

## 叙述形容詞がとる前置詞の選択に関する考察

梅本 孝

### Manifestations of prepositions concerning the source and the goal: Focusing on prepositional phrases in non-attributive adjective phrase constructions

Takashi UMEMOTO

本論では英語の叙述用法の形容詞の後に続く前置詞について考察を行った。前置詞の中でも特に起点を表す前置詞 *from* と着点を表す前置詞 *to* に焦点を当てて考察を行った。叙述用法の形容詞の意味が前置詞の選択に影響を与えるという想定のもとに論をすすめた。離反、或いはそれに類する意味の形容詞が使用される場合は意味的な整合性として起点を表す前置詞が選択されるであろうし、接近、或いはそれに類する意味を持つ形容詞が使用される場合は着点を表す前置詞が使用されると想定した。

結果、ほとんどの場合では想定の通りであったが、例外も数多く見られた。例外となる形容詞は以下のようなものである。different, averse, opposite, dissimilar, immune。これらの形容詞はその意味内容から考えて起点を表す前置詞を補語としてとることが予想される。しかし、これらの前置詞は起点を表す前置詞だけではなく、着点を表す前置詞もその補語となる。逆の事例についてはほとんど見出すことが出来なかった。

## 1. Introduction

In Umemoto (2012) I examined the underlying motivation of the goal-over-source principle proposed by Ikegami (1987). In this paper I would like to call attention to the collocation of adjectives and prepositions from the standpoint of their meanings and clarify why the collocation becomes a conventional unit: I assume that the unit represents a cognitive routine having cognitive naturalness.

Prepositions or more generally, adpositions<sup>1</sup> are often considered as function words and do not attract as much attention as nouns and verbs, a fact recently lamented by Hagège (2010: 1), who notes “linguists, so far, have not deemed it necessary to deal with Adps [adpositions] in a research project exclusively devoted to them.”

However, as long as a lexical category exists, it is not implausible to assume its *raison d’être*. In this paper prepositions are recognized as having a function within symbolic view of grammar (Langacker 2008). This idea is manifested as the “content requirement” suggested in Langacker (2008):

Any flights of fancy cognitive grammarians might be prone to are seriously constrained by the **content requirement**. Adopted as a strong working hypothesis, this requirement states that **the only elements ascribable to a linguistic system are (i) semantic, phonological, and symbolic structures that actually occur as parts of expression; (ii) schematizations of permitted structures; and (iii) categorizing relationships between permitted structures.** (p. 24-25) [emphasis in original]

This requirement implies that any overt element of expression must have some meaning, however little it may be. Also, the content of the meanings of the prepositions vary in terms of generality (e.g. from *of* to *throughout*): *throughout* obviously exhibits higher analyzability, thus more intrinsic meaning than *of*.

This paper seeks to describe the semantics of prepositions from the viewpoint

of semantic anomaly or congruence between adjectives and prepositions.

### 1.1 The scope of the study

The main theme of the present paper is the meanings of prepositions manifested in the combination of predicative adjectives and prepositions. There are three reasons why this unit is the target of the study. Firstly some grammars (e.g. Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 543ff.) treat the collocation of predicative adjectives and prepositions as a unit and in some cases the prepositions as the complement are obligatory when the adjectives are used in non-attributive constructions. Here are some examples (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 543-545)[italics and underlining in original]:

- (1) *annoyed about the delay*
- (2) *adept at making people feel at home*
- (3) *very distressed by these insinuations*
- (4) *responsible for the poor performance*
- (5) *divorced from reality*
- (6) *bathed in sunlight*
- (7) *afraid of dogs*
- (8) *based on/upon firm evidence*
- (9) *accustomed to getting his own way*
- (10) *very friendly towards us*
- (11) *careful with money*
- (12) *%different than it used to be<sup>2</sup> [comparative than]*
- (13) *the same as last time [comparative as]*

Another reason for believing that some predicative adjectives and the following prepositions are conceived as a unit is that they are obviously treated as collocational units in some dictionaries (e.g. Oxford Dictionary of English second edition 2005, henceforth ODE). Here are some examples from ODE (in all ODE examples italics

and bold are original):

- (14) The valley is **remote from** the usual tourist routes.
- (15) The star is 30,000 light years **distant from** Earth.
- (16) One and a half percent of the population is **allergic to** bee venom.

Still another reason is that the unit of adjectives and prepositions are often tantamount to stative verbs (Tsunoda 1991: 98-99). Here are some of his examples:

- (17) aware of = 'know'
- (18) fond of = 'like'
- (19) afraid of = 'fear'
- (20) desirous of = 'desire'
- (21) envious of = 'envy'

In this paper the units of predicative adjectives and prepositions indicating directions, esp. the source and the goal are examined as a basis for explaining why certain adjectives occur with particular prepositions.

## 2. Typical examples

Here I present typical examples in which directions are indicated by prepositions (the examples are from ODE unless otherwise stated):

- (22) a. The patterns of spoken language are **distinct from** those of writing.
- b. Exchange student is **far from** home but fitting in.

(Fallan Patterson,

[http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:jlrqAO7TkWMJ:aroundosceola.com/index.php%3Foption%3Dcom\\_content%26view%3Darticle%26id%3D11327:exchange-student-is-far-from-home-but-fitting-in](http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:jlrqAO7TkWMJ:aroundosceola.com/index.php%3Foption%3Dcom_content%26view%3Darticle%26id%3D11327:exchange-student-is-far-from-home-but-fitting-in)

%26catid%3D27%26Itemid%3D138+&cd=5&hl=ja&ct=clnk&gl=jp )  
[bold and italics mine]

(23) The car's ***different from*** anything else on the market.

[This ODE example mentions only *different from* but *different to* is also assumed to be acceptable.]

(24) a. One unit is ***equivalent to*** one glass of wine.

b. The hotel is ***close to*** the sea.

(22a, b) are typical examples in which the adjectives take only *from* as their complements. On the other hand (24a, b) are canonical adjectives which take only *to* as their complements. (23) is an example in which either *from* or *to* can be the adjectives' complement. In the next section I will consider examples in which predicative adjectives license both *from* and *to* complements.

### 3. Adjectives that take both *from* and *to*

Here are some predicative adjective examples that take either *from* or *to* as their complements (examples are from ODE unless otherwise stated).

averse

(25) I am inveterately averse from any sort of fuss. (Webster 1986)

(26) As a former CIA director, he is **not averse to** secrecy.

immune

(27) immune from further taxation (Webster 1986)

(28) They were naturally **immune to** hepatitis B.<sup>3</sup>

opposite

(29) be opposite from the station<sup>3</sup> (Lindstromberg 2010: 47)

(30) A word that is *opposite* in meaning **to** another.

#### 4. Adjectives that are expected to take *from* but take *to*

There are a number of non-attributive adjective examples that are expected to take source prepositions *from* but take goal prepositions *to* instead. Here are some examples:

(31) dissimilar to

(32) hostile to

(33) allergic to

(34) distasteful to

(35) impervious to

(36) opposed to

(37) resistant to

(38) antagonistic to

(39) contrary to

In this paper I assume that prepositions expressing the source should be associated with the idea of dissociation, while those expressing the goal should be associated with the idea of association. Dissociation is typically exemplified by a physical farness, either dynamic or static; *go away from* and *be far from* may be good examples. The idea can be applied metaphorically as in *subtract 1 from 2*. On the other hand association is typically exemplified by a physical closeness, either dynamic or static; *go to* and *be close to* may be good examples. The idea can also be applied metaphorically as in *go to recovery*.

From this viewpoint it is obvious that the meanings of the examples in this section should motivate the expression of the source type prepositions. However, the cases are different from our expectations.

## 5. Adjectives that are expected to take *to* but take *from*

So far, I have not found many convincing adjective examples that are expected to take *to* but in reality take *from*. This is surprising considering the amount of time I have spent in checking the collocations of predicative adjectives and prepositions. Consider the following:

- (40) a. Building 1 is close from here.
- b. Building 1 is close from there.
- c. \*We must be close from water.
- d. ??Water must be close from us.
- e. We must be close to water.
- f. Water must be close to us.

(Hikaru Kitabayashi, personal communication)

Considering all of the examples in this section, *close from* seems to be limited only to the cases in which the complement of *from* is place, e.g. *here*, *there*. In Japanese expressions, *eki kara tikai* (literally ‘station from close’, and the meaning is ‘close from the station’) is perfectly acceptable, although *kara tikai* applies only to places and not to human relations. In this sense, *kara tikai* is more restricted than *ni tikai* (literally *to close*) or *to tikai* (literally *with close*) where the expressions can apply both to geographical places and human relations.

## 6. The goal-over-source principle in English

The examples in sections 3 and 4 are strange in the sense that one expects that the adjectives should be described in terms of dissociation, or separation in a sense, hence, typically *from*, but they are often paired with *to* as well as *from*. It is interesting to note that concerning *averse* ODE states the following:

Traditionally, and according to Dr Johnson, **averse *from*** is preferred to **averse**

*to*. The latter is condemned on etymological grounds (the Latin root translates as ‘turn *from*’). However, **averse to** is entirely consistent with ordinary usage in modern English (on the analogy of *hostile to*, *disinclined to*, etc) and is part of normal standard English. [bold and italics original]

Again the idea of the source is naturally assumed to be associated with dissociation, hence separation (concrete or abstract) and the idea of the goal with association, hence approach (concrete or abstract). In this sense all the words in sections 3 and 4 should be associated with the idea of the source, hence *from* or similar kinds. However all examples may be followed by *to*, which should not be expected. This phenomenon is named the “goal-over-source principle” by Ikegami (1987). In Umemoto (2012) I investigated the reason and concluded why this is so.

## 7. Explanation of *different* and *same*<sup>5</sup>

Consider the following:

(41) College campuses look a lot different than they did years ago.

[Longman Advanced American Dictionary 2000: 388]

*Different* takes *to* and *than* as well as *from*. The fact that *different* takes *to* as its complement is understandable and to some degree predictable if we take the goal-over-source principle into consideration. But how should we think about the case of *than* as preceded by *different*? One also has to take it into consideration that *than* is not a preposition but a conjunction.

Firstly, *than* is used as a comparison marker (e.g. *taller*), either in relation to a higher degree or to a lower degree. Accordingly, it must imply some sort of inequality; hence, difference. It also implies that it has a negative meaning in the sense that tr is in some way different from lm.<sup>6</sup> Since there is a clear sense in which the idea of inequality is immanent in the concept of difference, it is not unreasonable



that *different* attracts *than* as its complement.

Secondly, *than* is not a preposition but a conjunction. This fact prompts one to analyze *different* as different from other synonyms, e.g. *distinct*, *separate*, *dissimilar* etc.

Interestingly enough, *than* and *as* are parallel in two significant respects: (1) *as* is also used as comparison marker (e.g. *A is as tall as B*); it is used in relation to the same degree, or to the same quality, (2) *as*, too is not a preposition but a conjunction.

I will assume that there ought to be reasons for the existence of *than* and *as* as complements.

Consider first the following:

(42) The heat in Arizona is different from the heat here.

[Longman Advanced American Dictionary 2000: 388]

In this case the tr and the lm of the preposition are comparable objects. When objects are in comparison with each other, the construction (*A is different from B*) is plausible. However, there should be instances where one needs to compare a concrete object with a process or an event. And this is exactly the case with (41).

In the case of *as*, consider the following:

(43) The view is never the same as last time.

In this sentence “the view” is not compared with “last time” itself. It is compared with the view seen last time. In this sense last time is not a concrete object, but rather a compacted event; the tr is compared with an event lm. Considering these facts, I will assume that in some cases one has to compare concrete objects with events in terms of their identity. The fact that *different* takes the conjunction *than* and that *same* takes the conjunction *as* may well be a natural consequence of the way human beings conceptualize the world.

There is clearly another sense in which *different* has a tinge of the comparative; it can be intensified by *far* as well as *very*. In the case of *same*, it is also similar to *different* in that it is also used with the comparative degree, and it is modified by *much* as in *much the same* although *same* is followed not by *than* but *as* suggesting comparisons of equality.

One has to note here that Huddleston & Pullum (2002: 545) suggest that although *similar* normally takes *to*, *as* is marginally acceptable, which implies that *similar* has a meaning of comparisons of equality at least to some extent.<sup>7</sup>

## 8. Concluding remarks

In this paper my objective is to present a linguistic manifestation of a particular conception, i.e. the goal-over-source principle focusing on prepositional phrases in non-attributive adjective phrase constructions.

I claim to have demonstrated the viability of the goal-over-source principle and to have shown that certain assumptions are less than self-evident: (1) the meanings of predicative adjectives and the following prepositions blend in harmony to a considerable extent, (2) but when discrepancy occurs, the goal-over-source principle often manifests itself, (3) the cases in which *different* takes *than* and *same* takes *as* as their complements have plausible reasons on their own grounds, (4) when the meanings of non-attributive adjectives and the following prepositions are not in harmony, but still remain acceptable unit, it is likely to have some limitations in their ranges of usage.

In a way I have discussed a range of linguistic phenomena, and I would argue for the adequacy of the goal-over-source principle. I would also argue that I shed some light on constructions taken for granted.

## Notes

1. “Adposition” is a cover term including both prepositions and postpositions. In my own usage, the term “preposition” expresses both prepositions and postpositions for

convenience.

2. “%” indicates grammatical in some dialect(s) only (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: xii).
3. In this paper *immune* followed by *against* is not considered. For example, *a full life is immune against boredom* (Webster 1986, s.v. *immune*). Also, it should be noted here that ODE gives two slightly different definitions for adjective *immune*: 1. resistant to a particular infection or toxin owing to the presence of specific antibodies or sensitized white blood cells; 2. protected or exempt, especially from an obligation or the effects of something. *Immune to* example is under the definition 1, while *immune from* example is under the definition 2. Then we suspect that *immune to* and *immune from* are always interchangeable, since linguistic forms are different. However, we assume that since the adjective is the same regardless of the number of the definitions, it should have more or less the same core meaning. It is still revealing that opposite types of prepositions *from* and *to* appear after the same predicative adjectives as part of their complements.
4. *Be opposite the station* is also possible, but is not considered in this section (Lindstromberg 2010: 47).
5. In cases such as in *She's always the same to me*, *to* is not considered as the complement of *same* in the same sense that *to* is the complement of *identical*. In this paper, when *same* is used, the identity of *tr* and *lm* are in focus.
6. *Tr* and *lm* are trajector and landmark respectively in the sense of Langacker (1991: 549, 555)
7. Huddleston & Pullum (2002: 1141) cites the following attested example: *The average Australian retiring in twenty years will need up to \$ 2 million in assets to live at a similar standard as today.*

## References

- Huddleston, R. & Pullum, G. K. (2002) *The Cambridge grammar of the English language*. Cambridge, UK/New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ikegami, Y. (1987) ‘Source’ vs. ‘goal’: a case of linguistic dissymmetry. In *Concepts of case*. Dirven, R. & Radden, G. (eds.), Tübingen: Gunter Narr. 122-146.

- Lindstromberg, S. (2010) *English prepositions explained*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Smith, Edward, and Kosslyn, M. Stephen. (2007). *Cognitive psychology: mind and brain*. New Jersey: Pearson Education.
- Tsunoda, T. (1991) *Sekai no gengo to nihongo* [World languages and Japanese language]. Tokyo: Kurocio.
- Umemoto, T. (2010) On source and goal manifested in language. *Journal of Shizuoka Sanyo University*, 12. School of Information Studies, Shizuoka Sangyo University, 295-304.
- Umemoto, T. (2012) The principle of the convergence of eye movements and related topics. *The Journal of the Institute for Language and Education Research*, 29, 21-38.