

Appendix: Further evidence for the dual source of adnominal adjectives.

In this Appendix a number of languages are briefly discussed which appear to overtly distinguish the two sources.¹

1. Chinese. Mandarin Chinese is one language which has been claimed to overtly distinguish direct modification from indirect modification adjectives (derived from reduced relative clauses).²

Sproat and Shih (1988,1991) point out that while adjectives followed by the marker *de* display no rigid order among each other, those that appear without *de* do display rigid ordering. Compare (1) (their 1988 (2a-a')) with (2) (their 1988 (3a-a')):

(1)a xiǎo-de lǜ-de hua-ping

small DE green DE vase

'a small green vase'

b lǜ-de xiǎo-de hua-ping

green DE small DE vase

'a small green vase'

(2)a xiǎo lǜ hua-ping

small green vase

'a small green vase'

b *lǜ xiǎo hua-ping

green small vase

'a small green vase'

They suggest that the first type of modification, which displays the same marker *de* found in relative clauses, is in fact nothing other than a (reduced) relative clause (whence the non rigid order of the adjectives typical of relative clauses – cf. also Aoun and Li 2003,150), while the second is a nominal compound (whence the rigid order, typical of compounds – cf. also Aoun and Li 2003,149, Cheung 2005, and Yang 2005, chapter 6).³

Subsequent research, however, has shown the picture to be more complex. Paul (2005,2007) provides evidence against Sproat and Shih's (1988,1991) (and Cheng 1986, and Duanmu's 1998, and Simpson's 2001) idea that adjectives with *de* in Mandarin Chinese are necessarily to be analysed as relative clauses and that 'A N' *de*-less modification structures are necessarily compounds. Concerning the first point, she shows that in contrast to what is sometimes claimed in the literature (cf. Sproat and Shih 1988,1991) even non predicative adjectives, like *yiqian* 'former', can (and must) be followed by *de* in adnominal position (see (3), (4), as well as (i)a-b of note 4).⁴

(3) Beijing daxue yiqian de xiaozhang (Paul 2005,fn.7)

Beijing University former DE president

'the former president of Beijing University'

(4) benlai de yisi (Paul 2005, section 2)

original DE meaning

'the original meaning'

Concerning the second point, Paul (2005,2009) (and Sio 2006,112f for Cantonese) show that some [A N] sequences behave as compounds (i.e. single words, whose components are invisible to syntactic processes), while other [A N] sequences behave like fully transparent syntactic phrases.⁵

Once the phrasal status of (certain) [A N] sequences is established, it becomes interesting to consider what syntactic and semantic differences there are between *de*-less adjectives and the same adjectives with *de*.

The properties of *de*-less adjectives appear to be consistently those isolated above for direct modification adjectives. We have already noted after Sproat and Shih (1988, 1991) that they enter a particularly rigid order (also see Paul 2005, section 3.3).⁶ Also, as noted in Huang (1982), and Cheung (2005, section 2.1), they only enter hierarchical (stacked) readings, while adjectives with *de* can enter either hierarchical or conjoined readings. From an interpretive viewpoint, they seem to differ from adjectives with *de* in being ‘defining’, or individual-level, nonrestrictive (they do not contrast one object from another, which may also explain why *de*-less adjectives are not possible with just any N – cf. Wang 1995, section 4.2.2; Paul 2005, section 3.2, 2007; Cheung 2005, and Sio 2006, 117ff) and nonintersective.⁷ Wei (2004), as reported in Sio (2006, 129 fn.5), observes that bare adjectives in Mandarin, along with their literal meaning, can also have nonintersective idiomatic readings, which are lost when the adjective is followed by *de*. See, for example, (5):

(5) tā dà zuǐbà

he big mouth

‘he has a big mouth’ or ‘he is gossipy’

Moreover, as noted by Sproat and Shih (1991, 571) (also see Yang 2005, chapter 6, section 4.6, Cheung 2005, section 2.2, and Sio 2006, Chapter 5, section 2.1.2) adjectives with *de* can only occur outside of *de*-less ones (see (6) and (7)):⁸

(6)a hēi-de xiǎo shū (Sproat and Shih 1991, 571)

black-de small book

b *xiǎo hēi-de shū

small black-de book

‘small black book’

(7)a na san-ge hong de da xiu (Cheung 2005, exx.(19)a-b)

that three-classifier red DE big ball

‘those three red big balls’

b *na san-ge da hong de xiu

that three-classifier big red DE ball

‘those three big red balls’

Also see Cheung (2005) and Yang (2005,211), where it is pointed out that while adjectives with *de* can occur, within the sequence Demonstrative Numeral+Classifier N, either before the Demonstrative, or in between the Demonstrative and the Numeral+Classifier (typical relative clause positions), as well as between Numeral+Classifier and N, *de*-less adjectives can only occur in the latter position.⁹

Given the possibility seen above for *de* to occur with (some) non-predicative adjectives, one should perhaps posit the existence of two *de*'s, one of which (the one also following, full or reduced, relative clauses) is necessarily pronounced; the other (the one following direct modification adjectives) sometimes is not pronounced (cf., in particular, the discussion in note 7 above).¹⁰

In conclusion, it seems reasonable to say that while not all direct modification adjectives are *de*-less, those *de*-less adjectives which do not form compounds are only direct modification adjectives.

2. Maltese.

Maltese also appears to distinguish direct modification adjectives from indirect modification adjectives in terms of the absence vs. presence of an adjectival determiner. In definite noun phrases:

“the definite article occurs on the noun and may be repeated, in the appropriate allomorphic form, on the adjective” (Plank and Moravcsik 1996,187). See (8), their (12)a:¹¹

(8)a il-mara (t-)twila
the-woman (the-)tall
'the tall woman'

As Plank and Moravcsik (1996) further note, “[r]e-articulated and bare adjectives are not in free variation” (p.187). The former have a restrictive reading, and the latter a non-restrictive one (p.187f); an observation that goes back to Sutcliffe (1938), as Fabri (2001,158) notes. In fact Fabri (1993,38ff, and 2001) provides extensive evidence for the restrictive nature of articulated adjectives. To give one example, he observes that when an adjective like “hot” modifies a noun like “sun” it cannot be articulated. Re-articulation of the adjective would only be “acceptable in the context of a science fiction story in which a fictitious world or planet had more than one sun” (2001,164; see also 1993,48f). Similar considerations are at the basis of contrasts like the following, also given in Fabri (1993, 2001):

(9) Xagħar Simon twil/*t-twil joghġob-ni (Fabri 1993,53)
Hair Simon long/the.long pleases-me
'I like Simon's long hair'

In the present analysis, the restrictive nature of articulated adjectives is an unambiguous diagnostic of their derivation from a reduced relative clause. That in turn implies that it should not be possible to re-articulate adjectives that cannot be predicates (hence predicates of a relative clause). This appears confirmed by various observations found in the literature on Maltese. So, for example,

nonintersective adjectives cannot be re-articulated ((10)a-b); and the same is true of classificatory adjectives ((10)c-e):

- (10)a ir-rumanz (*l-)ewlieni (Fabri 1993,51)
the-novel (the-)single
'the only novel'
- b l-ispirtu (*l-)awtentiku (Plank and Moravcsik 1996,188)
the-spirit (the-)authentic
'the authentic spirit'
- c il-qagħhada (*l-)internazzjonali (Plank and Moravcsik 1996,188)
the-situation (the-)international
'the international situation'
- d l-istudju (*l-)grammatikali (Borg 1996,16; Borg and Azzopardi-Alexander 1997,71)
the-studies (the-)grammatical
'grammatical studies'
- e l-ilsien (*il-)Gharbi (Plank and Moravcsik 1996,188)
the-language (the-)Arabic
'the Arabic language'

Also, as reported in Duffield (1995,337 fn34; 1999,§2.3), based on Fabri (1993,55), when both an articleless (in my interpretation, direct modification) adjective and a re-articulated (i.e., indirect modification) adjective co-occur, the articulated adjective must be outside of the articleless adjective much like in English and Italian (modulo their pre- and post-nominal position) indirect modification adjectives are outside direct modification ones. See (11):¹²

(11)a ?il-bozza hamra l-gdida

the-bulb red the-new

b *il-bozza l-hamra gdida

the-bulb the-red new

‘the new red bulb’

3. Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian. Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian adjectives display two distinct morphological forms: a “short” (traditionally “indefinite”) form, and a “long” (traditionally “definite”) form (Leko 1988,1992,1996,1999; Aljović 2000,2002).¹³ Syntactically, both forms can appear before the N:

(12)a nov kaput

new (short form) coat

‘a new coat’

b novi kaput

new (long form) coat

‘the/a new coat’

In predicate position, however, only the short form is possible (Leko 1999,234):¹⁴

(13) Njegov kaput je nov/*novi

his coat is new (short form)/*new (long form)

I take it to mean that the short form can only be used as a predicate; either an overt one (as in (13)), or a covert one (as in (12)a, where it is the predicate of a reduced relative clause). Evidence for this conclusion comes from the fact that adnominal short-form adjectives display properties that were seen above to characterize indirect modification adjectives (those derived from relative clauses).¹⁵

So, for example, unlike long-form adjectives, short-form adjectives cannot give rise to nonintersective (idiomatic) collocations; they can only give rise to literal (non-idiomatic) readings.

See, e.g., (14)-(15), from Leko (1992,623f):

(14)a slijepi miš

blind (long form) mouse

‘bat’

b slijep miš

blind (short form) mouse

‘blind mouse’

(15)a strani jezik

strange (long form) language

‘foreign language’

b stran jezik

strange (short form) language

‘some unfamiliar language’

Short-form adjectives show no strict order whatsoever. See (16), from Aljović (2002,34), and fn.17 below, and relative text, for the distinct behaviour of long-form adjectives:

(16)a pouzdano_{short} malo_{short} crno_{short} auto

reliable small black car

‘a reliable small black car’

b crno_{short} pouzdano_{short} malo_{short} auto

black reliable small car

‘a black reliable small car’

Interestingly, adjectives that cannot be used predicatively do not even possess a short form; they only have the long form. See, for example, the “adverbial” adjectives *navodni* ‘alleged (long form)’ and *budući* ‘future (long form)’ (Aljović 2000,103ff):

(17) a. *navodni*/**navodan* komunista

An/the alleged (long form)/(*short form) communist

b. *budući*/**buduć* predsjednik

a/the future (long form)/(*short form) president

and the classificatory adjectives of (18) (Rutkowski and Progovac 2005):

(18)a *centralni*/**centralan* komitet

a/the central (long form)/(*short form) committee

b *polarni*/**polaran* medved

a/the polar (long form)/(*short form) bear

c *generalni*/**generalan* direktor

a/the general (long form)/(*short form) director

For many speakers (though not for all – cf. Zlatić 1997,61; Aljović 2002,fn.14) short- and long-form adjectives can occur together prenominally. If they do, short-form adjectives necessarily precede long-form adjectives (Leko 1988,140f;1992,623; Olga Tomić p.c.):¹⁶

(19)a *siromašan* *bolesni* dječak

a/the poor (short form) sick (long form) boy

‘the poor sick boy’

b *bolesni siromašan dječak

a/the sick (long form) poor (short form) boy

(20)a bolestan siromašni dječak

a/the sick (short form) poor (long form) boy

‘a/the sick poor boy’

b *siromašni bolestan dječak

a/the poor (long form) sick (short form) boy

As to long-form adjectives, it seems that they can either have a direct modification source, or an indirect modification one, since they are systematically ambiguous between the two sets of properties associated with the two sources seen above (Nadira Aljović p.c.), and do not have an absolutely rigid order among each other, only a preferred one (Nedžad Leko, p.c.).¹⁷ They thus appear to be like prenominal adjectives in English, which are ambiguous between the two sources, and have a preferred, but not an absolutely rigid, order (see for discussion Chapter 3, section 3.3 above, and Chapter 5, section 5.1).

In any event, by virtue of their possible direct modification source, only long-form adjectives give rise to nonintersective (idiomatic) collocations, as noted in relation to (14)-(15), and only they give rise to a specific interpretation of the DP (Aljović 2000,189ff;2002; cf. also Trenkić 2004).¹⁸ Also, as Aljović (2000,104) observes, French prenominal adjectives (which we claim here only have a direct modification source) are rendered in Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian with long-form adjectives, while short-form adjectives correspond to those French postnominal adjectives that are interpreted as reduced relative clauses.

It thus seems that Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian overtly distinguishes one of the two reduced RC sources of adnominal adjectives from direct modification adjectives.¹⁹

4. Romanian

Romanian is another language that appears to distinguish the two sources. Adjectives preceded by the article *cel/cea/etc.* only have the reduced relative clause source.²⁰ Evidence for this conjecture comes from a number of restrictions, noted in the literature, on the distribution of APs preceded by *cel*.

First, they can only follow the N, even if the corresponding bare adjectives can either precede or follow it.²¹ See (21)b and (22)b.²²

(21)a *buni prieteni/prietenii buni*

good-**the** friends/friends-**the** good

‘the good friends’

b *cei trei prieteni cei buni/*cei trei cei buni prieteni*

the three friends the good/the three the good friends

‘the three good friends’

(22)a *curajosul băiat/băiatul curajos*

courageous-**the** boy/boy-**the** courageous

‘the courageous boy’

b *băiatul cel curajos/*cel curajos băiat*

boy-**the** the courageous/the courageous boy

‘the courageous boy’

If *cel* APs are in fact reduced relative clauses, their being limited to postnominal position simply follows from the fact that reduced relative clauses necessarily follow the N in Romanian (see (23)a-b, from Drăgan 2002,111, and (23)c, from Carmen Dobrovie-Sorin, p.c.), a feature that Romanian

shares with the other Romance languages (and which is not shared by the neighboring Balkan languages Greek and Bulgarian):²³

(23)a cărțile citite/*cititele cărți

books-the read.fem.pl/read.fem.pl.-the books

‘the books read’

b copacul ars/*arsul copac

tree-the burnt.masc.sg/burnt.masc.sg-the tree

‘the burnt tree’

c cărțile (deja) sosite/*(deja) sositele cărți

books-the (already) arrived/(already) arrived-the books

‘the (already) arrived books’

A second property of *cel*, observed in Giusti (1993) and Cornilescu (2003, 2006) as noted, is that it can only appear in front of predicative adjectives. See:

(24)a comedia (*cea) musicală

comedy-the (the) musical

‘the musical comedy’

b literatura (*cea) engleză

literature-the (the) English

‘the English literature’

c ordonanța (*cea) judecătorească (Coene 1994,18)

order-the (the) judicial

‘the judicial order’

d omul (*cel) biet (Cornilescu 1992,222)

man-the (the) pitiable

‘the poor man’

e demnitarul cel înalt (Cornilescu 1992,222)

official the tall/*high

‘the tall official’

These facts again follow directly if APs preceded by *cel* only have a reduced relative clause source. Since the adjectives in (24) are non-predicative, they cannot be the predicate of a (reduced) relative clause either; whence their ungrammaticality.

The conclusion that *cel* can only precede elements which are predicates of a reduced relative clause finds additional support in an observation found in Cornilescu (1992): “A significant fact, which seems to have gone unnoticed is that, while with modifiers postnominal *cel* is grammatical, even if redundant, it is utterly ungrammatical with a PP or a DP which is theta-marked by the head noun or subcategorized by it” (p.222). See (25) (= her (76)):

(25)a *fratele cel al Mariei

brother-the the of Mary

‘Mary’s brother’

b *grosimea cea a zidurilor

thickness-the the of the walls

‘the thickness of the walls’

c *distrugerea cea a oraşului

distruction-the the of the city

‘the destruction of the city’

d *venirea cea a musafirilor

coming-the the of the guests

‘the coming of the guests’

e *faptul cel că pleacă

fact-the the that he is leaving

‘the fact that he is leaving’

This becomes understandable under a derivation of *cel* phrases from relative clauses because subcategorized PPs and DPs cannot constitute the predicate of a relative clause modifying the N that assigns them a theta-role (**fratele care e al Mariei* ‘the brother who is of Mary’; **grosimea care e a zidurilor* ‘the thickness which is of the walls’, etc.).²⁴

5. Greek

Another language that would seem at first sight to overtly distinguish the two sources of adjectives is Greek. In Greek definite DPs, adjectives have two options (cf. Androutsopoulou 1994,1995, 2001; Kolliakou 1995,1998,1999,2003,2004; Stavrou 1995,1996, 1999, to appear; Alexiadou and Wilder 1998; Alexiadou 2001, 2003; Campos and Stavrou 2004, among others): they can either be articleless, in which case they necessarily precede the Noun ((26)), or they can be preceded by an article, in which case they can either precede or follow the N ((27)):²⁵

(26)a to megalo vivlio

the big book

b *to vivlio megalo

the book big

‘the big book’

(27)a to megalo to vivlio

the big the book

b to vivlio to megalos

the book (the) big

‘the big book’

Articulated adjectives (or adjectives in ‘Determiner Spreading’ - Androutsopoulou 1994,1995, 2001 – or adjectives in polydefinite constructions – Kolliakou 1995,1999,2003,2004, Campos and Stavrou 2004, Lekakou and Szendrői 2007), like (27), seem to have all the characteristics of what we called above, following Sproat and Shih (1998,1991), indirect modification (i.e. of reduced relative clauses):

1) Articulated adjectives are necessarily restrictive (Mouma 1993,86; Kolliakou 1999,126; Manolessou 2000,158; Campos and Stavrou 2004,143) (Marinis and Panagiotidis 2005,27 refer to them as ‘restrictive/predicative’).²⁶ When the adjective is nonrestrictive, as in (28), it cannot have its own article (Manolessou 2000,156; Alexiadou 2003, section 4.1):

(28) I gigandeia (*i) gafa (Manolessou 2000,156)

the gigantic (the) blunder ‘the gigantic blunder’

2) Articulated adjectives are interpreted intersectively (Kolliakou 1999,123; Campos and Stavrou 2004,144). So, for example, while (29)a is ambiguous between a nonintersective interpretation (“she sings beautifully”) and an intersective one (“the singer is a beautiful woman”), (29)b, the articulated variant, only has the intersective interpretation (“the singer is a beautiful woman”):

(29)a Gnorises tin oreá tragudistria? (Campos and Stavrou 2004,144)

meet.2sg the beautiful singer

b Gnorises tin oreá tin tragudistria?

meet.2sg the beautiful the singer

‘Did you meet the beautiful singer?’

3) According to Alexiadou and Wilder (1998,303ff), Alexiadou (2001,232) articulated adjectives display free order among each other, while articleless adjectives have a rigid order.²⁷

4) Articulated adjectives, as noted by Kolliakou (1999,135), cannot be closer to the N than articleless adjectives. See (30):²⁸

(30)a *i megali kenuria [i kokini] valitsa

the big new the red suitcase

‘the big new red suitcase’

b i megali i kenuria kokini valitsa

the big the new red suitcase

‘the big new red suitcase’

5) Adjectives that cannot be articulated cannot be used as predicates either. However, as Androutsopoulou (1995,25; 2001,191) notes, the reverse is not true (pace Alexiadou and Wilder 1998,306). While most adjectives that cannot appear in predicate position cannot be articulated either (see (31)-(36)), there do exist adjectives that can be articulated even though they cannot appear in predicate position (as also noted in Leu 2007b). See (37)a-b, and the non intersective reading of *o ftohos o anthropos* ‘the poor/pitiable man’ mentioned in note 29, all unexpected for Alexiadou and Wilder (1998):²⁹

(31) o ipotithemenos (*o) eglimantias (Tredinnick 1992,203)

the alleged (the) convict

‘the alleged convict’

(Cf. *o eglimatias itan ipotithemenos ‘the convict was alleged’)

(32) o proin (*o) ipurgos (Alexiadou 2001,233)

the former (the) minister

‘the former minister’

(Cf. *o ipurgos itan proin ‘the minister was former’)

(33) i apli (*i) simptosi (Kolliakou 2004,264)

the mere (the) coincidence

‘the mere coincidence’

(34) o monos tu (*o) erotas (cf. Campos and Stavrou 2004,144)

the only his (the) love

‘his only love’

(35) i makedhoniki (*i) epithesi enadion ton Person (Androtsopoulou 1995,24)

the Macedonian (the) attack against the Persians

‘the Macedonian attack against the Persians’

(cf. *i epithesi enadion ton Person itan makedhoniki ‘the attack on the Persian was Macedonian’)

(36) o Indikos (*o) Okeanos (Campos and Stavrou 2004,163)

the Indian (the) Ocean

‘the Indian Ocean’

(37)a o proighoumenos (o) prothipourghos (Androtsopoulou 1995,24)

the former (the) prime minister

‘the former prime minister’

(cf. **o prothipourghos itan proighoumenos* ‘the prime minister was former’)

b o kaimenos o mathitis

(cf. Androutsopoulou 2001,191)

the pitiable the student

‘the poor student’

(cf. **Aftos o mathitis ine kaimenos* ‘this student is poor/pitiable’)

Examples such as (37), and the nonintersective reading of *o ftohos o anthropos* ‘the poor/pitiable man’ of note 29, appear to rule out any derivation in which the articulated adjective is necessarily merged in predicate position (as in Alexiadou and Wilder 1998, and Alexiadou 2001,2003). It is however still possible to derive articulated adjectives from a reduced relative clause if one assumes that the article and the adjective constitute a DP (with an elliptical N) which is the predicate of a reduced relative clause, as shown in (38) (alternatively, a DP (with an elliptical N) in “close apposition” to the DP containing the ‘modified N’, as suggested in Stavrou 1995, Marinis and Panagiotidis 2005, Lekakou and Szendrői 2007):

(38) to vivlio [_{IP} I° [_{DP} to kokkino VIVLIO]]

the book [_{IP} I° [_{DP} the red BOOK/ONE]]

This may account for the fact that articulated adjectives imply a contrast, as is the case for the remnant of a DP with N ellipsis: *I Theodora agorase to prasino Fiat ke i Maria agorase to kokino* ‘Theodora bought a green Fiat and Maria bought a red one’ (‘for a successful subdeletion there must be a contrast’ - Giannakidou and Stavrou 1999, 304). The arguments against an elliptical DP given in Alexiadou and Wilder (1998,section 2.6) only apply to an appositive source, not to the restrictive one. Note that an elliptical DP analysis of articulated adjectives can also accommodate

such cases as (37)a-b as the adjectives are merged as direct modifiers of the null noun (the same applies to the corresponding Slovenian and Bulgarian facts below). The fact that not all direct modifiers are possible in this construction can plausibly be attributed to its semantics (cf. ‘%the coincidence, the mere one’, ‘%the ocean, the Indian one’, etc.). The elliptical DP analysis may also be at the basis of a restriction that Melita Stavrou (p.c.) pointed out to me. For her only one articulated adjective is natural (which recalls the non iterability of articulated adjectives in Romanian – see note 21 above). This last property of Greek articulated adjectives is reminiscent (pace Leu 2008,56) of the impossibility of recursion in German Restrictive Elliptic Appositives (Riemsdik 1998).^{30,31}

6. Some notes on Russian and German. Russian, like Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian, also has short-form and long-form adjectives, but differs from the latter in two ways: first, it cannot use short-form adjectives in adnominal position (compare (39) with (12) above, repeated here as (40)) and second, it regularly utilizes long-form adjectives also in predicate position (cf. (41) with (13) above, repeated here as (42)).³²

(39) novyj/*nov dom stoit na gore (Russian - Pereltsvaig 2000,section 2)
 new:nom (long form/*short form) house:nom stands on hill
 ‘The new house stands on a/the hill.’

(40) novi/nov kaput (Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian)
 new (long form/short form) coat
 ‘the/a new coat’

(41) Dom nov/novyj (Russian - Pereltsvaig 2000,section 2)

house:nom new:nom (short form/long form)

‘The house is new.’

(42) Njegov kaput je nov/*novi (Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian)

his coat is new (short form/*long form)

‘His coat is new’

I submit that such differences ultimately stem from the fact that in Russian *all* adnominal adjectives, whether they are direct modification ones, or derive from the predicate of a (reduced) relative clause, *have to* take the long form, while in Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian adnominal adjectives deriving from the predicate of a (reduced) relative clause *can* retain the short form found in predicate position.³³

Let’s consider Siegel’s (1976a,b) analysis of Russian adjectives. She takes short-form adjectives to be exclusively predicative, semantically extensional and intersective, and long-form adjectives to be exclusively attributive, semantically intensional and nonintersective. The fact that long-form adjectives are apparently also found in predicate position (cf. (41) above) is for her due to the fact that they can be the attribute of a predicate nominal with an empty noun reconstructed from context (an analysis originally proposed in Babby 1970).³⁴ Thus, according to this analysis *dom nov* means ‘the house is new’ and *dom novyj* roughly means ‘the house is a new one’.

Siegel discusses some evidence in favor of this analysis. For one thing, the two options often differ semantically. So, for example, while both (43)a and b are possible

(43)a studentka umna

student.fem intelligent.fem (short form)

‘The student is intellegent’

b studentkaumnaja

student.fem intelligent.fem (long form)

‘the student is intelligent’

the former “means that the student is intelligent in general, absolute terms” while the latter “means that she is intelligent compared with other students; that is, ‘The student is an intelligent one’” (Siegel 1976b,297).

This analysis also leads one to expect that, when the predicate nominal option which licenses the long form as a predicate is semantically inappropriate, only the short form should be possible. This appears confirmed by examples of general laws or with certain kinds of abstract subjects like the following (where such paraphrases as “the space is an infinite one”, “everything is a clear one” and “to come home is a very pleasant one” are out of place):^{35,36}

(44)a prostrantsvo beskonechno/*beskonechnoe

space infinite (short form/*long form)

‘The space is infinite’

b Vse jasno/*jasnoe

everything clear (short form/*long form)

‘Everything is clear’

c prixodit’ domoj ochen’ prijatno/*prijatnoe

to come home very pleasant (short form/*long form)

‘To come home is very pleasant’

Nonetheless, as is observed in Larson (1999, lecture 2), this analysis leads to certain expectations that do not seem to be fulfilled (and which are not discussed by Siegel). If long-form adjectives are only intensional and nonintersective, adnominal adjectives (which obligatorily come in the long form) should never show intersective interpretations, and should never display the systematic

ambiguity that prenominal adjectives have in English between an intersective and a nonintersective interpretation in such phrases as *a beautiful dancer*. However, speakers of Russian consulted by Larson find that a phrase like *krasivyi tancor* ‘(a) beautiful dancer’ has the same ambiguity that *a beautiful dancer* has in English between an intersective and a nonintersective reading.

In spite of these apparent problems, Siegel’s analysis, with its desirable consequences mentioned above, can be retained, I think, if the following modification is introduced: long-form adjectives not only have the direct modification (intensional, nonintersective, individual-level, etc.) source, but can also derive from the other, relative clause, source (with its extensional, intersective, stage-level, etc., interpretations). What one has to assume is that an adjective that finds itself in an adnominal reduced relative clause necessarily takes on the long form. This is independently supported by the fact that participles unequivocally deriving from reduced relative clauses also take on the long form, which is different from the short form which they take in verbal contexts. See Siegel (1976b,293) and Bailyn (1994,28fn.15):

(45)a Ivan byl ubit (= (i) of fn.15 of Bailyn 1994,28)

Ivan was killed (short form)

b Ubityj soldat ležal na zemle (= (ii) of fn.15 of Bailyn 1994,28)

killed (long-form) soldier lay on ground

‘a dead soldier lay on the ground’

A similar proposal seems appropriate for German, where adjectives in predicate position (and in postnominal position, apart from those in the Restrictive Elliptic Appositive construction – Riemsdijk 1998,20) are invariant ((46)), while all prenominal adjectives necessarily show agreement with the N ((47)), whether they are of the direct modification type or are predicates of a reduced relative clause:

(46)a Der Vortrag war interessant/*interessanter

the contribution (masc.sg.) was interesting (neuter/*masc.sg)

b Die Diskussion war interessant/*interessante (neuter/*fem.sg)

The discussion (fem.sg) was interesting

(47)a Ein interessanter Vortrag

an interesting (masc.sg) contribution (masc.sg.)

b Eine interessante Diskussion

an interesting (fem.sg.) discussion (fem.sg.)

As in Russian, participles, which have clear verbal properties, display the same behavior. They are invariant ((48)), except when they are part of a reduced relative clause in prenominal position, in which case they obligatorily show agreement with the head noun ((49)):³⁷

(48) Der Student/die Studentin, [sein/ihr Studium seit langem hassend/*hassender/*hassende], fiel durch sein/ihr Examen

the student (masc./fem.), his/her study for a long time hating (neuter/masc.sg./fem.sg.), failed his/her exams

‘The student, as (s)he had been hating his/her study for a long time, failed his/her exams’

(49)a Ein [sein Studium seit langem hassender/*hassend] Student... (Riemsdijk 1983,234)

a his study for a long time hating (masc.sg/*neuter) student(masc.sg.)...

‘a student hating his study for a long time’

b a Eine [ihr Studium seit langem hassende/*hassend] Studentin...

a her study for a long time hating (fem.sg./neuter) student(fem.sg.)...

‘a student hating her study for a long time...’

¹ This seems clearly true of Chinese, as already claimed in Sproat and Shih (1988, 1991), (section 1), Maltese (section 2), Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian (section 3), and possibly Romanian (section 4). The case of Greek may instead be spurious if the analysis sketched in section 5 for the polydefinite construction (in terms of an elliptical DP with an adnominal adjective in apposition to another DP) is correct.

Other languages that will not be discussed here which seem to distinguish the two sources overtly are American Sign Language (MacLaughlin 1997, Chapter 4), (the Ganja dialect of) Balanta (Fudeman 2004), and the Ladin dialects studied in Rasom (2006,2008). If non-restrictive adjectives are only direct modifiers and restrictive ones only indirect modifiers derived from a reduced relative clause source (cf. Chapters 2 and 3 above), then Icelandic and Western Jutlandic also distinguish the two sources overtly. As observed in Delsing (1993,132fn25), Icelandic marks the non-restrictive interpretation with the strong form of the adjective (cf.(i)), and Western Jutlandic with the *æ* rather than with the *de* article (cf. (ii)) (also see the discussion in Roehrs 2006,132ff):

(i)a guli bíllinn

yellow [wk] car.the 'the yellow car'

b gulur bíllinn

yellow [str] car.the 'the car, which by the way is yellow'

(ii)a de gul bill

the yellow car 'the yellow car'

b æ gul bil

the yellow car 'the car, which by the way is yellow'

² As will be apparent from the text below, which draws on Mui's (2002) and Sio's (2006) analyses, Cantonese represents a similar case.

³ Rigidity of order, however, is not per se a necessary diagnostic of the compound status of a certain A A N sequence. See Paul (2005, footnotes 16 and 24; 2007), and here below in the text.

Not all Chinese dialects appear to allow for two adjectives with *de*. Yang (2005,218ff) reports that for Taiwanese speakers the second of the two adjectives in (1) and (2) must be without *de*.

⁴ As Aoun and Li (2003, chapter 5,fn.15) and Paul (2005,fn.7) observe, Sproat and Shih's conclusion was based on the impossibility of *de* with *qian* (the shorter form of *yiqian* 'former'. See **qian de zongtong* vs. *qian-zongtong* 'former president), which is plausibly a bound morpheme. Aoun and Li (2003, 148ff) , Cheung (2005), and Sio 2006, chapter 5, section 6.2.2, also argue that not all adjectives followed by *de* can be analysed as relative clauses since non predicative adjectives like *zhuyao* 'main', *weiyi* 'only', etc. can also be followed by *de*:

(i)a zhuyao de daolu (cf. *daolu (hen/bu) zhuyao ‘the road is (very/not) main’)

main DE road

‘the main road’

b weiyi de daolu (cf. *daolu weiyi ‘the road is only’)

only DE road

‘the only road’

⁵ Arguments for the phrasal nature of many A N sequences in Chinese are also presented in Wang (1995).

Among the considerations supporting the existence of phrasal [A N] sequences, is the fact that the adjective can itself be modified, if not by *hen* ‘very’, *tebie* ‘especially’, *feichang* ‘extremely’ etc., at least by the superlative adverb *zui* ‘most’ (although, as Chi Fung Lam points out, modification by *zui* is not entirely productive). This fact is reminiscent of what happens in Italian, where prenominal adjectives cannot be modified by *molto* ‘very’, *specialmente* ‘especially’, *estremamente* ‘extremely’, etc., but can by the superlative morpheme *più* ‘most’ (see (7) of Chapter 4):

(i) zui gao shuiping

most high level

‘the highest level’

Adjectives modified by *hen* ‘very’, reduplicated, or derived (what Huang 2006 calls ‘complex adjectives’) can be used as predicates (see (i)), but not as adnominal attributes without *de* (see (ii)). Bare adjectives, instead (what Huang 2006 calls ‘simple adjectives’) can be used without *de*, but not as predicates (cf. (i) with (ii)a):

(i) Zhangsan *(hen) gao (Huang 2006,345)

Zhangsan very tall

‘Zhangsan is very tall’

(ii)a zang shui (Huang 2006,345)

dirty water

b hen zang *(de) shui (Huang 2006,345)

very dirty (DE) water

Also see Paul (2006).

⁶ Reversals of the rigid order are possible only if *de* follows the first of the two adjectives; i.e. if the relative clause source is accessed:

(i) yi-tiao hei de da gou

1 -CL black DE big dog

'one black big dog'

In this case, *da* 'big' is "conceived of as [a] defining propert[y] and as a result, *da gou* 'big dog' [... is] interpreted as constituting [a] particular type of dogs. It is this newly created type as a whole that [is] subsequently modified".

⁷ See Sio (2006, chapter 5, section 2.2.3) for a finer analysis. Sproat and Shih (1990,574) note that the nonintersective adjective *wèi* 'fake', which is also non-predicative (**nèifu yào wèi* 'that medicine (is) fake') cannot be followed by *de*: *wèi (*de) yào* 'a fake medicine'. Aoun and Li (2003, chapter 5, note 15), however, observe that this behaviour of *wei* may be due to its prefix nature in Modern Chinese. Perhaps, only direct modification adjectives can be prefixes in Modern Chinese. On Italian and English adjectives *falso*, *finto* (*fake*, *false*) see Chapter 6, above, section 6.1). Yang (2005,253) notes that without *de* an adjective like *lao* 'old' is ambiguous between the meaning of 'of long standing' (*lao pengyou* 'old friend', *lao tongxue* 'old classmate') and that of "aged" (*lao xiansheng* 'old gentleman') (like the case of prenominal *vecchio* in Italian: *un vecchio amico* 'a friend of long standing', and *un vecchio signore* 'an aged gentleman'. Interestingly, when followed by *de* the meaning of 'of long standing' disappears (Tong Wu, p.c.): *lao de pengyou*. Again, compare the case of *vecchio* in Italian in a predicative position (*quel mio amico è vecchio* 'that friend of mine is aged'). This may be taken to suggest that when a direct modification adjective can be *de*-less (like *lao* 'old' vs. *yiqian* 'former') it must, so that the *de* that follows it is the relative *de* (which forces an intersective reading of *lao*). Sio (2006,123ff) notes the same for Cantonese. In a sentence like (i) the adjective 'old' followed by the subordination marker *ge* can only mean 'aged', while the bare adjective 'old', following it can be interpreted as 'of long standing':

(i) jat¹ go³ lou⁵ ge³ lou⁵ pang⁴-jau⁵

one CLF old MARKER old friend

'an old old friend'

As Wang also observes, "it is natural to say *xian yan* '(salty) salt' and *suan cu* '(sour) vinegar', but odd to say *xian de yan* and *suan de cu* because there is usually no other choice for *yan* and *cu* except to be *xian* and *suan*" (p.310); but see Paul (2009) for different judgments and interpretation. The fact, noted in Paul (2009, section 3), that such direct modifiers as *yiqian* 'former', *janglai* 'future', etc., require the presence of *de* does not seem to be a problem for the present analysis if, as just conjectured, direct modification adjectives are either with *de* or obligatorily without *de* (in which case whenever they appear with *de*, that *de* must be the relative clause *de*, with its associated properties.

⁸ The same is true of adjectives with *ge* in Cantonese, which have to precede bare adjectives (Sio 2006,114).

What remains to be understood is why this also holds, apparently, of combinations of two potentially non-predicative adjectives, like those in (40), one of which is with *de*, and the other without.

⁹ Aoun and Li (2003, chapter 5, note 11), Yang (2005,165fn.12), Simpson (2005,810), and Wang and Liu (2007, section 2.2) note that adjectives like ‘big’ or ‘small’ may occur in Chinese also between the numeral and the classifier (if they are not followed by *de*). Apparently these are two out of a handful of adjectives that can appear there, in semantic agreement with mass or sortal classifiers indicating size, shape, length, thickness, thinness, etc. (Tong Wu, and Liejiong Xu, personal communications), perhaps in the specifier position of the classifier projection.

¹⁰ For a critique of den Dikken and Singhapreecha’s (2004) Predicate Inversion analysis of Chinese adjectives with *de*, see Sio (2006,138-141).

Kang (2005) shows that the adjectival *-n* suffix of Korean should likewise not be necessarily identified with the relative clause suffix *-n*, and that not all Korean adnominal adjectives derive from relative clauses. Also see Yamakido (2000) on Japanese adjectives.

¹¹ Adjectives generally follow the N. The few which can precede it (like *allegat* ‘alleged’ Müller 2009, section 4) bear the article, which cannot be repeated in front of the N (Plank and Moravcsik 1996,189). In indefinite noun phrases, the indefinite article is never repeated in front of the adjective (Plank and Moravcsik 1996,187).

¹² I thank Ray Fabri for discussion on this point.

¹³ Special thanks go to Nadira Aljović, Nedžad Leko, and an anonymous reviewer for their judgments and comments. The distinction between the two forms is typically marked by an additional morpheme in the nominative masculine singular (*mlad* (short form)– *mladi* (long form) ‘young’), but depends on vowel length, and/or stress, and/or tone in other cases. For a discussion of the morphological complexities of the two forms, see Leko (1999) and Aljović (2000,2002). For arguments that the relevant distinction is specific/non-specific rather than definite/indefinite, see Aljović (2000,2002), and Trenkić (2004).

¹⁴ Aljović (2000,85) states that the long form is only acceptable in predicate position if it is “interprété comme un SN où l’adjectif précède un nom elliptique” (i.e. again in attributive position):

(i) *Goran je mudri* ‘Goran is the wise (long form) one’

For Nedžad Leko the long form with ellipsis of the head noun in predicate position is only possible if a demonstrative is also present: *Goran je onaj mudri* ‘Goran is that wise (long-form) one’ (I have a similar preference in Italian: (dei miei amici, Gianni è quello saggio/??il saggio ‘(lit.) Of my friends, Gianni is that wise one/??the wise one’).

This usage may be related (pace Pereltsvaig 2000) to the predicative usage of the long form of the adjective in Russian, which has also been analysed as occurring in an elliptical NP (Babby 1970,1973,1975; Siegel 1976a,b; Bailyn 1994).

See section 6 below for discussion.

¹⁵ Nadira Aljović tells me (p.c.) that the restrictive interpretation of short-form adjectives and the implicit relative reading of the short form of *moguć* ‘possible’ are, however, extremely difficult to obtain, possibly owing to the fact that short-form adjectives cannot easily combine with universal quantifiers, demonstratives, possessives, etc. Nonetheless, she says that to the extent that it is possible to use the short form of the adjective in examples like (i) with a universal quantifier, then the interpretation is exclusively restrictive:

- (i) (??) Svi naši vrijedni i pametni studenti vole sintaksu
all our diligent and clever students like syntax
‘all of our students that are diligent (and clever) like syntax’

¹⁶ Short-form As > long-form As > N. Those speakers (generally younger speakers) who find the combination short form followed by long form marginal still find the opposite order (long form followed by short form) totally impossible. Cf. Aljović (2002,fn.14). Leko (1992) takes this order to follow from the fact that short-form adjectives are base-generated higher than long-form adjectives. This is also the position taken here. The fact that short-form adjectives have to precede long-form adjectives even when the latter have a reduced RC source, as discussed in the text immediately below, may perhaps be understood if they are merged in the higher reduced RC slot which in English contains non bare AP reduced RCs, and which is higher than the reduced RC slot containing bare APs. See (11) of Chapter 5, and the relative discussion.

¹⁷ Nadira Aljović tells me (p.c.) that, differently from what she claimed in Aljović (2000,147; 2002,34; 2005,7), she now thinks that their order is indeed only a matter of (strong) preference. Bašić (2004,83) gives the following (partial) order as the natural order of adjectives in Serbian: evaluating > size > colour > referential > denominal (e.g., *ogromna bela srpska svadbena torta* ‘a huge white Serbian wedding cake).

¹⁸ This strikingly recalls the specificity-inducing property of the prenominal position of the adjective in Romance indefinite DPs noted above in Chapter 2.

¹⁹ As Leko (1992,624) notes, short- and long-form adjectives cannot be coordinated together:

- (iv) a siromašan i bolestan dječak
‘a/the poor (short-form) and sick (short-form) boy’
b siromašni i bolesni dječak
‘a/the poor (long-form) and sick (long-form) boy’
c *siromašan i bolesni dječak
‘a/the poor (short-form) and sick (long-form) boy’
d *siromašni i bolestan dječak

‘a/the poor (long-form) and sick (short-form) boy’

He also notes (p.225f) that only short-form adjectives can be separated from the N by parenthetical material or preposed to the beginning of the DP.

²⁰ But we do not exclude the possibility that (postnominal) adjectives not preceded by *cel*, may also be derived from reduced relative clauses. Giusti (1993,75ff, 2006) notes that cooccurrence with *cel* is only possible with adjectives that can be found in predicate position, and Cornilescu (2003, 2006) explicitly suggests that postnominal adjectives preceded by *cel* are (reduced) relative clauses. For comparative remarks on nominal modification in Romanian and in the Arvantovlaxika dialect of Aromanian, see Campos (2005).

²¹ Unless they are in the superlative form: *cei mai buni prieteni* ‘the best friends’, *cel mai curajos băiat* ‘the most courageous boy’. Lombard (1974,177) notes that another exception is the ordinal adjectival phrase *din urmă* ‘last’ (*cea din urmă pagină* ‘the last page’). For a possible reason why no more than one adjective can be preceded by *cel* (**băiatul cel înalt cel curajos* ‘the courageous tall boy’), see Grosu (1994, section 6.5.2). A similar restriction on Greek articulated adjectives is noted at the end of section 5 below.

²² Note that in the well-formed variant of (22)b there are two instances of determination, one on the N (*băiatul*) and one in front of the adjective (*cel*). The latter is comparable to the “adjectival determiner” that can also occur with Greek APs in the so called Determiner Spreading or Polydefinite constructions, which as will be noted in the next section many authors analyze as deriving from a (reduced) relative clause.

²³ Apparent counterexamples such as *conoscutele romane* ‘the well-known novels’, *iubitul/apreciatul cântăreț* ‘beloved/appreciated singer’ arguably involve adjectives, derived from past participles of “transitive verbs denoting states and evincing a marked imperfective reading” (Drăgan 2002,111). Also see note 1 of Chapter 6, for comparable cases in Italian.

²⁴ *Cel* can instead unproblematically precede PPs that are not subcategorized by the N (hence can be predicates of a (reduced) relative clause) (Cornilescu 1992,222):

(i)a *Palatul cel de argint*

palace-the *cel* of silver

‘the silver palace’

b *?romanul cel despre care ai vorbit cel mai mult*

novel-the *cel* about which (you) have talked most

‘the novel which you talked about most’

²⁵ Melita Stavrou tells me that with articulated adjectives, the postnominal order is the unmarked one, the prenominal being necessarily contrastively focused.

Postnominal adjectives in *indefinite* DPs can also be taken to be possible only under Determiner Spreading, if one assumes that what is occasionally taken to be an indefinite article is in fact just the numeral ‘one’ (in view of their homophony) and that the indefinite article in Greek is null. *Ena vivlio oreo* ‘(lit.) one/a book nice’ would thus be *ena ∅ vivlio ∅ oreo*, parallel to *to vivlio to oreo* ‘(lit.) the book the nice’ (this recalls Alexiadou and Wilder’s 1998, section 3.6, position, modulo their taking *ena* to be an article and to follow, rather than precede, an abstract indefinite determiner). Detailed syntactic and semantic evidence for this treatment of indefinite DPs (redressing Horrocks and Stavrou’s 1987, Karanassios’s 1992,53, and Stavrou’s 1996,1999, section 4.3.2, N-raising analysis of indefinite DPs) has in fact been presented by Melita Stavrou in classes at the University of Venice in the Spring of 2005. See, now, Stavrou (to appear).

²⁶ Campos and Stavrou (2004, section 3.3) also point out that in the Determiner Spreading construction the N may never be stressed and the adjective unstressed.

²⁷ The latter claim should perhaps be redressed. As Melita Stavrou pointed out to me (p.c.), articleless adjectives only show a preferred order. As in English, their order can be reversed under special pragmatic conditions if heavy stress is put on the first of the two adjectives. Compare *I megali dermatini tsanta* ‘the big leather bag’ with *I DERMATINI megali tsanta* ‘the LEATHER big bag’. This is expected given the further similarity between English prenominal adjectives and Greek articleless adjectives that she notes. Both English prenominal adjectives and Greek articleless adjectives are systematically ambiguous between the two sets of interpretations seen in Chapter 2 above, suggesting for Greek too the existence prenominally of a reduced relative clause source independent of Determiner Spreading. Interestingly, verbal reduced relative clauses can also be prenominal in Greek (see (5c) of Chapter 4, above). For the ambiguity of articleless adjectives also see Marinis and Panagiotidis (2005, section 2.2). Greek, then, is closer to English than to Italian. In prenominal position, it allows adjectives derived from relative clauses to precede adjectives merged as direct modifiers. In contrast to English, however, it does not allow for (articleless) postnominal adjectives (Alexiadou, Haegeman and Stavrou 2007, 287). Alexiadou and Wilder (1998,317) claim that in prenominal position even articulated adjectives have an unmarked order (size > colour > N vs. (*) colour > size > N), but not all speakers appear to share this judgment. See Ramaglia (2007,163,fn.1).

²⁸ Recall the analogous cases of Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian ((19) and (20) above), where short-form adjectives (which only have a relative clause source) cannot be closer to the N than long-form adjectives, and of Chinese *de* and *de*-less adjectives ((7)).

²⁹ Alexiadou and Wilder (1998) claim that “it is predicted that adjectives that cannot be used predicatively (in copula sentences etc.) should not permit determiner spreading in attributive use” (306), and that those readings of an adjective that are unavailable in predicate position, like the reading ‘unfortunate’/‘pitiable’ for the adjective *ftohos* (‘poor’), cannot be articulated (314f). However, Androutsopoulou (1995,24; 2001,191) gives examples such as (37) below, and Melita Stavrou (p.c.), tells me that *o ftohos o anthropos* can (for speakers like her) mean ‘the pitiable man’. Arhonto Terzi tells me (p.c.) that Determiner Spreading is in fact obligatory with *kaimenos* ‘pitiable’.

Those adjectives, or readings of an adjective, that are unavailable in predicate position are typically found in Romance in prenominal position, but Alexiadou’s (2001) claim that “those adjectives which do not participate in D[eterminer] S[preading] in Greek occur strictly in prenominal position in Romance” (p.222) (cf. also Alexiadou 2003, section 5.1) is not accurate. Thematic and classificatory adjectives corresponding to those in (35) and (36), which do not participate in DS, appear in Romance obligatorily in postnominal position, just as many other non-predicative adjectives (e.g., *L’/II* < *medio > *americano* < medio > ‘the average American’ (cf. Carlson and Pelletier 2000, and Kennedy and Stanley 2008), *un* < *unico > *figlio* < unico > ‘an only child’, < *stretti > *parenti* < stretti > ‘close relatives’. Romance nonrestrictive adjectives corresponding to the Greek example (28), which does not participate in Determiner Spreading, can also be postnominal.

³⁰ It is not clear whether the other two differences pointed out by Leu (2008,55f) between Greek Determiner Spreading and German Restrictive Elliptic Appositive are real differences. If what is proposed in note 25 above and in Stavrou (to appear) (namely that Determiner Spreading of null indefinite articles is also possible in Greek) German and Greek would be similar in this respect. The fact that in Greek Determiner Spreading is also possible prenominally while Restrictive Elliptic Appositives in German are not might instead depend on a separate difference: the existence of DP internal focus movement in Greek but not in German.

³¹ This analysis recalls the Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian case discussed in note 14 above (and of the analysis of Russian long-form adjectives to be discussed in section 6 below). More directly it recalls the analysis given by Marušič and Žaucer (2005,2006) and Laskova (2007) for the articulated adjective constructions of colloquial Slovenian and Bulgarian, respectively, in terms of an elliptical DP. See, for example, (i) from Slovenian and (24) from Bulgarian:

(i) *a tá [ta zelen [e]] svinčnik* (Marušič and Žaucer 2006,189)

this the green pencil

‘this green pencil’

b *moj [ta bivši [e]] mož je pjanc* (Marušič and Žaucer 2006,201)

my (the) former husband is drunkard

‘My former husband is a drunkard’

(ii)a onaia [zelenata [e]] bluza (Laskova 2007,72)

that green.*the* blouse

‘that gree blouse’

b onaia [predišnata [e]] magazinierka (Laskova 2007,79)

that previous.*the* shop clerk

‘That previous shop clerk’

As Marušič and Žaucer (2006,201) point out, only the presence of *ta* in (i)b (which is otherwise optional) implies that I have a new husband (as would, it seems, to say in English ‘my husband, the former one’ vs. ‘my former husband’).

Exactly the same holds of the corresponding Bulgarian sentence (Vesselina Laskova, p.c.).

If one adds the case of Romanian presented above, the phenomenon of reduced RCs with a DP in predicate position containing an elliptical N appears to represent a Balkan feature (although the case of articulated adjectives in Albanian may be different. See, for recent discussion, Androutsopoulou 2001, Turano 2002, Alexiadou 2003, section 6.3). It remains to be seen whether the differences pointed out in Marchis and Alexiadou (2008) between Greek Determiner Spreading and the Romanian *cel* construction can be explained away under an essentially unified analysis in terms of a reduced RC appositional DP with an elliptical N.

³² On Russian long- and short-form adjectives there is a rich literature. See Babby (1970,1973,1975,1999), Sussex (1971), Siegel (1976a,b), Bailyn (1994), Groen (1998), Pereltsvaig (2000,2001), Corbett (2004), Matushansky (2006, 2008), and references cited there.

³³ See note 16 above, where it was conjectured that only those adjectives that are merged as predicates of the higher reduced relative clause can retain the short form, while those merged as predicates of the lower reduced relative clause have to take the long form.

³⁴ See Pereltsvaig (2000, sections 4.1, 4.2) for some complications in the agreement properties of such null nouns. Even though she shows that some of the arguments for the presence of a null noun are not cogent, I take the overall evidence in favor of the null noun analysis to be sound.

³⁵ For similar examples, see Corbett (2004,206). Siegel (1976b) discusses additional evidence in favor of her analysis. For example, she notes (p.294f) that long-form adjectives ((i)a) behave like predicate nouns ((i)b), and unlike short-form adjectives ((i)c) and verbs ((i)d), in taking singular agreement with the 2nd person plural pronoun *vy* used for 2nd person singular in nonintimate speech:

(i)a Ivan, *vy* molodoj/*molodye

Ivan, you (are) young (long form sg/*pl)

b Ivan, vy artist/*artisty

Ivan, you (are an) artist (sg./*pl)

c Ivan, vy *molod/molody

Ivan, you (are) young (short form *sg/pl)

d Ivan, vy *govoril/govorili

Ivan you were speaking (*sg/pl)

(i)a and b reduce to one and the same property if long-form adjectives are taken to agree with a null predicate noun.

(Also see Bailyn's 1994,12ff, discussion on this point).

She also notes (p.293,fn.1) that those adjectives that cannot be used as predicates (like *byvshij* 'former') have no short form. For careful discussion of the traditional arguments and additional arguments that long-form adjectives in Russian are only attributive, see Matushansky (2006,2008, section 6).

³⁶ Pereltsvaig (2000,section 5.1) notes that short-form adjectives often differ from the corresponding long-form ones in a systematic way, with short forms denoting temporary (or stage-level) properties, and long forms more enduring (or individual-level) properties (also see Siegel 1976b,295, and Groen 1998). Pereltsvaig also points out that in some short-form/long-form pairs, the long forms have additional meanings. So for example the short-form *beden* means 'penniless' while the long-form *bednyj* means either 'penniless' or 'pitiful', which recalls the situation found in Romance, where the adjective 'poor' means 'penniless' when used in predicate position, but is ambiguous between 'penniless' and 'pitiful' in adnominal position.

³⁷ Also see Krause (2001,section 2.1.1, and 85ff). A similar situation holds in Dutch:

(i)a het boek is moeilijk (Corver 1997,345)

the book is difficult

b het moeilijk-e boek (Corver 1997,345)

the difficult-INFL book

(ii)a De vrouw kwam huilend de kamer binnen (Corver, p.c.)

The woman came crying the room into

'The woman entered the room crying/while she was crying'

b de huilend-e vrouw (Corver, p.c.)

the crying-INFL woman

On adjective inflection in Dutch, also see Kester (1996,section 2.3.1.3).