

PROPERTY CONCEPTS IN CONTRAST: THE TRANSLATION OF ADJECTIVALS (SPANISH-ENGLISH)*

Katerina Soumani

Universidad Complutense de Madrid

aikate@live.com

The present study explores the relation between the form and function of adjectivals that encode inherent property concepts in English and Spanish, which, contrary to transitory states, are assumed to be expressed by morphologically basic, prototypical adjectives (Dixon 1982). For this purpose, a corpus of Spanish literary texts and their corresponding English translations was compiled and subjected to a qualitative contrastive analysis, focusing on the ways in which Spanish adjectives/participles ending in *-do/a* are rendered into English. The observed pervasiveness and semantic versatility of the Spanish participial suffix *-do/a*, as well as the different patterns of meaning-to-form correspondence in adjectivals in the two languages possibly point to a different conceptualization. In turn, this difference in conceptual hierarchy, as reflected on linguistic forms, should have observable implications for the translation of the examined forms into English.

Keywords: *Adjectives, participles, property concepts, English-Spanish, contrastive analysis, translation.*

El presente estudio se propone examinar la relación entre la forma y la función de los adjetivales que expresan conceptos de propiedades inherentes en inglés y en español, que, a diferencia de los estados transitorios, supuestamente suelen ser denotados por adjetivos prototípicos y morfológicamente básicos (Dixon 1982). Con este objetivo, un corpus de textos literarios españoles y sus respectivas traducciones al inglés fue compilado y sometido a un análisis cualitativo y

contrastivo, que se centra en las distintas maneras de las que se traducen los adjetivos/participios en *-do/a* del español al inglés. La versatilidad del sufijo participial español *-do/a*, junto con los diferentes patrones de correspondencia entre la forma y el significado observados en los dos idiomas en cuestión posiblemente indican una conceptualización diferente. A su vez, esta diferencia en la jerarquía conceptual lógicamente tendría repercusiones en la traducción de dichos adjetivales al inglés.

Palabras clave: *Adjetivos, participios, conceptos de propiedad, inglés-español, análisis contrastivo, traducción.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Under the influence of Cognitive Semantics, lexical categorization, a rather controversial issue, has been revisited in recent literature (see, for instance, Delbecque 2008). Adjectives have always been the apple of discord among scholars, both in intra-linguistic research and contrastive or typological studies (see Dixon 1982, 1994, 2004; Wetzer 1996, among others) and from various theoretical viewpoints. From the exhaustive typological accounts provided by these studies, it becomes clear that what is conventionally referred to as *adjective class* in grammars and encyclopedias is a quite exceptional case in linguistic categorization. Even in languages which are assumed to have a definable adjective class, its members exhibit such diverse features in morphological and semantic terms that it may rightly be characterized as hybrid.

Regarding the hybrid nature of Spanish adjectives in particular, it has been pointed out that the morphological and semantic traits of a specific type of adjectives, namely the deverbal, place them in an intermediate position, halfway between adjectives and verbs (Varela 1992, Di Tullio 2008). Especially with respect to the latter, there seems to be a fuzzy area between adjectives and participles – which are clearly verbal forms. The great terminological inconsistency in the relevant literature add credence to this claim (see for instance Rainen

1999, Di Tullio 2008, Felú 2008, Bosque 1999, Bresnan 1995, Kibort 2005, for relevant discussions on the issue). Despite the various attempts to establish rigid formal criteria for distinguishing adjectives and participles, there always exist ambiguous cases that defy all classification. In Spanish, the suffix *-do/a* is prototypically related to participle derivation and present perfect constructions. However, its remarkable productivity and the semantic heterogeneity of the forms it gives rise to surely confer on it a special status among all other suffixes. This phenomenon is even more intriguing when compared with languages that do not allow for similar “incongruities” between form and meaning. If we consider, for instance, the relative proximity of Spanish and English in many respects, it would be interesting to examine whether the quasi-equivalent (at least in terms of form and function) English suffix *-ed* behaves in a similar way or not, and, in either case, what might be the reasons for this behavior.

The analysis presented here explores the semantic content and function of a particular kind of adjectival forms, regardless of the lexical category (i.e. adjectives or participles) they might be assigned to in each case. More specifically, the main focus is on the encoding of inherent *property concepts*, which, according to Dixon (1982), are typically described by morphologically basic, non-derived adjectives, as opposed to transitory states. Following Koontz-Garboden (2005), it is assumed that in English there is a tendency to match conceptually basic meanings (property concepts) to morphologically basic forms (prototypical adjectives) and that this meaning-to-form correspondence is usually rigid and rarely disrupted. On the contrary, Spanish does not seem to observe the same pattern, as the pervasiveness and semantic diversity of the participial suffix *-do/a* shows; the fact that lexical forms ending in *-do/a* frequently express both property concepts and resultative or transitory states without any morphological change may be evidence for a quite different perspective-taking. Expanding this hypothesis, it may be postulated that, in Spanish, even when there are morphologically basic adjectives available that encode a given property, there is a tendency to opt for the derived, participle-like form, thus adding a resultative nuance to the property in question. In English, however, this does not seem to be the case. Finally, it is predicted that this difference in conceptual hierarchy, as reflected in linguistic structures, has observable

implications for the translation of the *-do/a* Spanish forms into English. Before moving on to presenting the analysis, a few theoretical clarifications are in order. Firstly, and as regards the categorization of the lexical forms at hand, it has already been pointed out that, even in languages that have a distinct adjective class, its members tend to associate either with the nominal or the verbal system of the language. This observation led Wetzer to talk about the *continuum hypothesis*, according to which “adjectival words occupy an intermediate position in a language-independent lexical continuum or category space from Verb to Noun” (1996: 44). It is obvious that the traditional view of word classes as absolute and unrelated categories is incompatible with the continuum hypothesis, which provides a plausible, if not exhaustive, account of the overlap and the variation among word classes, particularly in the case of adjectives and participles.

Secondly, as far as the numerous attempts to formally distinguish adjectives and participles – and with respect to Spanish in particular – pose various problems related to the notoriously ambiguous position of participles and their two most conspicuous characteristics, which in Di Tullio’s words are “their hybrid nature between the verb and the adjective as well as their internal heterogeneity”¹ (2008: 99).

Since the main purpose of this study is not to provide a definite solution to the aforementioned problem, no attempt will be made to reformulate the existing criteria or to propose new models for either the distinction of participles and adjectives or for lexical categorization in general. What is of interest for our purposes, however, is the semantic content of the adjectival and participial forms in Spanish and how the choice of different forms for encoding the same meaning reflects a difference in perspective in the two languages. In this regard, there are three crucial semantic notions that have been taken into account during the analysis, namely *aspect* (Comrie 1976), *state* (Talmy 1987, Dixon 1982) and *orientation* (Kibort 2005). The most salient aspectual features of deverbal adjectives or participles in both English and Spanish might be described as *perfectivity* and *resultativeness*. With respect to state, in Dixon (1982) the distinction is made between property concepts and (result) states as encoded by adjectives. Dixon points out that, more often than not,

property concepts – which may be regarded as stable, permanent or even inherent to the entity they are attributed to – are described by non-derived, morphologically basic adjectives, and as opposed to result states, no information is provided about their inception or termination. Last but not least, the notion of orientation may also contribute to the understanding of the adjectives/participles in question. Kibort's (2005: 8) example of “dreadful” and “apprehensive” successfully clarifies the meaning of orientation: both adjectives involve the notion of fear and two (implicit or explicit) participants; however, “dreadful” is *oriented* towards the stimulus participant, whereas “apprehensive” is *oriented* towards the experiencing participant. According to Kibort, participles also display a clearly observable orientation towards one of the verb's participants, and, generally speaking, a participle can be either agent-oriented or patient-oriented; but not both. When it comes to language in actual practice, however, the question remains: how do orientation, aspect and state relate to the issue of perspective or unmarked preference in the two languages, in order for the same meaning to be encoded?

2. THE STUDY

The corpus consists of the following literary texts in print format, originally written in Spanish, and their corresponding translations into English:

Cuando fui mortal (Javier Marías, 1998)

When I was mortal (Margaret Jull Costa, 1999)

El inquilino (Javier Cercas, 2000)

The tenant (Anne Malean, 2005)

El móvil (Javier Cercas, 2003)

The motive (Anne McLean, 2005)

Despite the potential shortcomings of using translation corpora in contrastive analyses, which have been widely discussed (see Altenberg and Granger 2002, Krzeszowski 1990, among others), the choice of such corpus was found suitable for the purposes of the study, which neither lends itself to a strictly typological approach nor aspires to an exhaustive account of the issue. In accordance with the aims of

the study, the data gathering process was initially focused on the participial adjectival *-do/a* forms, as well as their irregular allomorphs, in the Spanish ST (source text), with no distinction regarding their position or syntactic function. The selection was made on the basis of the semantic content of the items: they would be most probably interpreted as assigning an inherent, relatively permanent property to the modified element. A sample of 74 instances was assembled, consisting of both highly frequent items and more marginal cases. The items of the sample were subsequently classified according to the ways in which they had been rendered in the English translations. On the basis of morphological criteria, it was possible to establish two broad groups, the first of which is in turn subdivided into six smaller categories. The analysis was essentially qualitative, complemented by a brief presentation of numerical results, which served to provide a clearer overall picture and support the points made in the study. The cases were also examined from an intra-linguistic point of view, which set the ground for the subsequent cross-linguistic comparisons and further comments on the respective choices and decisions made by the translators.

The first group (categories A-F) consists of instances of what may be called *direct translation*, which, roughly speaking, means that there is a one-to-one correspondence between the Spanish and English word forms (e.g. *agraciada* – attractive, *adinerado* – rich, etc.). This group is the largest and most diverse of the two, and it may be further subdivided to 6 categories, which are listed below:

-do/a forms à *-ing* forms (e.g. *holgada* – loose-fitting)

-do/a forms à *-ive* forms (e.g. *agraciada* – attractive)

-do/a forms à morphologically basic adjectives, not derived or whose formation is synchronically opaque (e.g. *desmedida* – enormous, *alargado* – long)

-do/a forms à *-ful* / *-less* forms (e.g. *descolorida* – colourless, *dolidas* – sorrowful)

-do/a forms à miscellanea / very few instances (e.g. *ondulados* – wavy, *pasmado* – dimwit)

-do/a forms à *-ed* forms (e.g. *adecuado* – suited, *depravado* – depraved)

The second group is made up of cases in which there is clearly no one-to-one correspondence at word level. Instead, the translator is guided by the overall/ contextual meaning of the sentence the lexical item in question belongs to and therefore exploits a variety of resources available in the TL in order to encode the same meaning, as shown in example (1) below:

- (1) *el ventanuco abocado al patio de las luces*
the little ventilation window that gave on to the courtyard

Although these instances might at first seem misleading or even irrelevant for the purposes of a contrastive analysis, seeing them from a different perspective reveals that this is not necessarily so: for any given item — in a specific context— to be translated there is always more than one translation option. The final choice the translator makes, i.e. the translation technique she opts for, is undoubtedly influenced by personal or subjective factors, along with contextual ones, but it is also, most crucially, conditioned by the conceptual/ linguistic repertoire available in the TL (target language). Thus, the selected translation techniques may be said to reflect the linguistic and conceptual patterns, albeit indirectly. Table 1 presents the number of instances corresponding to each of the 7 categories, as found in the sample under discussion.

Table 1

Categories and the number of instances corresponding to each one of them

English translation	Example	Instances in the sample	%
-ing	holgada → loose-fitting	10	13.5
-ive	agraciada → attractive	5	6.7
basic	alargado → long	26	35.1
-ful/ -less	descolorida → colourless	6	8.1
various	pasmado → dimwit	5	6.7
other TL resources	abocado al → that gave on to	9	12.1
-ed	adecuado → suited	13	17.5
TOTAL		74	100

2.1 The first group (Categories A-F)

2.1.1 *-do/a forms à -ing forms*

The *-ing* verbal suffix directly evokes specific aspectual traits, such as imperfectivity, progression and duration. Although the function of these adjectivals is to ascribe a property to the modified element, they do so from a dynamic perspective. The Spanish *-do/a* adjectivals, on the other hand, to which these *-ing* forms correspond, give a quite different picture. Here, the assigned property is presented as the result of some previous action, which the modified element has undergone – thus being more a patient than an agent. This resultative state, however, is no longer interpreted as such; it seems as if what was once seen as the immediate result of an action, ended up denoting a time-stable property, preserving its original form but adapting to a new semantic function.

Among the translated *-do/a* forms of this group, we find cases which are either ambiguous or ambivalent, in the sense that the same form may acquire a different semantic content, depending on the context in which it is found. Thus, in (2), *aburrida*, which modifies the noun *gente*, describes a rather stable quality and is obviously agent oriented. The exact same form, however, if combined with the verb *estar*, would refer to a transitory, patient-oriented state. In English, this semantic distinction would unavoidably be reflected in the form, too: *boring* and *bored*, respectively. This example is probably one of the most commonly cited in relevant discussions, and it is also a quite illustrative one.

(2) *gente emprendedora y saludable, rebosante de optimismo; un poco anodina, y hasta aburrida: eso se lo concede.*

enterprising, healthy people, bursting with optimism, a little dull, perhaps boring. I'll grant you that.

2.1.2. *-do/a forms à -ive forms*

Probably one of the most common adjectival suffixes, the *-ive* suffix, whether attached to nouns or verbs, usually denotes a tendency, a disposition or even ability. According to the *Longman Dictionary of*

Contemporary English (2003), for example, this suffix indicates that “someone/ something does or can do something”. This quite simple paraphrasing seems to suit well the instances that make up this group: *attractive, excessive, talkative, fugitive, decisive*. They all have a strongly active meaning; they may be characterized as agent- oriented and, even when they are derived from verbs, they do not exhibit any special aspectual properties. On the contrary, they are rather time-independent, and express inherent, stable properties. All in all, they qualify for core membership in the adjective class. Interestingly enough, and in spite of the existence of the historically related suffix *-ivo* in Spanish, these adjectives function as the translation equivalents of *-do/a* adjectives. In the ST, the same property is presented from a different perspective; it is the resultative character of the property that is foregrounded, and not the property as such.

(3) *con la **desaforada** pasión del converso, enumeró una a una las ventajas indudables que tal triunfo comportaba.*

*with the **excessive** passion of the convert, listed one after another the unquestionable benefits such a success brought with it.*

Although *desaforado* and *excessive* refer to the same quality, their orientation is clearly distinct: patient-oriented and agent-oriented, respectively. *Excessive* involves acting “in excess”, whereas *desaforado* implies being in a particular state, as a consequence of a similar process. Yet, as example (3) shows, they both characterize the nouns *passion / pasión*, assigning them a property.

2.1.3. *-do/a forms à morphologically basic/ synchronically opaque*

This category, which is the biggest and probably the most diverse of all, consists of adjectives considered morphologically basic, i.e. not derived. Their etymology reaches back into the history of the language, as they apparently have evolved directly from Latin, Old and Middle English, in most cases. Although the approach presented in this study is clearly synchronic, and therefore no exhaustive diachronic account is intended here, this distinction proves to be useful for the analysis, mainly because it helps us assess the degree to which certain affixes remain productive or not, as well as identify common patterns

in the semantic evolution of the words, whenever this is possible.

The adjectives in question constitute a highly heterogeneous group; thus, some of them typically refer to physical properties, such as size or shape (e.g. *long*, *enormous*), or describe human qualities (e.g. *impetuous*, *timid*) and retain these meanings in the text. In other cases, however, adjectives from both categories are used metaphorically (e.g. *vast repugnance*) or characterize abstract entities and situations. What they all have in common is that, just as the *-ive* category examined above, they, too, may well be considered prototypical English adjectives. Synchronically speaking, their morphologically basic form carries a conceptually basic meaning. On the contrary, their counterparts in the Spanish ST are forms predominantly derived from verbs or nouns, all ending in *-do/a*, and whose formation is rather transparent synchronically. Most of them are codified in dictionaries as adjectives, although their degree of lexicalization varies greatly.

(4) *habría quedado copado por su **desmedida** figura y descompensado, él a solas frente a cuatro comensales pasando aperturas.*

*would have been filled to capacity by his **enormous** bulk and would have looked unbalanced, with him sitting alone opposite four guests all crammed together:*

(5) *El anciano comentó en tono neutro que su último movimiento había sido muy **desafortunado***

*The old man commented in a neutral tone of voice that his last move had been **unfortunate***

Desmedido is labelled as an adjective in the dictionaries consulted; according to the *DRAE* in particular, it comes from the participle of the verb *desmedirse* and it means “disproportionately big, excessive in size”, like its translation equivalent. But, unlike *enormous*, its participial-like form adds a resultative nuance to its meaning. It is as if the currently excessive size of the modified element were the result of some extension or enlargement process it has previously been subjected to, as opposed to its morphologically more basic synonyms,

such as *enorme*, *gigantesco*, *inmenso*, *descomunal*, etc. In fact, *desmedido* belongs to a wider semantic field, the components of which share two extremely productive morphological features: the suffix *-do/a* and the prefix *des-* (which indicates, among other things, excess or lack of bounds). The long list of examples proves the pervasiveness of these features: *desproporcionado*, *desaforado*, *deslenguado*, *desvergonzado*, among others. A similar morphological and semantic pattern may be observed in the case of *desafortunado*, in (5). Although the latter does not derive from a verb, it exhibits the same characteristics as its deverbal counterparts mentioned above. The existence of such denominal adjectives probably reinforces the case for the pervasiveness and great productive potential of the suffix in question. *Desafortunado* is rendered by *unfortunate*, its English cognate. Despite their common origin, however, the suffix *-ado/a*, unlike *-ate*, remains semantically “active”.

2.1.4. *-do/a forms à -ful/ -less forms*

The members of this category, although derived from nouns and thus not morphologically basic like the ones in the previous group, may well be considered as prototypical adjectives, which denote property concepts. The suffixes *-ful* and *-less*, assign the property of being “full of” or “devoid of” respectively to the bases they are attached to:

- (6) *La voz de Ginger sonaba neutra, descolorida.*
Ginger's voice sounded neutral, colourless

Although *colourless* is semantically close to the Spanish *descolorida*, it seems that part of the semantic content of the original is somehow lost. Interestingly enough, there is a participial adjective in English that is closer to *descolorido*², in terms of form and, possibly, meaning, i.e. *discolored*. Nevertheless, the translator's choice shows that the resultative factor is not a priority in the English version. It is also possible that the overtly metaphorical use of the word has had an influence on this decision.

2.1.5. *-do/a forms à miscellanea / very few instances*

As the name of the group reveals, the adjectives assigned to it do not actually make up a separate category as such. In a sense, they

could form part of a rather wider group which would include all the prototypical, property-denoting adjectives examined so far, since they are no different in this respect.

(7) *Narró anécdotas que creía **divertidas**, pero que sólo eran grotescas.*

*She told anecdotes she thought were **funny** but which were actually just grotesque.*

Divertido is a typical example illustrating the absence of formal and semantic distinction which often characterizes these adjectival forms in Spanish. It is clearly an agent-oriented, property concept adjective of common use – and also classified as an adjective by dictionaries. Yet, it cannot be formally distinguished by the patient/experiencer-oriented or passive use of the word³. In English, on the other hand, *funny* is invariable in terms of orientation and semantically more transparent; it simply assigns a property to the entity it modifies.

2.1.6. *-do/a forms à -ed forms*

The last sub-category in the “direct translation” group includes the translation equivalents that are formally closer to the ST *-do/ a* forms, although it would be inaccurate to assume an exact correspondence between the suffixes in the two languages. These adjectives are, in a sense, related to those of the first category, since they usually receive the name of “participial adjectives”, as well as due to the fact that they derive from verbs. Despite the relatively limited size of the corpus, the frequency of occurrence of these forms (17.5%) seems significantly low, when compared to the frequency of the rest of the categories (82.2%) and, more specifically those consisting of typically property-denoting terms (categories B,C,D,E; 56%). In addition, the *-ed* forms in the translation seem to correspond to rather ambiguous or uncommon uses of the *-do/ a* forms in the ST; ambiguous, in the sense that it is not always clear whether they actually characterize the modified element in terms of an inherent property – although this interpretation is quite plausible.

(8) *era muy joven y bastante agraciada, con un aire tímido y a la vez **convencido**, una voluntad afirmativa.*

*she was very young and quite attractive, with an air about her that was at once shy and **determined**, an affirmative will.*

In the example (8) presented above, it is not easy to tell with absolute certainty whether *convencido/a* refers to a property perceived as an inherent quality of the character in question; however, the context does not point to the opposite interpretation, either. We once more come across the metonymic motif (*un aire [...] convencido*), as has already been identified in previous cases. The translator opts for a “safe”, literal choice, staying as close as possible to the ST.

2.2. EQUIVALENCE BY ALTERNATIVE MEANS: THE SECOND GROUP

Contrary to all the categories in the first group, this group accommodates those in which the translation equivalence does not occur at word level. Put differently, there is no one-to-one formal correspondence between the compared items. It is logically assumed that, more often than not, there is a wide range of options available of which the translator selects the one that she considers most apt. This decision is always context-dependent and the translation technique employed in each case is determined not only by subjective factors – i.e. the translator’s personal style and competence – but, more crucially, by the specific constraints posed by the TL. The resulting translation equivalents are not to be seen merely as wonders of (linguistic) creativity– although in some cases they definitely deserve such an appraisal. A closer examination is likely to reveal a number of intriguing cross-linguistic asymmetries that might point to different perspectives across languages. Despite the problems that these asymmetries entail for translation, they can be levelled successfully by means of the right resources.

(9) *era un quejido que venía del sueño, uno aprende a distinguir en seguida **el sonido dormido** de aquel con quien duerme.*

it was a moan made in her sleep, one quickly learns to distinguish the sounds the person one sleeps with makes in their sleep.

An illustrative example of what can occur when an author uses her creativity to exploit the affordances of language. As a result of this perfect complicity, *dormido* is used to describe the kind of sound a sleeping person produces. Although *dormido*, under normal circumstances, refers to a transitory state rather than an inherent property, in this case it seems to have lost its usual meaning. Despite its literary nature, this metonymic reference is not difficult to grasp. Instead of putting comprehensibility at stake, the translator goes for the simplest choice: *dormido* is substituted by a relative clause that leaves no room for misinterpretations.

3. CONCLUSION

The analysis has departed from the hypothesis that, in Spanish, there is a tendency for adjectival forms ending in *-do/a* to express both property concepts and resultative/ transitory states, which, in turn may be interpreted as a preference for describing inherent properties as the result of some (implicit) previous action. On the contrary, in English, the focus is on the property itself, as an independent characteristic of the modified element. In addition, there seems to be a more rigid correspondence between semantic features (aspect, state, orientation) and morphological features in English than in Spanish.

At a more general level, the present analysis may lead to some interesting conclusions, which are worth mentioning. First, although studying language as used in its specific real context instead of idealized, *in vitro* situations may be the only safe way to understand how it actually works, it nevertheless proves to be a frustrating task, since it often brings to light elusive cases that go beyond clear-cut definitions and categorizations. This fuzziness and versatility should be treated as intrinsic to language and therefore expected in advance. Second, despite their considerable degree of vagueness or unpredictability, linguistic structures reflect underlying conceptualization patterns and general tendencies; contrastive studies therefore cannot be limited to the surface level of linguistic forms. Third, if translation is taken to be a communicative event, albeit mediated, then the use of translated texts as corpora may yield

valuable insights for both intra-linguistic and cross-linguistic studies, which may be fruitfully applied to the practice of translation.

Given the limited scope of the study, no strong claims can be made. Although the results of the analysis seem to corroborate the initial hypotheses, the replication of the study using a larger corpus would certainly contribute to the reliability of the results, and would potentially point to other aspects of the topic which have not been touched upon here. One of the most interesting directions for further investigation, for instance, would be a more detailed account of the different strategies employed during the translation process, always with respect to the conceptual and formal asymmetries of the languages in question, i.e. Spanish and English. A parallel examination of translations from and into both languages would also be beneficial.

Finally, there is a specific aspect of this complicated issue that, despite its major importance, has been only parenthetically mentioned. The present approach has focused mainly on morpho-semantic considerations from a synchronic point of view. However, a more comprehensive account should definitely encompass a diachronic perspective, since the historical evolution of lexical items and linguistic structures, as reflected in etymology, often constitutes a key factor in their current use and provides a global picture which would otherwise remain concealed. From this point of view, many of the apparent morphological and semantic incongruities and irregularities in contemporary language may be explained and better comprehended. And in the case of the “hybrid adjectivals” discussed here, this aspect opens up new perspectives for further research.

NOTES

¹ “su naturaleza híbrida entre el verbo y el adjetivo, y su heterogeneidad interna”.

² According to the DRAE, the adjective comes from the participle of the verb *descolorir*, which is a defective verb that has almost fallen into disuse.

³ This may be accounted for by the fact that the verb *divertir* also appears in pronominal form, i.e. *divertirse*, which affects the

corresponding participles. The fact remains, however, that the resulting –do/ a forms, regardless of their meaning, are formally indistinguishable.

WORKS CITED

- Altenberg, B. and S. Granger .2002. “Recent trends in cross-linguistic lexical studies” in B. Altenberg and S. Granger, eds. *Lexis in Contrast*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 3-43.
- Bosque, I. 1990. “Sobre el aspecto en los adjetivos y los participios” in I. Bosque, ed. *Tiempo y Aspecto en Español*. Madrid: Cátedra. 177-214.
- Bresnan, J.1995. “Lexicality and argument structure”. Paper presented at Paris Syntax and Semantics Conference, 12 October 1995. Available at <http://www.stanford.edu/~bresnan/paris.pdf> [last accessed in April 2010)
- Cercas, J. 2002. *El inquilino*. Barcelona: Acantilado.
2003. *El móvil*. Barcelona: Tusquets. [*The Tenant- The Motive*. 2005, trans. Anne McLean. London: Bloomsbury.]
- Collins Universal. Español-Inglés / English-Spanish*. 2005. Glasgow: HarperCollins Publishers, Barcelona: Grupo Editorial Random House Mondadori, S.L.
- Comrie, B. 1976. *Aspect*. Cambridge: C.U.P.
- Delbecque, N. 2008. “Semántica cognitiva y categorización lingüística” in M. J. Rodríguez Espiñeira and J. Pena Seijas, eds. *Categorización Lingüística y Límites Intercategoriales*. Universidad de Santiago de Compostela Servicio de Publicaciones. 19-56.
- Di Tullio, A.L. 2008. “Participios y adjetivos” in M. J. Rodríguez Espiñeira and J. Pena Seijas, eds. *Categorización Lingüística y Límites Intercategoriales*. Universidad de Santiago de Compostela Servicio de Publicaciones. 99-125.
- Dixon, R.M.W. 1982. *Where Have All the Adjectives Gone?* Berlin; New York; Amsterdam: Mouton Publishers.
1994. “Adjectives” in R.E. Asher, ed. *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, vol. 10. Oxford: Pergamon, 29-35.
2004. “Adjective classes in typological perspective” in R.M.W. Dixon, and A.Y.Aikhenvald, eds. *Adjective Classes: A Cross-linguistic Typology*. Oxford: O.U.P.

- Felú Arquiola, E. 2008. "La codificación de los participios adjetivos activos" in M. J. Rodríguez Espiñeira and J. Pena Seijas, eds. *Categorización Lingüística y Límites Intercategoriales*. Universidad de Santiago de Compostela Servicio de Publicaciones. 165-179.
- Kibort, A. 2005. "The ins and outs of the participle-adjective conversion rule" in M. Butt and T. Holloway King, eds. *Proceedings of the LFG05 Conference*, University of Bergen, CSLI Publications. Accessed in April 2010 <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/>
- Koontz-Garboden, A. 2005. "On the typology of state/ change of state alternations". in G. Booij and J. van Marle, eds. *Yearbook of Morphology 2005*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer. 83-117.
- Krzeszowski, T. P. 1990. *Contrasting Languages. The Scope of Contrastive Linguistics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*. 2003. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Marías, J. 1996. *Cuando Fui Mortal*. Madrid: Alfaguara. [*When I was Mortal*. 1999, trans. Margaret Jull Costa. London: The Harvill Press.]
- Rainer, F. 1999. "La derivación adjetival" in I. Bosque, and V. Demonte, eds. *Gramática Descriptiva de la Lengua Española*. Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 4595-4643.
- Real Academia Española. 2001. *Diccionario de la Lengua Española*. 22nd edition. Accessed in May 2010 <http://www.rae.es/rae.html>
- Talmy, L. 1987. "Lexicalization patterns: semantic structure in lexical forms" in T. Shopen, ed. *Language Typology and Semantic Description*. Cambridge: C.U.P., 57-149.
- Varela, S. 1992. "Verbal and adjectival participles in Spanish" in C. Laeufer and T. A. Morgan, eds. *Theoretical Analyses in Romance Linguistics*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Wetzer, H. 1996. *The Typology of Adjectival Predication*. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.