i>] [S = pers; NP; EXPERIENCER] [C<sup>1</sup> = pers; NP<sup>dat</sup>/PP<sup>for</sup>; THEME] [(C<sup>2</sup>) = abst; SCOPE] • <i>seþe lufað fæder oþþe moder swiðor þonne me nis he</i><sub>Sub=NP=EXPERIENCER</sub> <i>me</i><sub>C1=NPdat=THEME</sub> <i>wyrðe vel meoduma</i> (<i>he who loves [his] father or mother more than me, he is not [of] me worthy or deserving</i>) (MtGl (Ru) 10.37) • <i>we</i><sub>Sub=NP=EXPERIENCER</sub> <i>magon on þyssum stowum [...]</i> <i>gode ȝ medeme weorþan for urum Drihtne</i><sub>C1=PPfor=THEME</sub> (<i>we can in this place [...] good &amp; fit become for our Lord</i>) (HomS 46 (BlHom 11) 251) ❷ <b>S+V+Adj+(C<sup>1</sup>)+C<sup>2</sup></b>: [V = Cop <i>bēon/wesan, weorþan</i>] [S = pers; NP; EXPERIENCER] [(C<sup>1</sup>)= pers; THEME] [C<sup>2</sup> = -anim; PPon/<i>þurb</i>; SCOPE] • <i>He</i><sub>Sub=NP=EXPERIENCER</sub> <i>wes meodum on eallum þingum</i><sub>C2=PPon=SCOPE</sub> (<i>he was worthy in all things</i>) (LS 3 (Chad) 76) • <i>he</i><sub>Sub=NP=EXPERIENCER</sub> <i>was þurh all meodum ȝ Gode gecoren</i> (<i>he was through all worthy &amp; chosen by God</i>) (Bede 4 3.262.30) ❸ <b>S+V+Adj+(C<sup>1</sup>)+C<sup>2</sup></b>: [V = Cop <i>bēon/wesan, weorþan</i>] [S = pers; NP; EXPERIENCER] [(C<sup>1</sup>)= pers; THEME] [(C<sup>2</sup>) = -anim; SCOPE] • <i>ðeah mon nu yfelum men anwald selle, ne gedeð se anwald hine</i><sub>Sub(Obj)=NP=EXPERIENCER</sub> <i>godne ne medomne</i> (<i>even though an evil man may have been given power, power will not make him good or worthy</i>) (Bo 16.38.32)</p>
---

<sup>20</sup> The basic meaning of *medeme* is “moderate, occupying or observing the mean position”, whence “meet for” or “worthy of something.” See Bosworth & Toller, *s.v. medume*. My dictionary entry sample in this article records this last sense, though it often proves difficult to pinpoint the exact meaning in extant examples.

The adjective *weorþ* is semantically more complex than *medeme*.<sup>21</sup> Three senses are relevant here:

“Having sufficient worth or merit in a certain respect to deserve having or receiving something”. With this sense it is a synonym of *medeme* and shares with it the same argumental and syntactic complementation structure.<sup>22</sup>

1.- “Legally entitled to something on account of something [=having the right to deserve].”

2.- “Worthy of esteem for somebody on account of something.”

Although the arguments of the adjective are the same in its three senses, they surface as different structures according to the meaning conveyed:

- (1) “DESERVING” AND (2) “ENTITLED”: EXPERIENCER (SUBJECT), THEME (C<sup>1</sup>) AND SCOPE (C<sup>2</sup>);
- (2) “ESTEEMED”: theme (SUBJECT), experiencer (C<sup>1</sup>) AND scope (C<sup>2</sup>).

Unlike *medeme*, *weorþ* is always used with at least one complement. Besides, both complements are allowed simultaneously. Examples (43) and (44) illustrate senses 1 and 3, with 2 complements.

(43) he [...]cwæð þæt he meahthe oðerne getæcnan, þe<sup>Sub-NP-EXPERIENCER</sup>  
**biscophada**<sup>C1-NPgen=THEME</sup> **wyrðra wære ge on gelærednesse ge on his**  
**lifes gegearnunge ge on gedefre eldo**<sup>C2-PPfor=SCOPE</sup>  
*(he [...] said that he could another[one] instruct, who [for the] bishopric*  
*worthier would be in learning, in his life's preparation and in adequate age)*  
*(Bede 4 1.254.6)*

(44) Wæs he<sup>Sub-NP=THEME</sup> **for his arfæstum dædum**<sup>C2-PPfor=SCOPE</sup> **eallum his**  
**geferum**<sup>C1-NPdat=EXPERIENCER</sup> leof ȝ weorð

<sup>21</sup> *Weorþ* has other meanings which that have nothing to do with the idea of deserving, such as “having a value equal to something specified”, “considered appropriate or acceptable for a given circumstance or purpose”, “of great value, importance or merit”, “deserving of or liable to punishment” (see Note 17), and “held in esteem by somebody on account of something”. These meanings, of course, are not considered in this article.

<sup>22</sup> However, the referent of the THEME in the case of *medeme* is always personal, while in the case of *weorþ* it may also be inanimate.

(*Was he for his honourable actions [to] all his companions dear & worthy*) (LS 17.1 (MartinMor) 31)

There exist a few adjectives lexically derived from *weorþ*, namely, *weorþfull*, *weorþig*, *weorþlic* and *unweorþlic*, which also belong to the “deserving” group. However, only *unweorþlic* “unworthy, unfitting” might be considered as ditransitive; see example (45). The adjective has three arguments, THEME, EXPERIENCER and SCOPE, which surface as subject, a dative NP complement and an infinitive-clause complement, respectively.<sup>23</sup>

- (45) þeah þe **heo**<sup>Sub=NP=THEME</sup> [spræce] si **us**<sup>CI=NPdat=EXPERIENCER</sup> **unwyrðlice** ȝ **unrihtlic to spreca**<sup>C2=enneInfCl=SCOPE</sup>  
 (even though it [speech] should be [for] us unfitting & wrong to speak) (GDPref and 3 (C) 15.209.16)

Table 11 illustrates the different patterns of the adjectives of the “deserving” group.

<sup>23</sup> When the SCOPE is an infinitive clause, the clause often contains yet another argument which surfaces as a dative NP. Semantically this NP is an AGENT within the infinitive clause, but in my view it is also an EXPERIENCER argument of the adjective predicate. The same analysis may be applied to a semantic class of adjectives which I have not considered in this article, that of “ease and difficulty”. In the sentence **þæs deges godspel**<sup>Sub=THEME</sup> is swiðe **earfoðe læwedum mannum**<sup>Comp1=EXPERIENCER</sup> **to understandenne**<sup>Comp2=SCOPE</sup> (ÆCHom II, 36.2, 271.6; *Today’s gospel is very difficult for uneducated men to understand*), the quality of *ease* applies not only to the action (*tō understandenne*), but also to the referent of the subject (*þæs deges godspel*). As Bolinger (1961: 373) points out (in his criticism of Lees’s (1960) thesis that *He is hard to convince* has the same origin as *It is hard to convince him*), these adjectives “can as readily modify the subject as the action.” Paraphrasing Schachter (1980: 446, Note 15), we could say that the act of reading the gospel is difficult by reason of some intrinsic quality of the gospel itself. See also Wülfing (1894–1901 II: 200). Since there are examples in OE with no infinitive clause complement, it is clear that the adjective can indeed qualify the subject: hu nearu ys **weg**<sup>Sub=THEME</sup> ȝ **earfoþe** se gelæt to life (LibSc 60.1; *how straight and difficult is the path that leads to life*). Here the SCOPE and EXPERIENCER arguments do not surface, though they are contextually recoverable (*\*mannum* and *\*tredan*, for example). There are examples where only the EXPERIENCER is overt and the SCOPE is covert (but recoverable: *\*tō donne*): Drihten hælend. nis **þe**<sup>CI=EXPERIENCER</sup> **nan ðing**<sup>Sub=THEME</sup> **earfoðe** (ÆCHom I, 4, 62.10; *Lord saviour, is to You nothing difficult*). Therefore, adjectives of “ease and difficulty” could arguably be included among our ditransitive adjectives. See also examples (26) and ((45)).

Table 11. Complementation patterns of adjectives of *medeme*, *unweorþ* and *weorþ* with the sense “deserving”

	S+V+Adj+C+C	S+V+Adj+C+(C)	S+V+Adj+(C)+C	S+V+Adj+(C)+(C)
<i>medeme</i>	-	+	+	+
<i>unmedeme</i>	-	-	-	+
<i>unweorþ</i>	+	+	+	+
<i>unweorþlic</i>	+	-	-	-
<i>weorþ1</i>	+	+	+	+
<i>weorþ2</i>	+	+	+	+

The complements of the adjectives of “deserving” take the following realizations:

Table 12. Formal realization of adjectives of “deserving”

	Dat NP		Gen NP		Acc NP		PP		Finite Cl.		Infin. Cl.	
	C <sup>1</sup>	C <sup>2</sup>	C <sup>1</sup>	C <sup>2</sup>	C <sup>1</sup>	C <sup>2</sup>	C <sup>1</sup>	C <sup>2</sup>	C <sup>1</sup>	C <sup>2</sup>	C <sup>1</sup>	C <sup>2</sup>
<i>medeme</i>	+						<i>for</i>	<i>on, þurb</i>				
<i>weorþ<sup>1</sup></i>	+		+		+(inst )		<i>tō</i>	<i>for, on</i>	+		+	
<i>weorþ<sup>2</sup></i>	+	+					<i>mid, on</i>	<i>for, in, mid, on</i>				
<i>unweorþ</i>			+					<i>fram, on</i>	+			
<i>weorþful1</i>				+								
<i>weorþful2</i>	+						<i>betweob, mid, on</i>					
<i>weorþig</i>				+								

## ADJECTIVES OF “AGREEMENT”

There are four adjectives denoting “agreement with somebody in something”: *ānræd*, *geþwære*, *ungerād* and *ungeþwære*. The arguments required by these adjectives are two EXPERIENCERS and a SCOPE. One of the EXPERIENCER arguments *always* surfaces as the subject and the other *may* be a complement (a dative NP or a PP); see example (46). As Comesaña-Rincón (2001b: 38) points out, there exists a relation of *reciprocity* between them: “a

change in the (linear) direction of the relation provokes no alteration in the relation itself.” Thus, example (46) may be rewritten as example (47).

- (46) Hwæt gewilnað þes wiðerwinna, þe wyle, þæt þu<sup>Sub=NP=EXPERIENCER1</sup> beo  
wið hine<sup>C1=PPwib=EXPERIENCER2</sup> **geþwære**, buton þines sylfes hæle? (ÆL<sup>et</sup>  
 6 (Wulfgeat), 135)

(What does this enemy wish, who desires that you should be agreed with him,  
 except your own salvation?)

- (47) \***he**<sup>Sub=NP=EXPERIENCER2</sup> beo **wip þe**<sup>C1=PPwib=EXPERIENCER1</sup> **geþwære**  
 (he should be agreed with you)

This reciprocal relationship is the reason why both arguments are given the same case label. Reciprocity also means that both EXPERIENCERS may appear as coordinated NPs with subject function, as is illustrated in example (48), with the antonym *ungerād*:<sup>24</sup>

- (48) Donne **se abbod**<sup>Sub=NP1=EXPERIENCER1</sup> and **se prafost**<sup>Sub=NP2=EXPERIENCER2</sup>  
**ungerade** beoð and him betwyx sacað [...] (BenR 65.124.18)

What is more, the referents of the two coordinated phrases, that is, the two EXPERIENCERS, may be realized by just one NP in the plural:

- (49) Æfter godes gesetnyse **ealle cristene men**<sup>Sub=NP=EXPERIENCERS1+2</sup> sceoldon beon  
 swa **geþwære**. swilce hit an man wære  
 (After God’s law, all Christian men must be as agreeing as if it one man were)  
 (ÆCHom I, 19, 272.23)

As for the second argument in the semantic frame, the SCOPE, it surfaces as a complement:

<sup>24</sup> Naturally, although these “transformations” involve no change of meaning, the focus is different. See Quirk & al. (1985: 940; 945 et passim).

- (50) And alle hi<sup>Sub=NP=EXPERIENCERS1+2</sup> wæron anræde æt callum þam  
ðingum<sup>C2=PPæt=SCOPE</sup>  
*(And they all were unanimous on all those things)* (WPol 2.1.1 (Jost) 161)

Figure 7 illustrates the dictionary entry of *ānræd*.

Figure 7. Dictionary entry of *ānræd*

<p><b>ĀNRÆD</b>  <b>being agreed with somebody concerning something</b> ♦ <i>agreed, one-minded, unanimous</i> ≠ <i>ungerād, ungeþwære</i> ♦ PREDICATIVE (C<sub>s</sub>) ♦ <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">EXPERIENCER<sup>1</sup></span>, <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">EXPERIENCER<sup>2</sup>, SCOPE</span> ❶ <span style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px;">S+V+Adj+C<sup>1</sup>+C<sup>2</sup></span>: [V = Cop <i>bēon/wesan</i>] [S = pers; NP; EXPERIENCER<sup>1</sup>, EXPERIENCER<sup>2</sup>] [C<sup>1</sup> = pers; PP<i>betwēon</i>; EXPERIENCER<sup>1</sup>, EXPERIENCER<sup>2</sup>] [C<sup>2</sup> = abst; PP<i>tō</i>/CI Fin: <i>þæt</i>; SCOPE] • And <u>hy alle</u><sup>Sub=NP=EXPERIENCERS1+2</sup> wæron <u>anræde him betweenan</u><sup>C1=PPbetwēon=EXPERIENCERS1+2</sup> <u>to þæra gesætnyssa</u><sup>C2=PPtō=SCOPE</sup> <i>(And they all were agreed between them concerning the decree)</i> (ÆLet 1 (Wulfsgige Xa), 98) • Wurdan þa <u>alle</u><sup>Sub=NP=EXPERIENCER1</sup> swa <u>anræde mid þam cyng</u><sup>C1=PPmid=EXPERIENCER2</sup> <u>þæt hy woldon Godwines fyrde gesecan gif se cyng þæt wolde</u><sup>C2=þætCI=SCOPE</sup> <i>([They] all became so agreed with the king that they would Godwin's army seek if the king so wished)</i> (Or else: “resolute in support of the king”; see <i>DOE</i>, s. v. <i>ānræd</i>) (ChronD (Classen-Harm) 1052.1.31) ❷ <span style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px;">S+V+Adj+(C<sup>1</sup>)+C<sup>2</sup></span>: [V = Cop <i>bēon/wesan</i>] [S = pers; NP; EXPERIENCER<sup>1</sup>, EXPERIENCER<sup>2</sup>] [(C<sup>1</sup>) = pers; EXPERIENCER<sup>2</sup>] [C<sup>2</sup> = abst; PP<i>æt</i>; SCOPE] • And <u>alle hi</u><sup>Sub=NP=EXPERIENCERS1+2</sup> wæron <u>anræde æt callum þam</u><sup>C2=PPæt=SCOPE</sup> <u>ðingum</u><sup>C2=PPæt=SCOPE</sup> <i>(And they were all agreed on all the things)</i> (WPol 2.1.1 (Jost) 161) ❸ <span style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px;">S+V+Adj+(C<sup>1</sup>)+(C<sup>2</sup>)</span>: [V = Cop <i>bēon/wesan, weorþan</i>] [S = pers/conc(fig); NP; EXPERIENCER<sup>1</sup>, EXPERIENCER<sup>2</sup>] [(C<sup>1</sup>) = pers; EXPERIENCER<sup>2</sup> &gt; reciprocity: C &gt; S] [(C<sup>2</sup>) = abst; THEME] • <u>þæt we alle</u><sup>Sub=NP=EXPERIENCERS1+2</sup> gemænelice, gehadede and læwede, <u>anræde</u> weorðan for gode and for worold <i>(that we all mutually, religious and lay [people], one-minded become for God and for [the] world)</i> (HomU 40 (Nap 50) 206) • <u>se mona</u><sup>Sub=NP=EXPERIENCER1</sup> and <u>seo sæ</u><sup>Sub=NP=EXPERIENCER2</sup> beon <u>anræde</u> <i>(the moon and the sea are harmonious)</i> (Days 3.2 (Först) 42)</p>
---

The various patterns used by the “agreement” adjectives are shown in Table 13.

Table 13. Complementation patterns of adjectives of “agreement”



*Old English ditransitive adjectives*

	S+V+Adj+C+C	S+V+Adj+C+(C)	S+V+Adj+(C)+C	S+V+Adj+(C)+(C)
<i>ānræd</i>	+	–	+	+
<i>geþwære</i>	–	+	+	+
<i>ungerād</i>	–	+	+	+
<i>ungeþwære</i>	–	+	+	–

The complements of the adjectives of “agreement” take the realizations shown in Table 14.

*Table 14. Formal realization of adjectives of “deserving”*

	Dat NP		PP		Finite Cl.	
	C <sup>1</sup>	C <sup>2</sup>	C <sup>1</sup>	C <sub>2</sub>	C <sup>1</sup>	C <sup>2</sup>
<i>ānræd</i>			<i>betwēon, tō</i>		+	
<i>geþwære</i>	+		<i>wiþ</i>	<i>on</i>		
<i>ungerād</i>	+		<i>betwēon</i>			
<i>ungeþwære</i>	+		<i>betwēoh</i>			

6.- ADJECTIVES OF “SIMILARITY”

The three adjectives of “similarity”, *ānlic* and *gelic* “like”, and their antonym, *ungelic* “unlike”, always involve two THEMES and a SCOPE. Therefore, the patterns are very similar to those of the “agreement” adjectives. However, a major difference is that “agreement” adjectives always involve personal referents, while “similarity” adjectives may involve either animate or inanimate referents. THEME<sup>1</sup> *always* surfaces as subject in the clause structure while THEME2 *may* surface as complement (C1), as in the following example:

- (51) Forþam ys **heofena rice**<sup>Sub=NP=THEME1</sup> **anlic þam cyninge**<sup>C1=NPdat=THEME2</sup> þe hys  
 þeowas geradegode  
 (*Therefore is the kingdom of heaven like that king, who his servants reckoned*)  
 (Mt(WSCp) 18.23)

Since the same type of *reciprocity* relation which obtains with “agreement” adjectives exists with “similarity” adjectives, example (51) may be rewritten as (52), with no change in meaning. What is more, both THEMES may appear as

coordinated NPs with subject function (example (53)) or as one NP with double reference (example (54)).

- (52) \***Se cyning**<sup>Sub=NP=THEME2</sup> ys **anlic heofena rice**<sup>C1=NPdat=THEME1</sup>  
*(the king is like [the] kingdom of heavens)*
- (53) **sio bioldo**<sup>Sub=NP1=THEME1</sup> j **sio monnðwærnes**<sup>Sub=NP2=O2</sup> bioð swiðe **anlice**  
*(the courage & the meekness are most similar)* (CP 40.287.23)
- (54) Ac **hiora anwalda endas**<sup>Sub=NP=THEMES1+2</sup> wæron swiþe **ungelice**  
*(But their rulers' ends were very unlike)* (Or2 1.38.17)

The second argument is SCOPE, that is, the extent to which the similarity or lack of similarity between two people or things obtains. It surfaces as a complement taking the shape of a NP or a PP, as in (55):

- (55) **Se fugel**<sup>Sub=NP=THEME1</sup> is **on hiwe**<sup>C2=PPon=SCOPE</sup> æghwæs ænlic, **onlicost**  
**pean**<sup>C1=NPacc=THEME2</sup>  
*(The fowl is unique in aspect most like [a] peacock)* (Phoen 311)

Figure 8 shows the dictionary entry for the adjective *gelic*. The section for Syntactic Pattern ② is further divided into subsections (A), (B) and (C) to illustrate more clearly the structures and types of referent of its components. Both the subject and the C1 take the shape of finite clauses introduced by *þe*, *þæt* and *swā*, often anticipated by or correlating with *hit*, *þām*, *þon* and *þæs*. Since these patterns disappeared in the course of history, the courtesy translations offered may at times prove a little taxing for PDE acceptability.

Figure 8. Dictionary entry of *gelic*

<p>GELĪC  having resemblance in certain features to someone or something ♦ <i>like, similar</i> =  <i>anlic</i> ≠ <i>ungelic</i> ♦ PREDICATIVE (C<sub>S</sub>/C<sub>O</sub>) ♦ [THEME<sup>1</sup>, THEME<sup>2</sup>, SCOPE]  ① S+V+Adj+C<sup>1</sup>+C<sup>2</sup>: [V = Cop <i>bēon/wesan, weorþan</i>] [S = ±anim; NP; THEME<sup>1</sup>]  [C<sup>1</sup> = ±anim; NP<sup>dat</sup>; THEME<sup>2</sup>] [C<sup>2</sup> = ±anim; NP<sup>dat</sup>/PPin/on; SCOPE] • Is <b>seo</b>  <b>eaggebyrd</b><sup>Sub=NP=THEME1</sup> <b>stearc ond hiwe</b><sup>C2=NPdat=SCOPE</sup> <b>stane</b><sup>C1=NPdat=THEME2</sup>  <b>gelicast</b> (<i>Is the eye rigid and in aspect [to] a stone most similar</i>) (Phoen 301) •  Wendun ge ond woldun, wiþerhycgende, þæt <b>ge</b><sup>Sub=NP=THEME1</sup> <b>scyppende</b><sup>C1=</sup></p>
--

<p>NPdat=THEME2          sceoldan <b>gelice</b> wesan <b>in wuldre</b> <sup>C2=PPin=SCOPE</sup> (<i>You imagined and wanted, evil-thinking, that you [to] the Creator must similar be in glory</i>) (Guth A,B 663) • Ne gedafenað biscope þæt <b>he</b> <sup>Sub=NP=THEME1</sup> beo <b>on dædum</b> <sup>C2=PPon=SCOPE</sup> <b>folces mannum</b> <sup>C1=NPdat=THEME2</sup> <b>gelic</b> (<i>It does not befit a bishop he should be in deeds [to] the folk's men similar</i>) (ÆCHom II, 10, 81.14)</p> <p>② <b>S+V+Adj+C<sup>1</sup>+C<sup>2</sup></b>: [V = Cop <i>bēon/wesan</i>] [(C<sup>2</sup>); -anim; SCOPE]</p> <p>Ⓐ [S = ±anim; NP; THEME<sup>1</sup>] [C<sup>1</sup> = ±anim; NP<sup>dat/gen/acc/PP</sup> <i>tō</i>/Cl Fin: <i>þæt</i> (anticipated by <i>hit</i>); <i>þe</i>; <i>þe</i> (anticipated by <i>þæm</i>, <i>þon</i>); <i>þæt</i> (anticipated by <i>þæs</i>); THEME<sup>2</sup>] • <b>Helias se witega</b> <sup>Sub=NP=THEME1</sup> wæs <b>us mannum</b> <sup>C1=NPdat=THEME2</sup> <b>gelic</b> (<i>Elias the prophet was us men like</i>) (ÆCHom II, 21, 189.277) • <b>gelic</b> is <b>rice heofunas</b> <sup>Sub=NP=THEME1</sup> <b>nett</b> <sup>C1=NPacc=THEME2</sup> <b>asendun in sae</b> (<i>similar is the kingdom of heavens [to] a net thrown into the sea</i>) (MtGl (Ru) 13.47) • <b>gelic</b> is <b>ric heofna</b> <sup>Sub=NP=THEME1</sup> <b>to darste</b> <sup>C1=PPtō=THEME2</sup> (<i>similar is [the] kingdom of heavens is to leaven</i>) (MtGl (Li) 13.33) • <b>hit</b> <sup>Anticip</sup> is us nu swiþor <b>bismre</b> <sup>C1=NPdat=THEME2</sup> <b>gelic þæt we þæt besprecað</b> <sup>Sub=þætCl=THEME1</sup> (<i>it is now [to] us more like shame that we should complain about that</i>) (Or3 11.82.33) • gyf hwa hwæt ungewealdes gedeð, ne byð <b>þæt</b> <sup>Sub=NP=THEME1</sup> eallunga na <b>gelic, þe hit gewealdes gewurþe</b> <sup>C1=þeCl=THEME2</sup> (<i>if somebody something does unintentionally, that is not at all like that, that [= as iff] it intentionally was done</i>) (LawIICn 68.3 7) • <b>hio</b> <sup>Sub=NP=THEME1</sup> [seo sibb] sie <b>þæm</b> <sup>Anticip</sup> <b>gelicost þe mon nime ænne eles dropan</b> <sup>C1=þeCl=THEME2</sup> [...] (<i>[peace] be that most like that, that [= as iff] somebody a drop of oil took [...]</i>) (Or4 7.97.28)</p> <p>Ⓑ [S = NP; pers/abst; THEME<sup>1</sup>, THEME<sup>2</sup>] [C<sup>1</sup> = -anim; NP<sup>dat</sup>; THEME<sup>1</sup>, THEME<sup>2</sup>] • <b>ealle gesceafta</b> <sup>Sub=NP=THEMES1+2</sup> þu gesceope <b>him</b> <sup>C1=NPdat=THEMES1+2</sup> <b>gelice</b> (<i>all creatures you created to them [= to one another] similar</i>) (Bo 33.79.31 7) • Ac <b>ealle þry hadas</b> <sup>Sub=NP=THEMES1+2</sup> emnece <b>him sylfum</b> <sup>C1=NPdat=THEMES1+2</sup> synt ȝ <b>gelice</b> (<i>But all three persons coeternal between themselves are &amp; coequal</i>) (PsCaI (Lindelöf) 19(15).26)</p> <p>Ⓒ [S = abst; Cl Fin: <i>swā/þæt/þe</i> (anticipated by <i>hit</i>); THEME<sup>1</sup>] [C<sup>1</sup> = abst; Cl Fin: <i>swā</i>; THEME<sup>2</sup>] • Emne <b>hit</b> <sup>Anticip</sup> bið <b>gelice swa man mid wætere þone weallendan wylm agiote</b> <sup>Sub=swāCl=THEME1</sup>, þæt he leng me mot rixian (<i>Likewise, it will be like that [as iff] somebody with water the flowing flame would soak</i>) (HomS 40.3 (ScraggVerc 10) 129)</p> <p>③ <b>S+V+Adj+(C<sup>1</sup>)+C<sup>2</sup></b>: [V = Cop <i>bēon/wesan</i>] [S = NP; pers/abst; THEME<sup>1</sup>, THEME<sup>2</sup>] [(C<sup>1</sup>); pers, abst; THEME<sup>2</sup>] [C<sup>2</sup>; -anim; PPon; SCOPE] • <b>hi</b> <sup>Sub=NP=THEMES1+2</sup> [iacob and esau] næron þeah <b>gelice on þeawum ne on lifes</b></p>	<p>(You imagined and wanted, evil-thinking, that you [to] the Creator must similar be in glory) (Guth A,B 663)</p> <p>(It does not befit a bishop he should be in deeds [to] the folk's men similar) (ÆCHom II, 10, 81.14)</p> <p>(Elias the prophet was us men like) (ÆCHom II, 21, 189.277)</p> <p>(similar is the kingdom of heavens [to] a net thrown into the sea) (MtGl (Ru) 13.47)</p> <p>(similar is [the] kingdom of heavens is to leaven) (MtGl (Li) 13.33)</p> <p>(it is now [to] us more like shame that we should complain about that) (Or3 11.82.33)</p> <p>(if somebody something does unintentionally, that is not at all like that, that [= as iff] it intentionally was done) (LawIICn 68.3 7)</p> <p>([peace] be that most like that, that [= as iff] somebody a drop of oil took [...]) (Or4 7.97.28)</p> <p>(all creatures you created to them [= to one another] similar) (Bo 33.79.31 7)</p> <p>(But all three persons coeternal between themselves are &amp; coequal) (PsCaI (Lindelöf) 19(15).26)</p> <p>(Likewise, it will be like that [as iff] somebody with water the flowing flame would soak) (HomS 40.3 (ScraggVerc 10) 129)</p> <p>[iacob and esau] næron þeah gelice on þeawum ne on lifes</p>
--	--

<p><b>geearnungum</b><sup>C2=PPon=SCOPE</sup> (they [Jacob and Esau] were not, however, alike in customs nor in life's earnings) (ÆCHom I, 7, 110.20)</p> <p>④ <b>S+V+Adj+(C<sup>1</sup>)+(C<sup>2</sup>)</b>: [V = Cop <i>bēon/wesan</i>] [S = ±anim; NP; THEME<sup>1</sup>, THEME<sup>2</sup>] [(C<sup>1</sup>) = anim, abst; THEME<sup>2</sup> reciprocity: &gt; S] [(C<sup>2</sup>) = -anim; SCOPE] • <b>Ealle we</b><sup>Sub=NP=THEMES1+2</sup> sind <b>gelice</b> ætforan gode (<i>We all are alike before God</i>) (ÆCHom I, 19, 260.24) • <b>Se forholena cræft</b><sup>Sub=NP=THEME1</sup> and <b>forhyded god</b><sup>Sub=NP=THEME2</sup> ne bið ællunga <b>gelice</b> (<i>The hidden skill and the concealed good will not be at all alike</i>) (Instr 69)</p>
---

The patterns for the “similarity” adjectives are shown in Table 15 and the formal realization of the complements in Table 16.

Table 15. Complementation patterns of adjectives of “similarity”

	S+V+Adj+C+C	S+V+Adj+C+(C)	S+V+Adj+(C)+C	S+V+Adj+(C)+(C)
<i>anlic</i>	+	+	–	+
<i>gelic</i>	+	+	+	+
<i>ungelic</i>	+	+	–	+

Table 16. Formal realization of adjectives of “similarity”

	Dative NP		Genitive NP		Accusative NP		PP		Finite Clause	
	C <sup>1</sup>	C <sup>2</sup>	C <sup>1</sup>	C <sup>2</sup>	C <sup>1</sup>	C <sup>2</sup>	C <sub>1</sub>	C <sup>2</sup>	C <sup>1</sup>	C <sup>2</sup>
<i>gelic</i>	+	+	+		+		<i>tō</i>	<i>in, on</i>	+	
<i>anlic</i>	+							<i>on</i>	+	
<i>ungelic</i>	+							<i>on</i>	+	

## 7.- CONCLUSIONS

Although the vast majority of OE adjectives are intransitive and do not require a complement, a substantial number of them are transitive and some fifty odd of these can be further considered to be ditransitive. OE ditransitive adjectives belong to just a few semantic classes (“gratitude,” “generosity,” “obedience,” “guilt and responsibility,” “deserving,” “agreement,” and “similarity”). Strictly speaking, the syntactic term *ditransitive* should apply only to adjectives which are always used with two complements (C1 and C2), but the broader definition I have used — ditransitive

adjectives are three-place adjectival predicates — allows me to include adjectives which are found with just one complement, that is, with an overt argument and with a covert, but recoverable, argument. This may be due either to the fact that tokens have not survived in extant texts (and are not found in the *DOEC*) or to the fact that they simply disallowed such syntactic patterns with two complements. However, it is on the grounds of their close semantic relationship to other adjectives of which there are extant examples that I posit, and hope to have shown, that their semantic structure is the same. This approach permits to organize the dictionary entries of these adjectives in the lexicon in a highly systematic way. It also allows for efficient comparison and cross-referencing between semantically- and lexically-related adjectives.

A. Alcaraz-Sintes  
University of Jaén

REFERENCES

- Alcaraz-Sintes, Alejandro 2006a: Proposal for a Dictionary of Syntactic and Semantic Complementation of Old English Adjectives. *Selected Proceedings of the 2005 Symposium on New Approaches in English Historical Lexis (HEL-LEX)*. McConchie R. W. & al. eds. 34–40. Somerville (Ma.): Cascadilla Proceedings Project. 14/04/2006. [www.lingref.com](http://www.lingref.com), document #1344
- Alcaraz-Sintes, Alejandro 2006b: *La complementación del adjetivo en inglés antiguo*. Jaén: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Jaén.
- Alcaraz-Sintes, Alejandro 2006c: Old English Ditransitive Adjectives. Paper delivered at the 18th SELIM Conference, University of Málaga.
- Alcaraz-Sintes, Alejandro In progress: A Dictionary of Adjective Semantic and Syntactic Complementation.

- Biber, Douglas, Susan Conrad and Geoffrey Leech 2002: *Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow, Essex: Longman, Pearson Education Limited.
- Bolinger, Dwight L. 1961: Syntactic Blends and Other Matters. *Language* 37. 366–381.
- Bolinger, Dwight L. & A. Donald Sears 1981[1968]: *Aspects of Language*. Third edition. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Bosworth, Joseph and T. Northcote Toller 1921[1898]: *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary. Based on the Manuscript Collections of the Late Joseph Bosworth*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Comesaña-Rincón, Joaquín 1986: *La complementación adjetiva en inglés contemporáneo*. PhD Thesis. Universidad de Sevilla.
- Comesaña-Rincón, Joaquín 1992: La modificación adjetiva de sustantivos deverbales en inglés: hacia una tipología transitiva de los adjetivos. *Actas del IX Congreso de AESLA. Congreso Nacional de la Asociación Española de Lingüística Aplicada*. Valladolid. Servicio Editorial de la Universidad del País Vasco. 1992. 179–189.
- Comesaña-Rincón, Joaquín 1998: La transitividad adjetiva: hacia una tipología completiva del adjetivo inglés. *Transitivity Revisited*. Montserrat Martínez Vázquez. Ed. 187–199. Huelva: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Huelva.
- Comesaña-Rincón, Joaquín 2001a: Decoding and Encoding Grammatical Information in Adjectival Entries: The Basics. *Atlantis*, XXIII 1, 27–40.
- Comesaña-Rincón, Joaquín 2001b: Decoding and Encoding Grammatical Information in Adjectival Entries: Processes and Cases. *Atlantis*, XXIII 2, 31–48.

- Cook, Walter A. S. J. 1998: *Case Grammar Applied*. Publications in Linguistics 127. Dallas (Texas): The Summer Institute of Linguistics and The University of Texas at Arlington.
- Denison, David 1993: *English Historical Syntax*. London and New York: Longman.
- DOE. *The Dictionary of Old English – A to F*. Antonette diPaolo Healey. Ed. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies.
- DOEC. *The Dictionary of Old English Corpus in Electronic Form*. 2004. diPaolo Healey, Antonette, Dorothy Holland, Joan Haines, David McDougall, Ian McDougall & Xin Xiang. Toronto: DOE Project.
- Fillmore, Charles J. 1968: The Case for Case. *Universals in Linguistic Theory*. Emmon Bach and Robert Harms. Eds. 1–88. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Fischer, Olga & Wim Van der Wurff. 2006: Syntax. Hogg, Richard & David Denison. Eds. 109–198. *A History of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Herbst, Thomas 2004: *A Valency Dictionary of English: a Corpus-Based Analysis of the Complementation Patterns of English Verbs, Nouns and Adjectives*. Topics in English Linguistics 40. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Huddleston, Rodney & Geoffrey K. Pullum 2002: *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lees, Robert B. 1960: A Multiply Ambiguous Adjectival Construction in English. *Language* 36. 207–221.
- Maling, Joan 1983: Transitive Adjectives: A Case of Categorical Reanalysis. *Linguistic Categories: Auxiliaries and Related Puzzles*. Frank Heny and B. Richards. Eds. 253–289. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Mitchell, Bruce 1985: *Old English Syntax*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- OED. The Oxford English Dictionary Second Edition on Compact Disk.* Version 3.0. 2002[1989]. Simpson, Joseph & Edmund Weiner. Eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech & Jan Svartvik 1985: *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London and New York: Longman.
- Trask, R. Larry 1993: *A Dictionary of Grammatical Terms in Linguistics*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Tucker, Gordon H. 1998: *The Lexicogrammar of Adjectives. A Systemic Functional Approach to Lexis*. London and New York: Cassell.
- Visser, Frederic Th. 1963–1973: *An Historical Syntax of the English Language*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Wülfing, J. Ernst 1894–1901: *Die Syntax in den Werken Alfreds des Grossen*. Bonn: B. Hanstein's.

\* † \*