ADJECTIVAL POSITIONS IN BARESE

LUIGI ANDRIANI[1]

Abstract. This paper presents an account of the semantic and syntactic mechanisms of adjectival modification in Barese, a dialect spoken in the upper south of Italy. Unlike early and modern Romance varieties, the dialects of central-southern Italy, including Barese, make very limited use of the pre-nominal position. The extensive use of the post-nominal position in these varieties for both direct and indirect adjectival modification leads to interpretative ambiguity whenever either modification applies in isolation. On the other hand, the Barese pre-nominal position currently accepts only eleven direct adjectival modifiers. A selection of these exceptionally pre-nominal adjectives will be surveyed and contrasted with their respective post-nominal counterparts in order to shed light on their interpretation and syntactic behaviour. Among these pre-nominal adjectives, only a few can productively modify any nouns: speakers use them to express their 'subjective' basic evaluations of the referent. Such adjectives, denoting value/quality, occupy the highest portion of the adjectival hierarchy described in Cinque (1995, 2005, 2010). Following Ledgeway (2007, 2009), this part of the hierarchy will be interpreted as the least affected by the process of diachronic change: the noun is forced to precede most direct modifiers, but may optionally remain lower alongside a few 'speaker-oriented' adjectives, of which only three, at most, can modify any nouns. Adopting Cinque's (2010) NP-movement analysis, we will propose the syntactic derivation of the Barese surface order (DmAP)-NP-(DmAP)-ImAP.

Key words: Barese, south-eastern Italian dialect, adjectival phrase, (in)direct modification, pre-nominal adjectives, NP-movement.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper explores the semantic and syntactic mechanisms of adnominal adjectival modification of N(oun)P(hrase)s within the D(eterminer)P[2] of Barese, a dialect spoken in the upper south of Italy. In §2 and §3, we will present a brief characterisation of the semantics of adjectival modification with respect to the position that A(djectival)Ps

[1] Department of Italian, University of Cambridge, Homerton College; LA337@cam.ak.uk. Many thanks to Adam Ledgeway, Michelle Sheehan, Giuliana Giusti and Anna Cardinaletti for their precious comments and suggestions. Thanks also to Silvio Cruschina, Alex Nicolae and Norma Schifano for the fruitful discussions on my ideas. The usual disclaimer applies.

[2] Cf. Abney 1987; Szabolcsi 1987, 1994; Bernstein 1991, 1993, 2001; Cinque 1995, 2005, 2010; Longobardi 1994, 2001, 2005; Giusti 2002; 2006; Alexiadou, Haegeman and Stavrou 2007; Roberts 2011; *inter alia*.

RRL, **LX**, *2–3*, p. 189–204, Bucureşti, 2015

lexicalise in Romance. In §4, we will observe how Barese DP behaves with respect to adjectival positions and relative interpretations. Special attention will be devoted to Barese pre-nominal adjectives, whose morpho-lexical, semantic and syntactic behaviour reveals different stages of fossilisation, with rare exceptions. The analysis in §5 follows Cinque's (1995, 2005, 2010, 2014; among others) hypothesis of one universal DP-structure to derive the generalisation in Greenberg's (1963) 'universal 20'. Cinque takes the cross-linguistically most attested sequence Demonstrative-Numeral-Adjective-Noun to be the base-generated universal order of DPs, with a peripheral area that determines the interpretation, an inflectional field and a lexical domain, closely replicating the clause structure [CP [IP [VP]]] (cf. Giusti 2006; Ledgeway, this issue). Appealing to Kayne's (1994) L(inear)C(orrespondence)A(xiom), Cinque (2010) derives the other possible combinations via NP-movement to the agreement phrases of the different DP-internal functional categories distributed across the nominal extended projection (cf. Grimshaw 2005). In the spirit of Cinque's (2010) comparative analysis of Romance and Germanic AP-distribution, the same leftward NP-movement will be used as a tool to understand the mechanisms of adjectival modification in Barese.

2. 'DIRECT' AND 'INDIRECT' ADJECTIVAL MODIFICATION: (PRAGMATICO-) SEMANTIC IMPLICATIONS

The umbrella term 'adjectival modifier' identifies the possible interpretative functions that adjectives fulfil when modifying a NP. Adjectival modifiers may either describe inherent, prototypical properties of the reference, or describe an extension of the semantic properties characterising the referent. These two types of modification can be characterised in terms of binary sets of antithetical values affecting the final interpretation of the NP(s) in question through syntactic distribution. An extensive use of different terminology has been made to classify these (roughly similar) sets of semantic relations between NP and adjectival modifiers, among which we may distinguish the values 'attributive/predicative' (Bolinger 1967), 'non-/restrictive' (Kamp 1975), 'non-/intersective' (Vendler 1967; Higginbotham 1985: 562), individual-/stage-level' (Carlson 1977), thematic/rhematic (Vincent 1986).

Following Sproat and Shih (1988, 1991) and Cinque (2005, 2010, 2014), we will simply distinguish between 'direct modification' (Dm), whereby the AP is interpreted as 'attributive', 'non-intersective', 'individual-level', 'non-restrictive', 'thematic', and 'indirect modification' (Im), which will force 'predicative', 'intersective', 'stage-level', 'restrictive' or 'rhematic' readings of the AP. These two types of adjectival modification can manifest themselves differently in the (morpho-)syntax of a given language, which led Sproat and Shih (1988; 1991) and subsequently Cinque (2005, 2010, 2014), to argue for a double syntactic source for Im and Dm adjectives. The main interpretative difference between Dm- and ImAPs is predicated on the basis of the minor or major syntactic proximity of these AP types to the N head. Sproat and Shih (1991: 566) observe that only DmAPs show universal ordering restrictions, i.e. value/quality > size > shape > colour > nationality; on the other hand, ImAPs do not follow a hierarchical organisation, behaving as DP-internal reduced relative clauses. We will assume this position to explain the

mechanisms of adjectival modification in Barese (see §5 for further details). Let us now turn to adjectival positions in Romance before we move onto the description and the analysis of the Barese data.

3. ADJECTIVAL POSITIONS IN ROMANCE

When we observe Romance adjectival distribution, the multiple modification of the NP yields (1) as the 'least marked' order. The ultimate surface position of the NP (in Romance) is obtained via obligatory movement across Sproat and Shih's (1991) hierarchy of AP-classes:

(1) $\text{DmAP}_{\text{value/quality > size}}$ > **NP** > $\text{DmAP}_{\textit{(value/quality > size >)}\ \text{shape > colour > nation}}$ > ImAP
(adapted from Cinque 2010: 22)

The proximity of the different adjectives to the NP determines whether direct or indirect modification applies. Indirect modification APs can only surface in post-nominal position i.e. can never occur pre-nominally (unlike in early Italo-Romance varieties, cf. Vincent 2007; Cinque 2010; e.g. old Neapolitan: Ledgeway 2007), whereas direct modification can apply both pre- and post-nominally, leading to possible interpretative ambiguities. In Romance, the only DmAP-classes allowed in pre-nominal position are value/quality and size, whereas the rest (shape, colour and nationality) must occur post-nominally in unmarked contexts. A concrete example of the scheme in (1) is given in (2) for Italian (cf. also Nespor 1988):

(2)

	(possessive >	*cardinal >*	*ordinal >)*	*quality >*	*size >*
(I)	suoi	due	altri	bei	grandi
The	his/her.m.pl.	two	other.m.pl.	beautiful.m.pl.	big.m.pl.

	shape >	*colour >*	*nation*	(Cinque 1995: 298)
quadri	tondi	grigi	cinesi	
painting.m.pl.	round.m.pl.	grey.m.pl.	Chinese.m.pl.	

The prenominal position seems to be reserved for distinct interpretative functions, and may be unavailable to certain classes of AP-modifiers, namely 'relational' APs, whose occurrence is limited to the post-nominal position in unmarked contexts, e.g. (3.b). However, the occurrence of these classes of APs in pre-nominal position is not entirely ruled out, but will have repercussion on the interpretation of the adjective due to the way it relates to its referent:

(3) a. Li guardò con materna dolcezza
them.m.ACC. look.3sg.PST with maternal.f.sg. tenderness.f.sg.
'She looked at them with maternal tenderness'
(Italian: Maiden and Robustelli 2000: 94)

b. Li guardò con dolcezza materna
them.m.ACC. look.3sg.PST with tenderness.f.sg. maternal.f.sg.
'S/he looked at them with motherly tenderness'

The pre-nominal (Dm)AP in (3.a) describes 'a known or inherent property of the noun' (Vincent 2007: 59), whereas the post-nominal ImAP provides an extension of the defining properties of the referent, i.e. a 'motherly'-type 'tenderness' (implicitly contrasting a 'fatherly' tenderness). The access to the pre-nominal position may potentially apply to quality/value and size APs, as well as to (unmarkedly post-nominal) shape/colour/nation APs: these can be preposed to the noun to convey an inalienable, intrinsic or, indeed, stereotypical property of the referent in question, or express the speaker's personal judgement, i.e. 'subjective' adjectives, in Adams's (1976: 89) terms (in the context of Latin adjectives).

However, this semantic and syntactic asymmetry between post-nominal position and pre-nominal position is argued by many scholars to be absent in early Italo-Romance varieties (e.g. Neapolitan: Ledgeway 2007, 2009; cf. Vincent 2007 for a general overview on early Italo-Romance vernaculars). In fact, early (literary) Italo-Romance varieties consistently exploited the pre-nominal position for both Dm and ImAPs with pre-nominal contrastive readings, entirely banned in modern Romance varieties. This suggests that the modern Romance N(P) must move higher than the entire DmAP-space, yet we shall see that the Barese N(P) behaves differently than standard Romance.

4. BARESE ADJECTIVAL MODIFIERS

The distributional freedom of APs described above for standard Italian[3] (with relative interpretative costs) is largely absent in Barese. More generally, the series of functional elements internal to the Barese DP, shown in Table 1, seem to always lexicalise the same fixed, recurrent positions, allowing minimal order permutations:

Table 1

Barese DP (cf. Ledgeway, forthcoming: §15.4.1)

Q	***D***	***Q***	***Adj***	***N***	***Comp***	***Poss***	***Adj***	***adjunct***
tùttə	*chiddə*	*tànda*	*bbèllə*	*màzzə*	*de cìmə də cólə*	*tu*	*vìərdə*	*ddà*
all	those	many	fine	bunches.m	of tops.f of cauwliflower	your.m.	green.m.pl.	there

The general tendency within the Barese DP (as is also true for many central and southern Italian spoken varieties[4]) is to restrict syntactic material to occur between D and N surface positions. The exceptions to this tendency are numerals, quantifiers (which are not rare post-nominally, e.g. *(ʔassà') èggh*ij*ə assà'*, 'lots of oil'), and only one single prenominal AP position, to which we will devote §4.2. Such syntactic constraints force in post-nominal position most of the remaining DP-functional components, i.e. the large majority of APs and both tonic and (en)clitic possessives, which must obligatorily occur right-adjacent to the N(P) (Andriani, forthcoming: chapter II, §3). It is crucial to note that

[3] Representative of the behaviour of most Romance varieties, with the exception of Romanian (cf. Brăescu 2013: 427-428; Cornilescu and Nicolae 2011) and Walloon (Bernstein 1991: 105; 1993).

[4] Cf. Rohlfs 1969: III, 330; Neapolitan: Ledgeway 2007, 2009; extreme southern Italian dialects: Guardiano 2011; northern Calabrian: Silvestri 2014.

the PP complement immediately follows the noun. We will interpret the surface distribution shown in Table 1 as the outcome of the obligatory high movement of the Barese noun (phrase) across possessives, Im- and most DmAPs.

We will now briefly discuss post-nominal modification in Barese starting from Cinque's observation on post-nominal ambiguity between direct and indirect modification. This does not fail to apply to Barese because of the higher movement of the NP: this will be particularly visible in §4.2, where the 'subjective' interpretation of those high APs can be licensed even post-nominally.

4.1. Post-nominal modification

As an initial premise, Barese (as many other southern Italian dialects) show a general resistance to generating clusters of serial adjectives, favouring instead parallel or coordinated, e.g. (4)-(5), sequences of APs (Sproat and Shih 1991: 578), where the independent modification of the NP obtains:

(4) Stònn' a ffà tànda palàzzə nuévə e ggrànnə
stand.3pl. to do many building.m.pl new.m. and big
'They are building many new big apartment houses' (Lacalendola 1972: 32)

(5) Àcqua assà' e ssalàtə (Sada 1977: 64)
water.f.sg. lots and salted
'A lot of salted water'

However, Barese also permits the combination of a – usually reduced – series of APs to occur post-nominally. On a par with Italian (§3), the post-nominal position in Barese is dedicated to indirect modification, thus receiving predicative, non-restrictive or contrastive interpretation:

(6) Mə so' accattàtə na (**pəccənònnə*) màghəna *PƏCCƏNÒNNƏ* (*no gràννə*)
self be.1sg buy.PtP a.f. small.f.sg car.f.sg. small.f.sg not big
'I bought myself a small car (not a big one)'

In (7), we note that the unmarked distribution of post-nominal DmAPs respects the Dm-hierarchy (size/colour/nationality), but the pre-nominal occurrence of most AP-classes is banned:

(7) nu **grèssə*/ **rùssə*/ **'taliànə*/ **məquàtə*/ pəmədòrə
a.m big.m. red.m. Italian rotten tomato.m.sg
grèssə rùssə 'taliànə MƏQUÀTƏ.
big.m. red.m. Italian rotten
'A big red Italian rotten tomato (i.e. not a fresh one)'

The main difference between Barese and standard Italian is that the latter can use the prenominal position for Dm readings (8.b) and leave the post-nominal position for (not always) unambiguous ImAPs (8.a). On the other hand, Barese (9) can only resort to the

post-nominal position for both direct and indirect modification, causing potential interpretative ambiguity in the case of isolated post-nominal modification:

(8) a. Devo comprare un abito *nuovo*
must.1sg buy a.m. suit.m.sg new.sg.m.
'I have to buy a (brand-)new suit'
b. … un *nuovo* abito (Italian)
a.m. new.m.sg. suit.m.sg.
'(i.e. another) suit'

(9) Agghij' a 'ccattà n' (**n(u)évə*) àbbətə
have.1sg. to buy a.m. new.m.sg. suit.m.sg
n(u)évə (Barese: Lacalendola 1972: 56)
new.m.sg
'I have to buy a new/another suit'

Hence, the higher NP-movement in Barese determines a more extensive use of the post-nominal position. Let us now turn our attention to the behaviour of the extremely exiguous number of Barese APs allowed in pre-nominal position.

4.2. Pre-nominal modification

On a par with most central and southern Italian dialects, the pre-nominal position in Barese is available to at most one DmAP at the time. Such a position can be considered largely unproductive, since it is restricted to a closed class of eleven adjectives: *bbu(é)nə*[5] (m.)/*bbònə* (f.) 'good(/-hearted)', *màlə* 'bad', *bbèllə* 'beautiful/nice', *bbrùttə* 'ugly/bad', *bbràvə* 'skilful/good(-hearted)', '*grànnə* 'big/great', *pòvərə* 'poor/pitiful', *vècchjə* 'old/former/long-standing', *sàndə* 'holy/blessed', *jàldə* 'tall/higher', *vàscə* 'short/lower'. This class of highly frequent pre-nominal APs, denoting rudimentary qualities and sizes, show different gradients of fossilisation in terms of morpho(-phono)logical shape, semantic interpretation and, obviously, syntactic distribution.

The literal meaning of the majority of these APs (i.e. the first of the two translations provided above) can only be retained post-nominally. By contrast, in pre-nominal position we observe two main co-existing tendencies of semantic shift in the process of lexicalisation: a partial shift, whereby the 'subjective' AP-reading can be felicitously licensed even in post-nominal position, and a radical shift, where the semantics of the AP

[5] The phonologically reduced masculine form *bbùnə* seems to constitute an innovation of its original form *bbuénə*: to my knowledge, *bbùnə* was unattested in most Barese texts and grammars prior to the 1970s, yet the younger generations mainly adopt this form in the modern variety. In this respect, Valente (1975: 17) attests the form *bbùənе* as the modern development of the more archaic form *bbuénə*. Older speakers of Barese barely accept *bbùnə*, since it represents an innovation, while some middle-aged speakers may restrict the use of *bbùnə* to [-animate] nouns (cf. also Altamurano (BA): Loporcaro 1997: 343; Molese (BA): Cox 1986: 43–44).

becomes opaque (usually the opposite of the 'subjective' counterpart) and is reanalysed as part of the entire nominal [A + N] compound.

The productivity of this set of DmAPs is predicated on the basis of their ability to modify any NPs. The limitations on the semantic classes of NPs selected will reveal the continuum of levels of major or minor fossilisation reached, ranging from completely idiomatic [A + N] fixed expressions to a few truly productive APs. For reasons of space, only the cases of the entirely fossilised *màlə* 'bad' and the most productive pre-nominally *bbèllə* 'nice' will be presented and discussed in the present article, leaving aside the semi-productive APs, for which the reader can refer to Andriani (forthcoming: chapter II, §1).

4.2.1. *Màlə* 'bad'

Among Barese pre-nominal APs, the adjective *màlə*, 'bad', appears to have completed its process of lexicalisation pre-nominal APs: its occurrence is confined to fossilised compounds of the type [*màlə* + N] as in (10.a). It is also unavailable in post-nominal position, where it is either replaced by a lexicalised adverbial form, *mala-mèndə*, literally 'bad-ly', or other adjectives, such as *malìgnə*, 'malign', or *bbrùttə*, '(ugly/)bad' (10.b):

(10) a. Màlə crəstiànə
bad.m. person.sg.m.
'Evil, mistrustful person'

b. Crəstiànə malamèndə / malìgnə / bbrùttə / (*màlə)
person.sg.m bad-minded.m. malign.m. bad.m bad.m.
'Evil, mistrustful person'

The loss of productivity observed for Barese *màlə* is not accidental or isolated if we consider that the identical situation is found in other southern Italian dialects, for example Neapolitan (cf. Ledgeway 2007; 2009). Such varieties opted for a specialised adverbial form to replace the adjectival one: *malamèndə* (literally: 'badly')[6], which can only occur post-nominally and is licensed mostly with animate/human referents, e.g. (10.b). Another alternative form to *màlə* is the AP *malìgnə* 'malign', only licensed with [+human] referents, on a par with Italian *cattivo* for [+animate] NPs. Finally, the most frequent alternative to the unproductive *màlə* is the productive, either pre- or post-nominal *bbrùttə*, which shifted its meaning from its original meaning 'ugly' to the figurative 'bad'.

We observe the high cohesion of the [*màlə* + N] compounds in the ungrammaticality of the inverted [N + *màlə*] order (11−12.b):

(11) a. Malamòrtə
bad.f.-death.sg.f
'Disgraceful death'

b. Mòrta bbrùttə (/*malə / *malaméndə)
death.sg.f ugly.f. bad.f bad-minded.f.
'Disgraceful death'

[6] It is worth noting that the *-mèndə* ('mind') ending was one of the most productive means of de-adjectival adverb formation via compounding in most Romance varieties, but was crucially lost in later development stages of southern Italian dialects, where adjectival forms are mainly employed adverbially (Ledgeway 2009: 223).

(12) a. Malavìtə
bad.f.-life.f.sg.
'Organised crime'

b. Vìta bbrùttə (/*màlə / *malaméndə)
life.f.sg. ugly.f. bad.f bad-minded.f.
'Hard, unhappy life'

On the other hand, the interpretation of *màlə* in the (a)-set of examples reveals two main trends: that in (11.a) which still transparently presents the 'subjective' figurative reading of 'bad, disgraceful', while (12.a) conveys a purely idiomatic expression. This suggests that the final status of nominal [A + N] compound has been reached, witness the relative opacification of the 'subjective' reading. A last piece of evidence supporting the claim of the complete fossilisation of the [*màlə* + N] compound can be observed in (13.a), where such a compound can be modified by a pre-nominal AP; by contrast, the partially lexicalised instances do not accept further modification (13.b).

(13) a. vècchja màla vìtə pòvərə
old.f. bad.f life.f.sg. poor.f.
'The impoverished old(-generation of) organised crime'

b. *bbrùtta/ *pòvera malamórtə
ugly.f. poor.f. bad.f.-death.f.sg.

Predictably, no other AP can disrupt the [A + N] compound, as it would constitute additional pre-nominal modification, which is banned in Barese (§4.2). We may now move onto observing the behaviour of one of the few exceptionally productive instance of Barese pre-nominal AP, *bbèllə* 'nice'.

4.2.2. *Bbèllə* 'nice'

At the other extreme of the productivity scale, we find the evaluative DmAP *bbèllə*, literally 'beautiful', shown in (14), (15) and (16) modifying different types of NPs. This DmAP is one of the few exceptions as it can modify productively any type of NP in pre-nominal (and also post-nominal) position.

(14) [+animate]

a. Bbèllə crəstiànə
beautiful.m. person.sg.m.
'Good-natured, kind person'

b. Crəstiànə bberəfàttə (/bbèllə)
person.sg.m. beautiful-made.m. beautiful.m.
'Good-looking(/good-natured, kind) person'

(15) [-animate]

a. Bbèllə ggiardìnə
beautiful.m. garden.m.sg.
'Well-kept/big/nice garden'

b. Ggiardìnə bberəfàttə (/bbèllə)
garden.sg.m. beautiful-made.m. beautiful.m.
'Beautiful(/nice) garden'

(16) [+abstract]

a. Bbèllə məstìərə
beautiful.m. job.sg.m.
'Good, nice job'

b. Məstìərə bbèllə (/*bberəfàttə)
job.sg.m beautiful.m. beautiful-made.m.
'Good, nice job'

The first striking restriction of *bbèllə* is morpho-lexical: post-nominally, the literal, Im interpretation of 'beautiful, good-looking' can be only conveyed by the specialised univerbated form *bbərəfàttə*/*bbərafàttə*[7] (m./f.; lit. 'beautiful+made'). Since this ImAP can only denote 'physical beauty', such a form cannot modify abstract NPs, whence the ungrammaticality of (16.b). By contrast, *bbèllə* will always license the evaluative Dm reading of 'nice, pleasant', both in pre- and post-nominal position. The existence of a dedicated form for the literal meaning of 'good-looking' has further implications: *bbèllə* is able to modify its referents post-nominally exclusively with its 'subjective' reading, being deprived of its literal interpretation on a par with its pre-nominal counterpart.

Hence, the productive *bbèllə* generally expresses the speaker's [positive] judgement or opinion on the (ideal) referent, roughly paraphrasable as 'a good, nice, ideal, valid (exemplar of the kind of) N' depending on the pragmatico-semantic context of occurrence, i.e. the NP it modifies. In fact, the productive instances of pre-nominal *bbèllə* present general interpretative tendencies rather than clear-cut readings, which are especially visible in (18) with non-animates.

(17) nu bbèllə chəmbàgnə/ attànə/ sìnnəchə/ cavàddə
a.m. beautiful.m. friend.m.sg. father.m.sg. mayor.m.sg. horse.m.sg.
'A good (example of) friend/ father/ mayor/ horse'

(18) na bbèlla scólə/ mədəcìnə/ pìzzə/ lùnə
a.f. beautiful.f. school.f.sg. medicine.f.sg. pizza.f.sg. moon.f.sg.
'A(n example of) good school/ adequate medicine/ tasty pizza/ nice and bright moon'

Moreover, what makes *bbèllə* the most productive AP in pre-nominal position (but also post-nominally) is its interpretative versatility depending on the modified NP and context of occurrence.

However, we must again separate the cases of productive usage of *bbèllə* from those (very few) instances in which the process of fossilisation into univerbated [A + N] compounds is concluded:

(19) la bbèlla staggiónə (??bberafàttə)/ (*bbellə)
the.sg.f. beautiful.f. season.sg.f. beautiful-made.f. beautiful.f
'Summer' (Lacalendola 1972: 54)

The case in (19) shows a very common compound adopted in most southern Italy to refer to the 'Summer (season)', *la bbèlla staggiónə* (literally 'the beautiful season'): despite the interpretation of the entire compound having become synchronically opaque[8], the literal meaning of the single constituent can be readily retrieved as a single lexical item. In post-nominal position, instead, only the alternative *bbərafàttə* could be marginally accepted if

[7] The rhotacised forms *bbèrə*/*bbèra* (m./f.) are completely unproductive and ungrammatical in the modern-day dialect both in pre- and post-nominal position. Moreover, they do not even match the archaic indigenous morpho-lexical candidate which developed from Latin BELLU(M), i.e. *bbèddə* (m./f.), now fallen in disuse.

[8] This idiomatic compound is frequently used only with the definite article, implying a unique referent, though omitting the AP, as in *la staggiónə* 'the season'.

we were to describe the (inherent) beauty of this season (suggesting a [+human] characterisation of it); on the other hand, the counterpart *bbèllə* is by all means ruled out since its 'subjective' interpretation cannot be licensed by the referent.

4.3. Barese pre-nominal position: interim conclusions

So far, we have observed that Barese pre-nominal APs receive non-literal, 'subjective/figurative' interpretations, mainly expressing the speaker's rudimentary [positive] or [negative] evaluation or opinion on the referent, rather than describing any extensional property of it. Jones (1993) remarks for Sardinian pre-nominal APs that 'such adjectives convey an affective attitude of appreciation or depreciation, rather than describing an inherent property of the referent' (Jones 1993: 42). This tendency has also been noted by Ledgeway (2007: 111; 2009) for Neapolitan and by Guardiano (2011) for extreme southern Italian dialects.

What is relevant for our purposes is that these pre-nominal APs are actually morpho-lexically bound to modify a minor or major recurrent number of NPs, reflecting different stages of lexicalisation into nominal compounds. These generalisations are captured below in Table 2:

Table 2

Productivity of pre-nominal Barese APs

	+ Productive		- Productive	Fossilised
1.	*bbèllə*			
2.		*bbrùttə*		
3.		*bbràvə*$_{[+animate]}$		
4.		*bbuénə/bbónə*		
5.		*sàndə*		
6.		*pòvərə*		
7.			*vècchjə*	
8.			*gràννə*	
9.				*àldə*
10.				*bbàssə*
11.				*màlə*

In Table 2, we may isolate three main groups of pre-nominal adjectives on the basis of their productivity:

i. In the bottom rows, *màlə* 'evil, bad', *àldə* 'higher', *bbàssə* 'lower' are entirely fossilised in both their semantics (i.e. may assume a 'figurative' meaning from their original, 'subjective' meaning) and syntax (i.e. the [A + N] compound may accept further pre-nominal modification, usually banned in Barese, cf. §4.2.); These must be treated as semantically complex entries stored in the lexicon as nominal compounds.
ii. The grey middle area signals the semi-productive pan-Romance *bbu(é)nə*(m.)/*bbònə* (f.) 'good-hearted', *grànnə* 'great', *pòvərə* 'pitiful', *vècchijə* 'former, long-standing', but also the typically Italo-Romance *sàndə* for 'blessed/cursed'. These either license 'subjective' readings when modifying a limited class of NPs (which blocks further pre-nominal modification), or they are instances of fossilised [A + N] nominal compounds with 'figurative/translated' readings (which do allow further pre-nominal modification);
iii. At the top of scale, we find the most productive pre-nominal adjectival modifiers describing the speaker's basic evaluations/opinions/judgements on the reference e.g. *bbèllə*, 'nice', *bbrùttə* 'bad', *bbràvə* 'good(-hearted)' (for animates): these APs are the only ones showing 'real' pre-nominal productivity, with minor degrees of fossilisation.

At this point, we may readapt Cinque's scheme of Romance adjectival position to Barese, as shown below in (20):

(20) $DmAP_{value} > [(DmAP_{quality > size}) > \mathbf{NP}] > DmAP_{value/quality > size > shape > colour > nation} >$ ImAP

The pre-nominal space, generally reserved for quality- and size-DmAPs, i.e. the highest part of the hierarchy used by the majority of Romance languages, appears to be in an advanced process of (complete or partial) fossilisation in Barese. This is represented by group (i) and by some instances of group (ii), e.g. *le (grànnə) səgnùrə (grànnə)* 'the great gentlemen'. On the other hand, the top-most field of the Dm-hierarchy, dedicated to value/quality-DmAP, is the only genuinely productive area of adjectival modification in Barese, inasmuch as it licenses the speaker's evaluative [positive] or [negative] opinions/judgements with respect to the referent in both post-nominal and pre-nominal position. Bearing these facts in mind, we can now turn to the derivation of the different AP-positions in Barese.

5. THE SYNTAX OF BARESE DIRECT AND INDIRECT ADJECTIVAL MODIFICATION

In the preceding sections, we have observed that the position targeted by the Barese N(P) appears to be higher than that of other standard Romance varieties, resulting in a limited use of the prenominal position and the tendency to post-nominal distribution of all AP-types. To account for these facts, we adopt Cinque's (2010, 2014) phrasal movement approach across the double syntactic source for Dm- and ImAPs. Recall the universal DP-

structure (21) in which N is generated low in the lexical domain, and ordered functional projections are merged in the extended projection of N:

(21) [$_{DP}$ D [$_{NumP}$ NumP [$_{FP2}$ IP [PRO [I **ImAP**]]…[$_{FP1}$ **DmAP** **quality/size/shape/colour/nation** [F [$_{NP}$ N]]]]]]

Cinque (2010) argues that DmAPs are merged as specifiers of their own F(unctional)P(rojection)s in close proximity of the N head, following a fixed hierarchical order which is claimed to apply universally. On the other hand, ImAPs are treated as DP-internal R(educed)R(elative)C(lause)s, situated above the Dm-source and below numerals. The actual ImAP is merged as the complement of a silent head I (i.e. the silent V of the RRC), whose specifier is occupied by a PRO, which would technically replace/coincide with the head N.

Cinque (2010) claims that each FP merged inside the DP (e.g. APs) is governed by its own AgrP, whose head is endowed with a nominal feature. Such a feature attracts the NP (or XP containing it), which will undergo movement from the lexical domain to the specifier of the AgrP merged above each AP (Cinque 2005: 325–326). Bearing this mechanism in mind, we can now propose a derivation of the different adjectival positions in Barese: the crucial difference that sets Barese apart from other standard Romance varieties is the obligatory higher NP-movement across the Dm-hierarchy, which will be in turn obligatorily pied-piped across the Im-source.

5.1. Barese pre- and post-nominal APs

Below in (22) is presented the surface order of a Barese DP formed by the [NP + PP] complex *àgənə də grànə* ‘grains of wheat’, modified by the DmAPs *bbèllə* ‘nice’ and *grèssə* ‘fat’ and the ImAP *pələzzàtə* ‘clean(ed)’:

(22) *(**ImAP)* *DmAP (*DmAP)* *[$_{NP}$ N* *PP* *]* *DmAP* *ImAP*
(**pələzzàtə) **bbèllə** (*grèssə) **àgənə də grànə** **grèssə** **pələzzàtə**
cleaned.pl. nice.pl. fat.pl. grain.pl of wheat.sg fat.pl. clean(ed).pl.
‘Nice big clean grains of wheat’

In the prenominal area, we observe once again the ungrammaticality of an indirect modifier and more than one direct modifier at a time. Moreover, it is crucial to note that the [N + PP] move as a complex constituent, whereas N-movement alone would yield an ungrammatical DP, i.e. *bbèllə àgənə də grànə grèssə (*də grànə) pələzzàtə (*də grànə)* (for the rare occasions of N-movement only in Barese see Andriani, forthcoming: chapter II, §3). Therefore, following Cinque (2010), and assuming the universal first-merge order of DP-internal categories for Barese as in (23.a), we derive the final unmarked order *bbèllə àgənə də grànə grèssə pələzzàtə* ‘nice big clean grains of wheat’ via phrasal movement of the entire NP for the pied-piping to the inflectional field of the lexical complement, the PP.

(23) a. [$_{DP}$ [$_{FP3}$ [IP [$_{SpecIP}$ PRO [$_{I°}$ [**$_{ImAP}$ pələzzàtə**]]]] [$_{F3°}$ [$_{FP2}$ [**$_{DmAP}$ bbèllə**] [$_{F2°}$ [$_{FP1}$ [**$_{DmAP}$ grèssə**] [$_{F1°}$ [$_{NP}$ [$_{N}$ **àgənə** [$_{PP}$ **də grànə**]]]]]]]]]

The first derivational operation concerns (both pre- and post-nominal) direct modification, the closest of the two AP-sources, merged above the NP. Later in (23c), we will observe the mechanism to derive the obligatorily post-nominal position of ImAPs, merged above the Dm-space.

As a first operation after the merge of the NP and the DmAP(s), the NP [*àgənə*$_{N}$ *də gránə*$_{PP}$] moves first to the AP-space where Dm applies, as shown in (23.b):

(23) b. [$_{DP}$ [$_{FP2}$ [$_{DmAP}$ **bbèllə**] [$_{F2°}$[$_{AgrF1P}$ [$_{NP}$ **àgənə də gránə**$_{i}$] [$_{AgrF1°}$ [$_{FP1}$ [$_{DmAP}$ **grèssə**] [$_{F1°}$ [$_{NP}$ [$_{N}$ ~~àgənə~~ [$_{PP}$ ~~də gránə~~]]]]]]]]]

In contrast with most Romance varieties, Barese NPs will obligatorily cross over most of the Dm adjectival classes, for instance the size-AP *grèssə* 'fat' in (23.b). However, *bbèllə* instantiates one of the exceptionally productive cases in which the DmAP can or cannot be optionally crossed over by the NP and end up either in pre- or post-nominal position, retaining the so-called 'evaluative' reading. Once both pre- and post-nominal direct modification of the NP have taken place, the RRC containing the I°-complement ImAP *pələzzàtə* 'cleaned' is merged on top of the DmAP-space, as shown in (23.c):

(23) c. [$_{DP}$ [$_{FP3}$ [$_{IP}$ [PRO [$_{I°}$ [$_{ImAP}$ **pələzzàtə**]]]] [$_{F3°}$ [$_{FP2}$ [$_{DmAP}$ **bbèllə**] [$_{F2°}$ [$_{AgrF1P}$ [$_{NP}$ **àgənə də gránə**$_{i}$] [$_{AgrF1°}$ [$_{FP1}$ [$_{DmAP}$ **grèssə**] [$_{F1°}$ [$_{NP}$ [$_{N}$ ~~àgənə~~ [$_{PP}$ ~~də gránə~~]]]]]]]]]]]

The next operation involves the obligatory movement (common to most Romance varieties) of the syntactically compact constituent formed by the (partially) raised NP and its direct modifiers, i.e. Vincent's (2007) complex NP. The complex phrase moves further up to a SpecAgrP projected above the RRC, pied-piping (Ross 1967) the entire post-nominal domain in a 'snow-ball' fashion (Shlonsky 2004: 1483), as shown in (23.d):

(23) d. [$_{DP}$ [$_{AgrF3P}$ [$_{F3°}$ [$_{FP2}$ [$_{DmAP}$ **bbèllə**] [$_{F2°}$ [$_{AgrFP1}$ [$_{NP}$ **àgənə də gránə**$_{i}$] [$_{AgrFP1°}$ [$_{FP1}$ [$_{DmAP}$ **grèssə**] [$_{F1°}$ [$_{NP}$ [$_{N}$ ~~àgənə~~ [$_{PP}$ ~~də gránə~~]]]]]]]]]]] [$_{AgrF3°}$ [$_{FP3}$ [$_{IP}$ [PRO [$_{I°}$ [$_{ImAP}$ **pələzzàtə**]]]] …
… [$_{F3°}$ [$_{FP2}$ [$_{DmAP}$ ~~bbèllə~~] [$_{F2°}$ [$_{AgrFP1}$ [$_{NP}$ ~~àgənə də gránə~~$_{i}$] [$_{AgrFP1°}$ [$_{FP1}$ [$_{DmAP}$ ~~grèssə~~] [$_{F1°}$ [$_{NP}$ [$_{N}$ ~~àgənə~~ [$_{PP}$ ~~də gránə~~]]]]]]]]

The pied-piping of the NP and the relative direct modifiers leaves the RRC in the right-most post-nominal position to receive the Im-interpretation, and the final unmarked order of adjectival modification in (24) obtains:

(24) **DmAP$_{value}$** (DmAP$_{quality > size}$) **NP** **DmAP$_{size}$** >
[$_{DP}$ [$_{DmAP}$ bbèllə] [$_{NP}$ àgənə də gránə] [$_{DmAP}$ grèssə]

DmAP$_{colour > nation}$ > **ImAP**
[$_{ImAP}$ pələzzàtə]]

Summing up, the Barese data have shown that the post-nominal position is employed to convey both Dm- and Im- interpretations for the AP-modifiers of the N head. Therefore, ambiguity arises in post-nominal position between two types of functions these APs may assume: the correct interpretation of each function can only be disambiguated when the

pragmatic context of their occurrence is considered. However, the different semantic functions of these two types of adjectives reflect their separate underlying structures. The cross-linguistic evidence of two distinct DP-internal sources for Dm- and ImAPs, provided by Sproat and Shih (1989, 1991) and further extended to Germanic and Romance by Cinque (2010), lead us to exploit this intuition also for Barese adjectival modification. ImAPs show the lowest degree of proximity to the N head, and behave as if they were RRCs lacking a strict hierarchical ordering. By contrast, DmAPs enter into a closer relation with the modified N head, being merged in hierarchical order in its extended projection, immediately on top of NP. The final order of constituents within the Barese DP is derived via a first obligatory NP-movement across (certain) classes of DmAPs, and a second obligatory movement of this larger derived nominal XP, containing the NP and its direct modifiers, across all ImAPs, on a par with most Romance varieties. Movement implies pied-piping of the APs (Dm followed by Im) along with the NP to derive grammatical orders with the relative interpretation. The pre- and post-nominal position of APs with respect to the NP-final landing site determines their 'subjective' or the literal interpretation (respectively). However, the ability of the Barese NP to partially climb the Dm-hierarchy, landing in intermediate positions of the said constituent, results in those rare instantiations of pre-nominal DmAPs.

These Barese facts provide us with important syntactic evidence which does not surface overtly when considering pre-nominal adjectival modification in other standard Romance varieties: As claimed by Cinque (1995, 2005, 2010, 2014), Romance quality- and size-DmAPs may occur pre-nominally in unmarked contexts; however, every class may potentially surface pre-nominally in higher registers of the given languages to receive a 'subjective' interpretation (cf. §3.). That is, the NP partially moves and lands in an(y) intermediate position of the DmAP hierarchy. By contrast, in Barese, the NP is obliged to move across the majority of the DmAP classes, forcing even those DmAPs with 'subjective' interpretation to surface post-nominally: this overt structural reflex provides clear evidence for a higher obligatory movement of the Barese NP with respect to Romance.

However, these eleven Barese DmAPs are allowed to surface pre-nominally (one at a time), modifying an equally limited set of referents: this already testifies to the limited productivity of pre-nominal modification. Only the very top end of the hierarchy hosts the only productive class of DmAPs, which do not denote any extensional property of the referent they modify, but rather encode the speaker's basic evaluative opinions/judgements. The spectrum of values only ranges between polar [positive] and [negative]. Among these few pre-nominal DmAPs, the Barese quality- and size-DmAPs allowed to surface pre-nominally are either relics of older stages of higher pre-nominal productivity found across early Italo-Romance varieties (cf. Vincent 2007, Ledgeway 2007, among others) or non-productive/lexicalised 'innovations' brought about (again) by the increasing influence of standard Italian on the dialect. These pre-nominal DmAPs were observed to be at varying degrees of lexicalisation into [A + N] compounds. Hence, the highest part of the hierarchy of Barese DmAPs may be thought of as being split into a productive value-DmAP class, and a (completely or partially) fossilised quality- and size-DmAP, whose productive instances will mainly be expressed post-nominally (i.e. the NP will raise past them).

REFERENCES

Abney, S., 1987, *The English Noun Phrase in its Sentential Aspect*, doctoral dissertation, MIT.
Adams, J. N., 1976, "A typological approach to Latin word order", *Indogermanische Forschungen*, 81, 70–99.
Aboh, E., 1998, *From the Syntax of Gungbe to the Grammar of Gbe*, doctoral dissertation, University of Geneva.
Alexiadou A., L. Haegeman, M. Stavrou, 2007, *The Noun Phrase in the Generative Perspective*, Berlin, De Gruyter.
Andriani L., forthcoming, *Aspects of the Morpho-Syntax of Barese*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Cambridge.
Bernstein, J., 1991, "DPs in French and Walloon: Evidence for Parametric Variation in Nominal Head Movement", *Probus*, 3.2, 101–126.
Bernstein, J., 1993, *Topics in the Syntax of Nominal Structure across Romance*, Doctoral Dissertation, CUNY.
Bernstein, J., 2001, "The DP hypothesis: Identifying clausal properties in the nominal domain", in: M. Baltin, C. Collins (eds), *Handbook of Contemporary Syntactic Theory,* Malden (MA), Blackwell, 536–561.
Bolinger, D. L., 1967, "Adjectives in English: Attribution and Predication", *Lingua*, 18, 1–34.
Brăescu, R., 2013, "Adjectives and Adjectival Phrases" in: G. Pană Dindelegan (ed.) *The Grammar of Romanian*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 410–431.
Carlson, G. N., 1980 [1977], *Reference to Kinds in English*, Garland, New York.
Cinque, G., 1995, *Italian Syntax and Universal Grammar*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
Cinque, G., 2005, "Deriving Greeberg's Universal 20 and its Exceptions", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 36, 3, 315–332.
Cinque, G., 2010, *The Syntax of Adjectives: A Comparative Study*, Cambridge (MA), MIT Press.
Cinque, G., 2014, "The Semantic Characterisation of Adjectives. A View from Syntax", *Studies in Chinese Linguistics*, 35, 1, 3–32.
Cornilescu, A., A. Nicolae, 2011, "Nominal peripheries and phase structure in the Romanian DP", *Revue roumaine de linguistique*, LVI, 1, 35–68.
Cox, T., 1986, "Polysemy in Attributive Adjectives in a Southeastern Italian Dialect", in: A. M. Kinloch *et al*. (eds), *Papers from the Tenth Annual Meeting of the Atlantic Provinces Linguistic Association*, 10, Fredericton, University of New Brunswick, 38–45.
Giorgi, A.,G. Longobardi (1991). *The Syntax of Noun Phrases*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Giusti, G., 2002, "The Functional Structure of Noun Phrases. A Bare Phrase Structure Approach", in: G. Cinque (ed.), *Functional Structure in DP and IP: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures I*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 54–90.
Giusti, G., 2006, "Parallels in clausal and nominal periphery", in: M. Frascarelli (ed.), *Phases of Interpretation*, Berlin, Mouton De Gryuter, 163–184.
Greenberg, J. H., 1963, "Some Universal of Grammar with Particular Reference to the Order of Meaningful Elements", in: J. H. Greenberg (ed.), *Universal of Language*, Cambridge (MA): MIT Press, 73–113.
Grimshaw, J., 2005 [1991], "Extended Projection", *Words and Structure*, 151, Stanford, CSLI, 1–74.
Guardiano C., 2011, "DPs in Southern Italy: a Comparative perspective", paper presented at CIDSM6, University of Cambridge, UK.
Higginbotham, J., 1985, "On Semantics", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 16, 4, 547–594.
Kamp, H., 1975, "Two Theories about Adjectives": in E. Keenan (ed.), *Formal Semantics of Natural Language*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 123–155.
Kayne, R., 1994, *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*, Cambridge (MA), MIT Press.
Lacalendola, A., 1969, *Grammatica del dialetto di Bari*, Palo del Colle (Bari), Liantonio.

Lacalendola, A., 1972, *Frasario del dialetto di Bari*, Palo del Colle (Bari), Liantonio.
Ledgeway, A., 2007, "La posizione dell'aggettivo nella storia del napoletano", in: D. Bentley, A. Ledgeway (eds), *Sui dialetti italoromanzi. Saggi in onore di Nigel Vincent*, Norfolk, Biddles, 104–125.
Ledgeway, A., 2009, *Grammatica diacronica del napoletano*, Tübingen, Niemeyer Verlag.
Ledgeway, A., forthcoming, "The Dialects of Southern Italy", in: A. Ledgeway, M. Maiden (eds), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Longobardi, G., 1994, "Reference and Proper Names", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 25, 609–665.
Longobardi G., 2001, "The Structure of DPs: Principles, Parameters and Problems", in: M. Baltin, C. Collins (eds), *Handbook of Syntactic Theory*, Malden (MA), Blackwell, 562–603.
Longobardi, G., 2005, "Toward a Unified Grammar of Reference", *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft*, 24, 5–44.
Loporcaro, M., 1997, "Puglia and Salento", in: M. Maiden, M. Parry (eds), *The Dialects of Italy*, London, Routledge, 338–348.
Maiden, M., C. Robustelli, 2000, *A Reference Grammar of Modern Italian*, London, Edward Arnold.
Nespor, M., 1988, "Il sintagma aggettivale" in: L. Renzi, G. Salvi (eds.) *Grande Grammatica Italiana di Consultazione.* Bologna, Il Mulino, 425–442 (Reprinted in 2001, Bologna, Il Mulino).
Pearson, M., 2000, "Two Types of OV languages" in: P. Svenonius (ed.), *The derivation of OV and VO*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 327–364.
Roberts, I., 2011, "FOFC in DP: Universal 20 and the Nature of Demonstratives", Manuscript, University of Cambridge, UK.
Rohlfs, G., 1969, *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti. Sintassi e formazione delle parole,* III, Torino, Einaudi.
Ross, J. R., 1967, *Constraints on variables in syntax*, doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge (MA).
Sada, L., 1977, *Le Puglie in Bocca*, Palermo, Il Vespro.
Shlonsky, U., 2004, "The Form of the Semitic Noun Phrase", *Lingua*, 114, 12, 1465–1526.
Siegel, M. E. A., 1976, *Capturing the Adjective*, doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst (MA).
Silvestri, G., 2014, "Adverb and participle agreement: micro-variation in Italo-Romance", in: *Proceedings of IGG40*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter.
Sproat, R., C. Shih, 1988, "Prenominal Adjectival Ordering in English and Mandarin", in *Proceeding of NELS 12*, 465–489.
Sproat, R., C. Shih, 1991, "The Cross-Linguistic Distribution of Adjective Ordering Restrictions" in: C. Georgopoulos, R. Ishihara (eds), *Interdisciplinary Approaches to Language*, Dordrecht, Kluwer, 565–593.
Szabolcsi, A., 1987, "Functional categories in the noun phrase" in: I. Kenesei (ed.), *Approaches to Hungarian* II, Szeged, JATE, 167–190.
Szabolcsi, A., 1994, "The Noun Phrase", in: F. Kiefer, K.E. Kiss (eds.), *The structure of Hungarian*, *Syntax and Semantics 27*, San Diego (CA), San Diego Academic Press, 179–274.
Valente, V., 1975, "I dialetti della Puglia", in: M. Cortellazzo (ed.), *Profilo dei dialetti italiani*, 15, 5–75.
Vendler, Z., 1967, *Linguistics in Philosophy*, Ithaka (NY), Cornell University Press.
Vincent, N., 1986, "La posizione dell'aggettivo in italiano" in: H. Stammerjohann (ed.), *Tema-rema in italiano*, Tübingen, Gunter Narr, 181–195.
Vincent, N., 2007, "Learned vs. Popular Syntax: Adjective Placement in Early Italian Vernaculars", in: A. L. Lepschy, A. Tosi (eds), *Languages of Italy*, Ravenna, Longo, 55–75.