# STUDIA GRAMATYCZNO-LEKSYKALNE

ANNA BONDARUK

## TWO TYPOLOGIES OF AP PREDICATES IN POLISH
## – A COMPARISON

## 1. INTRODUCTION

APs in Polish can function as primary predicates in copular clauses. They can also be used in non-copular clauses as secondary predicates modifying subjects or complements. In the former use, all types of AP predicates are possible, but they yield different semantic effects. In the latter case, only a restricted set of APs is felicitous. It is the aim of this paper to determine the various syntactic and semantic restrictions on AP predicates functioning as both types of predicates in Polish and to link them with the two typologies of predicates present in the literature. The first typology is well-established and goes back to the works of Gary Milsark[1] and Greg Carlson[2]. It posits a binary distinction within the class of AP predicates, namely between Individual Level Predicates (henceforth, ILP) and Stage Level Predicates (henceforth, SLP). The other more recent typology, proposed by Isabelle Roy[3], rejects the IL/ SL

---

Prof. dr hab. ANNA BONDARUK profesor nadzwyczajny – Katedra Językoznawstwa Teoretycznego KUL; adres do korespondencji: Katolicki Uniwersytet Lubelski Jana Pawła II, Instytut Filologii Angielskiej, Al. Racławickie 14, 20-950 Lublin; e-mail: bondaruk@kul.pl

[1] G. MILSARK, *Existential sentences in English*, Ph. D. dissertation, Cambridge (MA) 1974.

[2] G. CARLSON, *Reference to kinds in English*, Ph. D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst 1977.

[3] I. ROY, *Nonverbal predication. Copular sentences at the syntax-semantics interface*, Oxford 2013.

dichotomy, and offers instead a ternary division of predicates into defining, characterizing and situation-descriptive. It is argued here that although both typologies can account for some data, neither of them is capable of handling the whole range of AP predicates in Polish.

The paper has the following structure: Section 2 focuses on the distinction between ILPs and SLPs and the way it is manifested for Polish AP predicates. Section 3 highlights some problematic cases for the IL/SL dichotomy. Section 4 introduces Roy's three-way typology of predicates, while section 5 demonstrates its validity for Polish. Section 6 makes an attempt at comparing the two typologies with each other in order to check which of them is more advantageous in the light of the data analyzed. Section 7 provides the conclusions.

## 2. IL AND SL ADJECTIVES IN POLISH

It has been widely recognized that AP predicates can refer to either stable, habitual and unalterable properties or to temporary, accidental and transient ones. This distinction has been formalized by Milsark and Carlson, who put forward a distinction between ILPs and SLPs[4]. Carlson proposes that the former are directly predicated of individuals[5], while the latter are predicated of stages, where a stage is defined as "a spatially and temporally bounded manifestation of something"[6]: it is "a space-time slice" of an individual[7]. To illustrate the difference between ILPs and SLPs, Carlson uses examples such as (1) and (2):

    (1) John is drunk.
    (2) John is intelligent.

Carlson argues that (1) denotes a set of stages of being drunk, while (2) represents a permanent property of an individual called John. Sentence (1) is true if and only if one of John's stages corresponds to the stage of being drunk. Sen-

---

[4] Actually Milsark calls SLPs state-descriptive predicates.

[5] For Carlson, individuals correspond to objects and kinds. Objects represent specific entities such as *Mary* and *my cat*, while kinds comprise generic NPs such as *cats*. This distinction is not relevant for the discussion carried out in the paper, and therefore we will not elaborate on it any further.

[6] G. CARLSON, *Reference to kinds...*, p. 115.

[7] G. CARLSON, *Reference to kinds...*, p. 128.

tence (2), in turn, is true if and only if John, rather than one of his stages, is in the set of individuals that are intelligent.

Some instances of adjectival ILPs from Polish are provided in (3) below[8]:

> (3) *wysoki* 'tall', *inteligentny* 'intelligent', *mądry* 'wise', *ostrożny* 'careful', *głupi* 'foolish', *grzeczny* 'polite', *gruby* 'fat', *łysy* 'bold', *polski* 'Polish', *nerwowy* 'nervous', *młody* 'young', *szeroki* 'wide', *mały* 'small', *dyskretny* 'discreet', etc.

Some adjectival SLPs are listed in (4):

> (4) *chory* 'sick', *nieobecny* 'absent', *sam* 'alone', *zdenerwowany* 'angry', *znudzony* 'bored', *pijany* 'drunk', *nieprzytomny* 'unconscious', *zmęczony* 'tired', *nagi* 'naked', *zadowolony* 'satisfied', *zaabsorbowany* 'absorbed', *wściekły* 'furious', etc.

The distinction between ILPs and SLPs has been commonly located in the Lexicon (cf. William Ladusaw[9], Angelica Kratzer[10], Gennaro Chierchia[11]). For a number of linguists, lexical items are selected from the Lexicon to enter the derivation specified for the feature IL or SL (or even both). However, there are linguists who treat this typology as belonging to the realm of syntax, rather than the Lexicon (cf. Gillian Ramchand[12], Ángel Gallego and Juan Uriagereka[13], Roy)[14]. For them, the IL/SL dichotomy is constructed at the level of sentence structure, and  is not a part of a lexical entry of a given word. It is not our purpose here to determine which of the two stances presented above is right. However, it seems that there is evidence in favour of the claim that the

---

[8] The IL/SL distinction is valid not only of AP, but also of other types of predicates, including VPs, NPs and PPs. Compare sentences (i) and (ii) below with verbal predicates, where the former refers to a temporary activity, while the latter denotes a stable one:
> (i) Mark kissed Betty.
> (ii) Mark adores Betty.

[9] W.A. LADUSAW, *Thetic and categorical, stage and individual, weak and strong*, in: *Proceedings of SALT IV*, eds. M. Harvey and L. Santelmann, Cornell: Ithaca 1994, pp. 220-229.

[10] A. KRATZER, *Stage-level and individual-level predicates as inherent generics*, in: *The generic book*, eds. G.N. Carlson and F.J. Pelletier, Chicago–London 1995, pp. 125-175.

[11] G. CHIERCHIA, *Individual-level predicates as inherent generics*, in: *The Generic book*, eds. G.N. Carlson and F.J. Pelletier, Chicago–London 1995, pp. 176-223.

[12] G. RAMCHAND, *Two subject positions in Scottish Gaelic: The syntax-semantics interface*, "Natural Language Semantics" 4(1996), pp. 165-191.

[13] Á. GALLEGO and J. URIAGEREKA, *The lexical syntax of ser and estar*, ms., Universitat Autónoma de Barcelona and University of Maryland 2011.

[14] Gallego and Uriagereka treat the IL/SL distinction as belonging to the so-called lexico--syntax.

IL/SL dichotomy is not restricted to the Lexicon. In particular, ILPs can get a stage-level reading, depending on the context, as confirmed by (5):

(5) Marek zaczął studia      głupi,   a      skończył   mądry.
    Mark   started studies    stupid  and    finished   wise
    'Mark started his studies dumb and finished them wise.'

Normally both adjectives *głupi* 'stupid' and *mądry* 'wise' are IL, however, in the context present in (5), the adjective *głupi* 'dumb' gets a temporary interpretation, typical of SLPs. This strongly suggests that IL or SL interpretation of the adjective cannot be determined once and for all at the lexical level.

IL/SL adjectives have been extensively studied in Spanish and Russian. In Spanish, the IL/SL dichotomy seems to be reflected in the choice of one of the two copulas *ser* or *estar*, present in the language. There are a number of linguists who, at least to some degree, associate ILPs with *ser*, and SLPs with *estar* (cf. Manuel Leonetti[15], Rafael Marín[16], Maria Arche[17], inter alia). In Russian, there are long and short adjectives, whose occurrence is sometimes related to the SL and IL property, respectively (cf. Terence Wade[18])[19].

In Polish, the IL/SL distinction has not attracted much attention so far. A cursory mention of this dichotomy can be found in the context of Polish nominal predicates in Barbara Citko[20], and for a limited set of primary and secondary AP predicates in Martin Renz and Gerd Hentschel[21]. Although the IL/SL dichot-

---

[15] M. LEONETTI, *Ser y estar: estado de la cuenstión*, "Barataria" 1(1994), pp. 182-205.

[16] R. MARÍN, *Entre ser y estar*, Madrid: Arco/Libros 2004; R. MARÍN, *Spanish adjectives within bounds*, in: *Adjectives: formal analyses in syntax and semantics*, eds. P. Cabredo-Hoffher, and O. Matushansky, Amsterdam 2010, pp. 307-332.

[17] M.J. ARCHE, *Individuals in time: tense, aspect and the individual/stage distinction*, Amsterdam 2006.

[18] T. WADE, *A comprehensive Russian grammar*, Oxford 1992.

[19] The relation between the form of the adjective and the IL/SL interpretation has been widely opposed in the current literature, including Hentschel, and Roy, among others.

Russian allows only long forms of adjectives as secondary predicates. They can be marked for either the nominative or instrumental, which Hinterhölzl links with the permanent (non-bounded) vs. temporary (bounded) property of the antecedent, respectively. A different approach is taken by Richardson, who argues that the case marking of adjectives in Russian secondary predicates has nothing to do with the permanent or temporary quality of their antecedent.

[20] B. CITKO, *Small clauses reconsidered: Not so small and not all alike*, "Lingua" 118(2008), pp. 261-295.

[21] M. RENZ and G. HENTSCHEL, *On adjectives and adverbs expressing 'nakedness' and 'barefootness' in Polish and Russian: a study on morphosyntactic variation*, "Russian Linguist" 35(2011), pp. 63-87.

omy is not manifested in Polish in either the choice of the copula, as in Spanish, or the morphological form of the adjective, as in Russian, it seems to surface in a number of syntactic phenomena. First of all, Polish is sensitive to the IL/SL  dichotomy as regards complements of perception verbs. Carlson[22] notes that in English only SL predicates are allowed in this context, in contradistinction to IL predicates. The contrast in question is illustrated for Polish in (6) and (7) below:

(6) Widziałam Marię      zdenerwowaną.        SL
    I-saw       Mary-acc  angry-acc[23]
    'I saw Mary angry.'
(7) *Widziałam  Marię      nerwową.            IL
    I-saw         Mary-acc  nervous-acc
    'I saw Mary nervous.'

Sentence (6), containing a Stage Level predicate, is perfectly acceptable, whereas example (7), showing an IL predicate, is ill-formed. Consequently, the conclusion can be drawn that Polish, like English, can host only SLPs in perceptual reports.

The second test that Carlson makes use of to establish the distinction between IL and SL predicates is based on the difference in interpretation of bare plural subjects found with these two types of predicates. He argues that bare plural subjects can have both an existential and generic interpretation when constructed with SLPs in English, while they admit only a generic interpretation when they appear with ILPs (cf. also Kratzer, Moly Diesing[24]). This observation is directly applicable to Polish, as confirmed by the data in (8) and (9):

(8) Lekarze          są dostępni.          SL
    doctors-nom      are available-nom
    'Doctors are available.'
(9) Lekarze          są pomocni.           IL
    doctors-nom    are helpful-nom
    'Doctors are helpful.'

In (8) and (9) APs are used as primary predicates. Sentence (8) contains a SLP, whereas (9) hosts an ILP. The two sentences differ in interpretation. Only the former admits both the existential and generic interpretation, corresponding to

---

[22] G. CARLSON,  *Reference to kinds...*, p. 124ff.

[23] The following abbreviations have been used in the paper: acc – accusative, imperf – imperfective, instr – instrumental, and nom- nominative.

[24] M. DIESING, *Indefinites*, Cambridge (MA) 1992.

the following two readings, respectively: *There are doctors available*, and *All doctors are available*. The latter allows only the generic reading, i.e. *All doctors are helpful*[25]. In this respect, Polish behaves in a way analogous to English.

Another test typically used to distinguish ILPs from SLPs in the literature is based on APs used as adjunct predicates, or the so-called depictives (cf. for instance, Tova Rapoport[26], Louise McNally[27], Marín[28], Antonio Fábregas et al.[29]). The data such as (10) and (11) below demonstrate that only SL adjectives can be used in Polish as depictives, in contradistinction to IL adjectives[30].

(10)  Marek      przyjechał do domu   zdenerwowany.   SL
      Mark-nom arrived      home          angry
      'Mark arrived home angry.'

(11)  *Marek      przyjechał do domu   wysoki.            IL
       Mark-nom    arrived      home      tall
      '*Mark arrived home tall.'

---

[25] The contrast in the interpretation of (8) and (9) comes to light in existential sentences. A corresponding existential sentence is possible only for (8), as can be seen in (i) below, but not for (9), as confirmed by (ii):

  (i) Są dostępni     lekarze.
      are available   doctors
      'There are doctors available.'
  (ii) *Są   pomocni      lekarze.
       are   helpful         doctors
      'There are doctors helpful.'

[26] T. RAPOPORT, *Adjunct predicate licensing and D-structure*, in: *Syntax and semantics 25, Perspectives on phrase structure; heads and licensing*, ed. S. D. Rothstein, San Diego 1991, pp. 159-187; T. RAPOPORT, *Stage and adjunct predicates*, in: *Knowledge and language*, vol. II: *Lexical and conceptual structure*, Dordrecht–Boston–London 1993, pp. 157-182.

[27] L. MCNALLY, *Adjunct predicates and the individual/stage distinction*, in: *Proceedings of WCCFL 12*, eds. D. Farkas, P. Spaelti and E. Duncan, Stanford (CA) 1994, pp. 561-576.

[28] R. MARÍN, *Spanish adjectives...*, pp. 307-332.

[29] A. FÁBREGAS, B. LEFERMAN and R. MARÍN, *Evaluative adjectives and Davidsonian states*, in: *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 17*, eds. E. Chemla, V. Homer and G. Winterstein, Paris 2012, pp. 237-253.

[30] Szajbel-Keck notes that APs are not frequently used in Polish as secondary predicates, compared to English and German. Instead of APs, PPs are much commoner in this function. This is demonstrated in (i) below, where both an AP and a PP depictive are possible, and (ii), in which the AP is impossible, but the PP is fully acceptable:

  (i) Przyjechał  do domu       po pijanemu/pijany.
      he-came    home           while drunk/drunk
      'He came back home drunk.'
  (ii) Wytarła    podłogę    do sucha     /*suchą.
      she-wiped  floor       to dry         *dry
      'She wiped the floor dry.'

The adjective *zdenerwowany* 'angry' belongs to SLPs (cf. (4) above), and as can be seen in (10), it can be felicitously used as a secondary predicate referring to the subject. The adjective *inteligentny* 'intelligent', which represents an ILP (cf. (3) above), cannot be used as a depictive modifying the subject, as demonstrated in (11).

Still another difference between IL and SL predicates becomes noticeable when we take into account modification by time adverbials (cf. Kratzer, Claudia Maienborn[31]). Only SLPs can be so modified, while ILPs do not tolerate this type of modification. The contrast comes to light in sentences such as (12) and (13) below:

> (12)  Marek jest czasami   chory.              SL
>        Mark  is   sometime  sick
>        'Mark is sometimes sick.'
> (13)  *Marek   jest czasami   wysoki.          IL
>        Mark     is   sometimes tall
>        'Mark is sometimes tall.'

In (12) and (13) the adverb *czasami* 'sometimes' is used with a SL and IL predicate, respectively. Only the former sentence is grammatical, while the other one is semantically ill-formed, since according to Krazter, a temporal quantifier needs a temporal variable to bind, which is missing for ILPs.

ILPs are different from SLPs in that they do not admit modification by place adverbials (cf. for instance Satu Manninen[32]), as confirmed by the following data:

> (14)  Marek był    pijany w biurze.             SL
>        Mark  was    drunk  in office
>        'Mark was drunk in the office.'
> (15)  *Marek    był    wysoki    w biurze.       IL
>        Mark      was    tall      in office
>        'Mark was tall in the office.'

The place adverbial such as *w biurze* 'in the office' can be felicitously added in (14), which contains a SLP, but not in (15), which hosts an ILP. In a way

---

[31] C. MAIENBORN, *Situationsbezug und die Stadien/Individuen-Distinktion bei Kopula-Prädikativ-Konstruktionen*, "ZAS Papers in Linguistics" 14 (1999), pp. 41-64.

[32] S. MANNINEN, *A minimalist analysis of stage level and individual level*, "Working Paper in Linguistics" 1(2001), Lund, The Department of English in Lund.

similar to example (13) above, the unacceptability of (15) follows from that fact that an ILP lacks, not only a temporal, but also a locative variable for the locative modifier to bind (cf. Kratzer).

So far, five differences between ILPs and SLPs realized as APs in Polish have been pointed out. Space limitations prevent us from mentioning all the contrasts between these two classes of predicates. They include, among others, the use of these two types of predicates in absolute constructions (see Manninen, Marín[33]), accompanied by *when*-conditionals (cf. Gerhard Jäger[34], Fábregas et al.), and leading to or blocking life time effects (see Kratzer, Jäger, as well as examples (24)-(27) below). However, since the IL/SL dichotomy has a number of syntactic and semantic reflexes in Polish, it seems justified to claim that this typology is valid for Polish. Nonetheless, as shall see in section 3, there are some serious problems that this distinction faces in Polish and in other languages.

### 3. PROBLEMATIC ISSUES FOR THE IL/SL DISTINCTION

The most serious problem that arises for the IL/SL dichotomy, which has already been hinted at while discussing example (5) above, concerns the fact that ILPs often coerce into SLPs. Coercion of this kind is particularly noticeable in the case of the so-called Evaluative Adjectives (henceforth, EAs)[35]. These are adjectives such as the following:

(16) *okrutny* 'cruel', *mądry* 'wise', *ostrożny* 'careful', *głupi* 'foolish', *grzeczny* 'polite', *miły* 'nice', *hojny* 'generous', *inteligentny* 'intelligent', *tchórzliwy* 'cowardly', etc.

---

[33] R. MARÍN, *Spanish adjective...*, pp. 307-332.

[34] G. JÄGER, *Stage levels, states, and the semantics of the copula*, "ZAS Papers in Linguistics" 14(1999), pp. 65-94.

[35] Coercion is defined by Pustejovsky (p. 111) as follows: "Type coercion is a semantic operation that converts an argument to the type which is expected by a function where it would otherwise result in a type error".

Coercion affects not only AP predicates, but also verbal ones, as can be seen in (i) below, taken from Escandell and Leonetti (p. 164):

(i) Suddenly, I knew the answer.

In (i) the stative verb seems to be incompatible with the adverb *suddenly*. This incompatibility is resolved by coercing a state into an event.

EAs are normally treated as ILPs (see Carlson, Fábregas et al.), which is confirmed by the fact that some of the adjectives enumerated in (16) are also included in the list of ILPs in (3) above. This classification, however, is problematic, as EAs pattern with ILPs only in two respects, i.e. as regards the interpretation of bare plural subjects and their inability to function as depictives[36]. These two properties are illustrated in (17) and (18):

(17)   Lekarze    są inteligentni.                    EA
       doctors    are intelligent
       'Doctors are intelligent.'
(18)   *Marek przyjechał do domu    inteligentny.       EA
       Mark arrived      home         intelligent
       'Mark arrived home intelligent.'

Sentence (17), similarly to that in (9), has only a generic interpretation, but it lacks an existential reading, i.e. it can only mean *All doctors are intelligent*. Sentence (18), in a way analogous to (11), is impossible with the EA used as a depictive.

EAs are different from ILPs, but resemble SL predicates as regards modification by temporal adjuncts. This is illustrated in (19) below, which is perfectly grammatical just like (12) above with a SLP.

(19)   Marek jest czasami     miły.              EA
       Mark  is   sometimes   nice
       'Mark is sometimes nice.'

In a way similar to SLPs, EAs also allow locative modifiers, as can be seen in (20)[37]:

---

[36] In perception reports such as (6) and (7) above, EAs are generally marginal, in a way similar to ILPs, as can be seen in (i) below:
    (i) ??Widziałam   Marię grzeczną/ inteligentną.
        I-saw         Mary polite /intelligent
        'I saw Mary polite/intelligent.'
[37] Some EAs are marginal with locative modifiers, cf. the following:
    (i) ??? Marek jest inteligentny  w biurze.
        Mark      is   intelligent   in office
        'Mark is intelligent in the office.'
The acceptability of sentences such as (i) increases, when the verb *być* 'to be' is put in its imperfective form, as in (ii):
    (ii) Mark  bywa      inteligentny   w biurze.
        Mark  is-imperf intelligent    in office
        'Mark is intelligent in the office.'

(20)    Marek jest miły    w pracy.                         EA
        Mark  is  nice     at work
        'Mark is nice at work.'

What is more, EAs can co-occur with both time and place adverbials, as in (21):

(21)    Marek jest czasami    miły    w pracy.             EA
        Mark  is  sometimes  nice    at work
        'Mark is sometimes nice at work.'

The data such as (19), (20) and (21) are problematic for the conclusion reached in section 2, following Kratzer, that only SLPs must be anchored in space and time.

In order to deal with the problem that EAs give rise to, Fábregas et al. argue that EAs have a special status and should in fact be viewed as ILPs that have an ability to predicate of two types of subject, either an individual or an event. In the former case, they behave like typical ILPs, while in the latter they resemble eventive verbs, which need to be anchored in time and space. If this approach is adopted to Polish, the EA in (17) will be seen  as behaving like an ordinary ILP that attributes a property to the subject, i.e. *lekarze* 'doctors'. The EAs in (19) and (20) (as well as in (21)), on the other hand, will be viewed as predicating of an event of being nice, rather than attributing a property to an individual Mark. In other words, (19) would mean *Mark sometimes behaves in a nice way*, while (20) would be understood as *Mark behaves in a nice way in the office*. Fábregas et al. show how this approach can be implemented in syntax and semantics. However, the details of their analysis will not be presented here, as they are not relevant for the main purpose of this paper, which is a comparison of the IL/SL dichotomy with Roy's typology of predicates, to which we will turn in Sections 4, 5 and 6.

## 4. ROY'S TYPOLOGY OF PREDICATES

Roy, who rejects the IL/SL distinction, proposes that predicates should be divided into three types, namely defining, characterizing, and situation-descriptive. Defining predicates are those that express a defining property, i.e. "a property salient enough to "define" an individual as a particular member of a class of

individuals"[38]. Characterizing predicates ascribe a property to an individual, whereas situation-descriptive predicates do not ascribe any property, but describe situations. Roy analyses both nominal and adjectival predicates found in copular clauses in French, Russian, Spanish and Irish. She notes that only nominal predicates can be defining, and they can be found, for instance in French copular sentences containing nominal predicates preceded by an indefinite article, as in (22) below. Copular clauses with bare (article-less) nominal predicates in French, exhibit characterizing predicates, as illustrated in (23):

(22)  Raymond  es   un acteur.          defining
      Raymond  is   an actor
      'Raymond is an actor.'
(23)  Raymond  es   acteur.            characterizing
      Raymond  is   actor
      'Raymond is an actor.'

Roy notes that both sentences (22) and (23) represent attributive predication, but only in the former is the predicate defining in the sense described above, while in the latter the predicate belongs to the characterizing class and thus represents a case of pure attribution. Roy shows that defining predicates differ from characterizing ones as regards their use as secondary predicates, their appearance with a time or place adverbial, and their giving rise to life time effects, among others.[39, 40] Only characterizing predicates (as in (23)) can be used as secondary predicates, can be restricted by time and place adverbials, and do not give rise to life time effects in the past, in contradistinction to defining predicates (as in (22)), which show the opposite properties.

It is worth noting that the properties mentioned above as distinguishing defining from characterizing predicates closely resemble those characteristics that were used in section 3 to draw a line between ILPs and SLPs. Even as re-

---

[38] I. ROY, *Nonverbal predication...*, p. 35.

[39] Roy's analysis is presented in detail in Bondaruk. Moreover, Bondaruk shows that Roy's distinction between defining and characterizing predicates is valid for Polish nominal predicates attested in copular clauses. In particular, nominative case marked predicates are defining, whereas instrumental case marked ones are characterizing. The majority of the differences that Roy notes for French nominal predicates can also be observed for Polish nominative vs. instrumental case-marked nominal predicates. As the paper deals with AP predicates, not with nominal ones, the interested reader is referred to Bondaruk for details.

[40] Life time effects arise in those past tense sentences that entail that their subject is now dead (cf. (24)-(27) below).

gards life time effects, the literature (see, for instance Kratzer[41], Jäger[42]) emphasizes the fact that ILPs, when used with the past tense verb, give rise to life time effects, in contradistinction to SLPs. This difference is illustrated in (24) and (25) from English, and (26) and (27) from Polish:

(24)    Mary was American.          IL
(25)    Mary was busy.              SL
(26)    Maria   była   nudna.       IL
        Mary    was    boring
        'Mary was boring.'
(27)    Maria   była   znudzona.    SL
        Mary    was    bored
        'Mary was bored.'

Sentences (24) and (26), containing ILPs, imply that Mary is no longer alive, whereas no entailment of this kind ever arises in sentences (25) and (27), which host SLPs.

However, Roy[43] observes that the distinction between defining and characterizing predicates cannot be captured within the individual vs. stage level dichotomy. She argues that a defining predicate refers to a defining property, i.e. the most salient or characteristic property of an individual; a notion that does not easily reduce to a permanent vs. transient contrast. Furthermore, defining predicates are often ungrammatical in various contexts which tolerate adjectival individual level predicates.[44] Likewise, characterizing predicates differ from stage level predicates in that they do not behave in a homogenous way with respect to classic stage level tests which involve the use of temporal and locative modifiers. Bare nouns in French (cf. (23) above) sometimes pattern

---

[41] A. KRATZER, *Stage-level and individual-level predicate...*, p. 155ff.

[42] G. JÄGER, *Stage levels, states...*, p. 68.

[43] I. ROY, *Nonverbal predication...*, p. 47.

[44] The contrast between defining predicates and IL predicates can be observed in (i) and (ii) below, quoted after Roy (p. 48):

(i) *Personne  n'est   un acteur.          defining
    nobody     not-is  an actor
    'Nobody is an actor.'
(ii) Personne  n'est   intelligent/grand/ italien.      IL
    nobody     not-is  intelligent/tall/Italian
    'Nobody is intelligent/tall/Italian.'

Sentence (i), containing a defining predicate, cannot be found in the context which favours ILPs, as confirmed by (ii). The grammaticality contrast between sentences such as (i) and (ii) strongly argues against subsuming defining predicates under the label. of ILPs.

with stage level predicates and sometimes with individual level predicates, which makes it impossible to treat characterizing predicates as members of either of the two classes. Consequently, Roy[45] concludes that neither the bare nominal nor the variant with the article have exactly the properties of stage and individual level predicates, respectively.

Having presented the basic tenets of Roy's analysis, let us now turn to the way she approaches adjectival predicates in French. For her, AP predicates can be either characterizing or situation-descriptive. Characterizing AP predicates, as in (30) below, similarly to characterizing NP predicates, as in (29) below, can answer the question in (28)[46]:

(28) Qu'est-ce qu'est Paul?
     what-is-it that-is Paul
     'What is Paul?'

(29) Paul est ivrogne.            characterizing
     Paul is drunkard
     'Paul is a drunkard.'

(30) Paul est ivre.              characterizing
     Paul is drunk
     'Paul is drunk.'

However, only APs, as in (32), but not NPs, as in (33), can function as situation-descriptive predicates, and then they answer the question provided in (31)[47]:

(31) Qu'est-ce qui s'est passé dehors, c'est quoi tout ce bruit?
     'What happened outside, what is all this noise about?'

(32) Paul est ivre   (et il a renversé      la poubelle
     Paul is drunk   (and he has knocked-over the trash can
     comme toujours).
     as always
     'Paul is drunk (and he has knocked over the trash can as usual).'

(33) #Paul est ivrogne  (et il a renversé      la poubelle
     Paul is drunkard  (and he has knocked-over the trash can
     comme toujours)[48].
     as always
     '#Paul is a drunkard (and he has knocked over the trash can as usual).'

---

[45] I. ROY, *Nonverbal predication...*, p. 66.
[46] The examples in (28)-(30) come from Roy (p. 74).
[47] The data in (31)-(33) are taken from Roy (p. 76).
[48] The symbol '#' stands for semantically/pragmatically ill-formed.

Additionally, Roy[49] emphasizes that there is a semantic difference between situation-descriptive and characterizing predicates, which comes to light in sentences such as (34) below:

> (34)   Paul   est ivrogne,   mais   là (exceptionnellement)   il   n'est   pas
>        Paul   is drunkard   but there   exceptionally         he   not-is   not
>        ivre.
>        drunk
>        'Paul is a drunkard, but now (exceptionally) he is not drunk.'

Sentence (34) contains an NP predicate *ivrogne* 'drunkard', which expresses a characterizing property of the subject, and the AP predicate *ivre* 'drunk', which describes a particular situation. Nonetheless, sentence (34) is not contradictory, as the property of being a drunkard, although characteristic of Paul, does not have to characterize him at the moment when the utterance is produced.

Roy[50] argues that characterizing and situation-descriptive predicates differ as regards the semantic notion of density, i.e. characterizing predicates are non-dense, while the situation-descriptive ones are dense. The formal definition of density is provided in (35), reproduced after Roy[51]:

> (35) If a predicate P is interpreted as *dense*, then P is true of an eventuality *e* in an interval I if and only if for any I', a subinterval of I, there exists another eventuality e', such that P is true of *e'* and *e'* is part of *e*.

The definition in (35) predicts that a predicate is dense when it holds for every subpart of a given eventuality, whereas it is non-dense if it does not satisfy this condition[52]. The contrast can be illustrated by means of (32) and (33) above. The state of being drunk, as in (32), lasts throughout the whole eventuality of Paul's drunkenness, while the state of being a drunkard, as in (33),

---

[49] I. ROY, *Nonverbal predication...*, p. 74.

[50] I. ROY, *Nonverbal predication...*, p. 75.

[51] I. ROY, *Nonverbal predication...*, p. 75

[52] Roy (p. 77) defines formally a non-dense predicate as follows:

If a predicate P is interpreted as non-dense, then P is true of an eventuality *e* in an interval I if and only if:

> (i) there exists a predicate P' true of *e* in a qualifying amount of non-overlapping intervals I' of I, and
>
> (ii) for every P, P' is the corresponding dense predicate.
>
>     The qualifying amount, mentioned in (i), is determined by pragmatic and sociological factors for each individual predicate.

does not have to hold without any interruptions (as confirmed by (34)). Roy[53] argues that for the predicate to be dense, it must be a possible answer to the questions *What happened?* and *What's going on?*. She explains that predicates such as *happen* and *go on* are always dense, because if an event is not happening/going on, then it ceases to happen/to go on. Consequently, an answer to the question such as (31) above from French, can only be a dense predicate as in (32).

To sum up, Roy's typology relevant for our analysis of AP predicates in Polish is based on the distinction between characterizing (non-dense) and situation-descriptive (dense) predicates. To simplify a bit, dense predicates are those that refer to states that are maintained without interruptions, whereas non-dense predicates do allow for gaps. It is also worth stressing the fact that for Roy, the distinction between dense and non-dense predicates is not lexical, but semantic and context-dependent. The subsequent section aims to test whether the distinctions that Roy has posited based on French data can be applied to Polish AP predicates.

## 5. ROY'S TYPOLOGY APPLIED TO POLISH AP PREDICATES

It seems that Polish, in a way analogous to French, possesses two types AP predicates, i.e. characterizing on the one hand, and situation-descriptive on the other. The former type answers the question starting with *jaki* 'what' (cf. (28) above), while the latter can serve as a reply to the Polish equivalent of the *what is going on question* (cf. (31) above). The contrast between these two types of AP predicates is demonstrated by the following data:

(36)   Jaki    jest Marek?
       what    is   Mark
       'What is Mark like?'

(37)   Marek jest wysoki/pijany.          characterizing
       Mark   is   wysoki/drunk
       'Mark is tall/drunk.'

(38)   Co      jest z     Markiem?
       what    is   with  Mark
       'What is going on with Mark?'

(39)   Marek jest pijany/*wysoki.          situation-descriptive
       Mark   is   drunk/*tall
       'Mark is drunk/tall.'

---

[53] I. ROY, *Nonverbal predication...*, p. 76.

The sentence in (37) with a characterizing adjective such as *wysoki* 'tall' can answer the question such as (36), but it cannot be felicitously used as an answer to the question in (38).[54] An adjective such as *pijany* 'drunk', on the other hand, can be used as an answer to the *what is going on question* as in (38), and then it represents a situation-descriptive predicate, but it can also answer the question in (36), and then it can be classed as a characterizing predicate.

However, the characterization of the two adjectives present in (37) and (39), provided above, is not unproblematic. First, of all, the adjective *pijany* 'drunk' must be viewed as dense on the situation-descriptive reading, but as non-dense with the characterizing interpretation. In other words, the state of being drunk must be seen as continuously maintained in (39), but allowing for gaps in (37). This is disadvantageous, as one adjective seems to escape a uniform classification within this typology. A bigger problem relates to the fact that the adjective *wysoki* 'tall', as in (37), must be viewed as characterizing and hence non-dense. This is highly problematic, as this kind of adjective does not normally have 'natural gaps', i.e. it does not allow for episodes when it does not hold, which would be the case if it were non-dense (cf. footnote 52). To account for this apparent paradox, Roy[55] proposes that adjectives like *tall* (also *obese*, *bold*, etc.) are coerced into non-dense readings (for a definition of coercion cf. footnote 35) and then they are true in those contexts in which gaps arise. In particular, the adjective *tall* can be coerced into a non-dense reading in which the state of being tall may change. One context in which this kind of reading is possible is a fairy tale. An approach along these lines could be applied to the Polish counterpart of the English adjective *tall*, i.e. *wysoki*, used in (37), as well, but it seems to be dubious, since viewing the state of being tall as non-continuously maintained is very unlikely outside the fairy tale context.

---

[54] Polish characterizing nominal predicates (always in the instrumental case), in contradistinction to their French counterparts, do not answer the same question as characterizing adjectives, but require a question such as (i) below, which can be answered as in (ii):

    (i)   Kim      jest  Marek?
           who-instr is    Mark-nom
           'Who is Mark?'

    (ii) Marek      jest moim     przyjacielem.       characterizing
           Mark-nom  is   my-instr friend-instr
           'Mark is my friend.'

[55] I. ROY, *Nonverbal predication...*, p. 78.

Another test that may be used to distinguish dense from non-dense adjectives is based on the use of locative modifiers. Roy[56] notes that locative PPs are always dense, and are therefore compatible only with dense predicates. That this is indeed the case can be observed in (40) and (41):

(40)    Marek  jest pijany w  domu.        situation-descriptive (dense)
        Mark   is   drunk at  home
        'Mark is drunk at home.'

(41)    #Marek jest wysoki  w  domu.       characterizing (non-dense)
        Mark   is   tall        at home
        'Mark is tall at home.'

Sentence (40) with a dense predicate *pijany* 'drunk' allows a locative modifier, whereas no modification of this kind is possible in (41), containing a non-dense predicate *wysoki* 'dense'.

However, Roy[57] realizes that some non-dense predicates can co-occur with locative modifiers, but then they do not lead to an intersective interpretation, but rather to a subsective one. Consequently, while (40) means that *Mark is drunk when he is at home*, a sentence such as (42) below can only mean that *Mark, being an individual bold on the top of his head, belongs to a subset of individuals who are bold*.

(42)    Marek  jest łysy  na czubku głowy.    characterizing (non-dense)
        Mark   is   bold  on top       of-head
        'Mark is bold on the top of his head.'

Roy also mentions that locative modifiers with non-dense APs are most commonly interpretable when they are constructed inside a restrictive relative clause put inside a generic statement. Then, the restrictive relative clause can be viewed "as restricting a subset of eventualities or situations where the predicate is true"[58]. In those cases in which neither the subsective nor the generic interpretation is available as in (43) below, the locative PP with a non-dense AP predicate is ill-formed:

---

[56] I. ROY, *Nonverbal predication...*, p. 79.
[57] I. ROY, *Nonverbal predication...*, p. 80.
[58] I. ROY, *Nonverbal predication...*, p. 80.

(43)    #Marek jest inteligentny  w  biurze.  characterizing (non-dense)
         Mark   is   intelligent    in office
         'Mark is intelligent in his office.'

To recapitulate, Polish, like French, has two types of AP predicates, i.e. char-
acterizing and situation-descriptive. The distinction is semantic in nature and
contextually determined. Situation-descriptive predicates used with locative
modifiers allow for intersecive readings, whereas characterizing predicates co-
occurring with locatives trigger a subsective or generic interpretation. The
subsequent section will relate the two typologies examined in this paper to each
other and point out the merits they have and the problems they give rise to.


## 6. THE TWO TYPOLOGIES – A COMPARISON

In section 3 some problems have been pointed out for the IL/SL dichotomy,
whereas in section 5 we have hinted at some troublesome issues for Roy's ty-
pology of AP predicates. Let now take a closer look at the two typologies in
question and make an attempt at comparing them with each other.

It seems that the IL/SL dichotomy cannot be easily translated into the char-
acterizing vs. situation-descriptive distinction, postulated by Roy. Actually it
might seem that ILPs, which represent stable properties, should be subsumed
under the label of dense, hence  situation-descriptive, predicates, and SLPs,
which encompass transient properties, should be classed as non-dense and
therefore characterizing. This intuition, however, is not borne out. As has been
shown in section 5 above, typically ILPs such as *wysoki* 'tall', or *łysy* 'bold',
as in (37) and (42), cannot be treated as dense, as they resist the two density
tests proposed by Roy. Firstly, predicates of this type can never be used in an-
swers to the *what is going on* question (cf. (39)) and secondly, they do not tol-
erate locative PP modifiers with an intersective interpretation (see (41) and
(42)). To be able to treat typically individual level predicates as non-dense,
Roy is forced to appeal to the process of coercion, which turns a dense predi-
cate into a non-dense one. This move allows Roy to account for the grammati-
cality of sentences such as (44) below (example (5), repeated below for con-
venience):

(44)    Marek zaczął studia głupi, a    skończył mądry.
         Mark   started studies stupid and finished   wise
         'Mark started his studies dumb and finished them wise.'

The adjectives *głupi* 'stupid' and *mądry* 'wise', used in (44), are ILPs, but within Roy's model they are both non-dense, as they can answer the respective questions: *Jaki był Marek kiedy zaczął studia*? 'What was Mark like when he started studies?', and *Jaki był Marek kiedy skończył studia*? 'What was Mark like when he finished studies?'. This is certainly an advantage of this model. However, coercing typically ILPs such as *wysoki* 'tall' and *łysy* 'bold' as non-dense is stipulative, as it does not seem to be possible, outside the fairy tale context, to view being tall, or being bold as non-continuously maintained.

It does not turn out to be feasible to treat SLPs as characterizing within Roy's model. For her, SLPs, such as *pijany* 'drunk' (cf. (37), (39) and (40) above), or *chory* 'sick' (cf. (12) above), can be dense if the predicate is maintained for the entire duration of the eventuality without gaps, or non-dense if it allows for interruptions.[59] In other words, in Roy's model SLPs can be viewed as either situation-descriptive (dense) or characterizing (non-dense), depending on the context. In spite of this, her model is able to account for the contrasts between IL and SL predicates, noted in section 3. For instance, the interpretation of bare plurals, as in (45) and (46) (examples (8) and (9), repeated for convenience), can be treated as a contrast between a dense predicate used in the former, and a non-dense one, found in the latter:

    (45)    Lekarze       są dostępni.      SL
              doctors-nom   are available-nom
              'Doctors are available.'
    (46)    Lekarze       są pomocni.       IL
              doctors-nom  are helpful-nom
              'Doctors are helpful.'

Both (45) and (46) can answer the question *Jacy są lekarze*? 'What are doctors like?', however, only (45) can answer the question *Co jest z lekarzami*? 'What is going on with doctors?'. In Roy's analysis, dense predicates, such as *dostępny* 'available', can be associated with the existential and generic interpretations, while the non-dense adjectives, such as *pomocny* 'helpful', give rise to a generic interpretation only. Consequently, the contrast posited on the basis of the IL/SL distinction can also be captured within Roy's typology.

---

[59] The fact that SLPs can be persistent in time has also been noted by Arche, who supports this claim with the data such as (i) below:
    (i) Nasz  wódz   jest martwy.        SL
        our     leader is   dead
       'Our leader is dead.'

EAs, which are highly problematic for the IL/SL distinction (cf. section 4), in Roy's model can be classified as characterizing, hence non-dense, as confirmed by the fact that sentence (47) cannot serve as answer to the *what is going on* question, provided in (38):

  (47)    Marek jest inteligentny.                    EA
          Mark  is   intelligent
          'Mark is intelligent.'

Neither can an adjective like *inteligentny* 'intelligent' co-occur with place adverbials, as demonstrated in (48) (example (i) from footnote 36, repeated for convenience), which, although not entirely unacceptable, is marginal:

  (48)    ???Marek jest inteligentny w biurze.        EA
          Mark       is   intelligent   in office
          'Mark is intelligent in his office.'

However, the acceptability of a sentence such as (49) (example (20), repeated for convenience below) is problematic for Roy's analysis:

  (49)    Marek jest miły w pracy.                    EA
          Mark  is   nice at work
          'Mark is nice at work.'

The only interpretation available for  the locative PP in (49) is the intersective one, i.e. (49) can be understood as: *Mark is nice when he is at work*. This interpretation, however, in Roy's model is reserved for dense predicates only (cf. (40) above). This, in turn, leads us to the conclusion that the status of EAs remains problematic also in Roy's model. Some of EAs show properties typical of non-dense predicates, while some other display properties of dense predicates. This is, certainly a problem for Roy's model.

All in all, it appears that the IL/SL dichotomy is more rigid than Roy's system, as it makes it possible to classify an AP predicate as belonging either to one class or the other. Roy's typology allows for more freedom, as one adjective can be characterizing or situation-descriptive, depending on the context in which it appears. In both typologies, the status of EAs is far from certain. As has been noted in section 4, EAs show some properties of ILPs and some of SLPs, which cannot be easily captured within the  IL/SL distinction. In Roy's model, EAs exhibit some properties typical of non-dense predicates, and some of dense ones.

## 7. CONCLUSIONS

The paper has aimed to show that the two typologies of predicates posited in the literature on the basis of languages other than Polish, namely the IL/SL dichotomy, and the distinction between characterizing and situation-descriptive predicates are valid for Polish AP predicates. It has been argued that the IL/SL contrast is manifested in a number of syntactic and semantic differences. SLPs can be used in perceptual reports, can function as depictives, allow modification by place and time adverbials, and when used with singular bare nominals, they give rise to existential and generic readings. ILPs, on the other hand, show the opposite behavior, and when used in the last context, they are associated with just a generic interpretation. Polish adjectival predicates can also be classified as characterizing and situation-descriptive. The former answer the *jaki* 'what' question and can be modified by place adverbials with the subsective meaning, whereas the latter can be used as answers to the *co jest z x*? 'what is going on with x?' question, and when modified by a locative PP, they admit only the intersective interpretation. The two typologies have been compared and the conclusion has been drawn that each of them has its merits. The IL/SL dichotomy makes it possible to classify a given adjective as either a member of one class or the other, while Roy's typology allows for more freedom in that one adjective can be a viewed as characterizing or situation-descriptive, depending on the context. The class of adjectives that remains a problem for both typologies covers EAs. Since they show properties of both IL and SL predicates, it is difficult to classify them as belonging to one class or the other. In Roy's model, EAs seem to behave as non-dense adjectives in that they answer the *jaki* 'what' question, but some of them allow locative PP modifiers with intersective interpretation, in a way typical of dense predicates. All in all, both typologies certainly broaden our knowledge concerning predicate types and the way the different types of predicates bear on syntax and semantics. Nonetheless, they do have some shortcomings that cannot be easily dealt with.

## REFERENCES

ARCHE M. J.: Individuals in time: tense, aspect and the individual/stage distinction, Amsterdam 2006.

BONDARUK A.: Copular clauses in English and Polish. Structure, derivation and interpretation, Lublin 2013.

BONDARUK A.: Characterizing and defining predicational clauses in Polish, in: *Complex Visible out there. Proceedings of the Olomouc Linguistics Colloquium 2014: Language Use and Linguistic Structure*, eds. L. Veselovská and M. Janebová, Olomouc 2014, pp. 1-16.

CARLSON G.: Reference to kinds in English, Ph. D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst 1977.

CHIERCHIA G.: Individual-level predicates as inherent generics, in: *The Generic book*, eds. G.N. Carlson and F.J. Pelletier, Chicago and London 1995, pp. 176-223.

CITKO B.: Small clauses reconsidered: Not so small and not all alike, "Lingua" 118(2008), pp. 261-295.

DIESING M.: Indefinites, Cambridge (MA): the MIT Press 1992.

ESCANDELL V. and LEONETTI M.: Coercion and the stage/individual distinction, in: *Semantics and pragmatics of Spanish*, ed. J. Gutiérrez-Rexach, Amsterdam: Elsevier 2002, pp. 159-179.

FÁBREGAS A., LEFERMAN B. AND MARÍN R.: Evaluative adjectives and Davidsonian states, in: *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung* 17, eds. E. Chemla, V. Homer and G. Winterstein, Paris 2012, pp. 237-253.

GALLEGO Á. and URIAGEREKA J.: The lexical syntax of ser and estar, ms., Universitat Autónoma de Barcelona and University of Maryland 2011.

HENTSCHEL G.: *Morphosyntaktische Markierung sekundärer Prädikate*, in: *The Slavic langauges. An international handbook of their structure, their history, and their investigation*, eds. S. Kempgen, P. Kosta, T. Berger, and K. Gutschmidt, Berlin and New York 2009, pp. 369-391.

HINTERHÖLZL R.: Semantic constraints on case assignment in secondary adjectival predicates in Russian, "ZAS Papers in Linguistics" 22(2001), pp. 99-112.

JÄGER G.: Stage levels, states, and the semantics of the copula, "ZAS Papers in Linguistics" 14(1999), pp. 65-94.

KRATZER A.: Stage-level and individual-level predicates as inherent generics, in: *The generic book*, eds. G. N. Carlson and F.J. Pelletier, Chicago–London 1995, pp. 125-175.

LADUSAW W.A.: Thetic and categorical, stage and individual, weak and strong, in: *Proceedings of SALT IV*, eds. M. Harvey and L. Santelmann, Cornell (Ithaca) 1994, pp. 220-229.

LEONETTI M.: Ser y estar: estado de la cuenstión, "Barataria" 1(1994), pp. 182-205.

MAIENBORN C.: Situationsbezug und die Stadien/Individuen-Distinktion bei Kopula-Prädikativ-Konstruktionen, "ZAS Papers in Linguistics" 14(1999), pp. 41-64.

MCNALLY L.: Adjunct predicates and the individual/stage distinction, in: *Proceedings of WCCFL 12*, eds. D. Farkas, P. Spaelti and E. Duncan, Stanford (CA) 1994, pp. 561-576.

MANNINEN S.: A minimalist analysis of stage level and individual level*,* "Working Paper in Linguistics" 1(2001), Lund, The Department of English in Lund.

MARÍN R.: Entre ser y estar, Madrid 2004.

MARÍN R.: Spanish adjectives within bounds, in: Adjectives: formal analyses in syntax and semantics, eds. P. Cabredo-Hoffher and O. Matushansky, Amsterdam 2010, pp. 307-332.

MILSARK, G.: Existential sentences in English, Ph. D. dissertation, Cambridge (MA) 1974.

PUSTEJOVSKY J.: The generative Lexicon, Cambridge (MA) 1995.

RAMCHAND G.: Two subject positions in Scottish Gaelic: The syntax-semantics interface, "Natural Language Semantics" 4(1996), pp. 165-191.

RAPOPORT T.: Adjunct predicate licensing and D-structure, in: *Syntax and semantics 25, Perspectives on phrase structure; heads and licensing*, ed. S. D. Rothstein, San Diego 1991, pp. 159-187.

RAPOPORT T.: Stage and adjunct predicates, in: *Knowledge and language. Vol. II: Lexical and conceptual structure*, Dordrecht–Boston–London 1993, pp. 157-182.

RENZ M. and HENTSCHEL G.: On adjectives and adverbs expressing 'nakedness' and 'barefootness' in Polish and Russian: a study on morphosyntactic variation, "Russian Linguist" 35(2011), pp. 63-87.

RICHARDSON K.: What secondary predicates in Russian tell us about the link between tense, aspect and case, "ZAS Papers in Linguistics" 26(2001), pp. 152-177.

ROY, I.: Nonverbal predication. Copular sentences at the syntax-semantics interface, Oxford 2013.

SZAJBEL-KECK M.: Prepositional secondary predication in Polish: adjectives in complex constructions, paper presented at FASL 22, 2014.

WADE T.: A comprehensive Russian grammar, Oxford 1992.

## DWIE TYPOLOGIE PREDYKATÓW W JĘZYKU POLSKIM
## – PORÓWNANIE

S t r e s z c z e n i e

Artykuł bada dwie typologie predykatów obecne w literaturze, zaproponowane dla języków innych niż polski, głównie dla angielskiego, hiszpańskiego, rosyjskiego i francuskiego. Pierwsza z typologii ma swe źródło w pracach Mislarka (1974) i Carlsona (1977), którzy postulują wyróżnienie predykatów charakterystycznych i epizodycznych. Pierwsze z nich odpowiadają z grubsza cechom stałym, a drugie cechom zmiennym. To rozróżnienie przejawia się w składni i semantyce. Artykuł pokazuje, że ta dychotomia jest obecna również  w wypadku polskich grup przymiotnikowych. Druga typologia, zaproponowana przez Roy (2013), zakłada rozróżnienie pomiędzy przymiotnikowymi predykatami charakteryzującymi i opisującymi sytuację. Artykuł udowadnia, że ta typologia ma zastosowanie również dla polszczyzny. Te dwie typologie zostały ze sobą porównane. Pokazano, że dychotomia pomiędzy predykatami charakterystycznymi i epizodycznymi pozwala nam na sklasyfikowanie danego przymiotnika jako członka jednej lub drugiej klasy, zaś w typologii Roy (2013) dany przymiotnik może być albo charakteryzujący, albo opisujący sytuację, w zależności od kontekstu. Przymiotniki oceniające są klasą predykatów, która  nie daje się łatwo sklasyfikować w obu analizowanych typologiach.

**Słowa kluczowe**: predykaty charakterystyczne, predykaty epizodyczne, predykaty charakteryzujące, predykaty opisujące sytuację, grupy przymiotnikowe, gęstość.

TWO TYPOLOGIES OF AP PREDICATES IN POLISH
– A COMPARISON

S u m m a r y

The paper examines two typologies of predicates found in the literature, put forward for languages other than Polish, mostly English, Spanish, Russian, and French. The first typology goes back to Milsark (1974) and Carlson (1977), who argue for dividing predicates into individual level and stage level. The former roughly correspond to stable properties, the latter to the transient ones. The distinction has its manifestations in syntax and semantics. The paper shows that the dichotomy is also present in the case of Polish AP predicates. The other typology, that of Roy (2013), posits the distinction between characterizing and situation-descriptive adjectival predicates. The paper demonstrates that this distinction is valid for Polish, as well. The two typologies have been compared with each other. It has been argued that the IL/SL dichotomy allows us to classify a given adjectival predicate as a member of one class or the other, whereas in Roy's (2013) typology a particular adjective can be either characterizing or situation-descriptive, depending on the context. EAs constitute a class of adjectival predicates that escapes a  uniform classification in both typologies under scrutiny.

**Key words**: individual level predicates, stage level predicates, characterizing predicates, situation-descriptive predicates, APs, density.