Building Deverbal Ability Adjectives in Icelandic

Jim Wood and Einar Freyr Sigurðsson[*]

1 Introduction

Two ways of forming Icelandic ability predicates are (i) with the present participle *-andi*, and (ii) with the adjectivizing affix *-anlegur*; (1) is an attested translation of an Oscar Wilde quote.

(1) Munurinn   á   blaðamennsku og bókmenntum er sá,
     difference.the between journalism   and literature   is it
     að blöðin   eru **ó-les-andi**   en bókmenntirnar eru ekki lesnar.[1]
     that newspapers.the are un-read-ing but literature.the   is   not read
     'The difference between literature and journalism is that
     journalism is **unreadable**, and literature is not read.'

(2) Póstið hér ef þið viljið fá einkaþráð   sem   er ekki **les-an-legur** af öðrum.[2]
     post   here if you want get private.thread which is not   read-ing-ADJ by others
     'Post here if you want to use a private thread that's not **readable** by others.'

In this paper, we examine the properties of Icelandic ability adjectives and ability participles, and show that they each share distinct properties with passives and with middles (and differ from both). The analysis proposed, and the overall picture, suggests that ability adjectives in general do not embed a primitive passive or middle voice head; instead, they are built from some of the same, smaller primitives.

While *-andi* participles have been the subject of a number of theoretical and descriptive studies (Friðjónsson 1982, H.Á. Sigurðsson 1989, H.Á. Sigurðsson and Egerland 2009, Jóhannsdóttir 2007, 2011), *-anlegur* adjectives have received almost no attention in theoretical work (but see Rögnvaldsson 1988). We will follow a suggestion in Kvaran (2005:140) and assume that morphologically, *-anlegur* is built by adding the general adjectivizing affix *-legur* to the participle *-andi*. (See also Jóhannesson 1927:67; thanks to Jón Axel Harðarson for pointing out this reference to us.) As we will see below, this decomposition is important, because a relationship between passive/middle voice, stative aspect, and ability modality can be seen in a number of phenomena in a number of languages, but this relationship needs to be better understood (Kayne 1981, Dubinsky and Simango 1996, Roeper and van Hout 1999, 2009, Oltra-Massuet 2010, Samioti 2013, Anagnostopoulou and Samioti to appear).

We begin with a brief overview of the properties associated with passives and middles, followed by a brief discussion of *-andi* participles more generally in Section 3. We then turn to the ability use of *-andi*, which we call "Ability Participles" (APs), followed by *-anlegur* adjectives, which we call "Ability Adjectives" (AAs) in Sections 4–5, followed by a comparison of the ability semantics of APs and AAs in Section 6. We then turn to an analysis aimed at teasing apart the syntactic and semantic primitives used in building ability adjectives in Section 7, before concluding.

2 Passives and Middles

Passives and middles are similar in that both involve a semantically transitive verb with the external argument, such as the "agent," not being projected/merged in overt syntax, though in both cases, it is implicit in some sense. Passives and middles can be distinguished, however, by a number of

diagnostics, some of which will be reviewed in this section. To begin, by-phrases naming an implicit agent are possible in passives, but not generic middles. Instrument PPs are possible with both.

(3) a. The ship was sunk (by pirates).   (Passive)
     b. Enemy ships sink easily (*by pirates).   (Generic Middle)
(4) a. The door was opened with a skeleton key.   (Passive)
     b. This door opens easily with a skeleton key.   (Generic Middle)

Indirect objects are possible with passives, but not generic middles. (5b) is ungrammatical on the reading where the subject receives the money; it is, of course, acceptable if the subject is the agent, but that is not the reading we are interested in here.

(5) a.   He was paid the money.   (Passive)
     b. * He pays money easily.   (Generic Middle)

Here, we understand the term "indirect object" as referring to the intersection between the thematic roles introduced by Appl(icative) heads in Pylkkänen (2008) and the morphosyntactic property of being the "first object" in a double object construction (regardless of case-marking).

An adverb, negation, or other licensing material is needed for generic middles, but not passives.

(6) **Passive**   **Generic Middle**
     a.   This bread was cut.   d. ?? This bread cuts.
     b.   This bread was cut easily.   e.   This bread cuts easily.
     c.   This bread won't be cut.   f.   This bread won't cut.

In case-marking languages like Icelandic, accusative may become nominative in the passive, while dative and genitive are retained, as illustrated for dative in (7b). In middles, dative and genitive may be lost (Maling 2001), as illustrated in (7c).

(7) a. Við læsum oft   **þessari hurð**.   b. **Þessari hurð**   er oft   læst.
         we lock often this   door.DAT   this   door.DAT is often locked
         'We often lock this door.'   'This door is often locked.'
     c. **Þessi hurð**   læsist ekki.
         this   door.NOM locks not
         'This door doesn't lock.'

We will summarize the properties of passives and generic middles in the table in (29), which shows also how they compare to AAs and APs. But first, we turn to a brief, general discussion of *-andi* participles in order to familiarize the reader with them.

3 Properties of *-andi* Participles

-andi is a present participle affix that in many instances has a distribution similar to English *-ing*.

(8) Þarna kemur hún hlaup-andi.
     there comes she run-ing
     'There she comes running.'   (H.Á. Sigurðsson 2010:37)
(9) Við héldum áfram, hann   les-andi bókina,   ég   horf-andi á sjónvarpið.
     we held   on   he.NOM read-ing book.the.ACC I.NOM watch-ing on TV.the
     'We continued, him reading the book, me watching TV.'

However, *-andi* is also quite different from *-ing* in that it cannot form a progressive construction describing an ongoing activity. Instead, the active progressive requires an adverbial like 'always' or an "iterative" prefix like *sí-* (Friðjónsson 1982, Jóhannsdóttir 2007, 2011).

(10) a. * Hann er **les-andi núna**.   b. Hann er **alltaf   les-andi**.
            he   is read-ing now   he   is always read-ing
            INTENDED: 'He is reading now.'   'He is always reading.'

   c.   Hann er **sí-les-andi** þessa dagana.   d. Jón er **alltaf hlaup-andi**.
       he   is ever-read-ing these days   John is always run-ing
       'He's always reading these days.'   'John is always running.'

This is a potentially important property of *-andi*, given the connection between stativity and ability modality (Samioti 2013). Jóhannsdóttir (2007:182) writes that "when we have a present progressive sentence with an implicit *when*-clause, such as in ([10d]), [...] it seems as if the implicit time frame is stative. It does not have the punctual reading of 'now' but rather the durative reading of 'these days'." Similarly, sentences like (11) refer to Maggie's state generally, not her actions at the moment.

(11) **Maggie Simpson**: [...] Hæglátur krakki enda ekki enn tal-andi[3]
                  quiet   kid   since not yet talk-ing
                  'A quiet kid, as she's still not talking.'

    The *-andi* suffix can also form attributive adjectives with an 'active' meaning, similar to English *-ing*, as shown in (12), and a number of other uses as well. It may, for example, form adverbs, and agent-denoting nominals (much like *-er* in *buyer*, though the suffix *-ari* probably corresponds more directly to *-er*). Attributive *-andi* adjectives can also yield an 'able' meaning, as shown in (13). In this paper, we focus on the use of *-andi* in (13), but in the predicative position rather than the attributive.

(12) a. Hann sá **glans-andi bíl**.
        he   saw glisten-ing car
        'He saw a glistening car.'   (Friðjónsson 1982:193)
    b. Hún er ákaflega **hríf-andi kona**.
        she is extremely enchant-ing woman
        'She is an extremely enchanting woman.'   (Thráinsson 1999:37)

(13) a. **Ó-drekk-andi vatn** í Höfnum[4]
        un-drink-ing   **water** in Hafnir
        'Undrinkable **water** in Hafnir.'
    b. Hún systir mín lét mig hafa þessa líka forláta   expresso könnu
        she sister my let me have this   PRT excellent espresso can
        svo ég prófaði hvort   ég gæti gert **drekk-andi kaffi** úr   henni.[5]
        so I tested whether I could make drink-ing   coffee out.of it
        'My sister let me have this excellent espresso can
        so I checked whether I could make **drinkable coffee** from it.'

4 Ability Participle *-andi*

Like the passive, the AP may preserve dative/genitive case (14c–d), but not accusative (14a–b).

(14) a. Við   drekkum **mjólkina**.   c. Við breyttum **þessu**.
        we.NOM drink   milk.the.ACC   we changed this.DAT
        'We drink the milk.'   'We changed this.'
    b. **Mjólkin**   er ekki drekk-andi. d. **Þessu**   var ekki breyt-andi.
        milk.the.NOM is not drink-ing   this.DAT was not change-ing
        'The milk is not drinkable.'   'This was not changeable.'

    It is worth briefly noting that accusative is possible for some speakers, in some constructions, when the DP is left low and does not move to the subject.

(15) það   er ekki drekk-andi Miller nema **ÍSKALDANN** [*sic*][6]
      EXPL is not drink-ing   Miller unless ice.cold.ACC
      'There is no drinking Miller unless it is ice-cold.'
(16) [...] að það   sé ekki finn-andi **mann**   eða **konu**
           that EXPL is not find-ing man.ACC or woman.ACC
      í þessu þjóðfélagi sem er siðferðislega samkvæmt [*sic*] sjálfum sér.[7]
      in this   society   who is ethically   accountable   self REFL

'(I'm starting to worry) that there's no finding any man or woman
in this society who is ethically consistent.'

This construction seems to resemble English constructions like *There's just no talking to him*, which also have an ability meaning, and may have properties in common with the 'New Impersonal Passive' (see Maling and Sigurjónsdóttir 2002, 2013, Eythórsson 2008, Jónsson 2009, H.Á. Sigurðsson 2011, Ingason et al. 2012, E.F. Sigurðsson 2012); we have to set such cases aside for now.

Indirect objects are possible in APs, although not all verbs seem to allow them.

(17) a. Við   bjóðum **mönnum** þetta   ekki.
      we.NOM offer   people.DAT this.ACC not
      'We don't offer this to people.'   (H.Á. Sigurðsson 1989:341)
   b. Þetta   er ekki **mönnum   bjóð-andi**.
      this.NOM is not   people.DAT offer-ing
      'This is not offerable to people.'   (H.Á. Sigurðsson 1989:341)
   c. **Ólafi**   er ekki **bjóð-andi**.
      Ólafur.DAT is not   offer-ing
      'Ólafur is not inviteable.'   (H.Á. Sigurðsson 1989:342)

(18) a. Við   svöruðum **honum** þessu.
      we.NOM answered him.DAT this.DAT
      'We answered him this.'
   b. **Heimskum karlrembusvínum** er   ekki **svar-andi**.[8]
      stupid   chauvinists.DAT   are not answer-ing
      'It's not worth responding to stupid chauvinists.'
   c. Annars   er **sumu fólki**   ekki **svar-andi**[9]
      otherwise are some people.DAT not   answer-ing
      'Actually, some people are not answerable.'

(19) Amma   mín sagði að fermingarmyndin   mín væri
     grandmother my said   that confirmation.picture my was
     svo ljót að hún væri ekki **mönnum sýn-andi**!!![10]
     so ugly that it.F was not men.DAT show-ing
     'My grandmother said that my picture from when I got confirmed
     was so bad that it couldn't be shown to people.'

By-phrases are not possible with APs (see 20), while instrument PPs are (see 21).

(20) a. Einkaþráðurinn   er ekki les-andi (*af neinum).
      private.thread.NOM is not   read-ing   by anyone
      'The private thread is not readable.'
   b. Lögunum   er ekki breyt-andi (*af hverjum sem er).
      laws.the.DAT are not change-ing   by whoever
      'The laws are not changeable.'

(21) a. Stjórnmálamönnum er ekki mút-andi **með peningum**.
      politicians.DAT   are not bribe-ing with money
      'Politicians are not bribable with money.'
   b. Þetta fólk   er nú eiginlega ekki finn-andi **með svona lélegu GPS tæki**.
      these people.NOM is PRT sort.of   not find-ing with such   bad   GPS machine
      'These people aren't really findable with such a bad GPS.'
   c. Miðþúfa [...] er mjög brött og ekki far-andi nema **með réttum búnaði**.[11]
      Miðþúfa   is very steep and not go-ing unless with right   equipment
      'Miðþúfa is very steep and not traversable unless you have the right equipment.'

Like middles (and unlike passives), APs generally need a special licensing environment; in fact, their distribution somewhat resembles that of weak NPIs. They are odd on their own (22a), but they are possible with the negative *ó-* prefix (22b), clausal negation (22c), 'only' (22d) and yes-no questions (22e).

(22) a. # Mjólkin   er **drekk-andi**.   b. Mjólkin   er **ó-drekk-andi**.
          milk.the.NOM is drink-ing   milk.the.NOM is un-drink-ing
          INTENDED: 'The milk is drinkable.'   'The milk is undrinkable.'

      c. Mjólkin   er **ekki** drekk-andi.   d. **Aðeins** mjólkin   er drekk-andi.
          milk.the.NOM is not   drink-ing   only   milk.the.NOM is drink-ing
          'The milk is not drinkable.'   'Only the milk is drinkable.'

      e. Er mjólkin   drekk-andi?
          is milk.the.NOM drink-ing
          'Is the milk drinkable?'

To sum up this section, *-andi* participles are like passives in that they preserve dative and genitive case and allow indirect objects, and are like middles in that they disallow by-phrases and need an adverb, negation, or other special licensing environment.

5 Ability Adjective *-an-legur*

Like APs, *-anlegur adjectives* (AAs) can be attributive adjectives, as shown in (23a–c). Unlike middles and APs, AAs may—but need not—take a negative adverb or *ó-* 'un-' prefix, as shown in (23d).

(23) a. Þetta er vel **njót-an-leg   mynd**.   b. Þetta er **sökkv-an-legt skip**.
         this is well enjoy-ing-ADJ movie   this is sink-ing-ADJ   ship
         'This is an easily enjoyable movie.'   'This is a sinkable ship.'

     c. Guðbrandsdalsost   er **sker-an-legur ostur**. d. Sláttufjarlægð er **(ó-)breyt-an-leg**.
         Guðbrandsdals.cheese is cut-ing-ADJ   cheese   cutting.depth is (un-)change-ing-ADJ
         'Guðbrandsdals cheese is a cuttable cheese.'[12]   'The cutting depth is (un)changeable.'

AAs do not preserve any case assigned by the verbs they are derived from, neither accusative (24a–b), dative (24c–d), nor genitive (25).

(24) a. Við   drekkum mjólkina.   c. Við   breytum ekki lögunum.
         we.NOM drink   milk.the.ACC   we.NOM change   not laws.the.DAT
         'We drink the milk.'   'We don't change the laws.'

     b. Frosin mjólk   er ekki drekk-an-leg.   d. Lögin   eru ekki breyt-an-leg.
         frozen milk.NOM is not   drink-ing-ADJ   laws.the.NOM are not   change-ing-ADJ
         'Frozen milk is not drinkable.'   'The laws aren't changeable.'

(25) a. Við   njótum rómantískra gamanmynda.
         we.NOM enjoy   romantic   comedies.GEN
         'We enjoy romantic comedies.'

     b. Rómantískar gamanmyndir   eru njót-an-legar.
         romantic   comedies.NOM are enjoy-ing-ADJ
         'Romantic comedies are enjoyable.'

     c. [...] þannig að þýðingar   [...] eru auð-skilj-an-legar
              such   that translations   are easily-understand-ing-ADJ
         og vel njót-an-legar hverju barni   enn í dag[13]
         and well enjoy-ing-ADJ each   child.DAT still today
         '...such that translations are easily understandable and enjoyable to every child today.'

Like passives and unlike APs or middles, AAs may allow by-phrases (E.F. Sigurðsson 2012:5), as illustrated in (26). Like APs, middles, and passives, instrument PPs are possible, as shown in (27).

(26) a. Er ekki hægt   að endurskoða þau þegar nauðsyn krefur;
         is not possible to reinspect   them when need   arises
         skrifuð af mönnum breyt-an-leg   af mönnum?[14]
         written by people   change-ing-ADJ by people
         'Isn't it possible to re-examine them when the need arises;
         written by people, changeable by people?'

    b. Póstið hér ef þið viljið fá einkaþráð   sem er ekki **les-an-legur af öðrum**.[15]
         post   here if you want get private.thread which is not read-ing-ADJ by others
         'Post here if you want to use a private thread that's not **readable by others**.'

(27) a. Sláttufjarlægð   er breyt-an-leg   **með yfirtengi dráttarvélar**.[16]
         cutting.depth.NOM is change-ing-ADJ with control.rod tractor's
         'The cutting depth is changeable with a tractor's control rod.'
    b. Neyðarrofi   fyrir hús,   læs-an-legur **með lykli**[17]
         emergency.switch for   house, lock-ing-ADJ with key
         'emergency switch for a house, lockable with a key'

Like middles and unlike APs and passives, indirect objects are not possible subjects of AAs. (This is still impossible even if dative case is preserved: *Heimskum karlrembusvínum er ekki svaranlegt.*)

(28)   * **Heimsk karlrembusvín**   eru ekki **svar-an-leg**.
        stupid   chauvinists.NOM are not answer-ing-ADJ
        INTENDED: 'Stupid chauvinists are not answerable.'

To sum up this section, ability *-an-legur* adjectives are like passives in that they allow by-phrases and do not require a special licensing environment, and are like middles in that they disallow indirect objects and do not preserve dative and genitive case. Combining this with the last section, we see that AAs and APs share different properties with passives and middles; this is summarized in the table in (29).

(29)

	Passives	Middles	APs	AAs
Instrument PPs	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
By-phrases	Yes	No	No	Yes
Indirect objects	Yes	No	Yes	No
Preserve dative/genitive	Yes	No	Yes	No
Requires adverb/negation	No	Yes	Yes	No

6 Ability Meaning Compared

While both *-andi* participles (APs) and *-anlegur* adjectives (AAs) translate to English '-able' adjectives, and their meanings can be hard to tell apart in some cases, there turn out to be important differences between the two. With APs, the ability relates to properties of the understood subject or the event process. Whether the event can happen may depend on the ability of the subject to make it happen. With AAs, the ability relates to properties of the theme/object or the result. Whether the event can happen depends on the properties of the object. This is illustrated with the following contrast.

(30) a.   Mjólkin   er ekki drekk-an-leg.
         milk.the.NOM is not drink-ing-ADJ
         'The milk is not drinkable (because it is **frozen**).'
    b.   Mjólkin   er ekki drekk-andi.
         milk.the.NOM is not drink-ing
         'The milk is not drinkable (because it **tastes terrible**).'

(31) a. # Oddatölum   er ekki deil-andi með tveimur.
         odd.numbers.DAT are not divide-ing with two
         ≈ 'One shouldn't bother dividing odd numbers by two.'
    b.   Sléttar tölur   eru deil-an-legar með tveimur.
         even   numbers.NOM are divide-ing-ADJ with two
         'Even numbers are dividable/divisible by two.'

Heimir Freyr Viðarsson (p.c.) informs us that for him (30a) can mean (30b), but not the other way around. This makes sense, since taste can be construed as a property of the object or of the experiencer/agent. Similarly, (32a) is untrue because a pan is always touchable, even if it is very hot and would burn the toucher. (32b) is true in a circumstance where the pan is hot, because it is only untouchable in the sense that touching it will have unacceptable consequences: it will burn you. Thus, (32c) is not a contradiction.

(32) a. # Pannan   er ekki snert-an-leg.
          pan.the.NOM is not touch-ing-ADJ
          'The pan is not touchable.' (generally untrue of pans)
      b.   Pannan   er ekki snert-andi.
          pan.the.NOM is not touch-ing
          'The pan is not touchable (because it is **very hot**).'
      c.   Þessi sjóðandi heita panna **er snert-an-leg**, en hún er **ekki snert-andi**.
          this steaming hot pan is touch-ing-ADJ but it.F is not touch-ing
          'This steaming hot pan is touchable, but it's not "touchable."'

These examples suggest that APs relate the ability modality to the properties of the subject or event as a whole, whereas AAs relate the ability modality to the properties of theme.

7 Analysis

The table in (29) compared APs and AAs with passives and generic middles on the basis of five properties. We now use these properties to sketch an analysis of APs and AAs couched within a syntactic theory of word formation and a constructivist theory of argument structure, along the lines of Embick (2004), Oltra-Massuet (2010) and others. Instrument PPs, which are acceptable in both APs and AAs, diagnose the presence of an agentive Voice head (Bruening to appear, 2013; Anagnostopoulou and Samioti to appear; a.o.). Voice is also suggested by the morphology of the stem (Wood 2012).

(33) a. Þeir   **brjót**-a glugga.   b. Gluggar   **brot-na**.
          they.NOM break   windows.ACC   windows.NOM break-NA
          'They break windows.'   'Windows break.'
      c. Gluggar   eru { **brjót-an-legir** / ***brotn-an-legir** }.
          windows.NOM are { break-ing-ADJ / *break-ing-ADJ }
          'Windows are breakable.'

Both constructions include a stativizing Asp head (Oltra-Massuet 2010, Samioti 2013); this is the function of the head spelled out as *-an(di)*. If a verb assigns dative (*breyta* 'change'), this is specified on a v head that matches the verb root in question (H.Á. Sigurðsson 2012, Wood 2012). In *-anlegur*, *-legur* is a general adjectivizing head in Icelandic, a category-determining little a head in the present theory (Embick and Marantz 2008). In this case, it attaches on top of the *-an(di)* participle.

(34) a. AAs: $[_{aP} \text{ DP}_{NOM} [_{a'} \text{ a } [_{AspP} \text{ -an } [_{VoiceP} \text{ Voice } [_{vP} \text{ v}_{DAT} \sqrt{\text{BREYT}} \langle \text{DP}_{NOM} \rangle]]]]]$
      b. APs: $[_{XP} \text{ DP}_{DAT} [... [_{AspP} \text{ -andi } [_{VoiceP} \text{ Voice } [_{vP} \text{ v}_{DAT} \sqrt{\text{BREYT}} \langle \text{DP}_{DAT} \rangle]]]]]$

The main difference between the two is the adjectivizing affix in AAs, which must have the following effects: (a) it forces the internal argument to be predicated of little a; (b) it links the ability modality to properties of the internal argument; (c) it prevents v_{DAT} from assigning the (dative) case it is specified for; (d) it prevents indirect objects from being licensed; (e) it allows agentive by-phrases.

We assume, tentatively, that (b) can be made to follow from (a); (c) should also follow from the presence of the adjectivizing head. Bruening (to appear) offers one proposal that would derive this result. He proposes that adjectivizing heads force the internal argument to be a null operator, which derives a predicate such that the 'visible' internal argument is an externally-merged subject, much like the standard analysis of tough-movement. This operator could then silently bear the dative case assigned by v_{DAT}. We have no ready explanation for (d), except to note that this is a general property of middles, adjectival passives, and other constructions restricted to themes.

As for by-phrases, we assume that they are licensed in contexts where the agent is existentially closed over. By-phrases are unavailable despite agentive semantics when either (a) there is a syntactically present null DP argument (such as PRO) or (b) the event/implicit agent is generically quantified, rather than existentially quantified. Since *-andi* participles are similar to generic middles in other ways (e.g. requiring an adverb), we will assume that the latter explanation is on the right track for them. If we want to assume that the Asp head is the same in *-andi* participles

and *-anlegur* adjectives, this means that generic quantification (for *-andi*) and existential quantification (for *-anlegur*) are higher than Asp. Existential quantification, then, may be associated with the adjectivizing head (also as in Bruening to appear).

To summarize the analysis, for both AAs and APs Voice introduces the agent, and Asp stativizes the event and generically quantifies over it. For APs, something higher generically quantifies over the agent as well, and for AAs, the adjectivizing head existentially closes over the agent and predicates aP of the theme.

8 Conclusion

We conclude with a number of open questions. Why are indirect objects restricted in AAs and related constructions? How does the "stative" property of *-andi* relate to modality? Can the latter be made to follow from the former? Related to this, what is the status of English constructions such as *There's just no drinking this milk*, which has an *-ing* participle and an *-able*-like meaning? The evidence presented here suggests that *-able* adjectives are built in two steps: one step stativizing a VoiceP (with Asp), and another step quantifying over the understood agent. How that second step happens will have other effects, such as whether by-phrases or indirect objects are possible. Neither APs nor AAs fit well into a view of Voice systems which take "passive" and "middle" to be primitive, even if some properties appear to cluster together. Understanding "ability" constructions, then, will help us understand passives and middles better, since they use many, but not all of the same syntactic/semantic primitives.

Appendix: More on *-anlegur* Adjectives

In (35), we present AAs which have a clear ability meaning, some other meaning, and are ambiguous. Some non-ability adjectives have a derivationally unpredictable meaning—see below. The list, which we built in large part with the help of Snara (http://snara.is), an online resource of dictionaries, includes a few examples of P-Prefixing and is not supposed to be exhaustive in any way.

(35) **Ability Meaning**: *afsakanlegur* 'excusable', *betranlegur* 'improveable', *beygjanlegur* 'bendable', *borganlegur* 'payable', *breytanlegur* 'changeable', *brigðanlegur* 'repealable', *deilanlegur* 'dividable', *endurnýjanlegur* 'renewable', *fáanlegur* 'obtainable', *finnanlegur* 'findable', *fyrirgefanlegur* 'forgiveable', *færanlegur* 'moveable', *hagganlegur* 'budgeable', *heyranlegur* 'audible', *hreyfanlegur* 'moveable', *hræranlegur* 'moveable', *leysanlegur* 'soluble, solvable', *merkjanlegur* 'perceptible', *mælanlegur* 'measureable', *(í)náanlegur* 'reachable', *rekjanlegur* 'traceable', *ræktanlegur* 'arable', *sjáanlegur* 'visible', *skiljanlegur* 'understandable', *skýranlegur* 'explainable', *sveigjanlegur* 'malleable', *teljanlegur* 'countable', *teygjanlegur* 'stretchable', *vinnanlegur* 'winnable', *þekkjanlegur* 'recognizable', *þenjanlegur* 'stretchable', *þolanlegur* 'tolerable', *(á)þreifanlegur* 'touchable' **Non-ability Meaning**: *ákjósanlegur* 'desirable', *ánægjanlegur* 'fun/†enough', *blífanlegur* 'lasting', *blómganlegur* 'blooming, flourishing', *blöskranlegur* 'despicable', *efanlegur* 'questionable', *forkastanlegur* 'reprehensible', *furðanlegur* 'wonderful, remarkable/strange', *haganlegur* 'handy', *hjartanlegur* 'heartful', *hneykslanlegur* 'offensive, scandalous', *hugnanlegur* 'likeable', *nægjanlegur* 'enough', *skikkanlegur* 'orderly, well-behaved', *varanlegur* 'permanent, lasting', *vitanlegur* 'known', *væntanlegur* 'expected, hoped for', *yfirskynjanlegur* 'supernatural', *þénanlegur* 'serviceable', *þokknanlegur/þóknanlegur* 'pleasing' **Ambiguous Adjectives**: *ásættanlegur* 'acceptable', *átakanlegur* 'tangible/touching', *bölvanlegur* 'cursed, damned', *eftirgefanlegur* 'compliant, yielding', *eftirtakanlegur* 'noticeable, perceptible', *endanlegur* 'endable/final', *hugsanlegur* 'thinkable/likely', *trúanlegur* 'credible'

In the present system, compositional AAs are derived by attaching adjectivizers on top of verbal substructure (Roeper and van Hout 1999, 2009, Alexiadou 2009, Oltra-Massuet 2010, Borer 2012, Anagnostopoulou and Samioti to appear). Semantically idiosyncratic cases are generally assumed to involve lower attachment of those same heads (Nevins 2002, Volpe 2005, Roeper and van Hout 2009, Oltra-Massuet 2010). Basically, they can attach directly to the root. Ambiguous cases involve roots

that can occur in either structure. This is analogous to the two classes of English *-able* adjectives: productive/predictable and unproductive/unpredictable (Horn 1980, Kayne 1981, Fabb 1984, Roeper 1987, Nevins 2002, Volpe 2005, Oltra-Massuet 2010, Anagnostopoulou and Samioti to appear).

Source URLs for attested examples

[1]http://www.oliagustar.net/2005/10/04/hverjum-er-ekki-misbo%C3%B0i%C3%B0/
[2]http://heimur.takeforum.com/2008/11/06/faldir-vefir-hljomsveita/
[3](*Morgunblaðið* 7 July 1999 p. E 32) http://www.mbl.is/greinasafn/grein/478565/
[4]http://www.visir.is/odrekkandi-vatn-i-hofnum/article/2005507290345
[5]http://ofvitinn.wordpress.com/2008/08/24/ma%C3%B0ur-er-manns-gaman/
[6]http://www.live2cruize.com/spjall/archive/index.php/t-18687.html
[7]http://hekla.blog.is/blog/hekla/entry/1044796/
[8]https://www.facebook.com/pressan/posts/359850807378951
[9]http://www.847.is/spjall2/read.php?1,8001,8011,quote=1
[10]https://bland.is/messageboard/messageboard.aspx?type=52&advid=1519123
[11]http://cs-001.123.is/DeliverFile.aspx?id=9f46f77b-445d-436a-83e9-41f7eb864cb3
[12]http://www.ms.is/Vorur/ostur/erlendir-ostar/736/default.aspx
[13](*Kirkjuritið* 30(8–9):341, 1964) http://timarit.is/view_page_init.jsp?pageId=4742314
[14]http://gustaf.blog.is/blog/gustaf/entry/1122774/
[15]http://heimur.takeforum.com/2008/11/06/faldir-vefir-hljomsveita/
[16]http://www2.lexis.hi.is/cgi-bin/ritmal/leitord.cgi?adg=daemi&n=623629&s=679289&l=yfirtengi
[17]http://www.sminor.is/V%C3%B6rulisti/PDF_skrar/09_kafli.pdf

References

Alexiadou, Artemis. 2009. On the role of syntactic locality in morphological processes: The case of (Greek) derived nominals. In *Quantification, Definiteness and Nominalization*, ed. A. Giannakidou and M. Rathert, 253–280. Oxford University Press.

Anagnostopoulou, Elena, and Panagiota Samioti. To appear. Domains within words and their meanings: A case study. In *The Syntax of Roots and the Roots of Syntax*, ed. A. Alexiadou, H. Borer, and F. Schäfer. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Borer, Hagit. 2012. In the event of a nominal. In *The Theta System: Argument Structure at the Interface*, ed. M. Everaert, M. Marelj, and T. Siloni, 103–149. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bruening, Benjamin. 2013. *By* phrases in passives and nominals. *Syntax* 16:1–41.

Bruening, Benjamin. To appear. Word formation is syntactic: Adjectival passives in English. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*.

Dubinsky, Stanley, and Silvester Ron Simango. 1996. Passive and stative in Chichewa: Evidence for modular distinctions in grammar. *Language* 74:749–781.

Embick, David. 2004. On the structure of resultative participles in English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35:355–392.

Embick, David, and Alec Marantz. 2008. Architecture and blocking. *Linguistic Inquiry* 39:1–53.

Eythórsson, Thórhallur. 2008. The New Passive in Icelandic really is a passive. In *Grammatical Change and Linguistic Theory: The Rosendal Papers*, ed. T. Eythórsson, 173–219. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Fabb, Nigel. 1984. Syntactic Affixation. Doctoral Dissertation, MIT.

Friðjónsson, Jón G. 1982. Um lýsingarhátt nútíðar. *Íslenskt mál og almenn málfræði* 4:191–219.

Horn, Laurence R. 1980. Affixation and the Unaccusative Hypothesis. *Chicago Linguistics Society* 16:134–146.

Ingason, Anton Karl, Julie Anne Legate, and Charles Yang. 2012. Structural and evolutionary basis of the Icelandic New Impersonal Passive. Manuscript, University of Pennsylvania.

Jóhannesson, Alexander. 1927. *Die Suffixe im Isländischen*. Reykjavík: Árbók Háskóla Íslands.

Jóhannsdóttir, Kristín M. 2007. Temporal adverbs in Icelandic: adverbs of quantification vs. frequency adverbs. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 30:157–183.

Jóhannsdóttir, Kristín M. 2011. Aspects of the Progressive in English and Icelandic. Doctoral Dissertation, University of British Columbia, Vancouver.

Jónsson, Jóhannes Gísli. 2009. The new impersonal as a true passive. In *Advances in Comparative Germanic Syntax*, ed. A. Alexiadou, J. Hankamer, T. McFadden, J. Nuger, and F. Schäfer, 281–306. John Benjamins.

Kayne, Richard S. 1981. Unambiguous paths. In *Levels of Syntactic Representation*, ed. R. May and J. Koster, 143–183. Dordrecht: Foris.

Kvaran, Guðrún. 2005. *Orð* [Words]. Íslensk tunga II. Reykjavík: Almenna bókafélagið.

Maling, Joan. 2001. Dative: The heterogeneity of the mapping among morphological case, grammatical functions, and thematic roles. *Lingua* 111:419–464.

Maling, Joan, and Sigríður Sigurjónsdóttir. 2002. The 'new impersonal' construction in Icelandic. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 5:97–142.

Maling, Joan, and Sigríður Sigurjónsdóttir. 2013. Nothing personal? A system-internal syntactic change in Icelandic. In *From Quirky Case to Representing Space: Papers in Honor of Annie Zaenen*, ed. T.H. King and V. de Paiva, 109–126. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Nevins, Andrew. 2002. One *-able*, two attachment sites. Manuscript, MIT.

Oltra-Massuet, Maria Isabel. 2010. On the Morphology of Complex Adjectives. Doctoral Dissertation, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.

Pylkkänen, Liina. 2008. *Introducing Arguments*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Roeper, Thomas. 1987. Implicit arguments and the head-complement Relation. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18:267–310.

Roeper, Thomas, and Angeliek van Hout. 1999. The Impact of Nominalization on Passive, *-able*, and Middle: Burzio's Generalization and Feature-Movement in the Lexicon. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 35:155–211.

Roeper, Thomas, and Angeliek van Hout. 2009. The representation of movement in *-ability* nominalizations. Evidence for covert category movement, Edge phenomena, and local LF. In *Quantification, Definiteness and Nominalization*, ed. A. Giannakidou and M. Rathert, 344–364. Oxford University Press.

Rögnvaldsson, Eiríkur. 1988. Einsleitur grunnur íslenskra viðskeyta. Manuscript, University of Iceland.

Samioti, Panagiota. 2013. Stativity and ability: Is there a connection? Paper presented at the 21st International Symposium on Theoretical and Applied Linguistics.

Sigurðsson, Einar Freyr. 2012. Germynd en samt þolmynd: Um nýju þolmyndina í íslensku [Active but still passive: On the New Passive in Icelandic]. M.A. Thesis, University of Iceland.

Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 1989. Verbal Syntax and Case in Icelandic. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Lund.

Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 2010. On EPP effects. *Studia Linguistica* 64:159–189.

Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 2011. On the New Passive. *Syntax* 14:148–178.

Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 2012. Minimalist C/case. *Linguistic Inquiry* 43:191–227.

Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann, and Verner Egerland. 2009. Impersonal null-subjects in Icelandic and elsewhere. *Studia Linguistica* 63:158–185.

Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 1999. *Íslensk setningafræði* [Icelandic Syntax]. Reykjavík: Málvísindastofnun HÍ.

Volpe, Mark J. 2005. Japanese Morphology and its Theoretical Consequences: Derivational Morphology in Distributed Morphology. Doctoral Dissertation, State University of New York, Stony Brook.

Wood, Jim. 2012. Icelandic Morphosyntax and Argument Structure. Doctoral Dissertation, New York University.

Jim Wood
Department of Linguistics
370 Temple Street
Yale University
New Haven, CT 06520
jim.wood@yale.edu

Einar Freyr Sigurðsson
Department of Linguistics
619 Williams Hall
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6305
einarsig@ling.upenn.edu