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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. An overview on the empirical domain

The present work, devoted to Sardinian and its dialects, will be centred on two main aspects of their syntax: possessive constructions and adnominal adjectives. They will be discussed respectively in Chap. 2 and Chap. 3, providing examples taken from the Romance language and its dialects and especially from Baunese, the dialect which I have as L1. Before summing up the content of the chapters, a brief geographic introduction will be given.

Sardinian, actually, is a group of dialects spoken in the Sardinia region, in which however other minority languages are also spoken, for example, Corsian in Gallura and north Sardinian, Catalan in Alguer, Ligurian-Tabarchino in Calasetta and in the San Pietro island.

The following map\(^1\) shows dialects and languages spoken in Sardinian. Baunese is a central variety of Sardinian spoken in Baunei, a little town in the central east cost, in the region of Ogliastro, a province since 2001.

Later, a description about the main properties of the Romance language and its dialects will be given.

For the moment, let us to sum up the content of the following sections.

---

\(^1\) This map is taken from Secci (2003)
The different types of possessive constructions in Sardinian will be described and analysed in the second chapter. What I will show is that possessive elements and the prepositional possessive construction share the same basic-structure in Sardinian: the Possessor (PosP) is in general generated in the specifier of the Possessum and needs to raise to the Spec of a higher Agr\textsubscript{GEN} to be licensed. Here it receives the **structural genitive case**, and subsequently the two types of possessive constructions proceed their derivation in two different ways.

First of all, if one imagines a possessive relation, one usually thinks about something which someone possesses, for example *Mario possesses a red house.*

Languages have actually different ways to represent a possessive relation and in this work Sardinian possibilities will be presented.

In the Romance language taken into account there are three ways to show a possessive relation:

a) The verb *tenere* ‘have, possess (LIT.: hold)’ followed by the object.

b) Possessive elements (Adjectives and Determiner).

c) The prepositional construction *de*+NP.

At the beginning, a brief presentation of some features of the verb *tènnere* is given: it derives from Latin TENÈRE and has both a lexical and an auxiliary meaning, in contrast with *aere* ‘to have’ which is only auxiliary verb. An example: *Mariu tenet/*at una dommu orrubia* ‘Mario has got (possesses) a red house’.

The chapter will go on, focused on the formation and the features of the other two ways to express a possessive relation above mentioned.

After presenting the collected data, a generalization will be given: **possessive adjectives always occupy a post-nominal position in all the Sardinian dialects.** In order to obtain the Sardinian NP-Pos possessive word order, the Possessum (NP) is assumed to raise “somehow” over the Possessor (PosP), which in turn is assumed to be generated in the specifier (Spec) of the Possessum.

According to my proposal, Cinque’s (2000) Semitic DP analysis can explain the “somehow”, in other words, the movements carried out to achieve the Sardinian NP-Pos constituent.

As in Cinque (2000) it is claimed that successive internal XP-raising, rather than N-raising (to D°), happen in the Semitic DP yielding the so-called Construct State, in the same way a series of leftward movements within the Sardinian DP of the possessive construction are carried out to reach the higher functional head, crossing in this way the PosP.
Meanwhile, this latter has raised to the specifier of the functional head where it receives **structural genitive case** (which depends only on government\(^2\)) thank to the strict Head-Spec relation.

The syntactic tree (iii) on page 22, shows the formation of the **core of the possessive construction**: \[\text{NP-Pos}^\text{GEN} = \text{ammigu (suu, Mariu)}^\text{GEN}.\]

The syntactic tree holds for every type of PosP: on the one hand, for possessive elements (\textit{miu} ‘my’, \textit{tuu} ‘your’, \textit{nostru} ‘our’, ‘\textit{Ostru} ‘Your-Polite Form’ and their feminine and plural counterparts, but also for \textit{insoro} ‘their/of them’, in spite of the absence of nominal agreement features of the latter mentioned item); on the other hand, the same structure holds also for nouns (\textit{Mariu} ‘Mario’, \textit{su sindiu} ‘the mayor’) and for the 2\textsuperscript{nd} person plural, \textit{bosattro}\(^3\) ‘you-2\textsuperscript{nd} pl.’.

As for possessive elements, in Sardinian **possessive adjectives and possessive determiners** are found, whereas for example in Italian besides these also possessive pronouns are used:

\begin{itemize}
  \item ITA: (il) mio ‘mine (LIT.: the my)’ \(\rightarrow\) VS \(\rightarrow\) SRD: (*su) miu ‘mine (LIT.: the my)’
\end{itemize}

Actually, articles can in general be definite or indefinite: differently from possessive determiners, possessive adjectives do not have [+DEF] features, thus, they do not move to DP to be licensed and so articles serve to determine the [±DEF] value and of D°.

\begin{itemize}
  \item a) possessive Adjectives:
    \begin{itemize}
      \item su \textit{libbru miu} ‘LIT.: the book my’; cussu \textit{libbru miu} ‘LIT.: that book my’ VS *su \textit{miu libbru}; *cussu \textit{miu libbru}
    \end{itemize}
  \item b) possessive Determiners:
    \begin{itemize}
      \item (*the) \textit{frade miu} ‘LIT.: the brother my’; (*cussu) \textit{frade miu} (*a) brother my’
    \end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

In particular with respect to determiner possessives, they occur with family names and some names of domestic animals as (*su) \textit{frade miu} ‘the brother my’, (*sa) \textit{sorre tua} ‘the sister your’, (*su) \textit{babbu tuu} ‘the father your’, (*sa) \textit{mamma tua} ‘the mother your’\(^4\), (*su) \textit{calleddu tuu} ‘the dog your’.

---

\(^2\) Structural case is different from \textit{inherent case}, which is connected with two conditions, government and thematic-role assignment.

\(^3\) Wagner (1960-1964) claims that in Old Campidanese the voice \textit{vòs} was found, which became \textit{bos-bosu} in Modern Campidanese. In Old Logudorese, the only one form was \textit{vois}, \textit{bois} preserved even in Modern Logudorese. The origin could be the Latin \textit{VOBIS}, as for \textit{nos} > \textit{NOBIS}. Referring to many people, \textit{vos-bos} is substituted from \textit{bosaterus} in Campidanese and \textit{boisatteros} in Logudorese.

\(^4\) The section 2.5 of this chapter will be dedicated to an analysis of family names.
On the contrary, the **prepositional possessive construction** involves three types of PosPs: proper names, “det+noun” DPs, and the pronoun *bosattro* ‘you-2nd p. pl.’.

It consists of the insertion of the preposition *de* before the above specified PosPs following Kayne’s (2000) analysis. In fact, once the NP-Pos\textsubscript{GEN} is achieved, the GENP projection is inserted in the structure: Kayne (2000) explains that *of* merger, and so the merger of the GENP projection yields an attraction of Pos\textsubscript{GEN}P, (according to Longobardi (1991) the merger happens in superficial structure).

Subsequently, a series of attractions and mergers are involved, which give the prepositional possessive construction as a result.

The syntactic three in (vii) will present better the single involved movements.

It has been said that possessives and prepositional possessive constructions have in common the same base structure, represented in (iii). Obtained the possessive core, on the one hand possessive adjectives and possessive determiners always remain near the Possessum, even when other movements happen (for example in the structure (viii), in which two attributive adjectives like *geniosu* ‘nice’ and *tedescu* ‘German’ are inserted); on the other hand, the prepositional construction can be separated from the Possessum by some other elements (for example in (ix), in which the same mentioned attributive adjectives are inserted).

Possessive constructions are connected also with the use of family names, already mentioned, and with a peculiar construction of Sardinian which is similar to the Hebrew construct state.

With respect to family names, defined by Wagner (1960-64) as children’s words, possessives which combine with them have a specific property: they appear in two different morphological forms depending on the involved Possessor. Just to give some examples:

- **mamai** (it can only denote ‘my/our mother’) \( \Rightarrow \) VS > (*sa) *mama* tua, sua, de ’osattro, > VS > *sa mama* (it can only denote ‘his/her mother’);
- **nonneddu** (it can only denote ‘my/our’); (*su) *nonneddu* tuu, suu, de ’osattro, insoro > VS > *su nonnu* (it can only denote ‘his/her godfather’).

In conclusion, some data will be presented about a peculiar construction, which seems to be similar to the Hebrew construct state.
Just to present the subjects, take the contrast between Baunese *mere 'e sa idda* (LIT.: the master-'E-the town) and Hebrew *rosh hair*⁵ ‘the mayor (LIT.: ‘head the-city’). What is important is that in Baunese there is also the expression *mere de (sa) 'idda* ‘the owner of (the) town’, which shows the real possessive relation. Indeed it will be demonstrated that *mere'e sa 'idda* does not denote the owner, but rather someone who administrates the town (though existing the name *sindiu* ‘mayor’).

The same feature will be shown to be shared by the expression *mere 'e (sa) dommo*, which contrasts with *su mere de (sa) dommu*: the former has a more idiomatic meaning denoting a sort of manager, whereas the latter indicates really the owner, the real possessive relation.

Therefore, this kind of construct state provides a more idiomatic meaning to the expression. Note that these types of expressions are found in other dialects of Sardinian and are still rather productive. Although the aim of this work is not to find the reason and the origin of these peculiar constructions, it is possible to say that after the NP-POSGEN, the whole constituent might have been reanalysed as one single word and for this reason, a more idiomatic and wider meaning is assigned to it.

The third chapter will be devoted to adnominal adjectives in Sardinian and what will be verified is that also in this Romance language some adjectives carry different meanings depending on whether their position is before or after a noun following Cinque’s (2005) theory that adjectives are generated in the same positions in all languages although different raisings may occur due to parametrical variation.

After giving a brief description of the main properties of the Sardinian adjective system, collected data will be provided in favour to Cinque’s (2005) theory of two possible sources of adjectives, shared by all languages, based on Sproat & Shih’s (1988) distinction between **direct and indirect modifiers**.

**Direct modifiers** are the adjectives which have been merged in the specifiers of NPs or of their extended projections, whereas **indirect modifiers** derive from reduced relative clauses.

As for the position of modifiers within DPs in general, direct modifiers are always found in prenominal position, whereas indirect ones can appear before and after the noun. According to Cinque (2005), the superficial postnominal position of latter modifiers depends on whether a series of movements and raisings by mean of which indirect adjectives are apparently shifted after the noun happens or not. In addition to this, Cinque (2005) stresses that the two origins carry quite different semantic and syntactic properties.

---

⁵ The example is taken from Wintner (1999: 410).
Actually, comparing English with Sardinian, it needs to be said that the two languages share the same basic structure, which becomes evident only in few occasions, in that the above mentioned movements happen obligatorily in Sardinian though being optional in English. There are some languages, taken into account by Cinque (2005), which provide some evidences of the double source of APs distinguishing the two types of modifiers with morphological features, for example Mandarin, Serbian-Croatian-Bosnian, Greek and Maltese.

In a certain sense, Sardinian can be inserted in this group of languages: although it is not always easy to distinguish when modifiers are direct or indirect, because of homophony of some direct modifiers with indirect ones (which will be presented in the section 3.3.2), one exception is found with the pair \textit{grandi-mannu} ‘great, big’. As it will be seen in the section 3.3.3, the two adjectives are respectively a direct and a indirect modifier.

Probably, one could doubt whether \textit{mannu} is an indirect modifier and it can be thought that its position is due to a NP-movement over it. Actually, the clearest difference between a direct and indirect modifier is that only the latter (like \textit{mannu}) can be found in predicative position, i. e. after a copular verb, relative clauses, whilst the former (like \textit{grandi}) cannot. For this reason, indirect modifiers are also labelled predicative adjectives.


Furthermore, differently from \textit{grandi-mannu}, the homophonous modifiers, which have the same form both for direct and indirect modification, can show their real nature only through their position.

As already said, it will be demonstrated that these adjectives in prenominal position can only be the direct modifiers, carrying unambiguously non-restrictive, individual-level, non-intersective (adverbial) and absolute readings. On the contrary, the analysed indirect modifiers, in postnominal position, are ambiguous between restrictive and non-restrictive reading, stage-level and individual-level reading, intersective and relative readings.

It will be shown also that some other indirect modifiers, which usually occupy the postnominal position, in certain peculiar cases can appear before the noun: this will be explained through the influence of poetic styles on AP-interpretation.
It needs to be noted that expressions in which indirect modifiers appear before the noun, are considered ungrammatical by native speakers: still, if the same expressions are imagined in a poetic context, they suddenly become acceptable, no longer so ungrammatical (though being marked).

In fact, just above it has been said that postnominal indirect modifiers express a certain ambiguity in meaning. Still, when they are imagined «in poesia», in traditional songs, the same expressions lose one of the two readings, namely the restrictive one. Actually, in my opinion, this is the effect of poetic licence: it seems to force an indirect modifier to be interpreted (to behave) as a direct modifier by native speakers.

As a consequence of this, being direct modifiers interpretable only non-restrictively, the forced-direct ones too convey only this interpretation. Moreover, since direct modifiers cannot move from their original position while indirect modifiers appear postnominally, every prenominal modifier is automatically interpreted as being direct: this provides a poetic (not neutral) reading in native speakers.

In conclusion, in the last section of Chap. 3, some other prenominal adjectives will be discussed: they are APs which does not have attributive functions, but, as affirmed in Jones (1993:44), they have a specifier-like function. The traditional grammar has labelled them as demonstrative, anaphoric, numeral, interrogative and exclamative adjectives.

1.2. **The Sardinian language**

Sardinian can be defined as a group of dialects spoken in the whole island of Sardinia, except in some areas where other minority languages are spoken: in Calasetta and Carloforte (Ligurian), in Alghero (Catalan), in the region of Gallura and the North-Coast (Corsican), while in Sassari, according to Wagner (1951: 394) a dialect developed from the contacts of local people with Genoese and Pisan in the XII century is found.

The main linguistic division is constituted by the contrast between varieties spoken in the northern area (Nuorese-Logudorese) and those spoken in the southern area (Campidanese).

As Jones (1997) points out, no relevant differences between Nuorese and Logudorese are observed and for this reason they are often taken together into account, and in this work too.

It needs to be said that the two main groups have the same grammatical and syntactic phenomena, which determine certain homogeneity between the varieties.
Nevertheless, during the centuries, the Sardinian varieties have become so different from one another in phonology, morphology and lexicon that now Campidanese people can hardly understand Nuorese speakers from the region of Barbagia. Syntactically, the varieties have kept their homogeneity, what will be shown also in this work.

Before giving some important phonological, morphological and syntactic features of Sardinian and its varieties, consider some socio-linguistic data, in order to understand the use of the Romance language by native speakers.

Speakers usually use Sardinian only in their private life, with families or friends, while Italian is used in public occasions, therefore a clear situation of diglossia is the situation which is found in the island, although the recognition as a minority language arrived with law 482 (1999). Nevertheless, people have acquired more consciousness in these later years to use their language in more social contexts, introducing the language as a subject at school.

In Secci (2003), I stated that Sardinian had not yet had a system of graphic conventions, even if an official orthography was proposed at that time.

Something more has been done for the following three years. Indeed, since the 18 April 2006 the Administration of Autonomous Region of Sardinia has adopted the *Limba Sarda Comuna (LSC)* “The Common Sardinian Language” as own official language. It is a variety spoken in central Sardinian, which contains also openings to Logudorese and to Campidanese, and used by Administration to write acts and resolutions, and therefore used as a language of mediation.

Actually, what the Council of Sardinia has stated is what has been pointed out at the beginning of this work, namely the fact that Sardinian dialects present syntactically certain homogeneity, in that they share the same syntactic phenomena, as it will be shown here and as it was demonstrated in Secci (2003) on intransitive and unaccusative verbs, whereas the main differences are noted in phonology and morphology.

Nevertheless in my thesis, I will report data found especially in the written literature, dictionaries and poems maintaining visible phonetic differences.

With respect to Baunese, since the examples are taken from interviews with native speakers, etymological factors are taken into consideration to write examples.

---

6 There are not any linguistic differences between a *language* and *dialect*. Simone (1973) defines a dialect as a language in all respects, with only one difference: in a country, only a limited number of people can use the dialect.

7 [http://www.sardegnacultura.it/linguasarda/limbasardacomuna](http://www.sardegnacultura.it/linguasarda/limbasardacomuna)
Besides, in the preceding study I have already given some general feature of Sardinian-Baunese phonology, and recall this previous study for a deeper investigation.

Nevertheless some of the main phonological features of Baunese will be furnished, in order to be able to read the provided examples.

Subsequently, a presentation of the main properties of Sardinian grammar will be given, just to have a general knowledge of the Romance language taken into consideration.

Here below some phonetic and written conventions\(^8\) and some grammar aspects are presented:

\(\checkmark\) **Assimilation**: a sound is made more similar to sounds near it, for example, to bind two words: \textit{at bidiu} [\texttt{a_bbidiu}] ‘he has seen’; \textit{at giocau} [\texttt{a_ggiogàu}].

\(\checkmark\) **Rothacism**: the consonant \(<s>\) is pronounced as a \([r]\), when it appears before words beginning with voiced letters: \textit{Us ammigus tius} [\texttt{uz_amiguš_tuzu}] ‘your friends’ VS \textit{Us ammigus de ’osattro} [\texttt{uz_amigur_de_osatro}] ‘your friends’

\(\checkmark\) **Lenition**: occlusive consonants become voiced and less strong in intervocalic position: \(p > \beta\); \(t > d\); \(k > g\): \textit{giocau} [\texttt{ggiogàu}] ‘played’; \textit{su pane} [\texttt{su_βane}] ‘(the) bread’.

\(\checkmark\) **Epenthetic (or paragogical) vowel**: a vowel is adjoined to a word which ends with a consonant, if there is a rhythmical break: \textit{Us ammigus tuus} [\texttt{uz_amiguš_tuzu}] ‘your friends’ VS \textit{Us ammigus} [\texttt{uz_amigušu}] ‘the friends’.

\(\checkmark\) **Stress**: it will be written in tonic vowel of oxyton and proparoxytone words\(^9\).

\(\checkmark\) **3\(^{rd}\) person singular and plural**: the ending is in this case \(-t\): \textit{andat} [\texttt{andadba}] ‘(he) goes’; \textit{erriet} [\texttt{eriede}] ‘(he) laughs’; \textit{benint} [\texttt{bëninti}] ‘(they) come’ which may produce assimilation \textit{andat bene} [\texttt{anda_bbene}] ‘it goes well’

In the following table, some of the most important features taken from Sardinia varieties are presented, in order to point out some common properties but also some differences.

As it is easy to recognize the differences between varieties are due merely to phonetic problems.

\[^8\] [http://www.regione.sardegna.it/documenti/1_72_20060418160308.pdf](http://www.regione.sardegna.it/documenti/1_72_20060418160308.pdf)

\[^9\] In the oxyton (apocopated) words the stress is in the last syllable: ITA \textit{virtù} ‘virtue’, \textit{città} ‘city’. In the proparoxytone words the stress is in the third last syllable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Logudorese-Nuorese</th>
<th>Campidanese</th>
<th>Baunese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Articles and determiners</strong></td>
<td>(sg) su-sa&gt;</td>
<td>(sg) su-sa&gt;</td>
<td>(sg) su-sa&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(pl) sos-sas</td>
<td>(pl) is</td>
<td>(pl) us-as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Singular and plural agreement</strong></td>
<td>(sg) -u, -a, -e&gt;</td>
<td>(sg) -u, -a, -i&gt;</td>
<td>(sg) -u, -a, -e/i&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(pl) -os, -as, -es</td>
<td>(pl) -us, -as, -is</td>
<td>(pl) -os/-us, -as, -es</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal atonic pronouns D. Obj.</strong></td>
<td>(sg) lu-la&gt;</td>
<td>(sg) du-da &gt;</td>
<td>(sg) du-da &gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(pl) los-las</td>
<td>(pl) dus-das</td>
<td>(pl) dus-das</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal atonic pronouns I. Obj.</strong></td>
<td>(sg) li-li&gt;</td>
<td>(sg) di-da &gt;</td>
<td>(sg) di-da &gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(pl) lis-lis</td>
<td>(pl) dis-das</td>
<td>(pl) dis-das</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expletive elements</strong></td>
<td>Bi, inche</td>
<td>Dhu-inci</td>
<td>Je, ince</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verb conjugations</strong></td>
<td>-are, -ere, -ire</td>
<td>-ari, -iri,</td>
<td>-are, -ere, -ire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auxiliary verbs</strong></td>
<td>Essere VS òere</td>
<td>Ëss(i)ri) VS òere</td>
<td>Essere VS òere</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Besides this, it must be said that Sardinian is a SVO Romance language: *Mariu (S) ligget(V) su libbru (O) ‘Mario reads the book’; Mariu (S) pappat (V) ‘Mario eats’.*

Declarative sentences are introduced by the conjunction “ca”: *Mariu at naràu a Laura ca erribbat crasa ‘Mario told to Laura that he arrives tomorrow’.* On the contrary, the particle *chi* can be not only a relative pronoun (*Mariu, chi su pobiddu de Laura, erribbat crasa ‘Mario, who is Laura’s husband, arrives tomorrow’*), but also a “subjunctive” complementizer *Penso chi siet bellu... ‘Penso che sia/sarebbe bello...’*), an interrogative complementizer (*Non discimus chi ariu erribat crasa ‘We do not know whether Mario arrives tomorrow’*) and a conditional complementizer (*Chi bincio su dinare mi pigo una macchina ‘If I win (the) money, I will buy a car’*).

In conclusion, there are two kinds of direct interrogative sentences: *yes/no questions* and *Wh-questions*. The first type of questions expects as answer to confirm or to negate what is asked (*Benis crasa a iscola? ‘do you come tomorrow to school?’*); the second type requires a specific piece of information and the questions are introduced by interrogative adverbs or interrogative pronouns. In Sardinian (*Q: Cando andamus a giocare a pallone? > A: crasa ‘When do we go to play football? Tomorrow’*).

This introductory chapter has served to give an anticipation of the subjects which will be discussed in the next sections and besides this also a brief description of Sardinian has been given, in order to provide the instruments to read and so better understand collected data.
2. **POSSESSIVE CONSTRUCTIONS IN SARDINIAN**

In this chapter will take into account the three types of possessive constructions of Baunese and in general of Sardinian. After a brief overview of Italian, it will proceed to explain the collected data focus on possessive and prepositional constructions. It will be proposed that they (though their superficial aspect) share the same basic structure, which gives as result the core of the possessive relation \textbf{NP-PosP}_{\text{GEN}}. After having yielded the basic constituent, the two constructions go on their own way. The last two sections will be centred on family names and a sort of Construct State, expressions which are closely connected with the described possessive constructions.

2.1 **Subjects of NPs and Possessive Relations**

Starting from Cinque’s (1980, 1981a) generalization, according to which, in Italian, the extraction of argument or adjunct members of a head-noun is not allowed, except for the “subject” of the NP, Longobardi (1991) affirms that this subject can really be an argument of the NP and can be expressed as a possessive adjective. However, we observe that genitive arguments, PPs in construction \textit{di}-NP ‘of-NP’ can be pronominalized, therefore, they can be extracted. See the following examples taken from Longobardi (1991):

1) ITA:
   a. Abbiamo ricordato il desiderio \textit{di Gianni}.
      ‘We remembered the desire of John’
   b. Abbiamo ricordato il suo desiderio
      ‘We remembered his desire’

In (1a) a full PP appears headed by the preposition \textit{di} ‘of’, which governs the NP complement; in (1b) the PP has been pronominalized with \textit{suo}, which can refer to \textit{Gianni}.

As Longobardi (1991) explains, in (1a) the underscored expression can have two interpretations: the former is \textit{Gianni} as “theme of desire”, therefore \textit{John is desired by someone}; the latter is \textit{Gianni} as “experiencer”, therefore \textit{John desires something}.

The sentence (1b) is no longer ambiguous if the PP is cliticized (2a) or a Wh-phrase is extracted (2b), only the experiencer-reading is allowed:

2) ITA:
   a. Ne abbiamo ricordato il desiderio
      ‘We OF-HIM remembered the desire’
   b. Gianni, di cui abbiamo ricordato il desiderio
      ‘John, of whom we remembered John’s desire’
Actually, Cinque (1980) points out that his generalization is violated because the PP is reanalysed an external NP constituent, which probably is formed through an extraposition.

In Baunese, the corresponding examples of (1) and (2) are the following ones, respectively (3) and (4):

3) **BAU:**
   a. *Amus subenniu su disiggiu de Giuanni*<sub>i</sub>
      ‘We remembered the desire of John’
   b. *Amus subenniu su disiggiu suu*<sub>i</sub>
      ‘We remembered his desire’

4) **BAU:**
   a. *Ind*<sub>i</sub> *'amus subenniu su disiggiu*
      ‘We OF-HIM remembered the desire’
   b. *Giuanni*<sub>i</sub> *de chine amus subennius su disiggiu…*
      ‘John, of whom we remembered the desire’

Because of independent properties of Sardinian relativization (namely, the fact that *chine* can be only an interrogative item) Sardinian counterparts of the Italian sentence (2b) are not possible. Instead of this, consider an interrogative example:

5) **ITA:**
   a. *Di chi era il desiderio che abbiamo ricordato?*
      ‘OF-WHOM was the desire (that) we remembered?’
   b. *De chine fut su disìggiu chi amus subenniu?*
      ‘OF-WHOM was the desire (that) we remembered?’

On the one hand, (3) has the same reading as in Italian: the full NP *Gianni* (3a) has in common the same ambiguity as (1a), in other words *Gianni* can be both a theme and an experiencer, whereas in (3b) the possessive can only refer to the latter.
On the other hand, in (4) the only possible interpretation is Gianni as an experiencer: in (4a) *inde*\(^{10}\) is an enclitic pronoun corresponding to Italian *NE* ‘OF him’. In this case the only interpretation of *inde* can be Giuanni as experiencer.

Longobardi (1991) in his work provides a list of the most important conditions, reported below, assumed to hold of English and Romance NPs. This is the so-called *Possessivization Principle*:

6) a. A non-genitive phrase may never be expressed as a possessive
   b. A genitive phrase bearing a possessor role may be expressed as a possessive
   c. A genitive phrase bearing an external $\theta$-role may be expressed as a possessive only if no possessor is *overtly* present
   d. A genitive phrase bearing an internal $\theta$-role may be expressed as a possessive only if no possessor or external argument is *overtly* present
   e. No more than one phrase may appear as a possessive
   f. With some head Nouns (e.g. *desiderio-disiugu* ‘desire’) no internal argument may ever be expressed as a possessive even if no other genitive phrase is overtly realized.

As in Italian, also in Sardinian all the conditions seen above are respected.

According to Longobardi (1991), a noun as *descrizione* ‘description’ in Italian (in Sardinian *descrittione*) is ambiguous between an active or passive interpretation, because it indicates a real object, which can have an author or simply a possessor.

---

\(^{10}\) For a deeper study about *inde*, see Secci (2003), where she provided that the particle *inde* can be extracted in Sardinian not only from post-verbal subjects of transitive (*liggere* ‘read) and unaccusative (*erribbàre* ‘arrive’) verbs, but also from post-verbal subjects of intransitive verbs as *telef Fonare* ‘phone’, *trabballare* ‘work’, *allegare* ‘speak’. This is because unaccusatives share some peculiar features with intransitives, among which the existential construction, where the auxiliary verb always is *aere* ‘have’: what is important is that the verb agrees with a non-overt element, “pro”, not with the indefinite postverbal subject. Sardinian existential construction allows *inde-NE* extraction even with intransitive verbs. For example:

**A) Erribbare  ‘arrive’:**
1) *At erribbau medas [turistas]*
   ‘_Has arrived many tourists’
   2) *Ind’at erribbau medas [t]*
   ‘_NE-Has arrived many [t]’

**B) Telef Fonare  ‘phone’:**
1) *At telef Fonau medas [turistas]*
   ‘_Has phoned many tourists’
   2) *Ind’at telef Fonau medas [t]*
   ‘_NE-has arrived many [t]’
Consider the parallelism between Italian (7a-b) and Sardinian (7a’-b’):

7) ITA:
   a. la descrizione di Gianni
   ‘The description of John’
   b. la sua descrizione
   ‘His description’
   BAU:
   a’. sa descrizione de Gianni
   ‘The description of John’
   b’. sa descrizione sua
   ‘his description’ (LIT.: the description his)

In (7a-b), as in (7a’-b’), the interpretation of the PP and the possessive is again ambiguous. If one more PP is added to (7b-b’), the interpretation changes. For instance, consider (8) derived from (7b-b’):

8) ITA:
   a. La sua descrizione di Maria
   ‘his description of Mary’
   b. La sua descrizione da parte di Maria
   ‘his description by Mary’
   BAU:
   a’. sa descrizione sua de Maria
   ‘his description of Mary’ (LIT.: the description his of Mary)
   b’. sa descrizione sua fatta de Maria
   ‘his description by Mary’ (LIT.: the description his made by Mary)

Italian and Sardinian display the same behaviour. In (8a-a’) the possessive can only be the agent: someone (with index “i”) describes Mary (with index “k”); on the contrary, in (8b-b’), being specified that Mary has made the description, the possessive is the theme. Again some other examples, extracting a clitic and a Wh-element:

9) ITA:
   a. Ne ho interrotto la descrizione di Maria
   ‘I OF-HIM interrupted the description of Mary’
   b. Ne ho interrotto la descrizione da parte di Maria
   ‘I OF-HIM interrupted the description by Mary’
BAU:

a'. \( %\text{Ind}_1 \text{appo flimmau sa descritzione de } \text{Maria}_k \)

‘I OF-HIM\(_i\) interrupted the description by Mary\(_y\)’

b'. \( %\text{Ind}_1 \text{appo flimmau sa descritzione fatta de } \text{Maria}_k \)

‘I OF-HIM\(_i\) interrupted the description made by Mary\(_y\)’

The percentage symbol shows that they sound a little strange to some Sardinian native speakers (9a’-b’).

10) ITA:

a. Gianni\(_i\), di cui ho interrotto la descrizione di Maria\(_k\)

‘John, OF-WHOM\(_i\) I interrupted the description of Mary\(_y\)’

b. Gianni\(_i\), di cui ho interrotto la descrizione da parte di Maria\(_k\)

‘OF-WHOM\(_i\) I interrupted the description by Mary\(_y\)’

BAU:

a’. *Giuanni\(_i\), di chine appo flimmau sa descrizione de Maria\(_k\)

‘OF-WHOM\(_i\) I interrupted the description of Mary\(_y\)’

b’. *Giuanni\(_i\), di chine appo flimmau sa descrizione fatta de Maria\(_k\)

‘OF-WHOM, I interrupted the description by Mary\(_y\)’

11) ITA:

a. Di chi\(_i\) ho interrotto la descrizione di Maria\(_k\)?

‘OF-WHOM\(_i\) I interrupted the description of Mary\(_y\)’

b. Di chi\(_i\) ho interrotto la descrizione da parte di Maria\(_k\)

‘OF-WHOM, I interrupted the description by Mary\(_y\)’

BAU:

a’. \( %\text{De chine}_i \text{appo flimmau sa descritzione de } \text{Maria}_k \)?

‘OF-WHOM\(_i\) I interrupted the description of Mary\(_y\)’

b’. \( %\text{De chine}_i \text{appo flimmau sa descritzione fatta de } \text{Maria}_k \)?

‘OF-WHOM\(_i\) I interrupted the description by Mary\(_y\)’

As already explained in the example (4), for independent problems of relativization process in Sardinian, (10a) and (10b’) are ungrammatical.

In sentence (9a’) the clitic \( \text{inde} \) can only be an agent, while Mary is the theme; in (9b), being specified that Mary has made the description, then \( \text{inde} \) indicates the theme.

Both sentences in (11a’) and (11b’) sound a little strange to the ears of Sardinian speakers: percentage symbols show that the examples are ungrammatical with the meaning in glosses.
Consider some other examples, taken from Longobardi (1991):

12) ITA:
   a. Ho ammirato tutte le foto di Gianni/mia sorella/della fondazione
      ‘I admired all the pictures of John/my sister/of-the foundation’
   b. Ho ammirato tutte le sue foto di Gianni
      ‘I admired all her/its pictures of John’
   c. Ne ho ammirato tutte le foto di Gianni
      ‘I OF-HER/IT admired all the pictures of John’
   d. Mia sorella/la fondazione, di cui ho ammirato tutte le foto di Gianni
      ‘My sister/the foundation, of-which I admired all the pictures of John’

As Longobardi (1991) stresses, (12a) is ambiguous, whereas (12b) is disambiguated by the possessive pronoun: in fact, sua can be only the Possessor in the sentence. The clitic ne in (12c) and the relative pronoun cui in (12d), instead, refer to the author.

Now other Sardinian counterparts can be observed:

13) BAU:
   a. Appo ammirau tottu as fotos de Giuanni/sorre mia/de sa fundatzione
      ‘I admired all the pictures of John/my sister/of-the foundation’
   b. Appo ammirau tottu as fotos suas de Giuanni
      ‘I admired all her/its pictures of John’
   c. Ind appo ammirau tottu as fotos de Giuanni
      ‘OF-HER/IT I admired all the pictures of John’
   d. *Sorre mia/ sa fundatzione, de chine appo ammirau tottu as fotos de Giuanni
      ‘My sister/the foundation, of-whom I admired all the pictures of John’

Analysing the sentences above, it is observed that Sardinian has almost the same syntactic behaviour as Italian. There is only one difference: (13d) sounds unacceptable to Sardinian native speakers for independent reasons connected with relativization.

Up to here, Cinque’s (1980) generalization about subjects of NPs and possessive relations and Longobardi’s critical observations at it has been discussed.

---

11 The example taken from Longobardi (1991: 61) is considered a little strange by some Italian native speakers, this is what I want to indicate with the percentage symbol.
In conclusion, Longobardi’s Possessivization Principle can be resumed in this way:

14) The unique phrase allowed to appear as possessive is the hierarchically highest genitive argument of an NP

In all languages there are many different ways to realize a possessive relation. Brucart (1994), in his article, describes some possibilities: he focuses on a peculiar feature of possessive expressions, i.e. their ability to be arguments of a thematic noun.

What does *thematic noun* mean?

Consider the Italian examples below (15) and (16): in (i) and (ii) respectively the deep structures of the VP of the example (15) and of the NP of (16) are shown.

15) ITA:
   L’Italia invade l’Albania
   ‘Italy invades Albania’

16) ITA:
   L’invasione italiana dell’Albania
   ‘The Italian invasion of Albania’

One can observe that the two structures are quite similar. The noun *invasione* ‘invasion’ derives from the verb *invadere* ‘to invade’: so it is labelled as *deverbal noun*\(^\text{12}\).

As the verb selects two arguments, which receive two theta-\(\theta\)-roles, the deverbal noun in turn selects the same arguments and assigns the same \(\theta\)-roles.

---

\(^{12}\) Grimshaw (1990) defines this class of nouns complex event nominals. She does not consider possessives as arguments.
Thus, in structure (ii), *italiana* ‘Italian’ represents the external argument of the NP *invasione* ‘invasion’, while *Albania* represents the internal one. Haegeman & Gueron (1999: 412) provide the parallelism reported in (17):

17) ENG:
   a. The **enemy** destroyed the city
   b. The enemy’s destruction of the city
   c. Their destruction of the city

In (17a) the subject of the sentence is *the enemy*, which corresponds to *enemy’s* and to *their*, in other words possessive elements can also be external arguments of a noun.

On the one hand, possessive expressions can be external arguments of nouns and they can receive the agent θ-role. They can also be experiencers or patients, as illustrated in Spanish examples in (18) and in (19)\(^\text{13}\):

18) SPA:
   Su amor por Maria _______________________________ Experiencer
   ‘his love for Mary’

19) SPA:
   Su conquista por los Romanos __________________________ Patient
   ‘his conquest for Romans’

Interpreting the expression (18) as “someone loves Mary”, it is clear who the subject is: it represents what traditional grammar labels as *genitivus subjectivus*.

According to Brucart (1994), the property of the possessor’s thematic role is what differentiates them from other determiner adjectives or other noun specifiers.

Theta-role is assigned to possessive expressions in the deep structure by the noun, with which they are related.

On the other hand, the simple possessive relation, R-relation (Higginbothan, 1983), where someone possesses something, is shown by expressions (20) and (21):

20) ITA:
    La tua casa (di mattoni rossi) __________________________ Possessor
    ‘Your red bricks house’ (LIT.: the your house of bricks red)

21) ITA:
    La casa (di mattoni rossi) di Mario __________________________ Possessor
    ‘Mario’s red bricks house’ (LIT.: the house of bricks red of Mario)

\(^{13}\) Examples taken from “*Gramatica del Español*” of V. Demonte, chapter 1 by Brucart (1994: 55)
It is widely known that the origin of possessive expressions is universally in [Spec, NP], while parametrically possessive elements can appear before or after the noun, depending on what kind of movements they undergo. In this study, different ways to express a possessive relation in Sardinian will be discussed, focusing particularly on one of its dialects: Baunese.

2.2 Possessive constructions in Sardinian

2.2.1 An overview

In Sardinian, like in other languages, there are many ways to realize a possessive relation. If one imagines a possessive relation, one normally thinks about something which someone possesses, as for example in (22), in that Mario possesses a red house.

Before entering in details of constructions, attention is to be paid to examples below, which show three different groups:

lı Type A: verb tènner

22) BAU:

Mariu tènet una dómmu orrùbia
‘Mario has got a red house’

23) BAU:

Mariu tènet un ammigu tedescu geniosu
‘Mario has got a German nice friend’

24) BAU:

Giuanî e Mariu tènent duus cappèddos nòos
‘John and Mario have got two new hats’

lı Type B: Determiner and Possessive adjective

25) BAU:

Sa dommu mia iste orrùbia
‘My house is red’

26) BAU:

Appo obiàu cussu ammigu suu tedescu geniosu
‘I met his German nice friend’

27) BAU:

Frades insoro tenet us cappeddos nòos
‘Their brothers have got new hats’
28) BAU:  
*Sa dommu de Mariu iste orrùbia*  
‘Mario’s house is red’

29) BAU:  
*S’ammigu de Mariu is’ geniosu*  
‘Mario’s friend is nice’

30) BAU:  
*Us cappeddos de Giuanni e (de) Mariu funtis nòos*  
‘John’s and Mario’s hats are new’

31) BAU:  
*Sa dommu de su ‘igginu ist orrùbia*  
‘Neighbour’s house is red’

32) BAU:  
*S’ammigu de su sindiu is’ geniosu*  
‘The mayor’s friend is nice’

33) BAU:  
*Us cappeddos de us cassadores funtis nòos*  
‘Hunters’ hats are new’

34) BAU:  
*S’ammigu de ’osattro is’ tedescu*  
‘Your(2nd pl.) friend is German’

In the next section, some general aspects of these groups of possessive constructions will be examined in order to show some of their peculiar features. Before entering in details of the discussion, an important question has to be answered: if it is widely accepted that the Possessor is “universally” generated in [Spec, NP], thus prenominally, in the deep structure, how can it appear in the superficial structure in postnominal position, both in case of possessive elements and the prepositional possessive construction?
2.2.2 *The formation of the possessive “NP-Pos*$_{\text{GEN}}$*” constituent*

In order to obtain the Sardinian possessive word order the Possessum is assumed to raise somehow over the Possessor. Remind Cinque (2000): «Semitic DP involves successive internal XP-raising, rather than N-raising (to D°), with consequences also for the proper analysis of the so-called Construct State». In my suggestion, Cinque’s Semitic DP analysis can also explain movements carried out by each constituent to achieve the Sardinian “NP-Pos” word order. Consider the expressions in (35):

35) BAU:
   a. *s’ammigu suu*
      ‘his friend’
   b. *s’ammigu de Mariu*
      ‘Mario’s friend’

Actually, in (35) there are two examples of possessive expressions: in (35a) as a possessive element (in this case as a possessive adjective), whereas in (35b) as a prepositional possessive construction.

How is the constituent NP-Pos achieved?
Which movements are involved to build the NP-Pos$_{\text{GEN}}$?

The syntactic tree in (iii), later explained, is useful to answer the questions above. Still, first of all, attention has to be paid to the *Genitive-case-assignement*: the PosP moves to [Spec, Agr$_{\text{GEN}}$P], where the Possessor is licensed and where the structural genitive case is assigned by Agr$_{\text{GEN}}$°. This case-assignment takes place as consequence of the strictly Head-Spec relation: now the possessive constituent becomes NP-Pos$_{\text{GEN}}$. 
Analogously to the Construct State in Semitic Languages explained in Cinque (2000), Agr\_\textsuperscript{GEN} moves to W\textsuperscript{o} and adds to it; this activates [Spec, WP], which attracts to itself the NP-remnant. This produces the \textit{core of the possessive construction}:

\begin{equation}
\text{NP-Pos}_{\text{GEN}} = \text{ammigu (suu, Mariu)}_{\text{GEN}}
\end{equation}

In conclusion, the noun \textit{ammigu} ‘friend’ crossed over the possessive, which has now non-overt genitive case features.

With respect to possessive elements, actually in my proposal, the syntactic tree holds even for \textit{miu} ‘my’, \textit{tuu} ‘your’, \textit{nostreu} ‘our’, \textit{Ostru} ‘Your-Polite Form’ and their feminine and plural counterparts, but also for \textit{insoro} ‘their/of them’. This one shares the same behaviour as the named pronouns, in spite of the absence of nominal agreement features.
The same structure is shared also by noun-Possessor and the 2\textsuperscript{nd} person plural, *bosattro*\textsuperscript{14} ‘you-2\textsuperscript{nd} pl.’. In Baunese, indeed, *bosàttro* corresponds to the 2\textsuperscript{nd} person plural pronoun, whereas *Bos(o)* is used as Polite form to refer to old and respected people (for example, to refer to *gòppares* ‘godfather-godmother’ or *sògros* ‘parents-in-law’).\textsuperscript{15} *Bosattro* is an invariable word (37a-b):

\begin{enumerate}
\item BAU:
  \begin{enumerate}
  \item *Bosattro seis us meres de cussas dommos?*
  ‘You(inv.) are the(m) owners of those houses’
  \item *Bosattro seis as meres de cussas dommos?*
  ‘You(inv.) are the(f) owners of those houses’
  \end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}

With regard to the word origin, since *nòs* ‘we’ is the 1\textsuperscript{st} person singular pronoun, a similar item could be expected: thus, *Bòs* is simply a Polite form. So, the item *bosattro* is used to indicate the 2\textsuperscript{nd} person plural pronoun. As for the Possessor, actually, a really possessive adjective (similar to *miu, tuu, nostru*) exists, but it is used only as Polite form possessive element: ‘*Ostru, ’Ostra* ‘Your(m.Pol.), Your(f.Pol)’.

In order to disambiguate the forms, as 2\textsuperscript{nd} plural possessive is used the whole constituent *de ’osattro* ‘of you(2\textsuperscript{nd} pl.)’, where *bosattro* does not carry nominal agreement features. Blasco Ferrer (1988) considers this expression as a kind of periphrasis.

Later I will discuss in more details the parallelism between *bosattro* VS *de ’osattro*, dealing with the last possessive construction type: the prepositional possessive construction (DP+de+DP).

### 2.3 Possessive constructions types in detail

#### 2.3.1 Type A: verb “tènnere” + Object

The verb *tènnere* requires two arguments, which correspond to two \( \theta \)-roles: an external argument (*Mariu*, the subject, the **Possessor**) and an internal one (*una dommu orrubia*, the object, the **Possessum**).

\textsuperscript{14} Wagner (1960-1964) claims that in Old Campidanese the voice *vòs* was found, which became *bos-bosu* in Modern Campidanese. In Old Logudorese, the only one form was *vois, bois* preserved even in Modern Logudorese. The origin could be the Latin *VOBIS*, as for *nos*> *NOBIS*. Referring to many people, *vos-bos* is substituted from *bosaterus* in Campidanes and *boisatteros* in Logudorese.

\textsuperscript{15} Blasco Ferrer (1988) stresses that *boso* ‘You’ is used to refer to someone who belongs to the community. On the contrary, *Issu* (as Polite form, not the normally 3\textsuperscript{rd} person singular) is used to refer to people from outside the community to keep a certain detachment.
Consider example in (22), here in (38), whose deep structure is represented in (iii):

38) **BAU:**

*Mariu tènet cussa dòmmu orrùbia*

(iiv) *Mariu tenet cussa dommu orrùbia*

‘Mario has got that red house’

Tènnere derives from Latin TENÈRE: in English it means ‘hold, possess’. Tènnere can have not only a lexical meaning (39), but also an auxiliary function, whereas *aere* ‘have’ can only be an auxiliary (40).

See the contrast:

39) **BAU:**

a. *Mariu tenet/*at una dommu orrubia*

‘(LIT. Mario has got/*has a house red)’

b. *Mariu tenet/*at us oglos birdes*

‘(LIT. Mario has got/*has the eyes green)’

c. *Mariu tenet/*at 10 annos*

‘(LIT. Mario has got/*has 10 years)’
d. *Mariu tenet/*at un brassu segàu
   ‘LIT. Mario has got/has a broken arm’

Note that *tènnere* is used in an inalienable possessive context, as shown in (39d).

40) BAU:
   a. *Mariu at / tenet* bendiu una dommu orrubia
      ‘(LIT. Mario has/hold sold a house red)’
   b. *Mariu at / tenet* pigau una dommu orrubia
      ‘(LIT. Mario has/holds bought a house red)’
   c. *Mariu at a / tenet de* pigare una dommu orrubia
      ‘(LIT. Mario has to/holds of buying a house red)’

In other Romance languages something similar to *tènnere* is found: in Spanish (SPA) *tener*, in Catalan (CAT) *tenir*, in Portuguese (PORT) *ter*, which have the same behaviour as in Sardinian:

41)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SPA</th>
<th>CAT</th>
<th>PORT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Mario tiene una casa roja</td>
<td>En Mario té una casa vermella</td>
<td>Mario tem uma casa vermelha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Mario tiene los ojos verdes</td>
<td>En Mario té els ulls verds</td>
<td>Mario tem os olhos verdes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Mario tiene 10 años</td>
<td>En Mario té 10 anys</td>
<td>Mario tem 10 anos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.2 *Type B: Possessive Determiners and possessive Adjectives*


She claims that all possessive categories originate in [Spec, NP] and that they are licensed in a higher one [Spec, Agr\_GEN\_P]. The three classes advocated by Ihsane (2000) are differentiated depending on whether possessives move from [Spec, Agr\_GEN\_P] to DP or not.

Observing the data, Sardinian displays only the first two groups, not the third one.

According to Ihsane (2000), articles do not precede possessives that belong to the third class, as shown in examples in (42):

42) ENG:
   Speaker A: whose book is that?
   Speaker B: Hers / Mary’s

Since *hers* or, in general, this type of possessives cannot co-occur with overt nouns, they cannot be considered as determiners. Moreover, the absence of articles in spite of definiteness of possessives suggests that in (42) the possessive resides within the DP, because it needs a [+DEF] feature checking.
If possessives are found within DP, they have to be considered as maximal projections which move from [Spec, AgrGENP] to [Spec, DP]. Thus, they are maximal projections as Mary’s, whose and -s morpheme in hers, ours and theirs (corresponding to ’s morpheme in Mary’

In Italian, the expression corresponding to (42) is shown in (43):

43) **ITA:**

Speaker A: Di chi è quel libro?
‘OF-WHOM is that book?’

Speaker B: (il) suo
‘(the) hers / his’

In this case, since suo ‘hers/his’ can co-occur with a non-obligatory article, therefore, **Italian allows pronominal possessives**, as in English. On the contrary, Sardinian does not admit the third class of possessives advocated by Ihsane (2000).

Consider the following example:

44) **BAU:**

Speaker A: De-chine is’ cussu libbru?
‘OF- WHOM is that book?’

Speaker B: a. *(su) suu
‘(the) hers / his’

b. iste *(su) suu
‘It is (the) hers / his’

In examples above, the outside bracket asterisk in (44a) shows that the article is compulsory, even when there is the copular verb be (44b), otherwise it leads to an ungrammatical expression.

As consequence of this, Sardinian displays only the first and the second class of possessives: **possessive Determiners** and **possessive Adjectives**.

**Possessive determiners**

It corresponds to the possessive category which cannot co-occur with articles or other determiner in case of overt nouns, as shown through the inside bracket asterisks:

ENG: (*the) my book, (*the) your family, (*the) his car, (*the) our son

FRE: (*le) mon livre, (*la) ta famille, (*la) sa voiture, (le) notre fils

Ihsane (2000) explains that a DP carries [+DEF] features and the possessive moves to [Spec, DP], in order to receive these features, in consequence of the Head-Spec relation.
A definite element must appear DP internally, in order to be licensed, exactly in the same way as a Wh-Phrase, which requires [+Wh] features in C° in order to be licensed:

\[(v)\quad \text{DP} [+\text{DEF}] \quad \Rightarrow \quad \text{D°} [+\text{DEF}] \quad \Rightarrow \quad \text{Spec} [+\text{DEF}] \quad \text{XP} \]

\[(vi)\quad \text{CP} [+\text{Wh}] \quad \Rightarrow \quad \text{C°} [+\text{Wh}] \quad \Rightarrow \quad \text{Spec} [+\text{Wh}] \quad \text{XP} \]

As shown in (v) and (vi), the definite DP structure is quite similar to the interrogative CP one. This explains the impossibility for possessives to co-occur with articles: in fact, a definite article appears in D°, filled by [+DEF] features; in this case the possessive could not move either to the head or to the spec, because these positions are unavailable.

In Spanish too possessives cannot occur with articles for the same reasons, as Brucart (1994) mentions:

\[45)\quad \text{SPA:}\]

\[(*\text{el}) \text{ mi alumno}\]

‘my pupil’

As previously said, Sardinian possessive elements appear in post-nominal position and they can occur with articles. Nevertheless, in only few specific cases even postnominal possessives must occur without articles.

This is the case with family names and some names of domestic animals as (*su) frade miu ‘the brother my’, (*sa) sorre tua ‘the sister your’, (*su) babbu tuu ‘the father your’, (*sa) mamma tua ‘the mother your’, (*su) calleddu tuu ‘the dog your’.

I propose that in Sardinian the whole constituent raises through pied-piping movements to [Spec, DP] producing at the end of process expressions similar to (46): the mentioned movements happen once the \textbf{NP-Poss} constituent is achieved in (iii).

\[46)\quad \text{BAU:}\]

\[\text{Frade miu at liggiu un bellu}^{17} \text{ libbru}\]

‘My brother read a nice book’

For these reasons, possessives that occur with family names are included in the \textit{possessive class of determiners}.

---

\[^{16}\text{The section 2.5 of this chapter will be dedicated to an analysis of family names}\]

\[^{17}\text{In Ch.3 properties of pre-nominal adnominal adjectives will be discussed.}\]
Possessive adjective

Differently from English, in Sardinian possessives usually carry nominal agreement features, as in Italian:

47) NG:
   my red car

48) BAU:
   sa macchina mia orrubia
   ‘the+(f.sng) //car+(f.sng)/*my+(f.sng) // red+ f.sng’

49) ITA:
   la mia macchina rossa
   ‘the+(f.sng) my+(f.sng) car+(f.sng) red+(f.sng)’

Sardinian and Italian possessives carry singular feminine features in (48) and (49), because they agree with the noun with which they are in relation, although they appear in a different position\(^\text{18}\). Nevertheless, as Ihsane (2000) points out, nominal agreement features are not sufficient to classify possessives as adjectives. Otherwise, she continues, even articles in some Romance languages could be labelled as adjectives.

In respect to this, the most important factor is the co-occurrence of possessives with articles: really because of this, possessives are labelled as adjectives. What is remarkable is that articles can be definite or indefinite: differently from possessive determiners, possessive adjective do not have [+DEF] features, thus, they do not move to DP to be licensed. They remain in [Spec, Agr\(_{\text{GENP}}\)], where they are even so licensed.

Articles serve only to determine the [±DEF] value of D°.

We can label some possessives as possessive adjective even in elliptical expressions:

ITA: il mio, il suo, il nostro,…

BAU: su miu, su suu, su nostru,…
   (LIT. the my, the his, the our…)

\(^{18}\) In Italian, possessives usually occupy the prenominal position (1). However, with some specific nouns they can appear postnominally (2).

1) *(la) mia casa
   (LIT. the my house)

2) (la) casa mia
   (LIT. (the) house my)
They maintain the same nominal inflectional features, as if they modified an overt full noun, moreover, they co-occur with articles. As already said, in this case, in Sardinian, the article is compulsorily, otherwise it leads to an ungrammatical expression.

In this paragraph, some features of possessive elements in Baunese will be examined: *miu* ‘my’, *tuu* ‘your’, *suu* ‘his, her’, *nostru* ‘our’, ‘Óstru ‘your(Pol.) and they plural and feminine counterparts, and *insoro* ‘their’, an 3rd pers. pl. invariable possessive.

Since they agree (except to *insoro*) with the Possessor and with the Possessum, at first sight, they behave like normal adjectives (50) and (51).

To be more precise, possessives agree in person with the Possessor and in gender and number with the Possessum:

50) BAU:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sa dommu sua</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘the(f+sng) house(f+sng) his/her (m/f+sng)’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

51) BAU:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>as dommos suas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘the(f+pl) house(f+pl) his/her (m/f+pl)’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In (50) the adjectival possessive *sua* indicates that the Possessor is a 3rd person singular, but one does not know whether the Possessor is male or female (differently from English, where the gender of the Possessor is specified).

In Sardinian only the context, absent here, provides this information.

As already mentioned, among possessive elements only one exception is observed: *insoro* ‘of them/their’, the 3rd person plural of possessives. It is an invariable element: Wagner (1960-1964) explains that etymologically this word derives from Latin IPSORUM ‘of themselves’, genitive form of IPSE ‘self’.

One more peculiar factor of possessive items in Sardinian is that they always stand in post-nominal position, adjacent to the noun:

52) BAU:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. *sa sua macchina</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘his car’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. sa macchina sua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘his car’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sardinian native speakers judge examples as (52a), (53a) and (54a) as total ungrammatical, in contrast with (52b), (53b) and (54b), which are grammatical expressions.

The reported examples are taken from Baunese: Jones (1993) and Lepori (2001), however, confirm that possessive items occupy the post-nominal position even respectively in Nuorese and Campidanese varieties.

In conclusion, it is possible to generalize that possessive adjectives occupy a post-nominal position in all the Sardinian dialects.

Up to here, I have examined some important properties of the second group of possessive constructions, what has been defined as Type B: possessive adjectives and possessive determiners.

In the next section, the 3rd type of the possessive construction will be examined.

2.3.3 Type C: the prepositional construction “DP+de…”

The third group of possessive constructions, actually, consists of three sub-groups, depending on types of PosPs, Possessive Phrases.

As already seen in this work, PosP can be in general a proper noun (Mariu, ‘Mario’), a “Det+N” DP (su sindiu, ‘the mayor’) or even a pronoun (bosattro, ‘you-2nd p. pl.’). These three types of PosPs are considered as belonging to the same group, because I suggest that they have in common the same structure and that the same processes are carried out by them to obtain the superficial word order.

The contrast bosattro-Boso has already been discussed previously: the former is a 2nd personal plural pronoun, the latter the Polite form, corresponding to Italian Voi ‘You-polite form’.
Now, consider the example in (34), here in (55):

55) BAU:
   a. *S’ammigu *osattro ist tedescu
      ‘Your friend (LIT. the friend of-you) is German’
   b. *Us ammigus de *osattro funtis tedescos
      ‘Your(2\textsuperscript{nd} pl.) friends (LIT. the friend of you) are German’

In the sentence (55), because of the preceding preposition, *bosattro* ‘you(2\textsuperscript{nd} p. pl.)’ weakens and the beginning -b- of the pronoun drops: “*de+*bosattro” becomes one constituent: \textit{de-’osattro} (the apostrophe indicates the elision).

Furthermore, in some cases it becomes such an integrated constituent, that the preposition can hardly be heard, as shown in (55a) \textit{ammigu *osattro} ‘friend-of-you+2\textsuperscript{nd} pl., which is pronounced [amig-oz\text{\`a}tro]’. Similar examples are: \textit{mama *osattro} ‘mother-of-you+2\textsuperscript{nd} pl.’, which is pronounced [mama-oz\text{\`a}tro]’; \textit{babb *osattro} ‘father-of-you+2\textsuperscript{nd} pl.’, which is pronounced [bab-oz\text{\`a}tro].

Only with a Possessor in plural form, the hidden preposition is revealed, as in (55b) \textit{ammigus de *osattro} ‘friends-of-you+2\textsuperscript{nd} pl., which is pronounced [amigur-de-oz\text{\`a}tro]’.

See other examples: \textit{mamas de *osattro} ‘mothers-of-you+2\textsuperscript{nd} pl.’, which is pronounced [màmar-de-oz\text{\`a}tro]; \textit{babbus de *osattro} ‘fathers-of-you+2\textsuperscript{nd} pl.’, which is pronounced [bàbbur-de-oz\text{\`a}tro].

Rhotacism\textsuperscript{19}, indeed, separates sounds in words and the preposition \textit{de} can again be heard. Nevertheless, just for convenience, in this work I will write the preposition in such expressions, even if it is not always pronounced.

In conclusion, I want to remark one more thing: as already mentioned above, the Polite possessive expression corresponding to \textit{Bòso} is \textit{‘Ostru/’Ostra}; it is included in the “Type B- possessive adjective”. Still, there is also the invariable \textit{’Osattro}, (note the capital letter in order to distinguish it from 2\textsuperscript{nd} person plural pronoun), which belongs to the “Type C-prepositional possessive construction”:

56) BAU:
   a. *Babbu *Ostru/ de *’Osattro coment istat?
      ‘How is Your(Pol.) father’

\textbf{VERSUS}

\textsuperscript{19} Rhotacism is a phonetic feature of Sardinian described on page 9. The above presented examples are taken from Secci (2003)
It is widely accepted that D° is a functional head realized by an article but even by a non-overt
determiner while the NP is a nominal projection dominated by the DP. In Italian, articles appear in
D: in (57), taken from Haegeman & Gueron (1999), the article la precedes the Possessor and the
Possessum, whereas in (57b) there is no article and the possessor lies in a post-nominal position:

57)  ITA:
   a. La mia casa è bella
      (‘LIT.: the my house is beautiful’)
   b. (La) Casa mia è bella
      (‘LIT.: (the) house my is beautiful’)

In (b), casa is the head noun, which has moved from the N° position to D°.
As already explained in the previous section, there is not a simple N-to-D movement, but following
Cinque’s (2000) analysis of the Semitic DP, we can think that the movement involved in that of the
extended projections of N, as shown in (iii).
Haegeman & Gueron (1999) stress that the N(remnant)-to-D movement is applied to proper names
and certain kinship names, as well as casa. Thus, in (57b) the whole constituent [ne casa] has raised
to [Spec, DP].
Consider examples in (29) and (34) here in (58) and (59):

58)  BAU:
   S’ammigu de Mariu is’ geniosu
   ‘Mario’s friend is nice’

59)  BAU:
   S’ammigu de su sindiu is’ geniosu
   ‘Mayor’s friend is nice’

In (57), (58) and (59) examples of the three categories of PosPs involved in this Type C
construction are provided, respectively:
   a) de ’osattro ‘of you(2nd pl.); de ‘Osattro (m.Pol.)
   b) de Mariu ‘of Mario’
   c) de su sindiu ‘of the mayor’

Having previously said that PosPs are DP projections, how can a structure of merge be derived?
As for prepositional genitive possessive constructions, Kayne (2000: 30) is to be taken into
consideration as starting point with his analysis on the expression here below reported in (60).
He explains that *of* insertion yields an attraction of the Possessor:

60) **ENG:**

   a [picture] of John $t_i$

Kayne (2000) points out a paradox: «*of* is usually taken to be a (case-) license for John […] and *John* does not appear to be in Spec, *of*» and he proposes a sort of solution to resolve this paradox «by taking *of* to enter into two attraction operations».

Following his proposal, Sardinian possessive structures can be explained, as for example (58), here in (61):

61) **BAU:**

   *S’ammigu de Mariu*

   ‘Mario’s friend’

   a) Mariu ammigu $\rightarrow$ merger of *de*

   b) *de* [Mariu ammigu] $\rightarrow$ attraction of the possessor to Spec,*de*

   c) Mariu, *de* [ $t_i$ ammigu] $\rightarrow$ merger of W and raising of *de* to W

   d) *de*$_j +$ W Mariu, $t_j$ [ $t_i$ ammigu] $\rightarrow$ attraction to Spec,W

   e) [ $t_i$ ammigu]$_k$ *de*$_j +$ W Mariu, $t_j$ $t_k$

   f) *s’ammsgu de Mariu*

I propose that the pronominal PosP (62) and the “Det+noun” PosP (63) carry the same movements as well as proper names (61):

62) **BAU:**

   *S’ammsgu de ’osattro/ ’Osattro*

   (LIT.: The friend of you(2$^{nd}$ pl.)/You(Pol.)

   a) bosattro/’Osattro ammigu $\rightarrow$ merger of *de*

   b) *de* [bosattro/’Osattro ammigu] $\rightarrow$ attraction of the possessor to Spec,*de*

   c) (bosattro/’Osattro)$_k$ *de* [ $t_i$ ammigu] $\rightarrow$ merger of W and raising of *de* to W

   d) *de*$_j +$ W (bosattro/’Osattro)$_k$, $t_j$ [ $t_i$ ammigu] $\rightarrow$ attraction to Spec,W

   e) [ $t_i$ ammigu]$_k$ *de*$_j +$ W (bosattro/’Osattro)$_k$, $t_j$ $t_k$

   f) *s’ammsgu de ’bosattro / ’Osattro*
63) BAU:

S’ammigu de su sindiu
‘the mayor’s friend’

a) su sindiu ammigu → merger of de
b) de [su sindiu ammigu] → attraction of the possessor to Spec,de
c) su sindiu de [ t_i ammigu] → merger of W and raising of de to W
d) de_j + W su sindiu_t_j [ t_i ammigu] → attraction to Spec,W
e) [ t_i ammigu]_k de_j + W su sindiu_t_j t_k
f) s’ammigu de su sindiu

Following Kayne (2000), the correct word order is yielded in Sardinian DP+de+DP possessive construction (66) and (67).
(vii) S’ammigu de (Mariu, su sindiu, osattro’)\textsubscript{GEN}
LIT.: The friend of (Mario, the mayor, you)
A new position is inserted in the structure which shows how the prepositional possessive construction is obtained: the GENP projection, headed by the preposition *de*.

Longobardi (1991) affirms that the preposition insertion takes place not in the deep structure, but in a more superficial level. Thus, PosP receives [+GEN] features in the deep structure in [Spec, Agr<sub>GEN</sub>P], and subsequently it has to move to the head-preposition in order to be licensed.

Returning to the syntactic tree in (vii), again, the first movement in the process is carried out by PosP: it moves from its universal base position toward the higher [Spec, Agr<sub>GEN</sub>P], where it receives the structural genitive case. Unfortunately, Sardinian does not present case marking morphemes; therefore, it is only supposed, that Agr<sub>GEN</sub>P spreads [+GEN] features to its specifier, because of the strictly Head-Spec relation. PosP receives [+GEN] features, however, in order to be licensed it has to raise as far as the higher prepositional head.

How can PosP<sub>GEN</sub> reach the licensing projection GENP?

After the order NP-Pos<sub>GEN</sub> is achieved (iii), the PosP<sub>GEN</sub> is attracted by the head-preposition *de* ‘of’ to its spec, leaving an empty trace (the described extraction is shown in movement “4”). At the end, as proposed by Kayne (2000) and Cinque (2000), the head GEN° raises to W1° and adjoins it; this activates the last pied-piping movement and the constituent in [Spec, WP2], containing the PosP-trace, is attracted to the higher position [Spec, WP1].

In conclusion, although the PosP has received the genitive case from [Spec, Agr<sub>GEN</sub>P], it needs the preposition to be licensed, therefore another movement needs to be carried out. It seems to be a sort of dopple agreement, which completes the licensing process and is necessary to establish the N-Poss relation.

### 2.4 NP-Pos<sub>GEN</sub> within a DP

Greenberg’s Universal 20 claims that items which appear within a DP have a fixed order depending on whether they are found before or after the Noun. The items namely are demonstrative (Dem), numeral (Num) and adjective (A) elements:

64)  Greenberg’s Universal 20 (p.87)

When any or all of the items (demonstrative, numeral and descriptive adjective) precede the noun, they are always found in that order. If they follow, the order is either the same or its exact opposite.

---

20 In the preceding section, when it was argued the case of *insoro*, it was noted that this item etymologically should derive from the Latin ISPsORM, the genitive case of IPSE ‘itself’ (Wagner 1960-64): from this datum, it is possible to generalize that all the PosPs receive [+GEN] case features in [Spec, Agr<sub>GEN</sub>P] position, but the features are not always overt.
The Universal 20 can be resumed in this way:

\begin{align*}
\text{DEM} & \rightarrow \text{NUM} > \text{A} > \text{N} \\
\text{N} & > \text{DEM} > \text{NUM} > \text{A} \\
\text{N} & > \text{A} > \text{NUM} > \text{DEM}
\end{align*}

Nevertheless, Greenberg’s Universal 20 obtain some critical objections during the years, because some studies provide data according to which orders excluded by Greenberg’s hypothesis are possible.

Cinque (2004) offers an analysis on this: he suggests that the merge order must be DEM> NUM > A > N and stresses that «no head movement\textsuperscript{21}, nor phrasal movement (whether “remnant” or not) different from NP movement, is possible, except perhaps of the wh/focus type». He affirms that the items move depending on these parameters of movements:

i. No NP movement;

ii. NP movement plus Pied-Piping of the \textit{whose picture}-type;

iii. NP movement without Pied-Piping;

iv. NP movement plus Pied-piping of the \textit{picture of who}-type.

According to Cinque (2000) following these parameters a series of movements are involved, when the items DEM, NUM and A in a DP appear near the N.

Consider now the behaviour of possessives, when some adnominal adjectives are inserted in basic expressions like (65), the yielded word order is shown in (66):

\begin{align*}
\text{65)} & \quad \text{BAU:} \\
& \quad \text{\textit{us ammigus suus}} \\
& \quad \text{‘his/her friends’}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{66)} & \quad \text{BAU:} \\
& \quad \text{a. } \textit{cussus duus ammigus suus tedescos geniosos} \\
& \quad \text{‘LIT.: these(m.pl.) two(m.pl) friends(m) his/her(pl.) German(m.pl.) nice(m.pl.)’} \\
& \quad \text{b. } \ast \textit{cussus duus ammigus tedescos suus geniosos} \\
& \quad \text{‘LIT.: these(m.pl.) two(m.pl) friends(m) German(m.pl.) his/her(pl.) nice(m.pl.)’} \\
& \quad \text{c. } \ast \textit{cussus duus ammigus tedescos geniosos suus} \\
& \quad \text{‘LIT.: these(m.pl.) two(m.pl) friends(m) German(m.pl.) nice(m.pl.) his/her(pl.)’}
\end{align*}

\textsuperscript{21} Nevertheless, in this work I assume that some Head-movements exist but no N° movement crucially exists.
It can be easily observed that possessive elements must always be adjacent to the noun with which they are in relation despite the insertion of some other items.

Observe the same parallelism within a prepositional possessive construction like (67):

67) BAU:

\[ us \ ammigus \ de \ Mariu \]

‘Mario’s friends’

68) BAU:

a. \[ cussus \ duus \ ammigus \ tedescos \ geniosos \ de \ Mariu \]

‘LIT.: these(m.pl.) two(m.pl) friends(m) German(m.pl.) nice(m.pl.) of Mario

b. \[ *cussus \ duus \ ammigus \ de \ Mariu \ tedescos \ geniosos \]

‘LIT.: these(m.pl.) two(m.pl) friends(m) of Mario German(m.pl.) nice(m.pl.)

c. \[ *cussus \ duus \ ammigus \ tedescos \ de \ Mariu \ geniosos \]

‘LIT.: these(m.pl.) two(m.pl) friends(m) German(m.pl.) of Mario nice(m.pl.)

In the table above, it is possible to observe that differently from (66) the prepositional construction is not adjacent to the NP, but the two inserted adnominal adjectives have crossed over the “de-POS” constituent. Actually, it is not completely correct saying that the adjectives cross over the prepositional construction and we will observe the reason of this in the syntactic tree (viii).

Anyway, starting from the structure in (iii), where the core of the possessive construction was achieved, \( NP_{-}Pos_{\text{gen}} \), now the merge structure will be discussed. Before going on, it is necessary to take into account an important property of Sardinian adnominal adjectives basic word order, something that is still visible in tables above.
In fact, following Cinque (2005)\textsuperscript{22}, one observes that Sardinian shows a mirror image of attributive adjectives: this property is shared by other Romance languages, in contrast with Germanic languages, as shown in (69) and (70):

69) \textsc{Eng:} nice German friends

\textbf{An order} EVALUATING PROVENANCE NP

70) \textsc{Bau:} ammigu tedescu geniosu

\textbf{Na order} LIT.: friend German nice

NP PROVENANCE EVALUATING

The contrast can be resolved referring to Cinque (2000), according to whom «DPs involve successive internal XP-raising, rather than N-raising (to D) with consequences also for the proper analysis of the so called Construct State»\textsuperscript{23}.

Starting from the derivation seen in (iii), WP1=\textsf{NP-Pos}_{\textsc{gen}}, the merge order of the expression in (66a) is:

\textsc{Merge order: DEM – NUM – AP1 – AP2 – Pos}_{\textsc{gen}} – NP

\textit{Cussus} – duus – geniosos\textsubscript{1} – tedescos\textsubscript{2} – suus\textsubscript{gen} – ammigus

I. DEM – NUM – AP1 – AP2 – [\textsc{NP}]\textsubscript{i}-Pos_{\textsc{gen}} – ti

\textit{Cussus} – duus – geniosu\textsubscript{i} – tedescu\textsubscript{2} – [ammigu\textsubscript{i}, suu_{gen}] 

II. DEM – NUM – AP1 – [\textsc{NP}]\textsubscript{k}-Pos_{\textsc{gen}} \textsc{k} – AP2 – tk ti

\textit{Cussus} – duus – geniosu\textsubscript{k} – [ammigu\textsubscript{i}, suu_{gen}]\textsc{k} – tedescu\textsubscript{2} – tk ti

III. DEM – NUM – [\textsc{NP}]\textsubscript{k}-Pos_{\textsc{gen}} \textsc{k} AP2\textsubscript{j} – AP1 – tj tk ti

\textit{Cussus} – duus – [ammigu\textsubscript{i}, suu_{gen}]\textsc{k} – tedescu\textsubscript{2}\textsc{j} – geniosu\textsubscript{j} – tj tk ti

Attention must be paid to the syntactic tree in (viii), where all detailed movements in (I) (II) and (III) are explained.

\textsuperscript{22} Cinque (2005) claims that attributive adjectives in Germanic and Romance languages have a mirror image, where the ordering is the opposite one. It is one of different arguments that he proposes «against the N-movements hypothesis in favour of an alternative in which (attributive) APs are generable to the right of N…», page 101

\textsuperscript{23} Recall Cinque’s (2000) analysis in order to have a description of the Construct State process: the present work on Sardinian possessive construction is based on Cinque (2000).
(viii) BAU: Ammigu suu_{GEN} tedescu geniosu
LIT.: friend his German nice

(vii) BAU: Ammigu suu_{GEN} tedescu geniosu
LIT.: friend his German nice

(iii) NP-Pos_{GEN}
The above syntactic tree better represents the behaviour of an adjectival possessive expression after the insertion of two adnominal adjectives as *tedescu* ‘German’ and *geniosu* ‘nice’. Now, observe how a prepositional possessive construction behaves, when the same two adnominal adjectives are inserted in the expression.

Take, just as an example, (68): however, the same structure holds even for the pronoun *bosattro* and “Det+noun” *su sindiu*.

Merge order: DEM – NUM – AP1 – AP2 – Pos\textsubscript{GEN} – NP

\[ Cussus – duus – geniosos\textsubscript{1} – tedescos\textsubscript{2} – Mariu_{\textsc{gen}} – ammigus \]

I. DEM – NUM – AP1 – AP2 – [[NP]-Pos\textsubscript{GEN}] – t\textsubscript{i}

\[ Cussus – duus – geniosu\textsubscript{1} – tedescu\textsubscript{2} – [[ammigu], Mariu_{\textsc{gen}}] \]

II. DEM – NUM – AP1 – [[NP]-Pos\textsubscript{GEN}]\textsubscript{k} – AP2 – t\textsubscript{k} t\textsubscript{i}

\[ Cussus – duus – geniosu\textsubscript{1} – [[ammigu], Mariu_{\textsc{gen}}]_k – tedescu\textsubscript{2} – t\textsubscript{k} t\textsubscript{i} \]

III. DEM – NUM – [[NP]-Pos\textsubscript{GEN}]\textsubscript{k} – AP2\textsubscript{j} – AP1 – t\textsubscript{j} t\textsubscript{k} t\textsubscript{i}

\[ Cussus – duus – [[ammigu], Mariu_{\textsc{gen}}]_k – tedescu\textsubscript{2}j – geniosu\textsubscript{1} – t\textsubscript{j} t\textsubscript{k} t\textsubscript{i} \]

IV. DEM – NUM – [[NP]-Pos\textsubscript{GEN}]\textsubscript{z} GENP - [[NP]-t\textsubscript{z}]\textsubscript{k} – AP2\textsubscript{j} – AP1 – t\textsubscript{j} t\textsubscript{k} t\textsubscript{i}

\[ Cussus – duus – [Mariu_{\textsc{gen}}]_z – de - [[ammigu], t\textsubscript{z}]_k – tedescu\textsubscript{2}j – geniosu\textsubscript{1} – t\textsubscript{j} t\textsubscript{k} t\textsubscript{i} \]

V. DEM – NUM – de\textsubscript{x} [[NP]-Pos\textsubscript{GEN}]\textsubscript{z} t\textsubscript{x} – [[NP]-t\textsubscript{z}]\textsubscript{k} – AP2\textsubscript{j} – AP1 – t\textsubscript{j} t\textsubscript{k} t\textsubscript{i}

\[ Cussus – duus – de\textsubscript{x} [Mariu_{\textsc{gen}}]_z t\textsubscript{x} – [[ammigu], t\textsubscript{z}]_k – tedescu\textsubscript{2}j – geniosu\textsubscript{1} – t\textsubscript{j} t\textsubscript{k} t\textsubscript{i} \]

VI. DEM – NUM – de\textsubscript{x} [[NP]-Pos\textsubscript{GEN}]\textsubscript{z} – [[NP]-t\textsubscript{z}]\textsubscript{k} – AP2\textsubscript{j} – AP1 – t\textsubscript{j} t\textsubscript{k} t\textsubscript{i}

\[ Cussus – duus – [[ammigu], t\textsubscript{z}]_k – tedescu\textsubscript{2}j – geniosu\textsubscript{1}y – de\textsubscript{x} [Mariu_{\textsc{gen}}]_z – t\textsubscript{y} t\textsubscript{j} t\textsubscript{k} t\textsubscript{i} \]

In the following page, the merge structure\textsuperscript{24} of *Us ammigus tedescos geniosos de Mariu* is proposed: again starting from WP1=NP-Pos\textsubscript{GEN} achieved in (iii), here each subsequent single process to obtain the Sardinian word order in the prepositional possessive construction is shown.

\textsuperscript{24} In this work, I assume the extraction of the NP-remnant
(ix) **BAU:** ammigu tedescu geniosu de (Mariu, su sindiu, 'osattro)\textsubscript{GEN}

LIT.: friend German nice of (Mario, the mayor, 'you)
Since the Possessor is generally a DP projection, thus it can be a proper name (Mariu), a “Det+noun” constituent (su sindiu) or even a pronoun (bosattro) and they all have in common the same basic structure. At the end of these “roll-up” movements, the aimed orders have been achieved:

- S'ammigu suu\textsubscript{GEN} tedescu geniosu (viii)
- S'ammigu tedescu geniosu de (Mariu, su sindiu, 'osattro)\textsubscript{GEN} (ix)

In this section it has been observed that the distinction between the two possessive constructions, “de+DP” and with possessives, is given by the requirements of the preposition, which causes a sort of dopple agreement to licence the PosP.

In conclusion, it has been verified that the basic order remains universal, although the apparent postnominal position. Indeed, the basic order in which PosP is generated in [Spec, NP] is modified by a series of movements, by mean of which the NP-remnat crosses over it.

2.5 Family names

2.5.1 An overview

In this section, I present a brief discussion of about Sardinian family names: the behaviour of these names is strictly linked to possessive proprieties seen in previous sections.

Dealing with possessive determiners on page 26, also expressions as frade miu, babbu tuu, mama tua have been included in this category. Possessive items in those phrases are labelled as Determiners, because they do not co-occur with articles.

After obtaining the constituent NP-Pos\textsubscript{GEN} (iii), my proposal is that the whole constituent raises to [Spec, DP], where [+DEF] features are spread to it.

In fact, possessives which combine with family names have a specific property: they appear in two different morphological forms depending on the involved Possessor.

Look at the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Sng &amp; Pl. Possessor</th>
<th>Babbài</th>
<th>Mammài</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(*su) babbu tuu,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(*su) babbu suu; *(su) babbu (*suu); (*su) babbu insoro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(su) babbu de Mariu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(su) babbu de 'osattro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2nd Pl.; overt-noun Possessor</th>
<th>*(Sa) mama de Mariu</th>
<th>*(sa) mama de 'osattro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*(Su) babbu de Mariu</td>
<td>*(sa) mama de Mariu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(Su) babbu de 'osattro</td>
<td>*(sa) mama de 'osattro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**US NONNOIS** ‘the grandparents’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Sng &amp; Pl. Possessor</th>
<th>Nonnói</th>
<th>Nannài</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd Sng, 3rd Sng, 3rd Pl. Possessor</td>
<td>(*su) nonnói tuu; *(su) nonnói (*suu) insòro</td>
<td>(*sa) nannài tua; *(sa) nannài (*suu) insòro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Pl. &amp; overt-noun Possessor</td>
<td>*(Su) nonnói de Mariu</td>
<td>*(Sa) nannài de Mariu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*(Su) nonnói de ’osattro</td>
<td>*(Sa) nannài de ’osattro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**US NONNOS** ‘godfather and godmother’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Sng &amp; Pl. Possessor</th>
<th>Nonnéddu</th>
<th>Nonnèdda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd Sng, 3rd Sng, 3rd Pl. Possessor</td>
<td>(*su) nonnéddu tuu; *(su) nonnéddu (*suu) insòro</td>
<td>(*sa) nonnedda tua; *(sa) nonnedda (*suu) insòro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Pl. &amp; overt-noun Possessor</td>
<td>Su nonnu de Mariu</td>
<td>(Sa) nonna de Mariu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Su nonnu (e) ’osattro</td>
<td>(Sa) nonna de ’osattro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The different forms of family names depending on the Possessor must be noted, as already anticipated.

I want to point out the most peculiar behaviour of this type of names, when the Possessor is the 1st singular and plural person, (“my” and “our”). In this case, the family name does not co-occur either with the article or with the possessive item: these expressions are judged as completely ungrammatical:

a. [* sa mammai; *mammai mia; *sa mammai mia] VS mammài

b. [*su babbai; *babbai miu; *su babbai miu] VS babbài

In other Possessor cases, for example with nouns mamma ‘mother’ and babbu ‘father’, what appears relevant is the impossibility of mamma-babbu to co-occur with articles, if the Possessor is 2nd person singular or 3rd person singular and plural. This is in contrast to the prepositional possessive construction, where articles are obligatory.

Godfather-godmother names have two different morphological forms: nonnéddu-nonnèdda and nónnu-nonna. When “I” speak about “my” godfather or godmother, the only form I can use is nonnéddu-nonnèdda and no article nor possessive can co-occur with these forms; when “somebody” speaks about “my” or “his” godfather or godmother, then the same morphological item has to be followed by possessives tuu/a ‘your(m/f)’ or suu/sua ‘his/her’.

---

25 The suffix –ddu/-dda is usually used to form a term of endearment (page 47).
There is one more possibility, when “somebody” speaks about “someone else’s” godfather or godmother, then family name form changes: the only one possibility is *su nonnu de calegunu* ‘the godfather of someone’ or *sa nonna de calegunu* ‘the godmother of someone’.

Consider now “grandparents” examples: as observed in the table (71), despite different Possessors, only one possible basic-name is allowed: *nonnói-nannài*.

Anyway, when ‘I’ am speaking about “my” grandparents, *(us) nonnói mius*26, it is sufficient to say *nonnói* ‘grandfather(-my)’ or *nannài* ‘grandmother(-my)’; however, if “I” am not included in the Possessor relation, *nonnói tua*, *nonnói suu* or *nannài tua, nannài sua* must be used. Finally, when “one” talks about “someone else’s” grandfather, the form does not change, an article is adjoined and the prepositional possessive complement replaces the possessive item: *nonnói suu* ‘grandfather his’ > *su nonnói de Mariu* ‘the grandfather of Mario’. In this case, attention has to be paid to the plural expression *(us) nonnói, where the article must be obligatorily overt: the only possible Possessor is a 3rd (singular and plural as well) person.

Consider some examples, where different Possessors are shown through different indexes:

72) BAU:

*Ôe babbai i ste andau chin mammai i a clésia*

‘Today father-(my/our) has gone with mother-(my/our) to the church’

73) BAU:

*Ôe babbu tua i ste andau chin mammai a clésia*

‘Today father-your has gone with mother-(my/our) to the church’

74) BAU:

*Ôe babbu tua i ste andau chin maman tua a clésia*

‘Today father-your has gone with mother-your to church’

75) BAU:

*Ôe su babbu de Mariu i ste andau chin maman tua a clésia*

‘Today Mario’s father has gone with mother-your to the church’

76) BAU:

*Ôe su babbu(?) de Mariu i ste andau chin mamma a clésia*

‘Today Mario’s father has gone with mother-(my/our) to the church’

---

26 Note that the plural article is not obligatorily overt, if a possessive element appears in the plural expression: *(Us) nonnói mius* ‘(the) grandparents my(pl.)’. Nevertheless, it is observed that the overt article leads a marked reading. On the other hand, as later expounded, in a singular expression the article yields an ungrammatical phrase, unless a 3rd person possessor is involved: if I mean “my” grandfathers *(su) nonnói* ‘the grandfathers’ is incorrect; however, *(su) nonnói* ‘the grandfather’ denotes only a 3rd person possessor.
In examples above, the aim was to show how the family name constituents behave, changing on each sentence only the Possessor element, in order to obtain some minimal pair sentences. In (72) the Possessor can be “me” or “us”, the 1st person singular or plural. In (73) the former possessive construction is referred to the 2nd singular person, whereas in the latter is involved “my” or “our” mother. In (74) we are speaking about “your” parents, with the same index; in (75) and (76) the former possessive construction, headed by a preposition, shows overtly who the former possessor is, Mario, whereas the latter the Possessor is again “your” mother (75) and “my/our” mother (76). In the last example, (79), again two possessors are involved, but being R-expressions, understanding whose mothers are involved is quite clear. Sentences in (77) and (78), on the contrary, are a little more peculiar. Before analysing them, it is important to point out that all the family names in table (71) have in common one more peculiar property: expressions like sa mama, su babbu, su nonnói, sa nannài, su nonnu, sa nonna are referred only to a 3rd person Possessor. Nevertheless, the sentence in (77) is ambiguous: this is due to the presence of two possible antecedents, babbu and Mariu. Only the context, here absent, can specify whose mother is involved in these sentences. A way to disambiguate the interpretation is to put a post-nominal possessive: that means eliminating the pre-nominal article in the expression. Thus, starting from sa mama, mama sua has been yielded. The sentence (78) is not ambiguous and the only possible antecedent for the possessive item is babbu: in fact, “Mario’s father has gone with his mother (=Mario’s grandmother) to the church.”
2.5.2  *The origin of Sardinian family names: a proposal*

As for family names, Wagner (1960-64) argues that they are diminutive words, i.e. children’s expressions.

With regard to “mama, mamma” item in the etymological dictionary, he considers *mammaj* as a children’s word: in Nuorese the corresponding word to *mammaj* is *mamea*.

Some Nuorese speakers confirm that *mamea* is the contracted form of *mama mea*; they add that, actually, *mama mea* has been almost completely substituted by the contracted form *mamea*.

According to Wagner (1960-64), the contracted form is due to a syntactic splitting.

Thus, it is possible to say that in Baunese, where any syntactic splitting has not been carried out, the basic construction was *mama mia*.

Even if explaining how family names are formed is not the aim in this work, I will try to provide an analysis for them as well.

Indeed, the *mammaj* constituent could be obtained through two possible ways. One possibility is that the two items *mama mia* merged, yielding the whole expression *mamamia*. Subsequently, carried out contraction, the ending vowel –*a* has been eliminated with a reinforcing of the central –*m*, so obtaining *mammaj*. The second possibility could be that after the merging seen above, yielding *mamamia*, the central –*a* has fallen, yielding *mammia*, and successively a **vowel shift** has been carried out, so obtaining *mammaj*. In fact, in Baunese *mammaj mia* or *babbaj tuu* are completely ungrammatical expressions.

As for *babbaj, nonnói* and *nannái* formation, the single items (noun+possessive: *babbu miu, nonnoi miu* and *nannài mia*) probably carried out contraction, followed by an assimilation process. Without contraction, the family names followed by 1*st* possessor items above would be ungrammatical expressions. Actually, a phonological analysis should be necessary, in that according to above proposals the possessive is incorporated in the noun, but it does not explain why for example *mamai* denotes also “our” mother.

On the other hand, *nonnéddu-nonnèdda* are terms of endearment too: their basic forms are *nonnu-nonna* to which diminutive suffixes -*eddu; -edda* have been adjoined.

These suffixes, in general, serve to create diminutive words: for example *piccióccu ‘boy’* > *picciocchéddu ‘kid’; cóppiu ‘pig’* > *coppiéddu ‘little pig’. It is confirmed also by Lepori (2001): –*eddu* and –*edda* are diminutive suffixes in Campidanese too.

In conclusion, I propose that family names have incorporated possessive determiners as children’s words when the Possessor is a 1*st* singular or plural person.

Furthermore, the impossibility to co-occur with articles has been noted: articles and possessives are complementary items.
2.6 Another type of “DP-de-DP” constructions

The aim of the last section of this chapter is to collect data about a peculiar construction, still rather productive in Baunese, which is related to the prepositional possessive construction. The study aims at being a descriptive work, but it could cue to deeper inquiries.

A series of minimal pairs are shown below, in which a sort of reduced preposition can influence and change the meaning of the expression. Compare the following expressions in the column “A” and “B”:

80) BAU:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. su mere de *(sa) ‘idda</td>
<td>a’. su mer’e (sa) ‘idda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘the owner of the town’</td>
<td>‘LIT.: the master-’E-the town’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>= maybe the mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. (su) flaccu de muccittu</td>
<td>b’. (su) flacch’e muccittu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘(the) odour of (the/my) cat’</td>
<td>‘LIT.: (the) odour-’E-cat’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>= a bad smell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite the similarity of spelling between constituents of the group “A” and of the group “B”, Sardinian native speakers perceive a clear difference in the meaning among these expressions. Consider in details expressions in (80). In (80a) su mere de *(sa) ‘idda indicates a definite owner of the town, probably because being very rich he has bought it. On the other hand su mer’e (sa) ‘idda (80a’) is not the owner, but who administrates it. For example: a mayor, unu sindiu, is not su mere de *(sa) ‘idda because he has not bought it, but for a certain period of time an elected person can be su mer’e (sa) ‘idda, because he is one of the most important people in the town and he administrates it. Note that in (80a) the article in the prepositional complement is obligatory, whereas in (80a’) it is facultative, but anyway the all expression has [+DEF] features.

In (80b) flaccu de muccittu can refer to a definite cat, for example “mine” or “yours”, that had come in a room and one can perceive its odour: indeed the noun muccittu does not usually bear any article even when it is definite, much like kinship nouns (muccittu ist inongi “[our] cat is here”, nannai ist inongi “granny is here”). On the other hand, in (80b’) flacch’e muccittu refers to something which smells bad, the odour is similar to the cat’s one and the noun muccittu is felt as indefinite.
Comparing Baunese with other Romance languages, it is possible to state that the difference between (80b) and (80b’) is the same displayed in Italian: (80b) corresponds to Italian “odore del gatto”, whereas (80b’) to “odore di gatto”\(^{27}\).

Recall the first minimal pair in (80a) and (80a’): following Wintner (1999), it is important to point out that in Hebrew a similar expression to mer’e (sa) ‘idda is found:

81) BAU:

\[
\text{mer’e (sa) ‘idda}
\]

‘LIT.: master-'E-the town’ = (maybe) the mayor

82) HEB:

\[
\text{rosh ha-ir}\quad^{28}
\]

‘head the-city’ = the mayor

The parallelism is clear. Moreover, as in the Hebrew Construct State, the definite article ha spreads [+DEF] features not only on the NP ir ‘city’, but also on the whole constituent, for the same reason the constituent in (81) carries definite features: the article sa ‘the’ spreads [+DEF] features on the whole expression. As consequence of this, the following contrast is possible:

83) BAU:

\[
\text{a. } \text{unu mere de *(sa) ‘idda} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{a’. *unu mer’e (sa) ‘idda}
\]

‘a owner of the town’ ‘LIT.: a master-'E-the town’

It is observed that expressions of the group “B” act as whole constituents, like compound nouns: the phrase is reanalysed as one constituent and the meaning becomes a little more idiomatic. For example, examples similar to (80a)-(80a’) are found in (84a)-(84a’):

84) BAU:

\[
\text{a. su mere de sa/una dommu} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{a’. su mer’e (sa) domo}
\]

‘the owner of the house’ ‘the master-'E-the house’

85) BAU:

\[
\text{a. unu mere de *(sa) dommu} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{a’. *unu mer’e (sa) domo}
\]

‘a owner of the house’ ‘the master-'E-the house’

---

\(^{27}\) I hope I am not lacking in respect towards the reader, if I take as examples such sentences:

BAU: a. Soe intendendo flaccu de merda VS b. Soe intendendo flacch’e merda

‘(I) am perceiving odour of shit’ VS ‘(I) am perceiving odour-'E-shit’

In these examples, the first means that there is excrement and on can perceived the odour; in the latter case something smells bad, but it is not necessarily due to excrement.

\(^{28}\) Example taken from Wintner (1999: 410).
In (85a’) mer’e (sa) domo ‘master of the house’ is not ‘the owner, the Possessor of the house’ but the manager, whereas (85a) mere de *(sa) dommu is house’s owner because he has bought it but he is not necessarily the manager, who administers it.

On the other hand, in the pair (80b)-(80b’) one speaks about unu flaccu ‘a smell’ but in example (80b) the Possessor in the literal sense is shown, while (80b’) denotes a bad smell in general (not necessarily of a cat). Furthermore, if a native speaker pronounces expressions in “A”, e.g. mere de *(sa) ’idda, a light rhythmical break is perceived: thanks to the break, the preposition de does not drop. On the contrary, expressions in “B” do not have any break because they are one constituent, as a kind of compound nouns: the preposition de weakens and reduces phonologically to ’e.

This construction “DP-’e-DP” is very common in Baunese and it is still productive: many of these constructions can easily be heard. Here below a series of other examples will be given.

86) BAU:

a. giogu de pippius → b. giog’e pippius
‘a toy made for kids’ ‘LIT.: a play-E’ kids’
= a game typical of kids

In (84a) giógu de pippius indicates a toy made for kids (for example little cars or dolls); on the contrary giogh’e pippius (85b) denotes a game typical of kids (e.g. cùa-cùa ‘hide-and-seek’). This pair shows the difference also found in Italian: (84a) “gioco per bambini” (per bambini: a toy suitable for children) and (84b) “gioco da bambini” (da bambini: a child’s play).

The constituents “DP-’e-DP” sometimes corresponds also to independent expressions that can be reanalysed and a wider reading can be observed.

87) BAU:

a. dommu de su dottore → b. domm’e su dottore
‘the house of the doctor’ ‘LIT.: the house-’E-the doctor’
= doctor’s surgery

88) BAU:

a. maistru de linna → b. maistr’e linna
‘a teacher of wood’ ‘LIT.: a master-’E-wood’
= a carpenter

In (87a) the expression shows a house, whose owner is a define doctor; on the other side, in (87b) one speaks about a doctor’s surgery, probably a room or a building, not simply a house. The example in (88a) refers to an object made of wood, probably a statue, whereas (88b) denotes someone whose job is making or repairing wooden things.
This type of construction is used for some proper names, as for example resort names as shown in minimal pairs below:

89) BAU:
   a. \( \text{genna de arramene} \rightarrow \text{a'}. \text{Genna'è Arràmene' } \)
      ‘door of copper’ ‘LIT.: door-'E-copper’
      = a resort name
   b. \( \text{dommu de farra} \rightarrow \text{b'}. \text{Domm'e Farra} \)
      ‘house of flour’ ‘LIT.: house-'E-flour’
      = the name of a museum\(^{29}\)

In (89a), similarly to (88a), \( \text{genna de arramene} \) indicates an object, a door made of copper, while (89a’) \( \text{Genn'e Arramene} \) only denotes the name of a mountain resort in Sardinia, near Baunei. In fact, the sentences below provide some evidences.

90) BAU:
   a. \( \text{Deppemus acconciare sa } \text{genna de arramene} \neq *\text{Genn'e Arramene} \)
      ‘We must repair the door (made) of copper \neq *Genn’e Arramene-resort name’
   b. \( \text{Crasa mengianu obiàmus a } *\text{genna de arramene} \neq \text{Genn'e Arramene} \)
      ‘Tomorrow morning we’ll meet at door of copper \neq Genn’e Arramene-resort name’

In (89b) \( \text{dommu de farra} \) indicates a house made of flour\(^{30}\); (89b’) is one constituent and instead of indicating the material of which the house is made, it takes a more abstract meaning: the whole constituent indicates an old mill, which is now a museum.

91) BAU:
   a. \( \text{In cuss' istoria su panetteri bivìat in-d'una } \text{dommu de farra} \neq *\text{Domm'e Farra} \)
      ‘In that story the baker lived in a house (made) of flour \neq *Domm’e Farra-a name’
   b. \( \text{Andamus a bidere sa } *\text{dommu de farra} \neq \text{Domm'e Farra in Casteddu} \)
      ‘(We) go to see the *house (made) of flour \neq *Domm’e Farra-a name’

Another resort name is \( \text{Genn'e Coggina} \), which opposes to \( \text{genna de coggina} \) ‘the kitchen door’.

92) BAU:
   a. \( \text{una conca de burriccu} \rightarrow \text{b'. una conch'e burriccu} \)
      ‘a head of donkey’ ‘LIT.: a head-'E-donkey’
      = a stupid person, an idiot

\(^{29}\) Actually, \( \text{Sa Domm'e Farra} \) is the name of a museum in Cagliari, which once was a mill.

\(^{30}\) Probably, the sentence in (91a) does not make sense, but if one imagines a children’s story, then a house made of flour becomes possible.
In (90a) *conca de burriccu* indicates a head of a donkey: that is a body part of the animal. On the contrary, in (90b) *conch’e burriccu* is one constituent meaning a person stupid, dumb.

93) BAU:

a. *Su macellaiu at segau una conca de burriccu ≠ *conch’e burriccu*
   
   ‘The butcher has cut a head of donkey ≠ *conch’e burriccu-an idiot’

b. *Giannì iste proprìu una conca de burriccu ≠ conch’e burriccu*
   
   ‘John is really a head of donkey ≠ conch’e burriccu-an idiot’

As already explained, in Baunese, this type of expressions is very common and there are a lot of such compound names, as for example *mam’e terra* ‘earthworm’ or *mam’e sole* ‘a witch’, or some local nicknames *Cul’e Pippa*, *Facc’e Cadena*, *Conch’e Bagna*.

Also some month names are compound nouns as well: *Mes’e Lampaďas* ‘June’, *Mes’e Orgiolas* ‘July’, *Mes’e Nadale* ‘December’.

In his work, Jones (1993) noted such peculiar expressions in Nuorese and showed that «N+de+N sequences can plausibly be analysed as compound nouns».

94) NUO:

a. *una camisa de notte bianca*
   
   ‘a bluse-DE-night white’= a nightshirt

b. *una camisa bianca de notte*
   
   ‘a bluse white -DE-night’

95) NUO:

a. *unu maistru de linna abbistu*
   
   ‘a master-DE-wood clever’ = a carpenter

b. *unu maistru abbistu de linna*
   
   ‘a master clever-DE-wood’ = a carpenter

These examples above, taken from Jones (1993), provide evidences on what has been discussed in the present chapter: such expressions are considered as compound nouns and indeed they cannot be separated by a phrase consisting of more than one word.

Actually, considering Baunese above examples, Jones’s comment is not completely correct, because in (80a’) we saw such expression *su mer’e (sa) idda* and in (84a’) *su mer’e (sa) domo* in which two words can separate the nouns, without producing an ungrammatical example.

---
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My suggestion is that in some cases certain expressions are not compound nouns yet, but they are becoming them: actually, they are in a Construct State phase.

Moreover, according to my proposal “DP-’e-DP” constructions display similar features to the Semitic DP, following Cinque’s (2000) analysis: I have shown some common features with the Construct State in Hebrew in examples (81) and (82).

Actually, finding an explanation about these constructions was not the aim of this study. Nevertheless, after the merging process, in which the core of the constituent is achieved (again, likely similar to the prepositional possessive construction seen on page 40), the whole constituent can be reanalysed as one single word and for this reason, a more idiomatic and wider meaning is assigned to it.

In conclusion, it is has been observed that there is not only one type of such peculiar constructions and that the expressions seen above have different interpretation.
3. ADNOMINAL ADJECTIVES IN SARDINIAN

This chapter will be centred on adnominal adjectives in Sardinian and it will be verified that some adjectives carry different meanings in this Romance language, depending on whether their position is before or after a noun also. Some data will be given to supporte Cinque’s (2005) theory (based on Sproat & Shih’s (1988) distinction between direct and indirect modifiers) on the double sources of adjectives, according to which APs are generated in the same positions in all languages although different raisings may occur due to parametrical variation.

It will be presented that Sardinian usually distinguish between the two types of modifiers through AP-position after or before the noun: only in one case the distinction is morphological clear.

The last two sections will be focused on poetic styles, which influence indirect modifier interpretation, and on so-called “specifier-like” adjectives, APs which can only occur prenominally and have not qualifying features.

3.1 Sardinian and Italian adjectives: some general notes

3.1.1 Some important features of Italian prenominal adjectives

Before describing aspects of Sardinian prenominal adjectives, consider Italian prenominal adjectives, in order to point out some similarities.

As Nespor (1991: 425) claims, an NP can be preceded or followed by one or more adjectives. The choice between the prenominal or postnominal position is not free: they have not only different behaviours, but may also have different possible readings.

96) ITA:
   a. Un bel libro
   b. Un libro bello
      ‘a beautiful book’
   c. una lunga, interminabile attesa
      ‘a long, endless wait’
   d. una persona simpatica e interessante
      ‘a nice and interesting person’

Among prenominal attributive adjectives, those which have a connotative meaning with respect to the noun (i.e. appositive adjectives, which express the speaker’s taste or opinion) produce certain emotions in speakers or listeners:
ITA:

a. Luca è andato a Roma con un suo simpatico amico
   ‘Luca has gone to Rome with a his nice friend’

b. Luca è andato a Roma con un suo amico simpatico
   ‘Luca has gone to Rome with a his nice friend’

In (97b) the involved friend is simply denoted as nice. Luca has gone to Rome with someone who is not-well identified and belongs to the group of “Luca’s nice friends”. On the contrary, in (97a) the speaker who is telling the information expresses an opinion about Luca’s friend: he says indeed that Luca has gone to Rome with a friend and this friend is considered nice by the speaker, but not necessarily by Luca.

Nespor (1991) affirms that appositive adjectives can express the following meanings:

- Evaluations, as in (96a);
- Physical features: un rosso tramonto ‘a red sunset’, un giovane Eugenio ‘a young Eugenio’, le aride colline ‘the arid hills’;
- Inherent characteristics: la bianca neve ‘the white snow’, la buia notte ‘the dark night’.

Furthermore, they can also be used in a metaphorical sense (una bassa soddisfazione ‘a low(=mean, wretched) satisfaction’, alto ingegno ‘high(=a lot of) talent’). Even some denominal adjectives, i.e. derived from a noun, have appositive functions: paterna dolcezza ‘fatherly sweetness’, burocratica lentezza ‘bureaucratic slowness’.

As for Sardinian adjectives, they agree in number and gender with the noun with which they are in relation, and for this reason, they carry a nominal pattern of inflection.

### 3.1.2 Sardinian prenominal adjectives: some important features

This chapter will be centred on adjectives in Sardinian, especially in Baunese, which usually occur in prenominal position.

First of all, two classes of adnominal adjectives can be distinguished, depending on endings:

I  –u, -us/-os; -a, -as

II –e, -es/-i, -is

In the first class, two-ending adjectives are included: masculine and feminine endings (note the two possible endings in plural masculine)

---

98) BAU:

‘beautiful’: *bellu* (m. sng.), *bellos* (m. pl.); *bella* (f. sng.) *bellas* (m. pl.)

‘mad’: *maccu* (m. sng.), *maccus* (m. pl.); *macca* (f. sng.), *maccas* (m. pl.)

99) NUO-LOG:  

   *bellu* > *bellos*;  *maccu* > *maccas*

CAMP:  

   *bellu* > *bellus*;  *maccu* > *maccus*

BAU:  

   *bellu* > *bellos*;  *maccu* > *maccus*

In the second class, one-ending adjectives are included (one ending both for masculine and for feminine):

100) BAU:

   a. **strong**: *forte* (sng.), *fortes* (pl.):

      *su brassu* (m. sng.) *forte* ‘strong arm’; *us brassus* (m. pl.) *fortes* ‘strong arms’

      *sa manu* (f. sng.) *forte* ‘strong hand’; *as manus* (f. pl.) *fortes* ‘strong hands’

   b. **easy**: *facili* (sng.), *facilis* (pl.):

      *su compitu* (m. sng.) *facili* ‘easy homework’; *us compitus* (m. pl.) *facilis* ‘easy homework’;

      (f. sng.) *facili* ‘the easy cake’; *as truttas* (f. pl.) *facilis* ‘the easy cakes’

These classes are the same identified by Jones (1993) and Lepori (2001) as respectively for Nuorese and Campidanese, and the same classes are confirmed in Logudorese too. Only few phonetic differences can be noted:

   - In the first class, the masculine plural ending is only –*os* in Nuorese and Logudorese, only –*us* in Campidanese, whereas in Baunese (a more central dialect) both endings appear.

   - In Campidanese, the second class always has the ending –*i* instead of –*e*, widespread in the rest of the Sardinian dialects.

In conclusion of this overview on Sardinian adjectives, with respect to their position it has to be noticed that they usually occur in postnominal position, as also noticed by Pittau (1972) and by Jones (1993) in Nuorese and by Lepori (2001) in Campidanese, although some can appear both in prenominal and in postnominal position, producing deep changes in meaning.

In the next section, some important features of such adjectives will be discussed basing the analysis on the Sproat & Shih’s distinction between **direct and indirect modifiers** and on Cinque’s (2005) proposal about the double sources of APs.

---
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3.2 Direct and indirect modifiers: the double source of APs

As above anticipated, following Sproat & Shih’s (1988) distinction between direct and indirect modifiers focused especially on Mandarin Chinese, in Cinque (2005) the theory of two possible sources of adjectives is reinforced, providing some evidences from the languages in which morphological features distinguish two types of adjectives (for example Mandarin, Serbian-Croatian-Bosnian, Greek and Maltese).

As for direct modifiers, they are the APs which have been merged in the specifiers of NPs or of their extended projections, whereas indirect modifiers derive from reduced relative clauses.

Moreover, Cinque (2005) specifies that the two types of modifiers are universally generated in prenominal position, though in different projection: in particular, he assumes that «the merge position of relative clauses is […] in the specifier of a projection above a projection hosting the APs merged as direct adnominal modifiers of the NP» (pg. 15).

Still, in the superficial structure the first type of nominal modifiers is always found in prenominal position, while the second type can appear before or after the noun, depending on whether a series of movements happen by mean of which indirect adjectives are apparently shifted in postnominal position.

More precisely, it is explained in Cinque (2005) that the postnominal position of (reduced) relative clauses (RC) is taken to derive from RC-raising to the specifier of higher CP and, after this the insertion of an overt or covert complementizer attracts the remnant NP in the same way as that explained in Chap. 2 for prepositional possessive constructions, following Kayne’s (2001) proposal.

In general, English and Sardinian are seemingly different considering the adjectival system, in that the former does not allow NP-movement across adjectives, whereas the latter does and here adjectives are usually found after the noun (for example, possessive items and the most part of qualifying adjectives).

Still, in this chapter it will be demonstrated that the two languages taken into account share the same basic structure, which becomes evident only in few occasions. The reason of the apparently different word-order is connected with the fact that the movements thanks to which in the Romance language the indirect modifiers are found after the noun happen obligatorily in Sardinian though being optional in English only in some cases (es.: a beautiful dancer VS *a dancer beautiful VS a dancer more beautiful than her instructor).
In addition to this, Cinque (2005) points out that the two origins also imply quite different semantic and syntactic properties, which are respectively:

\[ 97 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIRECT MODIFIERS</th>
<th>INDIRECT MODIFIERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual level</td>
<td>Stage level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-restrictive</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modal interpretation</td>
<td>Implicit relative reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-intersective (adverbial)</td>
<td>Intersective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute interpretation</td>
<td>Relative or absolute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specificity-inducing</td>
<td>(Non)-specificity-inducing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Direct modifiers are also observed invariably nearer the noun and more rigidly ordered than indirect ones.

As also observed previously in Italian, generally in Romance languages prenominal and postnominal adjectives are systematically different in meaning, as explained also by Alexiadou (2001, 2003) and Nespor (1991).

Actually, it will be verified that some adjectives carry different meanings also in Sardinian depending on whether their position is before or after a noun. However, unfortunately, in Sardinian it is not always easy to distinguish when they are direct or indirect modifiers, because of homophony of some direct modifiers with indirect ones. Only one exception is found with the pair *grandi-mannu* ‘great, big’ respectively a direct and indirect modifier.

Thus, it needs to be noticed that four main groups of adnominal adjectives are distinguished in the Sardinian adjectival system:

- Adjectives in which direct and indirect modification are distinct by different morphology and by different positions in a phrase. The only pair with such properties is *grandi-mannu*: the former is a direct modifier and must only occur before the noun; the latter produces an indirect modification and obligatorily appears in postnominal position. (section 3.3.1)

Examples:

\[ 98 \]

BAU:

\[ a. \; una \; grandi \; dommu \; \quad VS \quad *una \; dommu \; grandi \]

’a great house’ \quad ‘a great house (LIT.: a house great)’
b. *una manna dommu VS una dommu manna

’a big house’ ‘a big house (LIT.: a house big)

- Adjectives which have the same form both in direct and indirect modification, and only the position produces a different reading. Crossing data between Baunese with the other Sardinian dialects discussed by Pittau34, Jones35, and Lepori36, it is possible to list such adjectives exhaustively: bellu ‘LIT.: beautiful’, bonu ‘LIT.: good, good-natured’, malu ‘LIT.: bad’, santu ‘LIT.: holy’, pòberu ‘LIT.: poor’, bruttu ‘LIT.: dirty’, bravu ‘LIT.: good-natured’ (section 3.3.2).

Examples: unu bellu cantadore VS unu cantadore bellu:

99) BAU:

a. unu bellu cantadore

’a person who sings beautifully and who is a beautiful (good-looking)’

b. un cantadore bellu

’a singer who is beautiful (good-looking)’

- All the other indirect modifiers, which usually occur after the noun: nevertheless, such adjectives can also appear before the noun but, it is due to a higher register and poetic styles (it will be explained in the section 3.3.3).

For example: as alturas birdes de su Gennargentu ‘LIT.: the mountains green of the Gennargentu37, VS as birdes alturas de su Gennargentu ‘LIT.: the green mountains of the Gennargentu (poet.)’.

- Finally, the forth group formed by adjectives which must appear only before the noun (section 3.4).

The contrast between grandi-mannu, the properties of adjectives which have only one form in direct and indirect modification and, in conclusion, why some indirect modifiers can also precede the noun in particular context will be the subjects dealt in the section (3.3).

34 Pittau (1972: 134) «Solamente quattro aggettivi possono essere anche anteposti al sostantivo: bellu, -a (beautiful); bonu, -a (good); meda (much); santu, -a (holy)»

35 Jones (1993: 42) «… there are a few attributive adjectives which can precede the noun: bellu ‘beautiful’, bravu ‘well-behaved’, bruttu ‘ugly’, poveru ‘poor’, santu ‘holy’.»

36 Lepori (2001: 16) «Gli aggettivi bonu (well-done/well-behaved), malu (not-well behaved), nisçunu (no-one), segundu (second), ùrtimu (last), santu (holy), bellu (beautiful) possono anteporsi al sostantivo…»

37 The highest mountain range in Sardinian.
The final part of the chapter (section 3.4) will be dedicated to other prenominal adjectives described by Jones (1993: 44) as items «with a “specifier-like” function». They are *demonstratives, anaphors, quantifiers, comparatives, interrogative and exclamative elements.*

As in Italian, the “functional” adjectives appear only in prenominal position, whereas the postnominal one is unavailable:

101) ITA:
   a. Ogni giorno
      ‘every day’
   b. *giorno ogni
      ‘LIT.: day every’

102) ITA:
   a. ciascun bambino
      ‘each child’
   b. *bambino ciascuno
      ‘LIT.: child each’

In conclusion, in the next section direct and indirect modifiers will be discussed, taken into account Sardinian in general. Indeed, the Sardinian dialects syntactically share the same features, although some morphological differences: for this reason, the presented examples will be chosen from Baunese, but they are assumed to hold also for Logudorese-Nuorese and Campidanese. Only if it is necessary, examples of other Sardinian dialects will be provided.

3.3  *Sardinian adjectives: direct and indirect modifiers*

   3.3.1  “Grandi” VS “Mannu”

Granđi (grandu in Campidanese and grande in Logudorese)\(^\text{38}\) is an invariable word in every dialect of Sardinian; on the contrary, mannú always agrees in number and gender with the noun with which it is in relation.

103) BAU:
   a. Grandi dommos  VS *grandis dommos
   b. Grandi féminas  VS *grandis féminas

---

\(^{38}\) Wagner (1960-40)
Wagner (1960-64) explains the etymology of the items taken into account here, claiming that *grandi* is an Italianism more used in abstract sense, while *mannu* is more popular and more common and it expresses the meaning of “bigness in size”. What was noted by Wagner is not wrong, but some other observations are possible.

With respect to *mannu*, besides the literal meaning, it can occur also to indicate a “metaphorical bigness” in sarcastic exclamative contexts:

105) **BAU:**

*Nonnoi mannu! A su postu de abbarhare chin su nepode, s’inde bat a cilleri!*

‘What a great granpa! (LIT.: Granpa big! [+neg]) Instead of staying with his grandchild, he always goes to the bar [+neg]’

In addition to this, consider the following examples:

106) **BAU:**

a. *Po sa cóua ant fattu una grandi festa*

‘For the marriage they made a great party’

b. *Po sa cóua ant fattu una festa manna*

‘For the marriage they made big party (LIT.: a party big)’

107) **BAU:**

a. *Cussu sindiu iste unu grandi ómine*

‘that mayor is a great man’

b. *Cussu sindiu iste un ómine mannu*

‘that mayor is a big man (LIT.: a man big)’

108) **BAU:**

a. *Torrandonce cussu dinare as fattu una grandi cosa*

‘Giving-back that money (you) did a great thing’

b. *Cussa macchina fut una cosa manna abberu!*

‘that car was really big (LIT.: that car was really a thing big)’

109) **BAU:**

a. *Bivent in grandi dommos*

‘They live in great houses’
b. *Bivent in dommos *mannas
   ‘They live in big houses (LIT.: in big houses)’

Actually, *grandi* expresses the meaning of English ‘great’ to indicate:
- Active interest and enthusiasm (106a);
- People standing above others in character or attainment or reputation (107a);
- Major significance or importance (108a);
- Something large in size: larger than others of its kind (109a).

On the contrary, in (106b), (107b) and (109b), where the adjective *mannu* appears, it carries a literal meaning referring to the size of something/someone, whereas in (108b) the item is used in a metaphorical sense.

As previously said, the two items are modifiers of NPs and one important difference stands immediately out observing the below examples:

100) BAU:
   a. *Issus tenent una* *grandi* dommu
      ‘They have a great house’
   b. *Issus tenent una dommu* *grandi*
      ‘LIT.: They have a house great’

101) BAU:
   a. *Issus tenent una dommu* mannu
      ‘LIT.: They have a house big’
   b. *Issus tenent una* mannu dommu
      ‘They have a big house’

*Grandi* must only precede the noun; *mannu* must only follow it.

This important feature presented in above examples is certainly crucial in this study: indeed, they show the different nature of the two items.

In the introductory section, it was explained that direct modifiers are found only in prenominal position, whereas the indirect ones can be found before or after the noun, depending on whether the movements thanks to which sometimes indirect modifiers are found after the noun happen in a sentence or not.

Nevertheless, how can one surely affirm that the position of *mannu* is not a consequence of an NP-movement over the adjectives, but that it derives from a reduced relative clause?
The answer to this question is actually immediate and clear: *mannu* (and all the indirect modifiers) can be found in predicative position (i.e., after a copular verb) and in relative clauses, whilst items which cannot appear in predicative position and in relative clauses (like *grandi*) cannot be found after a noun.

110) **BAU:**

a. *Sa dommu de Mariu is' *mannu
   ‘Mario’s house is big’

b. *In s’apposéntu de Mariu, chi is’ *mannu, je cappet un attru armariu.*
   ‘Mario’s bedroom, which is big, has room for another wardrobe’

c. *S’apposéntu chi is *mannu is de Mariu
   ‘LIT.: the room which is big is of Mario’

111) **BAU:**

a. *Sa dommu de Mariu is’ *grandi
   ‘Mario’s house is great’

b. *In sa camera de Mariu, chi is’ *grandi
   ‘Mario’s bedroom, which is great…’

c. *S’apposéntu chi is *grandi...
   ‘LIT.: the room which is great’

Thus, it has been demonstrated that *mannu* is a **predicative adjective** because it can appear in predicative position (namely after a copular verb), in a relative clause and therefore in postnominal position, whereas *grandi* is an **attributive adjective** and can only be found before a noun. Remind that such above mentioned movements are obligatory in Sardinian but facultative and occasional in English (Pg. 57).

Consider now *grandi festa* in (106a), in which the adjective denotes a “very amusing and exiting party”. What is important here is that the “party” is also intended to be “big” even if this feature is a (not obligatory) requirement to be also *grandi*. In other words, if the party were not big but simply beautiful, the adjective *grandi* would become unsuitable, and the adjective *bella* ‘beautiful’ would rather be preferred.

This holds even for other cases, for instance in (109a): *grandi* carries a wider meaning than *mannu* and includes the interpretation of “beautiful and big”, and indeed if the house, however, were not beautiful but only big, *bella* would again replace *grandi*. 
For this reason, in Baunese such following expressions are not possible:

112) BAU:
   a. *Po sa cóua ant fattu una **grandi** festa piccicca
      ‘LIT.: For the marriage they made a great party small’
   b. *Cussu sindiu iste unu **grandi** ómine picciccu
      ‘LIT.: That mayor is a great man small’
   c. *Geo bivo in-d’una **grandi** dommu picciccu
      ‘LIT.: I live in a great house small’

In fact, as already mentioned, it is not completely true to say that **grandi** corresponds or means **mannu**, but rather than this, **mannu** can be a (not obligatory) requirement to be also **grandi**.

Furthermore, referring to the table in (97), where semantic properties of direct and indirect modifiers have been listed, one can observe that **grandi** and **mannu** essentially differ for **absolute-relative reading**: if one says **una dommu manna** ‘a big house’, the house can be denoted as **bigger than another house**, (relative meaning), whereas **una grandi dommu** is “a great house” is an absolute sense.

113) BAU:
   a. **Issus bivent in-d-una dommu manna**
      ‘They live in a big house’
   b. **Issus bivent in-d-una dommu plus manna** (de cussa chi teniant)
      ‘LIT.: They live in a house bigger (than that-one they possessed)’

114) BAU:
   a. **Issus bivent in-d-una grandi dommu**
      ‘They live in a great house’
   b. *Issus bivent in-d-una plur grandi dommu
      ‘LIT.: They live in a greater house’

In other words, **mannu** implies a sort of comparison between two entities. On the contrary, **grandi** can only be understood in an absolute way.

Besides the ambiguity between absolute and relative reading, the pair **grandi-mannu** is ambiguous also between **restrictive and non-restrictive** interpretation:

115) BAU:

   **Mi subengio as grandi dommos de Casteddu** (only non-restrictive)
   a. ‘I remember (all) the great houses of Cagliari’
   b. ‘#I remember the houses which were great of Cagliari’
Thus, as for restrictive and non-restrictive ambiguity, it is possible to note one more difference between the direct modifier *grandi* and the indirect one *mannu*. On the one hand the former is understood in (115) in a general, non restrictive way (“all the houses in Cagliari are great and I remember them”), while the restrictive interpretation is not accessible. On the other hand, in (116) *mannu* has also the restrictive reading (“In Cagliari there are houses and I remember those which are big, not the small ones”) besides the non-restrictive interpretation. This opposition furnishes one more evidence of the indirect nature of modifier *mannu*.

In conclusion of this section, it is possible to say that in Baunese, and thus in Sardinian, the *grandi-mannu* contrast here explained provides evidences for Cinque’s (2005) proposal on the double sources of adjectives. Indeed, in the Romance language it is not always morphologically clear, when an adjective derives from a reduced relative clause or when it is an AP merged in spec-NP. However, the analysed pair represents one exception in this sense which confirms the double origin of APs.

In the next section, the category of items which have one form both for direct and indirect modification will be discussed and some data will be presented. It will be seen that, in this case, the position of adjectives is a decisive factor to distinguish the two types of modifications.

### 3.3.2 A «special» group of adnominal adjectives

The «special» adjectives which are going to be discussed belong to the first class of adjectives, this means they agree with the noun with which they are in relation, and thus they can carry feminine and plural pattern of inflection:

117) BAU:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>bellu, bella</em></td>
<td><em>bellos, bellas</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bónu, bona</em></td>
<td><em>bónos, bonas</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>malu, mala</em></td>
<td><em>malus, malas</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>santu, santa</em></td>
<td><em>santus, santas</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>póberu, pobera</em></td>
<td><em>póberos, poberas</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bruttu, brutta</em></td>
<td><em>bruttus, bruttas</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bravu, brava</em></td>
<td><em>bravus, bravas</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As already anticipated, the «special» adjectives carry different meanings in Sardinian as well as in Italian depending on their position: in postnominal position, they usually express a literal meaning, while prenominally they carry a wider metaphorical interpretation. Jones (1993: 42) claims about prenominal adjectives: «in prenominal position such adjectives convey an affective attitude of appreciation or deprecation rather than describing an inherent property of the referent».

Adopting the Sproat’s and Shih’s (1988) terminology, prenominal items are direct modifiers, whereas the postnominal ones produce an indirect modification.

Differently from *grandi-mannu*, pairs which are going to be presented have the same form both for direct and indirect modification, and only their position can show their real nature.

Consider now in detail, every single adjective presented in the list (117): for each a series of examples taken especially from Baunese will be provided.

(i) “Bellu”

118) BAU:

   a. *Giuanni iste unu bellu piccioccu*
      ‘John is a good boy’
   b. *Giuanni iste un piccioccu bellu*
      ‘John is a beautiful boy (LIT.: boy beautiful)’
   c. *Mariu e Giuanni funtis bellos piccioccos*
      ‘Mario and John are good boys’
   d. *Mariu e Giuanni funtis piccioccos bellos*
      ‘Mario and John are beautiful boys’ (LIT.: boys beautiful)

In example (118), native speakers can easy perceive different meanings though homophony of items. On the one hand, in (118b) and (118d), in which the adjective appears after the noun, it refers essentially to physical features of involved people, therefore they carry a quite literal meaning. On the other hand, in (118a) and (118c), the adjectives *bellu/bellos* refer to their personality: “they are good boys”. In this case, the meaning of *bellu/bellos* corresponds to Italian *bravo* ‘good-natured, good-hearted’, referred to their good attitudes. As a confirmation of what has been said in the previous section about predicative adjectives, observe these other examples:

119) BAU:

   *Cussu piccioccu is’ bellu*
   a. ‘#John is a good boy’
   b. ‘John is a beautiful boy (LIT.: boy beautiful)’
120) BAU:

_Us piccioccos chi funtis bellos accantant subitu trabballu_

a. ‘Boys who are beautiful immediately find a job’
b. ‘Boys who are good immediately find a job’

121) BAU:

_Us piccioccos bellos accantant subitu trabballu_

a. ‘Beautiful boys immediately find a job’
b. ‘Boys who are good immediately find a job (LIT.: the boy beautiful)’

Examples above show that when the adjective is found after the noun, in predicative position and therefore in a relative clause, the only possible interpretation is the literal one, i.e. that which refers to physical features of people. In this case, the wider meaning referred to people’s character is absolutely inaccessible.

Thus, the postnominal _bellu_ (actually a reduced relative clause) is an indirect modifier, whereas the prenominal one produces a direct modification of the NP. Besides, in (120) and (121) the adjectives have also a restrictive reading.

One more example can be a little clearer:

122) BAU:

_Giuanne iste unu cantadore bellu_

a. ‘John is a singer and also a beautiful person’
b. ‘John sings beautifully’

123) BAU:

_Giuanne iste unu bellu cantadore_

a. ‘John is a singer and also a beautiful person’
b. ‘John sings beautifully [even if he is not beautiful]’

Actually, the minimal pair in (122) and (123) differs in the **intersective and non-intersective reading**. On the one hand, in (122) where the adjective appears after the noun, refers directly to the referent _cantadore ‘singer’_ (“he is beautiful and nice, and is a singer”: intersective). On the other hand, in (123), in which the adjective precedes the noun, also the non-intersective adverbial reading is possible (“he sings excellently, beautifully”), besides the more literal interpretation “J. is a beautiful person”.

In other words, the _beauty_ of this person is not a fundamental requirement to be also a good singer, but it can be a circumstantial feature. Still, Sardinian speakers can immediately perceive that the expressions are not equivalent in meaning.
As counterevidence, if the singer were not so beautiful and nice, the postnominal position would be inaccessible.

Actually, the Baunese parallelism can be compared with Cinque’s (2005) analysis about a beautiful dancer, shown in (124) and (125). In fact, in English the ambiguity is found in prenominal position, whereas postnominally (in comparative contexts) the interpretation can only be non-intersective:

124) ENG:  
Olga is a dancer more beautiful than her instructor (unambiguous: intersective)
   a. ‘O. is a dancer who is also a more beautiful person than her instructor’
   b. ‘# O. dances more beautifully that her instructor’

125) ENG:  
Olga is a beautiful dancer (ambiguous: intersective, non-intersective)
   a. ‘O. is a dancer and also a beautiful person’
   b. ‘O. dances beautifully’

A certain asymmetry is noted between (122)-(123) and (124)-(125).

In conclusion, after having considered the examples above, it would be correct to say that unu bellu cantadore bellu, ‘a good beautiful singer (LIT.: a beautiful singer beautiful)’, denotes a singer who sings beautifully (non-intersective, adverbial reading) and who is also a beautiful person (intersective reading). Moreover, it is not possible to say that unu bellu piccioccu ‘a beautiful boy’ has the same meaning as unu piccioccu bellu ‘LIT.: a boy beautiful’: actually, the direct-modifier bellu can include also “references of physical features” but they are not fundamental characteristics to be a good boy. Analogously to unu bellu cantadore bellu, it is also possible to have unu bellu piccioccu bellu ‘a good beautiful boy (LIT.: a beautiful boy beautiful)’, but not %unu bellu piccioccu leggiu ‘LIT. a good boy ugly’: even if it is not completely ungrammatical, it is not really total accepted. Indeed, as already mentioned, bellu can include in its meaning physical characteristics, still they are not absolutely necessary to be also a good person.

(ii) “Bonu”

126) BAU:  
   a. Unu bonu dottore dat sempre sa cura giusta  
      ‘A talented doctor always gives the right cure’
   b. Us pippius non timent unu dottore bonu  
      ‘Children do not scare of a good-natured doctor (LIT.: doctor good- natured)’
   c. Us bonos dottores dant sempre sa cura giusta  
      ‘The talented doctors always give the right cure’
d. *Us pippius non timent us dottores bonos*

‘Children do not scare of good-natured doctors (LIT.: doctors good- natured)’

In examples above, it is shown that *bonu* referring to ‘doctors’ skill” usually appears in prenominal position. On the contrary, when *bonu* occurs postnominally in (126b) and (126b) doctors’ good- natured qualities are expressed.

Again the pair is ambiguous in *intersective-non intersective* reading and also *restrictive-non restrictive* interpretation. In Baunese the adjective *bonu* can precede or follow food and beverage names. In this case, the pair is ambiguous between *individual-level and stage-level* reading.

127) **BAU:**

a. *Una bona birra frisca*

‘A good frish beer (LIT.: a good beer frish)’

b. *Una birra bona frisca*

‘A good frish beer (LIT.: a beer good frish)’

In (127a)-(127b), the adjective *bona* appears in different positions: in (127a) it precedes the noun *birra*, whilst in (127b) it is found after, carrying a different meaning. The postnominal adjective refers to the taste and the quality of the beverage, therefore to “physical features” of beverage (stage-level reading), whereas in prenominal position the good quality (individual-level reading) is expressed.

The same parallelism can be observed with the noun *coffee*:

128) **BAU:**

a. *Unu bonu caffè is sighiu de una bona sigaretta*

‘A good coffee is followed by a good cigarette’

b. *Unu caffè bonne t’inde scidat subitu*

‘A good coffee wakes you up immediately (LIT.: a coffee good)’

In point of fact, when the item *bonu* occupies the postnominal position, the word undergoes a phonetic weakening, and so the first consonant usually is not pronounced. Therefore, expressions in (127b) and (128b) should be pronounced [bìrra-òna] or [kaffè-ònu]. One could think that it could represent a distinction between direct and indirect modifier, ([bónu] is the direct modifier; [ònu] is the indirect one) but in effect the contrast disappears when the expression is in plural: *birras bonas* ‘LIT.: biers good(pl)” [birrar·bonas]; *caffès bònos* ‘LIT.: coffee good(pl)” [kaffer·bônos].

As already mentioned, rhotacism separates sounds in words and the consonant can again be heard. What can be deduced is that it is not a morphological distinction between two types of modifiers, but a simple phonetic phenomenon.
Having verified that the phonetic weakening in expressions like (127b) and (128b) is due only to phonetic phenomena, still I deem it is necessary to write the whole word in such expressions, even if the first consonant is not always pronounced.

Jones (1993: 42) with respect to Nuorese notices that bonu usually occurs after a noun, but prenominally it is found only with abstract substantives (129a)-(129a‘):

129) NUO:

a.  un’ idea **bona**  VS  a’.  **una bona** idea
   ‘LIT.: an idea good’  ‘a good idea’

b.  **vinu bonu**  VS  b’.  *bonu vinu
   ‘LIT.: wine good’  ‘good wine’

Note that in examples (127a) and (128a) the adjectives can be replaced by the item bella/bellu always carrying the meaning “good”. This interpretation belongs to the “wide meaning” which prenominal direct modifier can have.

Actually, a Campidanese native speaker points out that una bona birra or unu bonu caffe’ sound a little strange to him. His perception is that in this case the adjective bonu/bona are better to be replaced by bellu/bella, as said for Baunese:

130) CAMP:

a.  **Una bona birra**  VS  a’.  **una bella** birra
   ‘a good beer’  ‘LIT.: a beautiful beer’

b.  Unu **bonu cafei**  VS  b’.  Unu **bellu cafei**
   ‘Good coffee’  ‘LIT.: a beautiful coffee’

131) CAMP:

a.  **Una birra bona**  VS  a’.  *una birra bella
   ‘LIT.: a beer good’  ‘LIT.: a beer beautiful’

b.  **Unu cafei bonu**  VS  b’.  *Unu cafei bellu
   ‘LIT.: a coffee good’  ‘LIT.: a coffee beautiful’

As it is possible to observe, Nuorese example (129b’) is in plain contrast with (128b) and (130b), in that this latter is considered acceptable by Baunese and Campidanese speakers. In conclusion, the adjective bonu used in postnominal position is an indirect modifier (derived from a relative clause), whereas in prenominal position it is a direct modifier. Besides the non-intersective and intersective reading and the non-restrictive and restrictive reading in (126), the individual-level and stage-level reading in (127), the expression bonu+N and N+bonu differ between the **absolute and relative** reading.
Consider again (128): *unu caffè bonu* is a “a coffee better than another coffee (in comparison with another one)”, whereas *unu bonu caffè* is a “good coffee” in an absolute sense.

(iii) “*Malu*”

As for the meaning, Wagner (1960-64) indicates Italian “cattivo, maligno”, ‘bad, malicious’, and in fact these interpretations are found when they occur after the noun. On the other hand, again in prenominal position another meaning is provided.

132) BAU:

a. *Babbai non m’at mai dau unu malu ingittu*
   ‘My father has never given wrong advice’

b. *Un pulitziotto non dat un ingittu malu*
   ‘A policeman cannot give wicked advice (LIT.: advice wicked)”

c. *M’as dau malus ingittus e non soe errenescia a erribbare in tempus…*
   ‘You gave me wrong markings and I cannot arrive on time’

d. *Us ingittus chi funtis malus non serbint…*
   ‘Advices which are wicked are not useful’

In (132b) and (132d) one is speaking about bad advice (in life), meaning wicked advices, while in (132a) and (132c) these are wrong, but not necessarily wicked: for instance, taking with you a gun is a wicked advice, whereas trusting everyone could be wrong (but not wicked).

Again, the type of modification is distinguished not through morphology, but through the position of the AP in a sentence, which causes a change in meaning. The predicative *malu* is the indirect modifier and can only mean literally “wicked, bad”, whereas the direct modifier, appearing before the noun, denotes something more than “wicked”: it means “wrong, in a wrong way”.

(iv) “*Santu*”

133) BAU:

a. *Unu sant’ómine iste bravu e tenet meda passientzia chin tottus*
   ‘A holy man is good-natured and patient with everyone’

b. *Un ómine santu iste ecchine iste stettiu canonizau.*
   ‘A holy man (LIT.: man holy) is who was canonized’

c. *Us santus ómites funtis bravus e tenent meda passientzia chin tottus*
   ‘Holy men are good-natured and patient with everyone’

d. *Us ómines santus funtis cussus chi funtis istettiu canonizau.*
   ‘Holy men (LIT.: men holy) are these who were canonized’
You can also have the following metaphorical use:

134) BAU:
   a. *Nonnói fut unu sant’ ómine: boliat sempre giogare chin us pippius*
      ‘Grandpa was a holy man: he always wanted to play with children’
   d. *Nonnói fut un ómine santu ca fut bonu e bravu che a Santu Nicola*
      ‘Grandpa was a holy man (LIT.: man holy): he was good-hearted like Saint Nicolas’

In (134b), in which *santu* is found after the noun, the adjective is understood as a figurative simile between a “simple man” and a “saint”.

On the one hand, *santu* in postnominal position usually refers to *canonised saints* but, metaphorically, also to *simple good-hearted people*. On the other hand, *santu* as direct modifier occurs in prenominal position and can only refer to a good-natured person, who is not necessarily a real saint. Pay attention to following examples, where one speaks about real saints.

135) BAU:
   a. *Santu Nicola dd’ant fattu ómine santu poîtte fut bravu meda e at fattu miraculus.*
      ‘Saint Nicolas was canonised as holy man (LIT.: man holy), because he was a good-natured man and did miracles’
   b. *%Santu Nicola fut un santu ómine ca fut meda ’onu*
      ‘Saint Nicolas was a holy man (LIT.: man holy), because he was very good-natured’
   c. *Santu Nicola e Sant’ Antoni ddus ant fattus ómines santus, poîtte furint bravus e ant fattu miraculus*
      ‘Saint Nicolas and Saint Antony were canonised as holy men (LIT.: men holy) because they were good-natured men and did miracles’
   d. *%Santu Nicola e Sant’ Antoni furint santus ómines, ca furint bonos*
      ‘Saint Nicolas and Saint Antony were holy men (LIT.: men holy), because they were good-natured’

(135a) and (135d), although he will consider grammatical, a native will not accept completely them, because the prenominal adjective indicates a good-hearted person, not a saint. What Jones (1993) explains about the same item *santu* in Nuorese is that in postnominal position the adjective «must denote one who has been canonised or, at least, has taken holy orders»39, as saints.

---

39 Jones (1993: 42)
When the adjective is found after the noun, namely it is a predicative adjective, only the indirect modification is allowed (136)-(137):

136) BAU:
   a. *Padre Pio commo iste santu
      ‘LIT.: Father Pio now is saint’
   b. *Nonnoi is santu
      ‘LIT.: Granpa is saint’

137) BAU:
   a. *Padre Pio, chi iste santu, at fattu miraculus
      ‘LIT.: Father Pio, who now is saint, made miracles’
   b. *Nonnoi, chi is santu…
      ‘LIT.: Granpa who is saint’

Furthermore, when the adjective *santu* appears in exclamative expressions, the following parallelism is noted:

138) BAU:
   a. *Oh, Pedru santu (miu)!*
      ‘LIT.: Oh, Peter holy!’
   b. *Oh, Santu Pedru!*
      ‘LIT.: Oh, holy(=Saint) Peter’

In (138), *santu* occurs in two different positions which determine again different readings. In the exclamative phrase (138a), *santu* can only refer to a person, whose name is *Pedru*, but not to the saint: it corresponds to English “dear” or Italian “benedetto”.

139) ENG:
   (My) dear boy!

140) ITA:
   a. *Benedetto ragazzo (mio)!*
      ‘LIT.: blessed boy (my)’
   b. Ragazzo (mio) benedetto!
      ‘LIT.: Boy (my) blessed’

On the other hand, the expression in (138b) can only refer to a real saint (Saint Peter). One last remark: in Baunese, when one speaks about someone who is dead, it is used the word *biade* ‘defunct, late’ before the definite noun: *biade nonnói* ‘the late granpa’, *biade Professor X* ‘the late Professor X’, *unu biade nonnói* or *unu biade nonnói*. The word taken into consideration can only occur prenominally as a kind of epithet.
(v) “Póberu”

141) BAU:

\[ Us \text{ poberos omines de cussa ditta trabballant troppu, mischinus! } \]

a. ‘(All) the men who work in that company work very hard: they find themselves in a bad (general) situation, how poor!’

b. ‘In that company there some men who work hard and they are poor (=have economic problems), how poor!’

142) BAU:

\[ Us \text{ omines poberos de cussa ditta trabballant troppu, mischinus! } \]

a. ‘(All) the men who work in that company work very hard: they find themselves in a bad (general) situation, how poor!’

b. ‘In that company there some men who work hard and they are poor (=have economic problems), how poor!’

143) BAU:

a. \textit{Cuss’omine is poberu} \\
‘that man is poor’

b. \textit{Cuss’omine chi is poberu is morindosi de su famene} \\
‘That man who is poor is dead hungry’

On the one side, in (141) the \textit{poor} in prenominal position denotes men “in a difficult situation but they do not have necessarily economic problems”. On the other side, in (142) the postnominal position denotes men “who are in a very difficult economic situation”.

Furthermore, the item in different position is ambiguous between restrictive and non-restrictive reading. Even for \textit{poberu}, indeed, the deduction is confirmed that the prenominal position produces a direct modification and the sentence (141) is interpreted non-restrictively, whereas \textit{poberu} found after the noun (142) is an indirect modifier and conveys both readings.

Consider one more peculiar aspect in the above sentences: all the examples end with an exclamative locution “\textit{mischinu!”}^{40}, which expresses pity for someone. As later shown in following examples and in the table (145), \textit{mischinu} can be followed by a definite noun:

144) BAU:

a. \textit{Mischinu babbu tuu, angasi malàidu!} \\
‘LIT.: Poor father your, so ill!’

\footnote{Mischinu ‘poor’ has nothing to do with Italian \textit{meschino}, which means \textit{mean}.}
b. **Mischinu su bigginu: at tentu unu incidente chin sa macchina**
   ‘LIT.: Poor the mayor: he had an accident with the car (of him)!’

c. **Mischina una mama chi siddi morit unu figgiu!**
   ‘LIT.: Poor a mother if/who SI-to-her dies a son!’

d. *Mischina una mama*
   ‘LIT.: Poor a mother’

Note that, while in examples (144) and (144b) *mischinu* is followed by a definite noun, in (144c) it is followed by a noun preceded by an indefinite article. Actually, (144c) is ambiguous, because the item *chi* can be both a complementizer introducing a conditional sentence (*…if her son dies*), and a relative pronoun referred to “mother” (*a mother, whose son dies*). In this latter case, the pronoun introduces a restrictive relative clause, which defines the indefinite NP *una mama*, thus the sentence is grammatical.

Now, comparing Sardinian with English, Italian and Veneto, one can find some common features.

145)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prenominal Adj. (bad situation)</th>
<th>Postnominal Adj. (economic problems)</th>
<th>Exclamative expressions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BAU</strong></td>
<td><em>Póberu</em>+NP</td>
<td>NP+<em>póberu</em></td>
<td>- «Mischinu*+NP!* » «Poberu <em>(NP)!» - «Mischinu!</em> »; «Poberittu!* »</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ITA</strong></td>
<td>Povero+NP</td>
<td>NP+povero</td>
<td>- «Povero+*(NP)!» - «Poveretto (NP)!»; «Poverino (NP)!»</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VEN</strong></td>
<td>poro+NP</td>
<td>NP+<em>pòvaro</em></td>
<td>- «Pòro+*(NP)!» - «Pòrèto *(NP)!»</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENG</strong></td>
<td>poor+NP</td>
<td>%NP+<em>poor</em></td>
<td>- «Poor+NP!* » - «Poor!* »</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observing the table in (145), on the one hand, no relevant differences are noted between Baunese and Italian with respect to the behaviour of the «special» adjective *poor* in prenominal or postnominal position: the word, indeed, does not have any morphological change. On the other hand, a peculiar feature in Veneto needs to be considered.

---

41 According to Cinque (1994), in English adnominal adjectives usually appear prenominally, the postnominal position being open to reduced relative clauses only. Moreover, he points out that such position of adjectives is available with an intonational break, which lets one perceive a hidden relative clause: *A man, (which is) poor and ill, has…*
Indeed, depending on the position of the item, the word changes the morphological aspect: *porate* appears in prenominal position, *un poro tôxo* ‘poor(=in a bad situation) boy’ but *un tôxo poro*, whereas *porate* appears only postnominally, *un tôxo porate* ‘a boy poor(=economic problems)’, but *un porate tôxo*.42

Thus, it is possible to deduce that Veneto distinguishes morphologically between the direct (*porate tôxo VS *un tôxo poro*) and indirect modifier (*un tôxo porate VS *un porate tôxo*).

Still, the most peculiar features in table (145) are found in the column of exclamative expressions. In Italian, besides *poveretto!*, even the item *poverino!* can be heard and both can be followed (not obligatorily) either by a definite noun or by an indefinite noun followed in turn by a restrictive relative clause, as previously seen.

On the contrary, Baunese and Veneto seem to share some properties with respect to exclamative locutions. Indeed *mischinu!*, whose behaviour has already been discussed above, can appear alone or followed by a noun which usually carries definite features.

Two more exclamative words can be found there: *poberittu!* (it cannot co-occur with a noun) and *pôberu* (it needs to be followed by a noun as *pôberu cristianu!* ‘poor christian(=person)’, *pôberu femina!* ‘poor woman’). The pair of items here considered *poberittu (*N)* – *pôberu *(N)* shares the same features as the Veneto pair, *poarêto *(N)* – *porate *(N)*.

In Veneto, actually, the form *porate* has to be followed by a noun (like *pôberu*), usually without an article43; on the contrary, *poarêto* cannot be a noun (as well as *poberittu*). Nevertheless, Sardinian *poberittu* cannot appear in predicative position (146), differently from Venetian *poarêto* (147):

146) BAU:

*Cuss’ômine iste (unu) poberittu!*

‘LIT.: That man is (a) poor!’

147) VEN:

Che l’òmo là, l’è (un) poarêto!

‘That man is (a) poor!’

---

42 The percentage symbols show that the expression is not really ungrammatical, although it is not properly accepted. Native speakers explain that the expression seems to be influenced by standard Italian.

43 Some Veneto native speakers claim that in few special cases, *porate* can be followed by a noun in turn preceded by a definite article; for example in metaphorical and sarcastic senses: *porate el (me) toxo!* ‘poor the (my) boy!’: *porate l’omo!* ‘poor the man!’
In conclusion, in Sardinian the item *poberu* too provides different reading depending on its position in the DP, and this helps us to distinguish between direct and indirect modifier: when *poberu* appears before the noun, then it is a direct modifier and carries a restrictive unambiguous interpretation (141); on the contrary, when it occupies the position after the noun, both restrictive and non-restrictive readings are possible (142).

In Veneto the distinction is clearer that in Sardinian: indeed, the direct modifier is *pòro* (*un poro tòxo VS *un tòxo poro*), whereas the indirect modifier is *pòvaro* (*un pòvaro tòxo VS un tòxo pòvaro*).

(vi) “Bruttu”

The adjective *bruttu* is apparently similar to Italian *brutto*, but in fact they are an example of “false friends” 44. Actually, it was translated by Jones (1993) as ‘ugly’: in Sardinian, however, *bruttu* in postnominal position mean “dirty, not clean”, whereas the meaning of ‘ugly’ is carried by the other postnominal adjectives *féu* and *lègiu*, respectively in Nuorese-Logudorese and Central-South Sardinian varieties. In Baunese, the item which means “ugly” is *legiu*, derived from Catalan *lleig* 45, whereas *féu*, in northern dialects derives from Spanish *feo* and Portuguese *feio*.

When *bruttu* appears in postnominal position, the adjective carries the literal meaning, instead, before the noun is understood with a pejorative interpretation: it reinforces more negatively an expression which has already a negative sense.

148) BAU:

a.  *Cussu bruttu burriccu de Mariu non is begnu a iscola*

‘That stupid (LIT.: That dirty donkey of) Mario did not come to school’

b.  %*Cussu burriccu bruttu de Mariu non is begnu a iscola*

‘%Mario’s donkey (LIT.: That donkey dirty of Mario) did not come to school’

c.  *Cussus bruttus burriccus de Pedru e de Giuanni non puntis begnus a iscola òe*

‘Those stupid (LIT.: Those dirty donkeys of) Peter and John did not come to school’

d.  %*Cussus burriccus bruttus de Pedru e de Giuanni non puntis begnus a iscola*

‘%Peter and John’s donkey (LIT.: Those donkeys dirty of P. and J.) did not come to school’

---

44 This is confirmed by [www.ditzionariu.org](http://www.ditzionariu.org)

45 Observe that in Alguerese, a variety of Catalan which is spoken in Sardinian, the word meaning “ugly” is *feu* though being in Catalan *lleig*: it is easy to notice that Alguerese undergoes the influence of northern Sardinian dialects, in which the used word is just *feu*. 
In (148b) and (148d) *burriccu* refers to the animal (the donkey) and the names in the prepositional constructions are interpreted as Possessors of the involved *dirty donkeys* ‘not-clean donkeys’. On the other hand, *bruttu* in prenominal position conveys a metaphorical depreciatory meaning: here the two people, respectively *Mario* in (148db) and *Peter and John* in (148d), are considered as “stupid and fool” as donkeys. Sardinian speakers, furthermore, state that the whole DP, for instance *cussu bruttu burriccu*, refers to a so stupid person that he/she disgusts them.

Besides this aspect, *bruttu* is often used to insult someone with imprecations and especially in exclamative locutions:

149) BAU:

a. **Bruttu stupidu!**
   ‘LIT.: dirty stupid!’

b. **Bruttu töntu!**
   ‘LIT.: dirty idiot!’

c. **Bruttu scemo!**
   ‘LIT.: dirty dumb!’

d. **Bruttu geniosu!**
   ‘LIT.: dirty nice’

Above in (149), *bruttu* is followed by adjectives of negative sense and, as already said, it reinforces them negatively. On the contrary, if the following adjective has a positive sense, the expression turns out to be ungrammatical (149d).

Still, return above and pay attention to examples in (148a) and (148c), in which *bruttu* appears before the noun *burriccu*. Actually, this is not interpreted as a real noun: it is a noun with an adjectival function, a sort of «adjectivilised noun».

However, in (150), with two «normal nouns» (a common noun *maistru* and a proper name *Mariu*) ungrammatical expressions are produced:

150) BAU:

a. **Bruttu maistru!**
   ‘LIT.: dirty teacher!’

b. **Bruttu Mariu!**
   ‘LIT.: dirty Mario!’

A Campidanese speaker, trying to explain what the word *bruttu* means prenominally, affirms that it expresses a subjective, emotional sense. He says that *bruttu* does not describe objective aspects of reality and, because of this, it is used especially in exclamative expressions, when one wants to let somebody else know what he is feeling at that moment.
In other words, adjectives which appear in prenominal position convey a more subjective reading, differently from adjectives after the noun which denote something more objective.

Returning to the double source of APs, again with *bruttu* the indirect modification is provided in postnominal position, in which the item means “dirty, not clean”, and the same reading is found also in predicative position, namely after a copular verb:

151) BAU:

\[ \text{Us pantalones chi funtis *bruttu* ddus deppo gettare a sciacquare} \]

‘I must wash up the trousers which are dirty’

(151) is an example in which the adjective *bruttu* is found both in a restrictive relative clause and in predicative position, after the verb *to be*. As a confirm for what has been said, here the adjective is an indirect modifier which has a restrictive reading, as in general indirect modifiers.

(vii) “Bravu”

When the adjective *bonu* was previously discussed, it was said that it means “good-natured, good-hearted”, when it occurs in prenominal position. The item *bravu*, actually, carries a similar meaning: it refers to good abilities doing something, “good, talented”.

152) BAU:

a. *Unu bravu* maistru ingittat medas cosas noas
   ‘A good teacher teaches a lot of new things’

b. *Us pippius picciccus non timent unu maistru bravu*
   ‘Children did not scare of a good-natured teacher (LIT.: teacher good)

c. *Us bravus maistrus chi si faent errespettare funtis us mengius*
   ‘Good teachers make themselves respected are the best’

d. *Us maistrus chi funtis bravus accattant subitu unu trabballu*
   ‘Children did not scare of good-natured teachers (LIT.: teachers good- natured)

Actually, when *bravu* is found in postnominal position their good-hearted nature is expressed in (152a) and (152d): in these examples a restrictive reading is perceived and in particular in (152d) the adjective appears in a restrictive relative clause after the copular, therefore it is a predicative item. Besides the items essentially differ for the interective and non-interective reading: on the one hand, (152a) and (152c) the adjective carries a adverbial (non-interective) interpretation; on the other hand, (152b) and (152d) the adjective is understood in an interective reading.
Thus, *bravu* behaves in the same way as the so-called «special» adjectives (which have the same form for direct and indirect modification): indeed, the adjective in prenominal position is a direct modifier, whereas in postnominal position it modifies indirectly the NP. As counterevidence, one can observe that in (152b) only the literal meaning referred to “teacher’s skill” is accessible, and the reason is that in this case *bravu* can only be an indirect modifier.

In conclusion of this section, it is possible to say that in a certain sense as Mandarin or Greek also Baunese (thus, the whole Sardinian) provides evidences for Cinque’s (2005) proposal on the double sources of adjectives.

Indeed, besides adjectives which distinguish morphologically between direct and indirect modifiers as *grandi* and *mannu*, there are also some other belonging to the so-called «special group» (for example *bellu*, *santu*, *bruttu*...) which do not show morphological differences, but the position within a DP plays a leading role in this sense.

Moreover, as it has been demonstrated, when these adjectives are found after the noun they are indirect modifiers and they convey a *restrictive, stage-level, intersective and relative reading*. On the contrary, in prenominal position they can only be direct modifiers, carrying a *no-restrictive, individual level, non-intersective (adverbial) and absolute reading*.

As previously said, since in general there is a parameter according to which indirect modifiers can be found before or after the noun, it needs to be pointed out that in Sardinian their accessible position is only postnominal. Actually, this is a feature which distinguishes the Romance language from English, where on the contrary indirect modifiers usually appear before the noun.

In the next section, I will discuss about some adjectives which can appear in prenominal position, but in fact they are indirect modifiers. As it will be later explained, it is possible only in particular cases which produce marked expressions, in particular for the influence of poetic styles.

### 3.3.3 The influence of poetic and high styles on adjectives

As already anticipated, during my research, I ran into some other adjectives which can appear in prenominal position even though they are *indirect modifiers* and it has been said that in Sardinian this is usually not possible (section 3.2).

These items, which will be discussed in this section, actually have been undergone in this case the influence of poetic styles or so high writing styles.
Previously it was also said, that these cases have not been included in the «special» group, because in this group items which can occur in both the positions in “normal stile”, therefore in non-marked expressions were included.

Still, the adjectives altu and celesti will be presented and in particular with these, someone could object that they in prenominal position acquire a wider “celestial” meaning.

Actually, I have preferred not to include the two mentioned adjectives in the group of bellu, santu, etc…, because poems or songs are not taken from all-day Sardinian and besides the used language could be influenced by standard Italian.

Anyway, I deem it necessary to present the collected data in order to reinforce Cinque’s (2005) proposal of the double source of APs.

(i) “Diciósu”

The adjective derives from the noun sa dicia ‘luck, happiness’: according to Wagner (1960-1964), its etymology must be related, to Spanish dicha and (old) Catalan dixta, which carry the same meaning. Thus, diciosu is a denominal first class adjective which indicates ‘who has good luck’, as in Spanish dichoso.

Diciosu usually occurs in postnominal position, but in some cases it appears also prenominally: this happens in songs, poems or exclamative locutions. Although different positions in a sentence, no fundamental changes in meaning are noted, but simply the change into a higher register is perceived.

The word diciosu is usually used in contexts of religious prayers:

153) LOG-NUO:

a. (…) Ei sa gratia nos donet // in vida e in sa morte. // Ei sa diciosa sorte// in Paradisu…

‘LIT.: And (God) the grace us gives // in life and in the death. //And the lucky // in Paradise’

b. De sas intragnas diciòsas naschet su bellu fiore

‘LIT.: from the breast lucky is born a beautiful flower’

c. Sa ditzosa sorte nos diat in paradisu

‘LIT.: the lucky luck (He) us gives in Heaven!’

\[46\] Taken from Deus ti salvet Maria, the Sardinian version of “Ave Maria”

\[47\] www.ditzionariu.org

\[48\] www.ditzionariu.org
Furthermore, *diciosu* usually recurs in exclamations as for example\(^{49}\):

154) **BAU:**

  a. **Diciosa Maria: galu istudiendo e giai trabbalando!**
     ‘How lucky Mary: she has still studied but she has already a job!’
  b. **Diciosu cussu piccioccu chi s’at couàu sa figgia de Paule!**
     ‘How lucky that boy who is going to marry Paul’s daughter!’
  c. **Diciosu unu piccioccu chi istudiat e trabbalat!**
     ‘How a lucky boy if/who studies and works’
  d. ***Diciosu unu piccioccu.***
     ‘(LIT: Lucky a boy)’

Here a similar characteristic as “*mischinu!*” and “*diciosu!*” is observed: first of all, note that (154c), as (144c), is ambiguous: again, the element *chi* can be both a complementizer (“if”-clause) and a relative pronoun (it introduces a relative clause, which defines the indefinite NP *unu piccioccu*).

Secondly, in (154a), (154b) the adjective precedes definite DPs as *Maria ‘Mary’* and *cussu piccióccu* ‘that boy’, whereas in (154d) the simple indefinite DP leads to an ungrammatical expression.

(ii) **“Celesti”**

Literally, it refers to the light blue colour: actually, it is a loanword taken from Italian, because in Baunese the same colour is *color’e celu*\(^{50}\) (=light blue), or *colorichelu* in Logudorese-Nuorese\(^{51}\).

Still, when it appears after the noun it indicates the colour, whereas when it precedes the noun, it usually refers to Celestial things (Heavenly provenance):

155) **CAMP:**

   **Celesti tesoru**\(^{52}\)
   ‘Celestial treasure (LIT.: light blue treasure)

156) **BAU:**

   a. **Tenet us oglos color-‘e-celu**
   ‘He has light blue eyes’

---

\(^{49}\) The opposite word of «*diciosu!*” in exclamative expressions is «*maladiciau!*’ how unlucky’

\(^{50}\) *Color’e celu* ‘colour-’E-sky’ can be considered as a compound noun similar to those analysed in 2.6

\(^{51}\) Taken from www.ditzionariu.org

\(^{52}\) Taken from the Christmas song *Celesti tesoru*
Between prenominal and postnominal position is noted a clear change of meaning, but actually, being (155) poetic verse and the word derives from Italian, the prenominal position probably is an influence of the standard language.

(iii)  "Dulce"

As for celesti, the same comments can hold also for this adjective. Indeed, the literal meaning “sweet” is provided in postnominal position: in prenominal position the meaning is “sweet, soft”.

157)  NUO-LOG:

(...) dulzos innos de gloria cantende (...)\(^ {53}\)

‘LIT.: sweet hymns of glory singing’

Thus, in (157) dulzos does not refer to taste, but to hearing: Baunese and Campidanese too display the same idiomatic interpretation for this word, but again in poems or in general “in poesia” (=traditional songs).

158)  BAU:

Sa trutta is dulce

‘the cake is sweet’

The adjective in predicative position carries a more literal meaning, referred to taste of the cake.

(iv)  "Altu"

On the one side, it refers literally to height, as physical feature and when it occurs after a noun, it indicates somebody or something tall. On the other side, when it is found before a noun, it refers to Heavenly provenance, more precisely to God:

159)  NUO-LOG:

a.  s’Altu Re\(^ {54}\)

‘the High King’ =God

b.  Su re altu

‘LIT.: the king tall’

Comparing these two expressions, it has to be noted that they carry a different reading: (159a) refers to God, thus it provides a metaphoric meaning; on the contrary, (159b) refers to a king (who is) tall. Therefore, in (159a) the prenominal position leads to a wider meaning: the “King” indicates God (one more time as someone of Heavenly provenance).

---

\(^ {53}\) Taken from the Christmas song Andammas a sa Grutta

\(^ {54}\) Taken from the Christmas song Naschind’est
This word is one more time related with the Celestial subject.

160) LOG-NUO:
   a. *Su divinu Sennore*\(^{55}\)
      ‘the divine Lord’ = God
   b. *su Sennore divinu*
      ‘LIT.: the Lord divine’ = God

In (160), even though the adjective appears in different positions (before or after the noun) the same meaning is maintained: the only difference is that in (160a) the prenominal position conveys a higher and more refined style, but again it can be also an influence of Italian.

In my data, I came across also examples with *misteriosu* ‘mysterious’ (161a), *tristu* ‘sad’ (161b), *umanu* ‘human’ (161c), *birde* ‘green’ (162), adjectives which usually occur in postnominal position, but because of poetic and marked styles they can also appear before the noun and this causes a change of register and sometimes of meaning.

161) CAMP:
   a. *(...) misteriosas allegrias (...)\(^{56}\)*
      ‘LIT.: mysterious happiness(f.pl.)’
   b. *No teniàus tristus pensamèntus (...)\(^{57}\)*
      ‘LIT.: (we do)not hold sad thoughts’
   c. *(...) totu is umanus sentidus (...)\(^{58}\)*
      ‘LIT.: all the human feelings’

162) BAU:
   a. *As birdes alturas de su Gennargentu*
      ‘LIT.: the green rises of the Gennargentu’
   b. *As alturas birdes de su Gennargentu*
      ‘LIT.: the rises green of the Gennargentu’

\(^{55}\) Taken from the prayer *Deus ti salvet Maria* (Ave Maria)

\(^{56}\) Taken from a Christmas song *In sa Notte Profunda*.

\(^{57}\) From “*Le Poesie: i compaesani*” by Luciano Melosu

\(^{58}\) From “*Pruini e nudda*”-Narrativa in Lingua Sarda
Actually, (162) is not taken from poems or novels: an interviewed native speaker gave it to me pointing out that it is available only «in poesia», i.e. in traditional songs.

In particular, the contrast between (162a) and (162b) shows what Cinque’s (2005) affirms about indirect modifiers which can occur before or after the noun, stressing that in the first case it causes a marked reading. He claims that one of the main differences between English and Italian is that the former provides a certain ambiguous reading in prenominal position (*His MOST UNSUITABLE unsuitable acts* is ambiguous between a restrictive and non-restrictive reading), whereas the latter is ambiguous in postnominal position (*I greci industriosi PIÙ INDISTRIOSI* ‘LIT.: The Greeks industrious most industrious’, ambiguous in restrictive – non-restrictive reading).

Consider Baunese examples in (162) which can be explained in the following way:

163) BAU:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{As alturas birdes de su Gennargentu} (unmarked style: ambiguous reading)
\item a. ‘In the Gennargentu all rises are green’ (non-restrictive)
\item b. ‘In the Gennargentu there are rises, some of them are green, some others are bare’ (restrictive)
\end{itemize}

164) BAU: (poetic style: unambiguous reading)

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{As birdes alturas de su Gennargentu}
\item a. ‘In the Gennargentu all rises are green’ (non-restrictive)
\item b. ‘In the Gennargentu there are rises, some of them are green, some others are bare’ (restrictive)
\end{itemize}

On the one hand, in (163), where the adjective is found after the noun, the expression is understood to be ambiguous between **restrictive and non-restrictive reading**, therefore it confirms that *birdes* ‘green’ is a indirect modifier. On the other hand, in (163) the adjective provides only one reading, the non-restrictive one: the poetic style deprives the indirect modifier of the restrictive reading.

Actually, if one thinks about the meaning expressed in (164), what can be image is that the *Gennargentu* is a green mountain chain, in other words the non-restrictive reading gets the better of it.

Anyway, note that the poetic style exerts its influence also on the pair *grandi-mannu* and, since the morphological distinction between the direct (*grandi*) and the indirect (*mannu*) modifier, it might probably better show what exactly happens in poetic contexts.

---

\[^{59}\text{Larson & Marušič (2004, 275)}\]
Consider examples in (115) and (116), reported here in (165) and (166):

165) BAU:

_Mi subengio as grandi dommos de Casteddu_ (only restrictive)

a. ‘I remember (all) the great houses of Cagliari’

b. ‘#I remember the houses which were great of Cagliari’

166) BAU:

_Mi subengio as dommos mannas de Casteddu_

a. ‘I remember (all) the big houses of Cagliari’ (non-restrictive)

b. ‘I remember the houses which were big of Cagliari’ (restrictive)

As already explained in the section 3.3.1, the direct modifier _grandi_ is understood in (165) only in a non-restrictive way (“All the houses in Cagliari are great and I remember them”), while the indirect modifier _mannu_ in (166) has also the restrictive reading (“In Cagliari there are houses and I remember those which are big, not the small ones”) besides the non-restrictive one. Furthermore, it has been said that in Sardinian indirect modifiers must occur after a noun and an expression as *una manna dommu* is considered as being ungrammatical by native speakers.

Still, if one imagines the above ungrammatical expression in a poetic context, what is noticed is that the phrase is no longer so ungrammatical, but it becomes acceptable.

167) BAU: (poetic style: unambiguous)

_Mi subengio as mannas dommos de Casteddu_

a. ‘I remember (all) the big houses of Cagliari’ (non-restrictive)

b. ‘#I remember the houses which were big of Cagliari’ (restrictive)

In (166), where the adjective occupies the prenominal position due to the poetic style, _mannu_, usually endowed with **restrictive and non-restrictive reading**, loses the restrictive one, only the general, non-restrictive interpretation remains possible.

Thus, it happens the same as what has been noted in (164) with _birde_.

Actually, the reason of the loss of the restrictive reading could be connected with the fact that the movements thanks to which the reduced relative clause (the base of indirect modifiers) is shifted after the noun happen obligatorily, whereas in English, for example, they are optional. Following this intuition, one hypothesis could be that the **“poetic licence”** allows the indirect modifiers to stay in their original position, blocking such described movements though being obligatory raisings.
Nevertheless, this hypothesis cannot completely explain the loss of the restrictive reading, in that in this case the ambiguity between the restrictive and non-restrictive reading should somehow be maintained. Unfortunately, this is not what happens in Sardinian: in fact, in the Romance language a change in meaning is produced, and the restrictive interpretation is no longer possible.

In point of fact, such indirect modifiers like *mannu*, *birde*, which undergo a meaning change when they occur prenominally because of the poetic license, in this case are perceived as being no longer as derived from restrictive relative clauses, but as a sort of direct modifiers.

In other words, an alternative hypothesis might be that the “poetic licence” forces an indirect modifier to be interpreted as a direct one: every prenominal adjective is forced to be understood as direct modifiers.

In conclusion, the cause of the strange and marked word order in (164) and at the same time the acceptability of the expression might probably be due to the poetic licence, which forces some indirect modifiers like *birde* in (164) and *mannu* (166) to be interpreted as direct modifiers.

In the first part of Chap. 3, it has been demonstrated that Sardinian, as other languages, but differently from Italian, distinguishes between direct and indirect modifiers: in the most part of cases the distinction is connected with the position of adjectives in DPs (before or after the noun), but in one case the difference in shown morphologically too (see the grandi-mannu contrast). At the end, a section was dedicated to some adjectives which usually behave like indirect modifiers, but they can also undergo the influence of poetic, marked styles and thanks to this the can appear before the noun. In this case, such adjectives might be supposed to be forcedly interpreted as being direct modifiers, because the prenominal position causes in them a slight change of meaning, in comparison with the postnominal counterparts.

In the second part of this chapter, prenominal not-qualifying adjectives (defined by Jones as “specifier-like adjectives”) will be discussed: the study will be focused on items which are labelled by the traditional Grammar as “adjectival determiners”. In this group are included: demonstratives and other determiners, quantifiers and in conclusion interrogative and exclamative elements.
3.4 Prenominal “specifier-like” adjectives

3.4.1 An overview

In the first part of this chapter, I have discussed about adnominal adjectives which can occur before or after a noun for different reasons: nevertheless, this does not usually happen in Sardinian because, as previously said, adjectives in general appear in postnominal position. It was also said that prenominal position causes a slight change of meaning, rendering the interpretation quite more subjective.

In the next section, I will deal with some other prenominal adjectives, which does not have attributive functions: they have been labelled in the traditional grammar as demonstrative, anaphoric, numeral, interrogative and exclamative adjectives.

Jones (1993: 44) states that «adjectives with a specifier-like function always precede the noun». Some Sardinian examples will be presented inspecting the different categories of adjectives, always focusing on Baunese but sometimes also on the two main varieties, Logudorese-Nuorese and Campidanese, in order to emphasize some common features.

3.4.2 Demonstratives: “Custu, cuddy, cussu”

These items can be both adjectives and pronouns, depending on whether they appear within the DP, or not. They are usually labelled as deictic elements, which denote whether or not a specific subset of a noun is intended. The use of demonstratives is up to the relation between the speaker and the listener: the distance (not only physical but also temporal) of the involved participants from other things or people in surroundings creates this relation.

As Blasco Ferrer (1988) points out, Sardinian in general maintains the Latin contrast between HIC, ISTE, ILLE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAT</th>
<th>HIC</th>
<th>ISTE</th>
<th>ILLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>Custu</td>
<td>Cussu</td>
<td>Cuddu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>Questo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quello(^{60})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Futhermore, Blasco Ferrer (1988) notices that the tripartition is mantained in Baunese also in local adverbs, as follows: inóngi ‘here’, igùi ‘there’, inèlo ‘over there’.

\(^{60}\) In Italian there is another demonstrative which has fallen in disuse: codesto. It indicated what was near the listener.
At first sight, it is possible to say that custu-cussu-cuddu are in direct contrast from one each other: the first indicates what is near the speaker, the second what is near the listener and the third should denote what is “further” from both the participants.

168) BAU:

a. **Cust’omine; custa fémina** > **custus ómines; custas féminas**
   ‘This man; this woman’
   ‘these men; these women’

b. **Cuss’ omine; custa fémina** > **cussus ómines; cussas féminas**
   ‘That man; that woman’
   ‘those men; those women’

c. **Cudd’ omine; cudda fémina** > **cuddus ómines; cuddas féminas**
   ‘That(far) man; that(far) woman’
   ‘those(far) men; those(far) women’

Blasco Ferrer (1988) notes that in Baunese there is an opposition between custu and cussu, whereas this latter has changed a bit the meaning, indicating now what is “further” in general. As consequence of this, cuddu is usually used to refer to what one does not know. Thus, on the one hand if custu-cussu are directly opposed (custu introduces the Rhema, what is new, whereas cussu indicates the Thema, what has already been mentioned), on the other hand cuddu is used to refer to a (temporal and local) far and indefinite situation or entity. Just to convenience, the gloss to explain the meaning of cuddu will be indicated as “that(+time,+loc.)”, to distinguish it from the gloss of cussu “that”.

As for cuddu in effect, what is expressed in (169) by this word is a kind of reduced restrictive clause: «do you remember THAT man WHO once…? He now…». The reference is always far in past, different from cussu, which can also referred to the present.

169) BAU:

**Cudd’omine chi m’ìat erregallau as berbes inc’est a su spidale**

‘That(+time,+loc.) man who gave me sheep is in hospital’

It is easy observed that the three elements agree in gender and number with the noun which they precede, in that they carry overt-nominal pattern of inflection.

Some examples in the other varieties are given here below:

170) LOG-NUO⁶¹:

a. **Custu triballu lu fato deo**
   ‘I will do this work’

b. **A cuss’ómine deo lu connosco**
   ‘I know that man’

---

⁶¹ The examples in (170) and (171) are taken from www.ditzionariu.org
c. *Ite at a fagher cudh’òmine
‘What will that man do?’

171) CAMP:
   a. De custu votu no potzu trantziri
      ‘I cannot remove myself from this vote’
   b. Cudha fiuda est torrendisi a cojai
      ‘That(+time,+loc.) widow is returning-herself (=again) to marry’

Being determiners, demonstratives do not allow the co-occurrence with articles (both definite and indefinite). Here below there are some Baunese examples, but the same holds for the whole Sardinian.

172) BAU:
   a. *Su/*unu custu traballu
      ‘The/a this work’
   b. *Su/*unu cussu traballu
      ‘The/a that work’
   c. *Su/*unu cuddu traballu
      ‘The/a that- work’

As in other languages, demonstratives in Sardinian can be preceded by the invariable universal quantifier *tottu* ‘all’:

173) BAU:
   a. Tottu custus/cussus/%cuddus pippius funtis malàïdus
      ‘all these/those/those(far-time) children are ill(m.pl.)’
   a’. Tottu cuddas pippius chi t’ppo narau funtis malaidus
      ‘all those(already mentioned) children(m) who I told you are ill’
   b. Tottu custas/cussas/%cuddas pippias funtis malàidas
      ‘all these/those(those(far) children are ill(f.pl.)’
   b’. Tottu cuddas pippias chi t’ppo narau funtis malaidas
      ‘all those(already mentioned) children(f) who I told you are ill’

Later some other features of *totti* will be discussed in the section dedicated to it.

One last comment about demonstratives, as already mentioned, they can also appear as pronoun, in particular when they occur in predicative position.
3.4.3 “Propriu” and “matessi”

In Sardinian, two words are found which have the meaning of “the same” or “self”: in north Sardinian *matessi* is more common, whereas in the south if the island *propriu* occurs more often. It is confirmed also by Wagner (1960-64), according to whom the origin of the two items must be dated back to the Catalan and Spanish influence: CAT. *mateix* > SRD *matessi*; CAT. *propi* and SPA. *Propio* > SRD. *Propriu, propiu*.

Anyway, they occur in prenominal position and are invariable in gender and number. They are an anaphoric element, namely their reference depends on the reference of other elements: they refers to something just mentioned in the context.

According to the first principle of the Binding Theory, reflexives (and reciprocals, such as "each other") are anaphoric elements and must always be bound in their domains, therefore also *matessi* and *propriu* share the same features.

Now consider some examples taken from Baunese:

174) BAU:

a. *Su propriu picciocchêddu de s’attra ìa*62
   ‘The same boy of last time’

a’. *Su picciocchêddu propriu de s’attra ìa*
   ‘The boy exactly (emph.) of last time’

b. *Commo ti fasso sa propriu dimanda*
   ‘Now I will ask you the same question’

b’. *Commo ti fasso sa dimanda propriu*
   ‘Now I will ask you the same thing’

It is possible to observe that *propriu* appears before the noun (174a) and (174b) meaning “the same”, whereas in postnominal position as in (174a’) gives emphasis to the expression, like an adverb, or in (174b’) it leads to an ungrammatical expression.

Speakers who do not have Baunese as mothertongue but as L2 very often use the item *stessu* instead of *propriu*, as for example *su stessu picciocchêddu*. However, older speakers judge it as an interference of standard Italian.

---

62 Blasco Ferrer (1988: 99)
Some examples taken from other dialects:

175) CAMP:
   a. *Dh'at torrau a fai sa própiu domanda*\(^{63}\)
      ‘He has asked him the same question again’
   b. *Teneus is matessi ideas*\(^{64}\)
      ‘We have the same(pl.) ideas’

176) NUO-LOG:
   *Amus bidu sos matessi ómines, sas matessi féminas*\(^{65}\)
      ‘We saw the same men, the same women’

As shown in example (175b) in certain Campidanese dialects besides *propriu* also *matessi* is found, and it agrees in number with the noun which it precedes, unlike Baunese and Nuoresse-Logudorese, and in contrast with Wagner who states that *matessi* is invariable. Differently from *propriu* which can sometimes occur after the noun but with an emphasized meaning, *matessi* cannot absolutely.

3.4.4  “Attru”

Differently from the invariable words *propriu-matessi*, this item agrees morphologically with the noun which it precedes: namely, it has usually overt agreement features and cannot absolutely occur postnominally.

177) BAU:
   a. *attru piccióccu; attra picciòcca* VS *piccioccu attru; *picciocca attra*
      ‘the other boy; ‘the other girl’
   b. *attros piccioccos; attras piccioccas* VS *piccioccos attrus; * piccioccas attras*
      ‘the other boys; ‘the other girls’

As already anticipated it is a prenominal element and can occur also as a pronoun.

It can co-occur with determiners but the reading changes a little. If fact, in (178a) one observes that *attru* provides a non-restrictive reading, when no determiners appear; on the contrary, the reading becomes restrictive, when *attru* is preceded by a determiner (178b).

178) BAU:
   a. *Sa cida passata appo pigau attros libbrus.*
      ‘Next week I bought other books’

---

\(^{63}\) Taken from www.ditzionariu.org
\(^{64}\) Taken from Lepori (2001: 40)
\(^{65}\) Taken from www.ditzionariu.org
b. *Sa cida passata appo pigau us attros libbrus.

‘Next week I bought the other books’

(178a) can be compared with (179a), where the object is in leftward dislocated and the resumptive pronoun dus is necessary as a clitic: in this case, the article or the demonstrative is obligatory. On the contrary, (149d) shows the object in its canonical position and here determiners are optional. Two possible meanings are produced in (149b): with determiners ‘two definite books’ are denoted; without them one speaks about ‘two whatever books’. ‘I will buy those(m.) other(m.pl.) two(m.pl.) books tomorrow’

179) BAU:

a. *(Us) attros libbrus dus pigo crasa

‘The other two books I will buy (them) tomorrow’

b. Crasa pigo (us/cussus) attros duus libbrus

‘Tomorrow I will buy (the/those) other two books’

In (180), it is possible to observe the collocation of attru with some other prenominal elements.

180) BAU:

a. Attros duus libbrus

b. *Duus attros libbrus

‘two other books’

181) BAU:

a. Medas/pagus attros libbrus

b. *Attros medas/pagus libbrus

‘Many/few other books’

In (181a) and (181b) attru appears near two quantifiers: attru precedes duus ‘two’, but it must follow medas-pagus ‘many/few’.

As for the universal quantifier tottu, the item attru can co-occur also with it, but in this case a definite article is obligatory (182a).

182) BAU:

a. tottu us attros libbrus

‘all the other books’

b. donni’ attru libbru

‘every other book’

On the other hand, (182b) gives an example, where attru precedes the quantifier donnia, which in turn obligatorily occurs in prenominal position.
3.4.5 **Quantifiers**

As for these elements, Giusti (1993) provides some data to demonstrate that quantifiers are heads of highest nominal projections, adding that in certain cases, they act as NP modifiers, similar to adjectives.

Adopting Giusti’s (1993) classification, I will study examples with **definite and indefinite quantifiers** in Baunese, and sometimes it can be useful taking examples from other Sardinian varieties.

What distinguishes the two types of quantifiers is the referential function, which is shown by the use of determiners, articles or demonstratives (Giusti, 1993): *tottu us pippius* ‘all the children’; *donnia pippiu* ‘every child’.

In particular, with respect to **indefinite quantifiers**, they play a leading role in the existential construction in all Sardinian. Indeed, both intransitive and unaccusative verbs can appear in the existential construction, in which the verb agrees with a phonetically null element in [spec,IP], whereas the post-verbal subject is plural and is introduced by an indefinite quantifier. The co-occurrence of these factors allows the indefinite quantified postverbal subject of intransitive and unaccusative verbs to be replaced by the clitic *inde* (corresponding to Italian *ne*).²⁶

**Definite quantifiers**: “*tottu*” and “*ambos*”

(i) “*Tottu*”

In this study, examples with *tottu* have previously been presented. It has been said that in Baunese *tottu* is an invariable word and it is confirmed also in Campidanese, whereas Jones (1993) states that in some Nuorese dialects the plural form of *tottu* is found when the item precedes numerals:

183) NUO:

* Tottas tres feminas

‘All three women’

Also the co-occurrence of this word with demonstratives in (173) and with *attru* in (182) has already been observed. Besides of this, the universal quantifier taken into account is also found in such peculiar expressions:

184) BAU:

a. *At iscuttu unu puínu a tottu fortza*

‘He drew an all-strength fist’

---

²⁶ For a deeper study on the existential construction in Baunese refer to Secci (2003).

²⁷ Jones (1993: 38)
b.  *S’ind est andau a tottu fua*
   ‘He IND has gone himself all-gallop’

c.  *Non boggio abbarrare a tottu vida in presone*
   ‘I do not want to stay all-life in prison’

d.  *At ploppiu a tottu notte*
   ‘It rained all-night’

These locutions are considered as being a kind of idioms and they are shared in other dialects. In general in (184) the universal quantifier gives more emphasis to the expressions, but in particular in (184c) and (184d) the emphasized meaning is “the whole night/life” (in German it correspond to *ganz; die ganze Nacht* ‘the all night’). Here Nuorese and Campidanese examples are reported:

185) NUO:
   [*Tottu bida*] 68
   ‘All life’

186) CAMP:
   [*Totu vida*] 69
   ‘All life’

(ii) "*Ambordus*"

It means “both” and in Baunese it incorporates the numeral *duus* ‘two’.

It is labelled by Jones (1993) as dual quantifier: indeed, it always appears followed by the verb in 3rd person plural form. The example blow shows that it can occur also alone, as a pronoun:

187) BAU:
   *Ambordus (cassadores) ince calāis a igùi*
   ‘Both hunters go over there’

Wagner (1960-64) explains that the item derives from Italian *ambedue* and states that in Logudorese only *ambos duos* ‘noth two’ is found. On the contrary according to Jones (1993), some speakers use the items *ambos-ambas* in order to show a gender opposition (188a)-(188b), whereas some others use *ambas* both in the feminine and the masculine (188c).

188) NUO:
   a.  *Ambos duos ómines*
   ‘Both men’

---

68 Pittau (1972: 134)

69 Lepori (2001: 39)
b. **Ambas duas feminas**
   ‘Both women’

c. **Ambas duos ómines**
   ‘Both men/women’

In addition to this, Jones (1993) observes that *ambos* can also be used without numerals, and in this case it always shows pattern of inflection: *ambos ómines, ambas feminas.*

Comparing the Baunese item *ambordus* with the Italian counterpart *entrambi* an important difference can easy be noted. Consider the following expressions:

189) **ITA:**
   
   Entrambi i bambini
   ‘Both the children’

190) **BAU:**
   
   a. **Ambordus pippius**
   b. *Ambordus us pippius*
   ‘Both children’

191) **NUO:**
   
   **Ambos (duos) pizzinnos**
   ‘LIT.: both-(two) children’

What can be noted is that in Italian the universal definite quantifier is followed by a determiner, whereas in Sardinian the article is absent. Finally, as said above, the item can also occur alone, as a pronoun, but it cannot absolutely occur after the noun, in postnominal position: *ambordus cassadores* VS *cassadores ambordus.*

**Indefinite quantifiers**

(i) “*Dónnia*”

This invariable indefinite quantifier always occurs in prenominal position and has a distributive value.

192) **BAU:**
   
   a. *M’inde peso donnia mengianu a is sette*70
   ‘Every morning I INDE get-up myself at seven’
   
   b. *Ant dau un erregallu a donnia pippiu*
   ‘They gave a gift to every child’

---

70 Taken from Blasco Ferrer (1988: 114)
c.  Donni'annu, donnia mese, donnia cida, donnia die, donnia minetu
   ‘Every year, every month, every week, every day, every minute’

d.  *Annu donnia; mengianu donnia…
   ‘LIT.: year every; morning every’

Actually, according to Lepori (2001: 39), donnia is more frequent in central and southern dialects, whereas in Logudorese and particularly in Nuorese the item cada is more common: it has almost completely fallen into disuse in Campidanese.

193)  LOG-NUO\(^\text{71}\):
   a.  Cada cristianu at a ischire ite depet fâghere
       ‘Every man will write what he has to do’
   b.  Cada pacas dies andhat a dommo de sa pitzoca
       ‘Every few days he goes to his girlfriend’s house’

As it is possible to note, also cada is invariable in gender and in number and must always appear before the noun, otherwise it leads to an ungrammatical expression.

   (ii)  ‘Meda-pagu’

The two opposite items usually are found in prenominal position, but it is not strictly fixed: indeed, they can also follow the noun, but in this case Baunese speakers point out the marked intonation (note the exclamation mark in (194b) and (194d)). Both agree in number with the noun they precede, but not in gender: meda-medas; pagu-pagus.

194)  BAU:
   a.  Amus biu meda/pagu binu eriserannotte
       ‘Last night we drank much/little wine’
   b.  Amus biu binu meda/pagu eriserannotte!
       ‘Last night we drank much/little wine (LIT.: wine much/little)’
   c.  Medas/pagus pippiu je teniat in iscola.
       ‘There were many/few children at school’
   d.  Pippiu medas/pagus je teniat in iscola!
       ‘There were many/few children at school (LIT.: children many/few)’

As shown in the example above, and as Jones stresses, meda, pagu and troppu (which we will see later) can quantify singular uncountable nouns (194a) and (194b) as well as countable ones (194c) and (194d).

\(^{71}\) Examples taken from www.ditzionariu.org
Last two examples show the existential construction, previously explained. Nevertheless, (194b) and (194d), in which the indefinite quantifiers follow the nouns, are possible only in exclamative contexts.

195) BAU:

a. *J’at medas/pagus attros libbrus bellos angasi
   ‘There are many/few other so beautiful books’

b. *J’at attros medas/pagus libbrus de bèndere
   ‘LIT.: there has other many/few books to sell’

In (195), the property (already mentioned on section 3.4.4) depending on which the indefinite quantifiers taken here into account cannot follow the item *attru ‘other’ is shown.

In Nuorese too, as Jones (1993) notes, *meda and *pagu occur after the noun particularly to emphasise the quantity:

196) NUO:

a. Amus bitu meda/pagu vinu
   ‘We drank much/little wine’

b. Amus bitu vinu meda/pagu [+emph.]
   ‘We drank wine much/little’

(iii) “Troppu”

This word means ‘too much’ and it is another element which usually occurs in prenominal position. As an adjective it is invariable (197a)-(197c), whereas as a pronoun it carries plural (not gender) morphological features (198).

197) BAU:

a. Inc’at troppu sale in sa menestra
   ‘There is too much salt in the soup’

b. *Troppos dommos rovinant su logu
   ‘LIT.: too-many houses ruin the territory’

c. Troppu dommos rovinant su logu
   ‘Too much houses destroy the territory’

198) BAU:

As dommos funtis troppus/*troppas
   ‘The house are too-many(m.pl)/*too-many(f.pl.)’

The contrast between (197b) and (197c) shows that *troppu in plural form leads to an ungrammatical expression.
(iv) “Pariccios”

Pariccios, which appears only in plural form though agreeing in gender, is an item attested in Baunese (199) also in Campidanese (200) and Nuorese-Logudorese (200):

199) BAU:

*Je teniat pariccias macchinas*

‘There were several cars (LIT.: there was several cars)’

200) CAMP:

*In parícius annus is matas funti crédias parícias metrus*

‘In several years the trees have grown up several meters’

201) NUO:

*Inue parizzos annos esti istadu*

‘He was here several years’

Unlike meda, pagu and troppu, which can quantify uncountable and countable nouns as well, pariccios can only occur with countable nouns.

202) BAU:

*Nos amus buffau paricciu binu erisero*

‘LIT.: We have drunk several yesterday’

Differently from some other quantifiers, pariccios cannot absolutely appear in postnominal position or in predicative position.

(v) “Nesciunu”

This indefinite quantifier is found in Baunese can be a pronoun an adjective and agrees in gender, but not in number, with the noun it precedes.

203) BAU:

a. *Nesciun’ómine iste angasi bellu*

‘No man is so handsome’

b. *Nesçiuna fémina iste angasi bella*

‘No woman is so beautiful’

c. *Nesćiun’attru ómine…*

‘No other man…’

d. *Attru nesçiunu…*

The item can also be a pronoun and in this case it can appear in predicative position:

---

72 Taken from www.ditzionariu.org

73 Wagner (1960-64)
204) BAU:

No appo bidiu a nesciunu
‘I did not see anyone’

According to Lepori (2001), nesciunu appears in Campidanese too as an adjective.

205) CAMP:

a. No tenit nisciun’amigu
   ‘He does not have any friend’

b. Nisciuna fémina du podit nai
   ‘No woman can say it’

(vi) “Calegunu” and “Unuscantus”

First of all, also calegunu can be an adjective as well as a pronoun. On the other hand unuscantus can only be an adjective. Both of the items occur in prenominal position: calegunu lies before singular nouns, whereas unuscantus with plurals. The postnominal position is for them unavailable.

206) BAU:

a. J’at galu calegunu pippìu malaidu
   ‘There is still some ill child’

b. Je tenet galu unuscantus pippius malàidus
   ‘There are still some ill children’

207) CAMP:

a. In calincunu logu dhoi nd’at de su chi ses circhendi
   ‘In somewhere there is some of what you are looking for’

b. Si contu unus cantus miràculus chi at fatu frà Nàssiu de Làcuni
   ‘I tell you some miracles which Brother Nassiu from Laconi did.’

208) NUO:

Còmporami carki ampulla de vinu
‘Buy me some bottles of wine’

In Nuorese the counterpart of calegunu is found: carki (208). As for the latter item unuscantus, Jones (1993) confirms that the pronoun unu in plural form in some dialect, especially in Campidanese, appears with cantu to express an indeterminate quantity.

74 Taken from www.ditzionariu.org
75 Jones (1993: 35)
209) SRD:

*Unas cantu (de) berbekes*

‘Some sheep’

In (209), taken from Jones (1993: 34), an example is reported and it seems to be implied that it is a Campidanese expression, however, for phonological properties it more likely seems a Nuorese example (‘sheep-plural’: *berbèkes* Nuorese; *brebéis* Campidanese; *berbès* Baunese). Moreover, according to Jones (1993), the optional presence of the preposition might indicate a partitive construction.

(vii) Numerals: cardinal and ordinal numbers

Number system is in Sardinian is rather similar to Italian.
The position of cardinal numeral is the prenominal one, whereas the postnominal is inaccessible.

210) BAU:

a. *Appo connottu tres (duas, quattro,… centu) feminas in trenu*

‘I met three/two/four/a hundred women in train’

b. *J’ant a esse unus degge pippius*

‘There may be still some ill children’

211) CAMP:

*Unus bint’òminis*

‘About twenty men’

With respect to complex nouns, they are formed through the combination of simple nouns: sometimes it is necessary to add a conjunction “e” ‘and’ to form them: *mill’e ducentos* ‘one thousand and two hundreds’.

212) NUO:

*Duus milliones de ómines*

‘Two millions of men’

On the other contrary, if cardinal numbers are similar to Italian counterparts, ordinal numbers display some peculiar properties.

As Lepori (2001) describes about Campidanese (but this feature is shared also with Baunese) ordinal numbers as *primmu* ‘first’ and *segundu* ‘second’ are found, but after these the expressions “article+DE+cardinal number” are more common, although there are such forms derived from Italian as *tertzu* ‘third’ and *quantu* ‘fourth’.

---

76 Jones (1993: 41)
213) **BAU:**

*Primmu, segundu, su ’e trees, su ’e quattro […] su ’e degge…*

‘first, second, the-’E-three (third), the-’E-four (fourth) […]’, the-’E-ten’

214) **CAMP:**

*Primmu, segundu/sicundu, su de tresi, su de cuatru*

‘first, second, the-’E-three (third), the-’E-four (fourth)’

As for Nuorese, Jones (1993: 41) claims that ordinals which are similar to Italian «apart from minor phonological changes» are less common: apart *primmu* and *sicundu*, are rarely used in colloquial speech, while it is more common to hear a **periphrastic construction.** Lepori (2001) stats that ordinal numbers are compounded from “article+of+cardinal”.

215) **NUO:**

*primu, sicundu, tertzu, cuàrtu, cuinu, sestu, settimu, ottavu, nonu, dekimu…*

‘first, second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth…’

Actually, the mentioned “article” behaves as a determiner, a kind of “pronominalized article”: e.g. *sa de duus* > **LIT:** “cussa de duus” ‘LIT.: that of two’. This pronoun is similar to German pronouns *der, die, das*, which can be determiners and relative pronouns:

216) **GER:**

a. Die Frau hat einen Brief geschrieben: **das** war ziemlich lang

‘The woman wrote a letter: **this** was quite long’

b. Die Frau hat einen Brief geschrieben, **das** ziemlich lang war

‘The woman wrote a letter which was quite long’

Besides of ordinal numbers, in Baunese such pronoun is found in (reduced) relative clause:

217) **BAU:**

a. *Inc’appo leàu sa macchina (chi is) de Mariu a sciacquare*

‘I have brought Mario’s car to be washed (LIT.: the car which is of)’

b. *Inc’appo leàu sa (macchina chi is) de Mariu a sciacquare*

‘I have brought that of Mario to be washed (LIT.: which is of)’

Anyway, with respect to ordinal numbers, Baunese speakers prefer to use such expressions in (213):

218) **BAU:**

a. *Iste sa primmu ìa chi bèngio inongi*

‘It is the first time that I come here’

b. *Iste sa ’e trees bias chi bèngio inongi*

‘It is the third (LIT.: -three) time that I come here’
c. *custu iste su ’e tres/su ’e degge biàggius a Casteddu chi fasso*

‘It is the third/the tenth time that I come here’

Note that in Baunese *primmu* does not agree in gender with the noun it precedes. This is confirmed also by Lepori (2001: 17) in Campidanese: he says that *primu, segundu* and *urtimu* (this latter will be discussed in the next section) can also be used in masculine although they are followed by a feminine noun:

219) CAMP:
   a. *Sa segundu borta ; sa segunda borta*
      ‘The second(inv.) time; the second(f.sng.) time’
   b. *S’urtimu borta; s’urtima borta*
      ‘The last(inv.) time; the last(f.sng.) time’

(viii) “Ultimu”

As mentioned above, this item is considered as belonging to the class of ordinal numbers. In all Sardinian varieties, it appears in prenominal position and can have overt nominal agreement features. Still, it can also occupy a predicative position, as shown in (220c).

220) BAU:
   a. *Custa is s’ultima ia chi ti mutto*
      ‘This is the last time which (I) you call’
   b. *S’ultima macchina chi is colada fut fuìndo meda*
      ‘The last car which is passed was speeding a lot’
   c. *Custa pinna is s’ultima*
      ‘That pen is the last one’

221) CAMP\(^{77}\):
   *Is úrtimas cartúcias*
   ‘The last cartridges’

222) NUO\(^{78}\):
   *s’úrtimu tretedhu\(^{79}\) de caminu l’aiamus fatu abbellu*
   ‘We went slowly in the last tract of street’

---

\(^{77}\) Taken from www.ditzionariu.org

\(^{78}\) Taken from www.ditzionariu.org

\(^{79}\) *Tretedhu* is the diminutive of word *trettu* which means ‘space, tract’
(ix) **Certu**

According to Lepori (2001), this item appears in Campidanese both as an adjective (*unu tzertu amigo* ‘a certain friend’), and as pronoun (*tzertus nanta* ‘some say…’). Actually, what has been said about Campidanese holds for all Sardinian dialects, as shown in examples below:

223) **BAU:**
   a. *Certos piscadores piscant accantu non podent*
      ‘Certain fishers fish where they cannot’
   b. *Non connoscio certos foèddos de su sardu*
      ‘I do not know certain Sardinian words’

224) **CAMP**
   a. *Biu tzertus piccioccus*
      ‘I see certain boys’
   b. *unu tzertu amigu*
      ‘A certain friend’

225) **NUO**
   a. *B’at galu zente ki subra tzertas cosbas b’andat galu cuntra*
      ‘There are people who go still against about certain subjects’
   b. * Custos modos de narrer chi s’agattan in tzertas biddas…*
      ‘These idiomatic expressions which are found in certain towns…’
   c. *Una tzerta nave*
      ‘A certain ship’

(225c) is an example taken from Jones (1993), who states that *tzertu* in plural can have function as a determiner, but in singular it must be preceded by an indefinite article: *tzertas naves VS una tzerta nave*.

226) **BAU:**
   a. *Certas macchinas funtis bellas*
      ‘Certain cars are ’
   b. *As macchinas funtis certas*
      ‘LIT.: The cars are certain/sure’

---

80 Taken from Lepori (2001)
81 Taken from www.ditzionariu.org
82 Taken from www.politicaonline.net
83 Taken from Jones (1993: 62)
In contrast with Italian, *certu* or the corresponding items in other Sardinian varieties is not found in postnominal position or in predicative one\(^{84}\).

### 3.4.6 *“Prossimu”*

The function of this item is not really clear. Actually, it is not attested neither in Campidanese nor in Nuorese, however, in Baunese some speakers have used it:

227) **BAU:**
   
   a. *Su prossimu* Re at a essere su figgiu de sa Reina
      
      ‘The next king will be the Queen’s son’
   
   b. *Sa prossima* ia chi bengio in Sardinia…
      
      ‘Next time that I come to Sardinian…’

Considering these examples, I would hazard a hypothesis, saying that its use could be an influence of standard Italian, even for speakers who have Sardinian as mothertongue. Furthermore, also future temporal expressions are not formed by *prossimu* but in the way reported below:

228) **BAU:**
   
   a. *Su mese ch’intrat*
      
      ‘Next month (LIT.: the month which enters)’
   
   b. *Sa cida/s’annu chi benit*
      
      ‘Next week/year (LIT.: the week/year which comes)’
   
   c. *Sa ìa chi benit*
      
      ‘LIT.: the time which comes’

As one can observe, this sort of periphrasis is not allowed in (228c), to which is rather preferred (227b). Actually, (228c) is not really wrong, but it means something other: “the time which he comes”.

In Italian, the item can occur postnominally in very few occasions and with a marked intonation, whereas in Sardinian it cannot absolutely appear in this position:

229) **ITA:**
   
   a. *La prossima volta*
   
   b. *La volta prossima*
      
      ‘Next time’

---

\(^{84}\) Note that in Italian *certo* in postnominal or predicative position is not an indefinite adjective, but it means “sure”. 
230) BAU:
   a. *Sa prossima ìa
   b. *Sa ìa prossima
      ‘next time’

3.4.7 “Unicu/solu”
Actually, the item unicu, similar to prossimu, is not attested in Sardinian dialects, but it is used in some examples, as this below reported: it is a translation from Italian into Sardinian of a prayer.

231) CAMP:
   E in s’unicu Fillu amau Gesu Cristu […]85
   ‘LIT.: and in the one Son loved Jesus Christ’
In the example above, I dare say that unicu probably is another influence of Italian, being a poetic translation as well. Although it seems to be an Italian loanword, I have found it in some other examples:

232) CAMP:
   S’unica cosa obbietiva chi podit nai unu criticu86
   ‘The only objective thing which a critic can say’

233) NUO-LOG:
   Como est s’unicu prozetu87
   ‘Now it is the only project’
Anyway, to express the idea of ‘only one’ the item solu is more frequent than unicu, but in this case it does not carry nominal agreement features and usually appears after the noun. Consider the following contrast:

234) BAU:
   a. Òe je tenet solu unu pippiu in iscola
      ‘Today there is only one child at school’
   b. Òe je tenet fetti/solu unu pippiu in iscola
      ‘Today there is only one child at school’
   c. %Òe je tenet unu solu pippiu a iscola
      ‘Today there is only one child at school’

85 Taken from www.sufueddu.org/pregadorias/Credo.htm, “Dottrina cristiana in versus” by Pilo, 1778
86 Taken from www.sotziulimbasarda.net/dicembre2006/criticabolo.htm
87 Taken from www.uls.it/348.page
d. *Occannu appo arrécciu duus [%solos/*solu] erregallus*
   ‘This-year I received two lonely gifts’

e. *Giuanni is figgiu solu*
   ‘John is an only son’

In (234) an example of the use of *solu* is given, however, some Baunese speakers agree with the opinion that (234b) sounds better than (234a): *fetti* and *solu* have an adverbial function which corresponds to “only”. The examples in (234c) and (234d) are perceived as being very strange by Baunese speakers: the adjective occurs in prenominal position but the position after numeral quantifiers makes the sentence quite unacceptable, even if the adjective agrees with the noun as in (234d).

Note that the item *solu* is invariable in number and gender: moreover, if it is used followed by a plural noun it corresponds to Italian *solamente* ‘only’.

235) BAU:

   *A Natale appo arrécciu solu erregallus carus*
   ‘On Christmas day I received only expensive gifts’

The item *solu* in postnominal position can only mean *alone*:

236) BAU:

   *Non si deppent lassare us figgius (a) solos in dommu*
   ‘Children must not stay alone at home’

In contrast with the Baunese example in (234c), in Lepori (2001) the following expression are found:

237) CAMP:

   *Unu solu nòmini*
   ‘One only name’

I would risk an attempt saying that also in Campidanese it could be a consequence of Italian influence, when *solu* is found before the noun.

3.4.8 “Possibili”

For what concerns these expressions above, actually they are supposed to be again Italian derived words. Indeed, they are not attested in the Sardinian dialects taken into account in this study. Nevertheless, a Baunese speaker has given to me the following example:

---

88 Neither Jones, Lepori, Pittau, Wagner nor the on-line dictionary attest these words
238) BAU:

Su giornalista at intervistau donna possibbili candidau

‘The journalist interviewed every potential candidate’

239) BAU:

Su giornalista at intervistau donna candidau possibbili

a. ‘the journalist interviewed every potential candidate (who was possible for her to interview)’

b. ‘the journalist interviewed every potential candidate’

Again, unfortunately, also the examples above can be due to Italian interference. Anyway, one can observe that in (238) the adjective is understood in a modal way, whereas in postnominal position it is ambiguous between a modal and implicit relative reading.

3.4.9 “Mesu/mettade”

Mesu usually occurs with quantity expressions. It can appear in prenominal position and agrees in gender and number with the noun it precedes:

240) BAU:

a. J’at galu mesu buttiilia de binu

‘There is still half bottle of wine’

b. Mi serbit mesu metro de filu

‘I need a half meter of yarn’

c. Po sa strutta serbit una mesu duzina de òso

‘For the cake is needed a half dozen of eggs’

Furthermore, it can appear also in postnominal position, and like in Italian, the meaning is slight different:

241) NUO:

Tres mesos litros faghen litru e mesu

‘LIT.: three half litre make litre and half’
Comparing the Baunese expressions with Italian and English counterparts, a parallelism is found:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0.5 Litre</th>
<th>1.5 Litre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAU</td>
<td>mesu litru</td>
<td>unu litru e mesu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>mezzo litro</td>
<td>un litro e mezzo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>Half liter</td>
<td>a liter and a half</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To express the “half” idea another item is used in Baunese: *metade* which corresponds to Italian *metà* ‘half’. As in Italian, this word can be a noun and also an adjective.

242) BAU:

*M’appo pappau metade paninu*

‘I ate half sandwich’

243) NUO:

*Metade caminu […]*

‘Midway (LIT.: half way)’

3.4.10 **Comparatives “Mengius/peus”**

As in other languages, also in Sardinian adjectives can have comparative functions. The examples below show it:

244) BAU:

a. *Fut su mengius/peus maïstru chi appo mai tentu*

‘He was the best/worst teacher that I have ever had’

b. *Fut su maïstru mengius/peus chi podiant accattare*

‘He was the teacher best/worst that I have ever had’

The comparative item can be found both before and after the noun: probably, in postnominal position in Sardinian it is more stressed. It is more often found before the noun, as it is shown in Nuorese-Logudorese and Campidanese here below.

245) LOG-NUO

*S’aian tancatu sos mentzus tretos*

‘They SI-enclosed the best places’

---

89 Even if a Baunese example has been taken, this behaviour is shared in all Sardinian, as shown in (242) in Nuorese

90 From [www.webalice.it/ilquintomoro/poetas%20improvvisadores/Cantadores/cantadores25.htm](http://www.webalice.it/ilquintomoro/poetas%20improvvisadores/Cantadores/cantadores25.htm)

91 Taken from [www.ditzionariu.org](http://www.ditzionariu.org)
3.4.11 Interrogative adjectives: “cale, cantu, eitte”

In this section of the chapter, interrogative items will be discussed.

One of important properties of these elements is that they must be found before the noun with which they are in relation.

In Baunese eitte ‘what type’ occurs with animate or inanimate nouns and is an invariable word.

247) BAU:

a. Eitte bestire t’as pigau?
   ‘What dress did you buy?’

b’. *Eitte bestires as pigau?
   ‘What dresses did you buy?’

b. Eitte faula t’at contau?
   ‘What lie did he tell you?’

b’. *Eitte faulas t’at contau?
   ‘What lie did he tell you?’

On the other hand, cale ‘which’ and cantu ‘how-much/many’ agree in number but not in gender with the noun which they precede:

248) BAU:

a. Cale dommu ais pigau?
   ‘Which house did you buy?’

b. *Cales dommos ais pigau?
   ‘Which houses did you buy?’

249) BAU:

a. Cantu farra as pigau?
   ‘How much meal did you buy?’

b. *Cantus dommos as pigau?
   ‘How many houses did you buy?’

As for these items in Campidanese, Lepori (2001) states that cali ‘which’ and cantu ‘how much/many’ are invariable only in gender.

---

92 Taken from www.ditzionariu.org
Nevertheless, they have singular and plural forms\(^\text{93}\): unfortunately, he has not given examples about plural forms, but I have found such other Campidanese expressions which confirm his account:

250) \text{CAMP}\(^\text{94}\):

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. \textit{Cali} \textit{libru} ‘olis?
      ‘Which book do you want?’
  \item b. \textit{Ita} \textit{librus} \textit{funti}?
      ‘What kind of books are they?’
\end{itemize}

251) \text{NUO}:

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. \textit{Cun cales} \textit{tintas, nára-mi, lu tìnghes}\(^\text{95}\)
      ‘Tell me with what colours do you dye them?’
  \item b. \textit{Cales àrbures est a pudare}\(^\text{96}\)
      ‘Which trees are to be trimmed?’
  \item c. \textit{De ite} \textit{colore fin sos ajos suos}?
      ‘Of what colour are his eyes?’
  \item d. \textit{Ite} \textit{vinu as comporadu}
      ‘Which wine have you bought?’
\end{itemize}

Jones (1993) notes that \textit{itte} since it has an inanimate reference occurs typical with uncountable nouns (251c) and (252d).

3.4.12 \textit{Exclamative adjectives: ‘ite!, cantu!, battigale!’}

In this study one exclamative expression has already been discussed in the section 3.2.1. This was \textit{mischinu} ‘poor’, which can appear alone or followed by a noun (‘\textit{mischinu!}’ or ‘\textit{mischina mammai!}’).

Baunese some other exclamative locutions are attested.

Exclamative items are: \textit{ite} ‘what!; how!’ (when it is pronounced the first vowel usually disappears [‘te]); \textit{cantu} ‘how much!’; \textit{battigale} ‘how huge!’). Actually some properties of \textit{ite} and \textit{cantu} have already been discussed in the previous section when interrogative elements were dealt with.

In (252) some example with the invariable \textit{ite} are shown.

---

\(^{93}\) Lepori (2001: 33) «Possono riferirsi sia a cose che a persone. Invariabili nel genere, posseggono sia il singolare sia il plurale»

\(^{94}\) Examples taken from Lepori (2001: 33)

\(^{95}\) Taken from www.lingrom.fu-berlin.de/sardu/Sardinian-Text-Database/LITERAS/litbator.html

\(^{96}\) Taken from www.ditzionariu.org
252) BAU:
   a.  *Itē* bella! *Itē* toga!
       ‘How nice!’
   b.  *Itē* pilus longos!
       ‘What long hairs!’
   c.  *Itē* oglos (*chì* tenet)!
       ‘What eyes (he has)!’

As it is possible to observe, *itē* is invariable and can be followed directly by an adjective (252a) or by a noun (252b) and (252c).

253) BAU:
   a.  *Cantu* attras bias si-dd’appo giai narau occannu!
       ‘How many times I have already told him it this year!’
   b.  *Cantu*’ attras bias si-dd’appo giai narau occannu!
       ‘LIT.: How many other times I have already told him it this year!’

Unlike *itē*, *cantu* ‘how much/many!’ agrees in gender and number and can be followed a by a noun (253a). In (253b) the considered item precedes the adjective *attru* which gives the idea of repeated action. Also, in Pittau’s (1972) Nuorese Grammar, *cantu* is labelled as exclamative item which can carry gender and nominal agreement features.

254) BAU:
   a.  *Battigale*!
       ‘So huge!’
   b.  *battigale* dommu!
       ‘What a big house!’
   c.  *Battigales* dommos *chì* je tenet!
       ‘What huge houses which there is!’

The expression *battigale* can occur as single word or before a noun, and it can carry plural features, but not the gender ones.
Actually, in Nuorese the word bette(dde) is attested by Pittau (1972) and Wagner (1960-64)\(^97\), also betecale is found:

255) NUO\(^98\):
   a. *Eh! Bette(dde) cane!*
      ‘Eh! What a big dog’
   b. *Eh! Bette(dde) cosa!*
      ‘Eh! What a big house!’

256) NUO\(^99\):
   a. *Ite bette cane!*
      ‘What huge dog!’
   a.’ *Ite cane bette!*
      ‘What dog huge’
   b. *Bete ómine ch’este, paret un'orcu!*
      ‘What man who is, he looks like an ogre’
   c. *Onzi bete fàula còntada!*
      ‘Every big lie told’
   d. *Tenzo una vática e b'at betecales melones!…*
      ‘I have a garden and there are big melons!’

In (256) some interesting examples are reported.

In (256c) the item appears after the indefinite quantifier. If onzi ‘every’ had preceded bete, it would have leaded to an ungrammatical expression. The item is classified as an adjective by (Pittau, 1972: 70), who provides plural forms of bete: *ite bettes canes!*

257) NUO:

   *Bete onzi fàula còntada!*
   ‘Big every lie told’

On the other hand, example in (256d) shows the analysed item in plural forms: also in Nuorese it agrees in number, but not in gender, with the noun which it precedes.

I suggest that Baunese (and Campidanese) item connected with Nuorese bete, bette(dde) to which the pronoun cale has been adjoined. Than, phonological assimilation intervenes in the word to become battigale in Baunese and something like batigali in Campidanese.

\(^97\) Wagner (1960-64): «Nei dialetti centrali è usato come esclamazione in combinazione con sostantivi per esprimere qualcosa di grande.». It also appears before a prepositional complement: bete (d)’e faula ‘what a lie!’

\(^98\) Taken from Pittau (1972: 70)

\(^99\) Taken from www.ditzionariu.org
3.5 Two origins of APs: conclusions

In Ch.3 it was observed how Baunese (and Sardinian) adjectives behave and the main properties were discussed.

Starting from Sproat & Shih’s (1988) distinction between direct and indirect modifiers, the present study provide some evidences to reinforce Cinque’s (2005) theory of two possible sources of APs. In general, the direct modifiers involve the APs merger in the Specifiers of NPs or of their extended projections, whereas the indirect modifiers derive from reduced relative clauses and can occupy the predicative position.

It is important to notice that both types of modifiers are generated in prenominal positions: nevertheless, in the superficial level indirect modifiers can appear after the noun, because of a series of movements and raisings, which happen obligatory in Sardinian and optionally in English. The problem is that in the Romance language, it is not always easy to understand when adjectives are direct or indirect modifiers, because of homophony of the most part of them, when they occur after or before the noun. Still, one exception was pointed out: the pair grandi-mannu.

Observing examples in the section 3.3.1, it was deduced that grandi is as a direct modifier, because it cannot appear after the noun; on the contrary, mannu derives from a reduced relative clause. Therefore, the items grandi-mannu have two different forms, appear in different positions (grandi only in prenominal position, mannu only in the postnominal one) and carry also quite different meanings. This latter is, actually, a feature shares by other Romance languages.

Thus, the Sardinian adjectival system includes four categories of APs:

- A pair of a direct and indirect modifier, morphologically distinct: grandi-mannu. The former is a direct modifier and must only occur before the noun; the latter produces an indirect modification and obligatorily appears in postnominal position. (section 3.3.1)

The different position produces also different readings for APs, which are unambiguous, when they are found before the noun, and ambiguous on the opposite case.
- All the other indirect modifiers influenced by poetic styles. Such adjectives usually occur after the noun: nevertheless, they can also appear before the noun but, it is due to a higher register and poetic styles (it will be explained in the section 3.3.3).
It was observed that the “poetic licence” provides some effects in the meaning of expressions, which in normal context are considered as ungrammatical. These effects force the indirect modifiers to be generated as direct ones, causing a difference of the register and of interpretation.

- Finally, the forth group formed by items which must appear only before the noun (section 3.4): these items were defined as “specifier-like” elements by Jones (1993).

In conclusion, in this chapter it has been demonstrated that two languages which apparently are so different like Sardinian (a Romance language) and English (a German language), in point of fact, they share the same basic structure, which becomes evident only in few occasions. The reason of the apparently different word-order is connected with the fact that the movements thanks to which in the Romance language the indirect modifiers are found after the noun happen obligatorily in Sardinian though being optional in English only in some cases (es.: a beautiful dancer VS a dancer beautiful VS a dancer more beautiful than her instructor).
4. REFERENCES


- Lepori, A. (2001) *Grammatica di Sardo Campidanese* →
  →http://www.comitau.org/Mangaras/gramatiga/gramatigasarda.pdf#search=%22grammatica%20sardo%20campidanese%22


