

CONCLUSION

The major point of this monograph is that adjectives enter the structure of DPs in two different ways: either as direct phrasal modifiers of dedicated functional heads of the extended projection of the Noun or as predicates of reduced relative clauses, merged above the functional projections hosting the former type of adjectives. The two types of adjectives were seen to be associated with different interpretive and syntactic properties.

A second, related, goal was to see if a better understanding could be achieved of the syntax of Romance and Germanic adjectives on the basis of the dual source of adjectives.

The account of the main properties and generalizations concerning Germanic and Romance adjectives can be briefly summarized as follows:

1. The APs which have a reduced relative clause source, and which precede the direct modification APs in prenominal position in Germanic are found in postnominal position in Romance following the direct modification APs (if any are present). This was attributed to the obligatory “extraposition” of reduced relative clauses in Romance as opposed to the impossibility of extraposing bare adjective reduced relative clauses in Germanic.
2. The APs which are merged as direct modifiers of dedicated functional projections above N remain prenominal in Germanic, while (except for few classes) they optionally or obligatorily end up postnominally in Romance, depending on the specific class they belong to.
3. The mirror image orders between Germanic and Romance follow from two types of rolling up phrasal movement; that involving indirect modification APs, and that involving direct modification APs:

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| | indir.mod. | dir.mod. | dir.mod. | |
| (1)a the | | <i>American</i> | <i>musical</i> | comedy of the '50's |
| b the only | | <i>possible</i> | <i>Roman</i> | invasion of Thrace |
| c She tried to interview every | <i>possible</i> | <i>potential</i> | | candidate |

| | | | | |
|---|-------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | dir.mod. | dir.mod. | indir.mod. |
| (2)a la commedia | | <i>musicale</i> | <i>americana</i> | degli Anni '50 |
| b La sola invasione | | <i>romana</i> | <i>possibile</i> | della Tracia |
| c Ha cercato di intervistare ogni candidato | <i>potenziale</i> | | <i>possibile</i> | alla presidenza |

4. The existence of the unexpected scope effects of the type in (3), noted in Chapter 1, section 1.3, derives from the possibility of pied piping the lower adjective with the N around the higher one, as shown in (3):

| | | | |
|--|----------|----------|--|
| | dir.mod. | dir.mod. | |
| (3)a E' una <i>sicura</i> [<i>giovane</i> promessa] → | | | |
| (he) is a sure young promise | | | |
| b E' una [<i>giovane</i> promessa] <i>sicura</i> t | | | |
| (he) is a young promise sure | | | |
| 'He is a sure young promise' | | | |

5. Prenominal APs in Romance are unambiguous because they can only have a direct modification source given that all types of (reduced) relative clauses obligatorily end up postnominally in Romance.

6. As noted, certain direct modification adjectives can only be prenominal (*vecchio* ‘of long standing’; *povero* ‘pitiable’; etc.). In the present analysis, this follows from the impossibility for the NP to cross over them (for reasons that remain to be clarified).

7. Postnominal APs in Romance are instead ambiguous because they can either arise from a direct modification source, or from an indirect modification source.

8. The difference in meaning of certain adjectives between the prenominal and the postnominal position was analysed here as due to the possibility for those adjectives to be used either as direct modifiers or as predicates of a reduced relative clause, and from the necessarily prenominal location of the direct modification usage of those adjectives (which leaves the reduced relative clause source as the only possible source for the postnominal adjective).

9. In addition to the ambiguity deriving from the possibility of having both a direct and an indirect modification source, certain adjectives display further ambiguities if they belong to more than one class of direct modification adjectives, and come to occupy different positions in the extended projection of the NP.

Colour adjectives are a particularly clear case. *Giallo* ‘yellow’ can be a low, obligatorily postnominal, direct modification classificatory adjective in *un libro giallo* ‘a thriller (lit. novel yellow)’ⁱ, as well as a non-restrictive, nonintersective, etc., prenominal direct modification adjective in *le gialle colline dell’Andalusia* ‘the yellow hills of A.’, in addition to being able to occur as a (relative clause derived) restrictive, intersective, etc., obligatorily postnominal, adjective in *(Passami) la cravatta gialla* ‘(Pass me) the yellow tie’.ⁱⁱ As seen, depending on where it is inserted, the same adjective will thus display different syntactic/semantic and word order properties. For discussion of several cases of this sort, see Adamson (2000) and Scott (2002).

ⁱ See Knittel (2005, 213ff) on the non-compound status of the corresponding French collocation *roman noir* ('thriller', (lit.) novel black).

ⁱⁱ Also see the case of the adjectives *grande* and *vecchio* in Chapter 2, note 16.

In its classificatory usage, a colour adjective will appear closer to the N than a nationality/provenance adjective, thus apparently contradicting what was taken in Chapter 3, section 3.6, and references cited there, the canonical order colour > nationality N. See *la mela verde canadese* (= *la mela più buona in assoluto*) 'the Canadian green apple (is absolutely the best apple)', and Yang (2005, Chapter 6, section 4.1) for the corresponding Chinese case. Also see the case of the prenominal adjective *grande* in Chapter 2, note 16.