

Chapter 2: A systematic contrast between English (Germanic) and Italian

(Romance)

In both English and Italian, prenominal and postnominal adjectives differ in interpretation with respect to a number of well-known semantic distinctions. As will become apparent, English (and more generally Germanic) displays a pattern which is the opposite of that of Italian (and more generally Romance). While English adjectives are ambiguous between the two values of a number of semantic distinctions in prenominal position, and have only one value in postnominal position (where available), adjectives in Italian are ambiguous in postnominal position and have only one value in prenominal position (which is, in fact, the opposite of the one displayed by English adjectives in postnominal position).

Our claim that the prenominal reading of many Italian (Romance) adjectives is also found postnominally is at variance with the often made claim that prenominal and postnominal adjectives in Romance differ systematically in meaning (see, among others, Waugh 1977,151f; Bernstein 1993a,56; 1993b,fn.18; Alexiadou 2001,2003; Mallén 2002; Alexiadou, Haegeman and Stavrou 2007, Part III, Chapter 1, section 4.2; Pasqui 2007). In fact, some even go so far as to claim that prenominal and postnominal adjectives in Romance can never have exactly the same interpretations in the two positions. Bouchard (2002,73ff), for example, reviews quite a number of well-known cases where such differences are obvious (*une femme seule* ‘a woman who is alone’ vs. *une seule femme* ‘only one woman’; *une victoire certaine* ‘a sure victory’ vs. *une certaine victoire* ‘a certain victory’, pp.81,85, etc.), and others where the differences are less obvious, yet real (*un habile chirurgien* ‘a skilful surgeon (as a surgeon)’ vs. *un chirurgien habile* ‘a skilful surgeon at something (for a surgeon)’, p.99). But this is not the point. What needs to be shown is that no cases exist where exactly the same reading is found both prenominally and postnominally (in addition to other, perhaps more salient, readings). Such cases, however, exist.

If one takes non-predicative adjectives that can occur both pre- and postnominally, the identity of the readings appears more evident, as no other reading is added when one puts the adjective in postnominal position: *questa è una vera e propria falsità, questa è una falsità vera e propria* ‘this is a real lie’; *questa è la probabile causa della sua morte, questa è la causa probabile della sua morte* ‘this is the probable cause of his death’; *questo è il principale motivo della sua partenza, questo è il motivo principale della sua partenza* ‘this is the main reason of his departure’ (Cinque 1994,94).¹

In general, when one construes the right context, many adjectives in Romance indeed prove to retain in postnominal position the meaning they have prenominal. This conclusion, which is shared by other authors (for French, by Delomier 1980,22; Ewert and Hansen 1993,167, who also cite Brunot 1922,639; Jones 1996,321; Abeillé and Godard 1999,12,16, and fns.4 and 12; Aljović 2000,102; Borrillo 2001,42f; for Spanish, by Contreras 1981,151; Demonte 1982,271,278ff, 1999a, 208; Rigau 1999, 351; for Romanian, by Cornilescu 2003b,5; 2006,60), stands as a problem for Bouchard’s (2002) analysis. Also see note 7 of this chapter.

We review now a number of well-known semantic distinctions, which reveal a very systematic pattern of oppositions between English (Germanic) and Italian (Romance).

2.1 Individual-level vs. stage-level readings. Building on Bolinger (1967), a number of authors (Ferris 1993, section 3.5; Sadler and Arnold 1994; Svenonius 1994; Larson 1998) note that in prenominal position English adjectives are systematically ambiguous between a reading in which they denote an enduring, or individual-level, property and one in which they denote a temporary, or stage-level, one (see (1)), while in postnominal position ((2)) they more typically (though perhaps not always) denote a stage-level property.²

English

(1)a The **visible** stars include Aldebaran and Sirius (*ambiguous*)

b ‘The stars that are generally visible include Aldebaran and Sirius’ (individual-level)

c ‘The stars that happen to be visible now include Aldebaran and Sirius’ (stage-level)

(2)a The (only) stars **visible** are Aldebaran and Sirius (*unambiguous*)

b #‘The (only) stars that are generally visible are Aldebaran and Sirius’ (individual-level)

c ‘The (only) stars which happen to be visible now are Aldebaran and Sirius’ (stage-level)

In Italian, and more generally in Romance, the situation is the opposite of that more typically found in English. Only one reading is possible prenominal (the individual-level reading – see (3)), while both readings are possible postnominally ((4)):

Italian

(3)a Le **invisibili** stelle di Andromeda esercitano un grande fascino (*unambiguous*)

the invisible stars of Andromeda have a great fascination

b ‘Andromeda’s stars, which are generally invisible, have a great fascination’ (individual-level)

c #‘Andromeda’s generally visible stars, which happen to be invisible now, have a great fascination’ (stage-level)

(4)a Le stelle **invisibili** di Andromeda sono moltissime (*ambiguous*)

the stars invisible of A. are very many

b ‘Andromeda’s stars, which are generally invisible, are very many’ (individual-level)

c ‘Andromeda’s generally visible stars, which happen to be invisible now, are very many’ (stage-level)

2.2 Restrictive vs. nonrestrictive readings. Another well-known distinction affecting the interpretation of adjectives is the restrictive/non-restrictive distinction (Jespersen 1924, chapter VIII; Bolinger 1967; Larson and Marušič 2004, among many others). The two languages show once again the same pattern. The adjective is ambiguous in prenominal position in English ((5)), and in postnominal position in Italian ((8)); and it is unambiguously interpreted as restrictive in postnominal position in English ((6)), and nonrestrictively in prenominal position in Italian ((7)).³

English

(5)a All of his **unsuitable** acts were condemned (*ambiguous*)

b ‘All his acts were condemned; they were unsuitable’ (non-restrictive)

c ‘All (and only) his acts that were unsuitable were condemned’ (restrictive)

(6)a Every word **unsuitable** was deleted (*unambiguous*)

b #‘Every word was deleted; they were unsuitable’ (non-restrictive)

c ‘Every word that was unsuitable was deleted’ (restrictive)

Italian

(7)a Le **noiose** lezioni di Ferri se le ricordano tutti (*unambiguous*)

the boring classes of F. remember all

b ‘Everybody remembers Ferri’s classes, all of which were boring’ (non-restrictive)

c #‘Everybody remembers just those classes by Ferri which were boring’ (restrictive)

(8)a Le lezioni **noiose** di Ferri se le ricordano tutti (*ambiguous*)⁴

the classes boring of F. remember all

- b ‘Everybody remembers Ferri’s classes, all of which were boring’ (non-restrictive)
- c ‘Everybody remembers just those classes by Ferri which were boring’ (restrictive)

2.3 Modal vs. implicit relative clause readings. Larson (2000a) notes that an adjective like *possible* in English is ambiguous in prenominal position between a modal reading (roughly paraphrasable as ‘potential’) and an implicit relative clause reading with Antecedent Contained Deletion (see (9)), while postnominally it is unambiguous, just retaining the implicit relative clause reading with Antecedent Contained Deletion (see (10)). Once again, Italian shows the opposite pattern: ambiguity in postnominal position ((12), and retention of just the modal reading in prenominal position ((11)).⁵

English

(9)a Mary interviewed every **possible** candidate (*ambiguous*)

b ‘Mary interviewed every potential candidate’ (modal reading)

c ‘Mary interviewed every candidate that it was possible for her to interview’ (implicit relative clause reading)

(10)a Mary interviewed every candidate **possible** (*unambiguous*)

b #‘Mary interviewed every potential candidate’ (modal reading)

c ‘Mary interviewed every candidate that it was possible for her to interview’ (implicit relative clause reading)

Italian

(11)a Maria ha intervistato ogni **possibile** candidato (*unambiguous*)

M. has interviewed every possible candidate

b ‘Maria interviewed every potential candidate’ (modal reading)

c #‘Maria interviewed every candidate that it was possible for her to interview’ (implicit relative clause reading)

(12)a Maria ha intervistato ogni candidato **possibile** (*ambiguous*)

M. has interviewed every candidate possible

b ‘Maria interviewed every potential candidate’ (modal reading)

c ‘Maria interviewed every candidate that it was possible for her to interview’ (implicit relative clause reading)

2.4 Intersective vs. nonintersective (adverbial) readings. In prenominal position in English, many adjectives are systematically ambiguous between an intersective and a nonintersective reading. So, for example, as Larson (1995) observed, in *Olga is a beautiful dancer*, *beautiful* can either refer to the set of beautiful entities intersecting with the set of dancers, in which case it is interpreted as applying to the extension, or referent, of *dancer* (“she is beautiful as a person, and is a dancer”), or can modify the intension of “dancer”, in which case its interpretation is ‘adverbial’ rather than intersective (“she dances beautifully”). See Vendler (1968, chapter 6) and, for a more accurate characterization of this ambiguity, Larson (1995,1998).

As (13) shows, the ambiguity is preserved even if prenominal *beautiful* is in the comparative form (and the standard of comparison is “extraposed”). Although an adjective like *beautiful* cannot be found by itself in postnominal position (**a dancer beautiful.*), it can if it is followed by the marker and standard of comparison, as in (14a), in which case it only has the intersective interpretation.⁶

Once again, Italian contrasts systematically with English. Prenominally, the adjective is

unambiguous (it can only be interpreted nonintersectively, or ‘adverbially’ - see (15)) , whereas postnominally it is ambiguous between the intersective and the nonintersective interpretations ((16)).⁷

English

(13)a Olga is a more **beautiful** dancer than her instructor (*ambiguous*)

b ‘Olga is a dancer who is also a more beautiful person than her instructor’ (intersective)

c ‘Olga dances more beautifully than her instructor’ (nonintersective)

(14)a Olga is a dancer more **beautiful** than her instructor (*unambiguous*)

b ‘Olga is a dancer who is also a more beautiful person than her instructor’ (intersective)

c #‘Olga dances more beautifully than her instructor’ (nonintersective)

Italian

(15)a Un **buon** attaccante non farebbe mai una cosa del genere (*unambiguous*)

a good forward not would.do never a thing of the kind

b ‘A forward good at playing forward would never do such a thing’(nonintersective)

c #‘A good-hearted forward would never do such a thing’(intersective)

(16)a Un attaccante **buono** non farebbe mai una cosa del genere (*ambiguous*)

a forward good not would.do never a thing of the kind

b ‘A forward good at playing forward would never do such a thing’(nonintersective)

c ‘A good-hearted forward would never do such a thing’(intersective)

2.5 Relative (to a comparison class) vs. absolute readings. As noted by many authors (Bartsch and Vennemann 1972, Part II, Bartsch 1972, Kamp 1975, Higginbotham 1985, among others), scalar adjectives (like *big* in *A big tank was coming toward us*) can be understood in an absolute sense ('a big object') or as relative to a comparison class (typically provided by the noun with which they combine, i.e. 'big for a tank').⁸

In prenominal position in Italian such adjectives can only be understood in an absolute way. So, for example, in (19)a, *gli altissimi edifici di New York* 'New York's very tall buildings' only means that New York's buildings are extremely tall objects, in an absolute sense, not that they are very tall compared to the average height of buildings. In postnominal position, on the other hand, *altissimi* 'very tall' is ambiguous between these two readings (see (20)). In English, it is the prenominal position that is ambiguous ((17)a) (for the postnominal position one cannot tell given that such adjectives cannot occur there):

English

(17)a New York's very **tall** buildings impress everybody (*ambiguous*)

b 'New York's buildings, which are very tall objects, impress everybody' (absolute)

c 'New York's buildings, which are very tall compared to the average height of buildings, impress everybody' (relative)

(18) [the postnominal positioning of the adjective cannot be tested]

Italian

(19)a Gli **altissimi** edifici di New York colpiscono tutti (*unambiguous*)

the very tall buildings of N.Y. strike all

b ‘New York’s buildings, which are very tall objects, impress everybody’ (absolute)

c #‘New York’s buildings, which are very tall compared to the average height of buildings, impress everybody’ (relative)

(20)a Gli edifici **altissimi** di New York colpiscono tutti (*ambiguous*)

the buildings very tall of N.Y. strike all

b ‘New York’s buildings, which are very tall objects, impress everybody’ (absolute)

c ‘New York’s buildings, which are very tall compared to the average height of buildings, impress everybody’ (relative)

2.6 Comparative vs. absolute readings of superlatives. A similar pattern is provided by the interpretation of the superlative form of adjectives. In prenominal position a superlative adjective in English is ambiguous between an absolute and a comparative reading. See (21) (for the postnominal position one cannot tell given that such adjectives cannot occur there).⁹

Once again, Italian differs in displaying ambiguity in postnominal position (see (24)), but not prenominally (see (23)), where it only admits an absolute reading:

English

(21)a Who climbed the **highest** snowy mountain? (*ambiguous*)

b ‘Who climbed Mt. Everest?’ (absolute)

c ‘Who climbed a snowy mountain higher than those which others climbed?’ (comparative)

(22) [the postnominal positioning of the adjective cannot be tested]

Italian

(23)a Chi ha scalato la **più alta** montagna innevata? (*unambiguous*)

who has climbed the most high mountain snowy

b ‘Who climbed Mt. Everest?’ (absolute)

c #‘Who climbed a snowy mountain higher than that which others climbed?’ (comparative)

(24)a Chi ha scalato la montagna innevata **più alta**? (*ambiguous*)

who has climbed the mountain snowy most high

b ‘Who climbed Mt. Everest?’ (absolute)

c ‘Who climbed a snowy mountain higher than that which others climbed?’ (relative)

2.7 Specificity vs. non-specificity inducing readings. There is another property which distinguishes the prenominal from the postnominal position of the adjective in Romance. This was originally noted by Bosque (1993) for Spanish (also see Bosque 1996 and 2001, Ticio 2003, 124ff, Jacob 2006), and, after him, by Picallo (1994) for Catalan. Similar facts seem to hold in Italian and French, and, we conjecture, throughout Romance. The prenominal position of the adjective renders an indefinite DP specific (in *realis* contexts). See (27), which implies the existence of a specific actor that will come to the party, whether or not the speaker knows his identity. When the adjective is postnominal, instead, the indefinite DP need not be specific ((28)). No comparable contrast is detectable in English, for reasons that we come back to (see (25) and (26)):

English

(25)a John will burn a **nearby** house (*ambiguous*)

b ‘John will burn some specific house which is near his’ (specific)

c ‘John will burn some house or other among those which are near his’ (non-specific)

(26)a John will burn a house **nearby** (*ambiguous*)

b ‘John will burn a specific house which is near his’ (specific)

c ‘John will burn some house or other among those which are near his’ (non-specific)

Italian

(27)a Domani, alla festa so che intervorrà un **famoso** attore (*unambiguous*)

tomorrow, to the party I.know that will.intervene a famous actor

b ‘Tomorrow, I know that a certain famous actor will come to the party’ (specific)

c #‘Tomorrow, I know that some famous actor or other will come to the party’ (non-specific)

(28)a Domani, alla festa so che intervorrà un attore **famoso** (*ambiguous*)

tomorrow, to the party I.know that will.intervene an actor famous

b ‘Tomorrow, I know that a certain famous actor will come to the party’ (specific)

c ‘Tomorrow, I know that some famous actor or other will come to the party’ (non-specific)

For reasons that remain to be understood, a prenominal adjective no longer forces a specific reading of an indefinite DP in Romance if this is embedded in a modal (*irrealis*) context. Compare (27)a with (29):¹⁰

(29)a Se mai incontrerò un famoso attore di Hollywood, gli chiederò un autografo

‘If ever I meet a famous Hollywood actor, I’ll ask him an autograph’

b Chiunque vorrebbe essere una famosa star del cinema

‘Anyone would like to be a famous movie star’.

When not in a modal context, exclusively prenominal adjectives like *vecchio* (in the sense of ‘long standing’), *povero* (in the sense of ‘pitiable’), etc. also induce a specific reading of the DP (*Domani, alla festa ci sarà anche un tuo vecchio amico* ‘Tomorrow, at the party there will be an old friend of yours’; *domani forse intervorrà anche un tuo povero collega* ‘tomorrow perhaps there will also be a poor colleague of yours’).

The specificity-inducing character of the prenominal position of the adjective in Italian emerges more clearly in contexts such as (30)a-b, which are incompatible with a specific interpretation of the indefinite DP (as they assert its non existence):

(30)a Purtroppo, su questo argomento, non esiste un <*significativo> articolo <significativo>

‘Unfortunately, on this topic, no significant article exists’

b Non credo proprio che ci sia un <*famoso> attore <famoso> per questa parte

‘I really don’t think that there is a famous actor for this part’

This context contrasts with that in (31), which is instead compatible with a specific interpretation of the indefinite DP:

(31)a Su questo argomento, Gianni ha già scritto un <significativo> articolo <significativo>

‘On this topic, Gianni has already written a significant article’

b Credo proprio che ci sia un <famoso> attore <famoso> per questa parte

‘I really think that there is a famous actor for this part’

Clear evidence in Spanish that an indefinite DP with a prenominal adjective is interpreted as specific is provided by contrasts like the following (from Bosque 2001,27):

(32)a Busco (a) un actor famoso

b Busco *(a) un famoso actor

‘I am looking for a famous actor’

When specific, animate direct objects are necessarily preceded by the preposition *a* (‘to’) (see Brugè and Brugger 1996, Torrego 1998 for discussion and references); hence the ungrammaticality of (32b) without *a*, given the necessarily specific interpretation induced by the prenominal adjective.¹¹

2.8 Evaluative vs. epistemic readings of ‘unknown’. Abusch and Rooth (1997) note that, when used attributively in an indefinite DP, an adjective like *unknown* is ambiguous between a simple evaluative reading and a epistemic one.¹² See (33) (the interpretation of *unknown* in postnominal position cannot be tested because the adjective cannot occur there).

In Italian, the same ambiguity is found in postnominal but not in prenominal position, where only the evaluative reading is possible (see (35)-(36)):

English

(33)a Maria lives in some **unknown** village in the South of France (*ambiguous*)

b Maria lives in some village in the South of France which is not a well-known one (*evaluative*)

c Maria lives in some village in the South of France, but it not known which one (*epistemic*)

(34) [the postnominal positioning of the adjective cannot be tested]

Italian

(35)a Maria vive in uno **sconosciuto** villaggio del sud della Francia (*unambiguous*)

M. lives in an unknown village of the South of the France

b ‘Maria lives in some village in the South of France which is not a well-known one’ (*evaluative*)

c #‘Maria lives in some village in the South of France, but it not known which one’ (*epistemic*)

(36)a Maria vive in un villaggio **sconosciuto** del sud della Francia (*ambiguous*)

M. lives in a village unknown of the South of the France

b ‘Maria lives in some village in the South of France which is not a well-known one’ (*evaluative*)

c ‘Maria lives in some village in the South of France, but it not known which one’ (*epistemic*)

2.9 NP dependent vs. discourse anaphoric readings of ‘different’. The adjective *different* in English, among its various interpretations (Carlson 1987; Moltmann 1992,1997, section 4.5.2; Beck 1998, 2000), has what Beck (1998, 2000) refers to as the “NP dependent” ((37)b), and the “discourse anaphoric” ((37)c) readings:¹³

English

(37)a Detmar and Kordula live in **different** cities (*ambiguous*) (Beck 1998,19)

b ‘The city that Detmar lives in is different from the city that Kordula lives in’ (*NP dependent reading*)

c ‘Detmar and Kordula live in cities which are different from some salient city’ (*discourse anaphoric reading*)

(38) [the postnominal positioning of the adjective cannot be tested]

In Italian, the same ambiguity is once again found in postnominal position, but not prenominal, where only the NP dependent reading is available. See (39) and (40):

Italian

(39)a Gianni e Mario vivono in **differenti** città (*unambiguous*)

G. and M live in different cities

b ‘The city that Gianni lives in is different from the city that Mario lives in’ (*NP dependent reading*)

c #‘Gianni and Mario live in cities which are different from some salient city’ (*discourse anaphoric reading*)¹⁴

(40)a Gianni e Mario vivono in città **differenti** (*ambiguous*)

G. and M live in cities different

b ‘The city that Gianni lives in is different from the city that Mario lives in’ (*NP dependent reading*)

c ‘Gianni and Mario live in cities which are different from some salient city’ (*discourse anaphoric reading*)

2.10 Summary of the basic generalizations.

The basic generalizations on the interpretive properties of prenominal and postnominal adjectives emerging from the data of the preceding sections are summarized in tables 1 and 2.

English (Germanic)

Prenominal adjectives	N	postnominal adjectives
stage-level or individual-level reading		stage-level (or individual-level) reading
restrictive or nonrestrictive reading		restrictive reading
implicit relative clause or modal reading		implicit relative clause reading
intersective or nonintersective reading		intersective reading
relative or absolute reading		[cannot be tested]
comparative or absolute reading of superlatives		[cannot be tested]
specificity or non-specificity inducing reading		specificity or non-specificity inducing reading
evaluative or epistemic reading of ‘unknown’		[cannot be tested]
NP dependent or discourse anaphoric reading of ‘different’		[cannot be tested]

table 1

Italian (Romance)

Prenominal adjectives	N	postnominal adjectives
individual-level reading		individual-level or stage-level reading
nonrestrictive reading		restrictive or nonrestrictive reading
modal reading		modal or implicit relative clause reading
nonintersective reading		intersective or nonintersective reading
absolute reading		relative or absolute reading
absolute reading of superlatives		comparative or absolute reading of superlatives
specificity inducing reading		specificity or non-specificity inducing reading
evaluative reading of ‘unknown’		evaluative or epistemic reading of ‘unknown’
NP dependent reading of ‘different’		NP dependent or discourse anaphoric reading of ‘different’

table 2

2.10.1 An asymmetric distribution of interpretive possibilities. The asymmetric distribution of interpretive possibilities seen in tables 1 and 2 can be characterized as follows.

In English (Germanic) the prenominal position is systematically ambiguous between the two values of each property, while the postnominal one (when available) has only one value: stage-level, restrictive, implicit relative clause, and intersective readings (the fact that it retains an ambiguity for the specificity/non-specificity inducing reading, and partly for the stage/individual level reading, will be later related to the fact that the adjective is similarly ambiguous in the predicate position of a relative clause).¹⁵

In Italian (Romance), instead, it is the postnominal position that is systematically ambiguous between the two values of each property, while the prenominal one only has the individual-level, nonrestrictive, modal, nonintersective, absolute, absolute with superlatives, specificity inducing, evaluative, and NP dependent, readings.¹⁶

These values necessarily go together. So, for example, the absolute interpretation of the adjective *altissimi* ‘very tall’, whether in prenominal ((19)a) or in postnominal ((20)a), position, is necessarily nonrestrictive, individual-level, etc.¹⁷ Similarly, the evaluative reading of *sconosciuto* ‘unknown’ in (35)a (*Maria vive in uno sconosciuto villaggio del sud della Francia* ‘Maria lives in some village in the South of France, which happens not to be a well-known one’) is also individual-level, nonrestrictive, specific, etc.¹⁸

2.10.2 Postnominal adjectives in English (first part). Postnominal adjectives in English are argued by Sadler and Arnold (1994,194-96), Larson (1998, 2000a,b), Larson and Marušič (2004) to be reduced relative clauses (also see James 1979,692, Ferris 1993, section 3.8, and Jacobsson 1996,214).

Evidence for this conclusion comes from the fact that whenever an adjective can be found both prenominally and postnominally, with different properties, the postnominal one invariably shows a behavior identical to that of the corresponding predicative adjective inside a restrictive relative clause.

As noted above, the prenominal position of *possible* in (9)a, repeated here as (41)a, is ambiguous between a modal reading (roughly equivalent to ‘potential’) and a reduced relative clause reading with Antecedent Contained Deletion (roughly paraphrasable as ‘every candidate which it was possible for her to interview’ - see Larson 2000a).

The postnominal position ((41)b), instead, only retains the reduced relative clause reading with Antecedent Contained Deletion, as in the corresponding relative clause containing the adjective in predicate position ((41)c):

(41)a Mary interviewed every possible candidate

b. Mary interviewed every candidate possible

c Mary interviewed every candidate which it was possible for her to interview

(42)a-b is another well-known minimal pair (see Sadler and Arnold 1994,194 for this and other such pairs, as well as Markus 1997). Prenominal *present* only has a temporal reading while postnominal *present* only has a locative meaning. The corresponding relative clause with *present* in predicate position ((42)c) only has the reading of postnominal *present*: the locative one.

(42)a the present editors

b the editors present

c the editors who are/were present

(43)a-b shows an adjectival doublet (cf. Larson and Marušič 2004,272f). One of the two (*live*) can only be found in prenominal position; the other (*alive*) only in postnominal position (but see Blöhdorn 2009,80 for an example of pronominal *alive*; and Jacobsson 1961). The only form possible in the predicate position of the corresponding relative clause ((43)c) is the ‘postnominal’ *alive*.

(43)a the live/*alive animals

b the animals *live/alive

c the animals which are *live/alive

The systematic identity in behavior between adjectives in postnominal position and the same adjectives in the predicate position of a relative clause becomes understandable if the former are actually nothing other than reduced relative clauses.¹⁹

2.10.3 Order of the two readings in prenominal position in English (Germanic). The two readings available prenominal in English can in fact cooccur, and when they do they are strictly ordered (Larson 1998, 2000a,b), the leftmost corresponding systematically to the postnominal (reduced relative clause) reading. See (44)-(52):

stage-level > individual-level > N > stage-level²⁰ (Larson 1998,155f)

(44)a Every VISIBLE visible star

(*Every visible VISIBLE star)

b Every visible star VISIBLE

restrictive > nonrestrictive > N > restrictive (cf. Larson and Marušič 2004,275)

(45)a His MOST UNSUITABLE unsuitable acts

(*His unsuitable MOST UNSUITABLE acts)

b His unsuitable acts MOST UNSUITABLE

implicit relative clause > modal > N > implicit relative clause (Larson 2000a)²¹

(46)a She tried to interview every POSSIBLE possible candidate

(*She tried to interview every possible POSSIBLE candidate)

b She tried to interview every possible candidate POSSIBLE

intersective > nonintersective > N > intersective (Larson and Marušič 2004,281)²²

(47)a She is a BEAUTIFUL beautiful dancer

(*she is a beautiful BEAUTIFUL dancer)

b She is a beautiful dancer MORE BEAUTIFUL THAN HER INSTRUCTOR

relative (to a comparison class) > absolute > N > relative (to a comparison class)

(48)a I have never seen QUITE SO TALL tall buildings

(*I have never seen tall QUITE SO TALL buildings)

b I have never seen tall buildings QUITE SO TALL

(49) [~~comparative superlative > absolute superlative N~~] (does not apply)

(50) [~~non-specificity > specificity inducing N~~] (does not apply)

epistemic > evaluative > N

(51)a Maria lives in some UNKNOWN unknown village in the South of France

(*Maria lives in some unknown UNKNOWN village in the South of France)

b [postnominal position cannot be tested]

discourse anaphoric > NP dependent > N

(52)a John and Mary live in DIFFERENT different cities

(*John and Mary live in different DIFFERENT cities)

b [postnominal position cannot be tested]

Given that they are invariably identical, it is reasonable to consider the leftmost of the two prenominal positions and the postnominal position deriving from a reduced relative clause to be transformationally related.

A possibility in line with the tradition would be to consider the leftmost prenominal position as derived through fronting of the postnominal one. For reasons discussed in Cinque (2003, 2008b, in preparation), I will rather assume (reduced) relative clauses to be merged preminally, their ultimate postnominal location being a consequence of their movement to a higher licensing position, followed by merger of a (possibly covert) complementizer that attracts the entire remnant to its left, along lines recently developed by Kayne (1999,2000,2005a). See Chapter 3, section 3.1 and Chapter 4, section 4.2, below for somewhat more detailed discussion. Nothing here, however, hinges crucially on that decision.

2.10.4 Order of the two readings in postnominal position in Italian (Romance). The two readings available postnominally in Italian (Romance) are strictly ordered in the opposite way (with the leftmost of the two corresponding to the prenominal one):²³

individual-level > N > individual-level > stage-level

(53)a una posizione invidiabile (oggi ancor più) INVIDIABILE

a position enviable (today even more) enviable

‘a (today even more) enviable enviable position’

(*una posizione (oggi ancor più) INVIDIABILE invidiabile)

b una invidiabile posizione (oggi ancor più) INVIDIABILE

an enviable position (today even more) enviable

‘a (today even more) enviable enviable position’

nonrestrictive > N > nonrestrictive > restrictive

(54)a I greci industriosi PIU’ INDUSTRIOSI

the Greeks industrious most industrious

‘the most industrious industrious Greeks’

(*I greci PIU’ INDUSTRIOSI industriosi)

b Gli industriosi greci PIU’ INDUSTRIOSI

the industrious Greeks most industrious

‘the most industrious industrious Greeks’

modal > N > modal > implicit relative clause²⁴

(55)a Cercò di intervistare ogni candidato possibile POSSIBILE

he tried to interview every candidate potential possible

‘He tried to interview every possible potential candidate’

(*Cercò di intervistare ogni candidato POSSIBILE possibile)

b Cercò di intervistare ogni possibile candidato POSSIBILE

‘he tried to interview every potential candidate possible’

nonintersective > N > nonintersective > intersective

(56)a Un attaccante buono BUONO

a forward good good

‘a good-hearted good forward’

(*Un attaccante BUONO buono)

b Un buon attaccante BUONO

a good forward good

‘a good-hearted good forward’

absolute > N > absolute > relative (to a comparison class)

(57)a edifici altissimi COSI’ ALTI

buildings very tall so tall

‘So tall very tall buildings’

(*edifici COSI’ ALTI altissimi)

b altissimi edifici COSI’ ALTI

very tall buildings SO TALL

‘So tall very tall buildings’

(58) [[N absolute superl. > comparative superl.] (does not apply)]

(59) [[N specificity-inducing > non-specificity-inducing] (does not apply)]

evaluative > N > evaluative > epistemic

(60)a (vive in) un villaggio sconosciuto SCONOSCIUTO

(she lives in) a village unknown unknown

‘She lives in an unknown unknown village’

(*Vive in un villaggio SCONOSCIUTO sconosciuto)

b (vive in) uno sconosciuto villaggio SCONOSCIUTO

(she lives in) an unknown village unknown

‘She lives in an unknown unknown village’

NP dependent > N > NP dependent > discourse anaphoric

(61)a Gianni e Mario vivono in città differenti DIFFERENTI

Gianni and Mario live in cities different different

‘Gianni and Mario live in different different cities’

(*Gianni e Mario vivono in città DIFFERENTI differenti)

b Gianni e Mario vivono in differenti città DIFFERENTI

Gianni and Mario live in different cities different

‘Gianni and Mario live in different different cities’

2.10.5 Summary of the orders of the two readings in English (Germanic) and Italian

(Romance). If we refer to APs with the readings individual-level, nonrestrictive, modal, nonintersective, absolute, specificity-inducing, evaluative, and NP dependent, as “direct modification” APs (to borrow a term from Sproat and Shih 1988,1991), the surface orderings so far reviewed may be succinctly stated as follows (RC = relative clause):²⁵

(62) English (Germanic)

AP from reduced RC > “direct modification” AP > N > AP from reduced RC

(63) Italian (Romance)

“direct modification” AP > N > “direct modification” AP > AP from reduced RC

¹ Alexiadou, Haegeman and Stavrou (2007, 329f, 374) surprisingly claim that in Italian the postnominal position of non predicative adjectives like *principale* is ungrammatical.

² While Bolinger (1967) appears to claim that when both positions are available for a given adjective, the adjective is interpreted as an enduring or characteristic property in prenominal position, and as an occasional, temporary, property in postnominal position (“[...] *the only river navigable* is unambiguously occasion, *the only navigable river* unambiguously characteristic” (p.4)), Sadler and Arnold (1994) observe that temporary (for them, stage-level) readings “are not totally excluded in prenominal position - one can speak of *currently navigable rivers*, for example, where *currently navigable* is presumably a stage-level predicate” (p.193). Similarly, though postnominal adjectives are more often interpreted as stage-level (see Larson 1998,2000b, and Larson and Marušič 2004), the individual-level interpretation does not seem to be entirely excluded (for some adjectives). See the discussion, and the examples, in Ferris (1993,45,48).

³ “Bolinger (1967) notes that prenominal adjectives can be ambiguous between a restrictive and a non-restrictive interpretation, whereas postnominal adjectives can only be understood restrictively” (Larson and Marušič, 2004,275). For the observation that prenominal adjectives in Italian are unambiguously nonrestrictive while postnominal ones are ambiguous between a restrictive and a nonrestrictive interpretation, see Giorgi and Longobardi (1991,123). This can also be seen with proper names in appropriate contexts. Differently from what is claimed in Ticio (2003,123), *Il Mozart geniale del periodo viennese* ‘the genial Mozart of the Viennese period’ does not necessarily contrast one (stage of) Mozart with another.

Bolinger (1972), Luján (1980,87-89), Demonte (1982,271,278ff), Martín (1995,187), Morzycki (2006, 2008,103f), citing Mackenzie (2004), note that postnominal adjectives in Spanish, in addition to a restrictive reading, can also have a nonrestrictive one. The same is true of Romanian (“In Romanian, the pre-nominal position mostly accomodates evaluative non-restrictive readings [...]. The post-nominal allows both readings” – Cornilescu 2006,60), and French. See, for example, *le coiffeur a peigné ses cheveux soyeux* ‘the hairdresser combed her silky hair’ (Vergnaud and Zubizarreta 1992,603). It has been claimed (Blinkenberg 1969,113) that with proper names even a prenominal adjective may have a restrictive reading: *J’aime mieux le jeune Renan que le vieux Renan* ‘I prefer the young R. to the old R.’ (the same appears true of Italian: *Ho letto il giovane Goethe, non il vecchio Goethe* ‘I read the young Goethe, not the old Goethe’). That conclusion is however dubious. The inappropriateness of (i)a and (ii)a in opposition to (i)b and (ii)b (where the adjective is postnominal) seems to indicate that the prenominal positioning is not genuinely restrictive (what the examples above compare, it seems, are two unanalyzable ‘stages’ of Renan and Goethe):

(i)a??Ho letto solo il giovane Goethe, non i suoi ultimi lavori

b Ho letto solo il Goethe giovane, non i suoi ultimi lavori

‘I read only the young Goethe, not his last works’

(ii)a *?Ho letto il giovane ma non il vecchio Goethe

‘I have read the young but not the old Goethe’

b Ho letto il Goethe giovane, ma non il Goethe vecchio

I have read the Goethe young, but not the Goethe old

‘I have read the young, but not the old Goethe’

⁴ For reasons that are not entirely clear, omission of the genitive PP *di Ferri* renders the nonrestrictive reading in (8)a virtually impossible, and (7)a, for which a restrictive reading is unavailable, virtually ungrammatical. A similar effect is noted for Spanish in Morzycki (2008,fn.2), where the observation is attributed to Violeta Demonte. See now Demonte (2008,74).

⁵ An analogous pattern is shown by the adjective *wrong*. Larson (2000a) takes the ambiguity of (*We discussed*) *the wrong answer* to stem from the possibility of interpreting *wrong* either as an attributive modifier (= ‘incorrect’), or (pace Schwarz 2006) as a predicative adjective in the predicate position of a reduced relative clause with Antecedent Contained Deletion (= the [*wrong for us to discuss*] answer). This seems confirmed by the possibility of having two occurrences of the adjective:

(i) We discussed the wrong wrong (=incorrect) answer

Gengel (2008,36) claims that in French the implicit relative clause reading with Antecedent Contained Deletion is also available preminally, but this was judged impossible by my informants. Her claim that French is much freer than the other Romance languages in the distribution of adjectives also finds no clear base.

⁶ A similar contrast is found between (i)a, which has both the intersective and nonintersective interpretations, and (i)b, which only has the intersective interpretation:

(i)a I’ve never met quite so beautiful a dancer as Mary

b I’ve never met a dancer quite so beautiful as Mary

For an interesting refinement of Larson’s analysis of the ambiguity of *beautiful dancer* that may account for the loss of the nonintersective reading of the adjective in such contexts as *a beautiful young dancer*, see Saba (2008).

⁷ The same holds for Spanish and French. See, for example, Demonte (1982,280) (“La diferencia de posición no correlaciona con la oposición intersectivo-no intersectivo [...]. En realidad, el único principio que puede formularse con alguna certeza es que los adjetivos que aparecen ‘exclusivamente’ antes del nombre son exclusivamente no-intersectivos [...]. No puede formularse ningún principio equivalente para los adjetivos pospuestos [...].” ; also see

Demonte 2008,72f); Abeillé and Godard (1999,fn.12) (“Avec les subsectives qui ont naturellement les deux positions, comme *immense*, les deux interprétations sont disponibles pour le A postposé; *C’est un artiste immense* (en tant qu’homme/par sa taille/ou en tant qu’artiste/par son talent .”).

Morzycki (2006, to appear), in analyzing the nonintersective use of size adjectives as adverbial, or degree, modifiers (like in the reading of *big drinker* which corresponds to ‘someone who drinks a lot’) claims that such a reading is available in Spanish only preminally. From such cases as (i), and from the Italian case in (ii), it seems however that in Romance that reading is not entirely excluded from the postnominal position:

(i) ?Un fumador grande de cigarillos (tiene riesgos de sufrir enfermedades pulmonares) (Maria Martinez Atienza p.c.)

a smoker big of cigars (has risks to suffer diseases of the lungs)

‘A big cigar smoker (risks suffering from lung diseases)’

(ii) ?Gianni è un ammiratore grandissimo di Gorbaciov

Gianni is an admirer very big of Gorbaciov

‘Gianni is a very big admirer of Gorbaciov (= Gianni admires Gorbaciov very much)’

If idiomatic readings of a noun plus an adjective are only possible when the adjective allows for a nonintersective interpretation, the fact that in Romance postnominal adjectives can induce an idiomatic reading (cf. Chapter 7, section 7.2) provides further evidence that postnominal adjectives in Romance can be nonintersective.

⁸ Also see Ludlow (1989), and references cited there. Adjectives relative to a comparison class are referred to as “subsective” in Chierchia and McConnell-Ginet (1990,370ff) in that, contrary to intersective adjectives (*Pavarotti is a pink tadpole*), they (*Pavarotti is a large tadpole*) do not allow the inference N_{proper} is A and an N_{common} (*Pavarotti is large and a tadpole*) but only the weaker N_{proper} is an N_{common} (*Pavarotti is a tadpole*), i.e. a subset of the set (of tadpoles). For the standard semantic classification of adjectives see Partee (1995) and Kamp and Partee (1995). In Partee (2003a,b,2007), partly redressing her own earlier analyses, she points out that the ‘NP/PP Splitting’ phenomenon of Polish (Nowak 2000) and other Slavic languages (Gouskova 2000, Junghanns 2000, Mehlhorn 2000) casts doubt on the standard semantic classification into intersective, subsective, privative, and modal adjectives. The main divide, as shown by the ‘NP/PP Splitting’ phenomenon, appears rather to be between intersective (‘carnivorous’, etc.), subsective (‘skilful’, etc.), and privative (‘fake, etc.), on one side, which allow splitting in Polish, and such adjectives as ‘poor’ in the sense of ‘pitiful’ and modal adverbial adjectives (like ‘former’, ‘alleged’, etc.) on the other, which do not. Crucially, she also points out that the adjectives “that cannot split also cannot occur predicatively”. This semantic generalization seems to converge with the conclusion reached here that the main syntactic divide is between ‘adverbial’ direct modification adjectives and those that derive from (reduced) relative clauses (as a consequence of their being able to

occur in predicate position). On the possible double nature of ‘fake,false’ in Italian (and English), see Chapter 6, section 6.1.

⁹ I thank Chris Kennedy for calling my attention to this ambiguity. For detailed discussion on the syntactic and semantic conditions licensing the relative and the absolute readings of superlatives, see Szabolcsi (1986), Farkas and Kiss (2000), and references cited there. The ambiguity was apparently first noted in Ross (1964). Also see Stateva (1999,2000), Sharvit and Stateva (2002), and Schueler (2005).

¹⁰ Subjunctive relatives in indefinite DPs in Italian induce a non-specific interpretation of the indefinite DP (*Cercano una segretaria che sappia tradurre in cinese* ‘They are looking for a secretary who can translate into Chinese’). However given that such relatives are only possible if embedded in a modal (*irrealis*) context, the presence of a prenominal adjective does not give rise to a conflict of interpretation, as the adjective in such context does not force a specific reading of the indefinite DP: *Cercano una brava segretaria che sappia tradurre in cinese* ‘They are looking for a expert secretary who can translate into Chinese’.

¹¹ Given that extraction is blocked from specific DPs (see Fiengo and Higginbotham’s (1981) Specificity Condition), there should be a contrast between the following two cases (in Italian):

(i)a Non ho che una foto piccola di tutti i miei figli

I do not have but a photo small of all the my children

‘I only have a small photo of all my children’

b Non ho che una piccola foto di tutti i miei figli

I do not have but a small photo of all the my children

‘I only have a small photo of all my children’

Indeed, (i)a, where the adjective is postposed, allows both the reading where *tutti i miei figli* ‘all my children’ scopes over *una foto* ‘a photo’ (‘I only have different small photos, one for each of my children’), arguably as a consequence of its extraction from the DP, and the reading where there is only one small photo depicting all of my children together (one > all). Example (i)b, on the other hand, only allows the second reading (one > all). We can attribute this effect to the prenominal position of the adjective, which forces a specific interpretation of the indefinite DP, and thus prevents the extraction of *tutti i miei figli* from it, forcing the other reading (all > one).

Examples with ‘LF’ extractions like (i) are clearer than examples of overt syntactic extractions of *di* ‘of’ phrases because of the interfering factor of base generated *di* phrases in sentence initial position (Barbaud 1976).

¹² Other adjectives showing a similar semantics are *undisclosed*, *unexpected*, *unspecified*, etc. See Abusch and Rooth (1997).

¹³ We abstract away from a third reading of *different* (the “reciprocal” one, for which see Moltmann 1992; Beck 2000,104). We also abstract away here from an additional distinction that Beck (2000) draws within the class of NP dependent readings between plural and universal quantifier NP dependent readings (which happen to be rendered by two distinct adjectives in German), for which also see Tovena and Van Peteghem (2003). On French *différent* see Laca and Tasmowski (2001, 2003, 2004) as well as Tovena and Van Peteghem (2003). Also see Alrenga (2006) and Brasoveanu (2008, 2009).

¹⁴ The inappropriateness of this reading is brought out more clearly in the following context, which provides a discourse salient item of comparison for ‘different’:

(i)a “Piero vive a Roma, ma...”

b #Gianni e Mario vivono in **differenti** città

c Gianni e Mario vivono in città **differenti**

‘Piero lives in Rome, but...Gianni e Mario live in different cities’

¹⁵ The fact that for some of these properties the postnominal interpretation cannot be tested in English (because of the limited availability of the postnominal position) should not be seen as a problem. The situation is still compatible with the generalization that the postnominal position in English is limited to interpretations available to adjectives in the predicate position of a relative clause. There would only be a problem if the postnominal position were available to a certain adjective and its interpretation were not that of the adjective in the predicate position of a relative clause.

¹⁶ This should not be taken to mean that prenominal adjectives in Italian (Romance) are never ambiguous. They are whenever they belong to two (or more) of the classes of adjectives that can occur prenominally with the properties associated to the prenominal position seen above. Consider, for example, the ambiguity of *grande* ‘great, or big’ in (i):

(i) De Laurentiis è stato un grande produttore cinematografico

De Laurentiis was a great or big film producer

That the ambiguity is a function of the structural position which the adjective occupies (rather than of a simple lexical ambiguity) is shown by the fact that the two readings can cooccur (in the order ‘great’ > ‘big’):

(ii) De Laurentiis è stato un grandissimo grande produttore cinematografico

De Laurentiis was a really great big/*really big great film producer

(Also see Abeillé and Godard 1999,13 for the similar case of French *un gros fumeur* ‘someone who smokes a lot or a fat smoker’). Another structural ambiguity is that of *vecchio* ‘old’ (*la vecchia bicicletta di Gianni* ‘Gianni’s old bicycle’) between what Larson and Cho (1999,2003) call the N-modifying (‘the bicycle that John possesses that is old’) and the POSS-modifying (‘the bicycle that Gianni formerly possessed’) readings. If both are prenominal, with some degree of

marginality (*la vecchia vecchia bicicletta di Gianni* ‘Gianni’s old old bicycle’), the first *vecchia* is necessarily interpreted as POSS-modifying and the second *vecchia* as N-modifying, just as in English. The better alternative is with the higher (POSS-modifying) *vecchia* in prenominal position and the lower (N-modifying) *vecchia* in postnominal position (*la vecchia bicicletta vecchia di Gianni*). Differently from their fn.5, I cannot easily have the POSS-modifying *vecchia* in postnominal position. On the ambiguity of French *vieux* and English *old*, see Bouillon (1999) and Taylor (1992).

¹⁷ The same is true for the absolute interpretation of superlatives. Szabolcsi (1986,255ff) makes the interesting observation that absolute superlatives pattern with definite/specific noun phrases (the absolute and the specific interpretations are also found, as noted above, with adjectives in prenominal position in Romance), whereas comparative superlatives pattern with indefinite/non-specific ones (again the relative and the non-specific interpretations are found together with adjectives in postnominal position in Romance).

¹⁸ One of the reviewers doubts “that all properties enumerated under *direct modification* hold at once”, adding that “it is semantically not possible for an adjective to be non-restrictive and non-intersective at the same time (e.g. *noiose* is non-restrictive and very clearly intersective in [7])”. While it may be difficult to tell apart the nonintersective reading of *noioso* in (7) (‘he lectured in a boring way’) from the intersective one (‘events that were lectures and were boring’, which I would still take not to be available prenominally), it is certainly true that an adjective can be nonrestrictive and nonintersective at the same time. See for example (i), in the ‘dance beautifully’ reading:

(i) Ieri abbiamo avuto modo di ammirare una meravigliosa ballerina

‘Yesterday, we had the opportunity to admire a beautiful dancer’

Following Siegel (1976), Alexiadou, Haegeman, and Stavrou (2007,336) claim that the restrictive/nonrestrictive and the intersective/nonintersective distinctions are independent from one another as *beautiful* in *Olga is the beautiful dancer on stage* can also be interpreted as nonintersective and restrictive. But this appears dubious, as one cannot easily contrast the adjective in the nonintersective interpretation as is normally possible with adjectives used restrictively. See *I want to hire the beautiful dancer, not the lousy one!*

¹⁹ There are only few exceptions to this generalization. Adjectives like *akimbo*, *aplenty*, and *galore* can only be postnominal, yet cannot be found in predicate position (Ferris 1993,49). A potential problem of a different kind is provided by *sinistro* ‘left’ and *destra* ‘right’, which are non predicative (**questa mano è sinistra/destra* ‘this hand is left/right’) and yet seem to be restrictive and intersective (properties that were seen to go together with the possibility of occupying the predicate position of a relative clause). Perhaps, they are syntactically complex modifiers incorporating a silent locative phrase (AT THE left/right SIDE), and directly modify the NP. Interestingly, Anna Cardinaletti tells me

that her son, at the age of 4.5, used these two adjectives also in prenominal position (which for him too was exclusively reserved for direct modification adjectives).

²⁰ This ordering is confirmed by the contrast between (i)a and b, observed by Barbara Citko (as reported in Larson 1998,155):

(i)a The INVISIBLE visible stars include these

b *The VISIBLE invisible stars include these

The first is coherent. It refers to intrinsically visible stars that happen to be invisible at the moment; (i)b is not, under normal conditions (it refers to a situation in which intrinsically invisible stars are said to be visible at the moment). Of course, it too would become coherent if, for example, the stars were invisible at naked eye, but contingently visible using a telescope.

²¹ Also see the case of *wrong* mentioned in note 5 of this chapter.

²² This order is also shown by other adjectives which are ambiguous between an intersective and a nonintersective reading, e.g. *old*, which is ambiguous, among other readings, between ‘aged’ (intersective), and ‘of long standing’ (nonintersective). See: *he is an old (aged) old (of long standing) friend* (DeGraff and Mandelbaum 1993; and Scott 2002,fn.43), which finds an exact parallel in the German *Er ist ein alter alter Freund* (Sauereisen 2005, section 3). Also see the case of *the good (=morally good) good (=fast, efficient) typist* discussed in Jackendoff (1997,62) and Scott (2002,112).

²³ Boucher (2006,52) also notes that postnominally, in French, individual-level adjectives are closer to the noun than stage-level ones, the mirror image of the English prenominal case observed by Larson (1998):

(i)a Les étoiles visible invisibles

the stars visible invisible

‘The visible stars invisible’

b *Les étoiles invisibles visible

the stars invisible visible

‘The invisible stars visible’

²⁴ Also compare the double occurrence of *sbagliato* ‘wrong’ in postnominal position in Italian with that of prenominal *wrong* in English (note 5 of this chapter). In Italian the readings are reversed:

(i) Abbiamo discusso la risposta sbagliata (= incorrect) sbagliata (= which it was wrong for us to discuss)

we.have discussed the answer wrong wrong

‘We discussed the wrong wrong answer’

²⁵ Although the present work corroborates Sproat and Shih’s fundamental insight of the existence of two different types of modification, and of the presence of ordering restrictions for only one of them, it differs from their work in a number of respects. For example, we do not take a “direct modification” adjective in combination with the noun to behave as a syntactic word (see Chapter 4, especially section 4.1.2); nor do we follow Sproat and Shih in analysing all Chinese adjectives followed by *de* as (reduced) relative clauses, and all *de*-less ones as compounds (see the Appendix, section 1). We would also give a different analysis to some of the facts of some of the languages discussed by them, even though their work has in general been greatly inspiring.

²⁶ We have omitted in (64) (and (65)) the case where the two readings are in conflict with each other (as is the case with the specificity and non-specificity inducing readings)

²⁷ On the basis of cross-linguistic evidence, in Cinque (2005) it is actually suggested that head movement within DP is unavailable, and that only movement of phrases containing the (pronounced) NP are possible (within a unique UG structure of Merge). See Chapter 3, section 3.6 below, for some discussion of this point.