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Abstract

This paper focuses on several morphosyntactic properties connected to qualitative binominal constructions (QBCs, complex noun phrases of the type a jewel of a village from a Southern Italo-Romance language spoken in the Apulian town of San Marco in Lamis (Foggia). Here, QBCs appear in two ways: prepositionally (with da, allowing definites, indefinites, and demonstratives), and non-prepositionally, (only allowing definite nouns with definite articles, and hence not proper names). We will suggest that in the latter type N1 and N2 are related by a categorial match in their determiner layer, ‘match D’. N1, a property-denoting element, is embedded as a noun, which allows 1) the recursive DP strategy found in non-prepositional genitives; 2) the generalization of this mechanism to qualitative phrases, where N1 has an adjective-like function. This derives the impossibility of syntactic operations such as extraction (which we connect to the notion of phase). With non-denominal N1’s, N1’s article will be treated as head-agreeing adjectival linkers, which form a constituent with the modifier but agree with the head. We will suggest that a phrase is interpreted as a qualitative binominal if N1 and N2 share the same number features and if the features of N1 do not allow for it to be interpreted as the head/possessum of N2. A few words will be spent on external agreement with either noun of the construction, and we will see that the data confirm the relevance of [ + HUMAN] features with regard to agreement relations.
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1) Introduction

This paper deals with a type of predicative phrase made up of two elements, in which the first one (either a noun, an adjective, or an interjection) embeds a second one (understood as the subject of the predication) through prepositions such as of (a jewel of a village). This type of phrase is characterized by a precise realization of the determiner layer. For example, in English, the subject (N2) generally hosts an indefinite article in its D position, a jewel of [a doctor] (qualitative) vs. a jewel of [the doctor’s] (possessive). In the first case, the usual meaning is that N1 is a quality being
predicated about \( N_2 \), i.e., the fact that the doctor is a jewel. In the second, the interpretation is instead that \( N_1 \) is possessed by \( N_2 \).

This construction has been extensively described in Aarts (1998) and Den Dikken (2006) in relation to Germanic (Dutch, English). It was the focus of studies such as Napoli (1989), Kayne (1994), Vişan (2003), Villalba (2007), and Tănase-Dogaru (2012) in relation to Standard Romance varieties (Catalan, French, Italian, Romanian, Spanish).

Several syntactic analyses, such as Den Dikken and Kayne’s, focus on the role of the preposition in the construction. Their syntactic analyses share a predicate-subject inversion strategy\(^1\) which in Den Dikken’s work is the mechanism triggering the presence of a preposition. Given that in the Apulian variety under analysis here such a construction occurs also in a non-prepositional fashion, then the analysis in which there is inversion, and inversion produces a preposition, is untenable.

1) l-a ˈkaspɔtə l-a bulˈetə Apulian (San Marco in Lamis, Foggia)\(^\text{ii} \)
   DEF-F.SG freaking DEF-F.SG bill
   ‘that freaking thing of a bill’

In this language, qualitative binominals are not the only construction involving the absence of a preposition; the so-called non-prepositional genitives also occur. In Massaro (2020) it is proposed that caseless, non-prepositional genitives in this language are interpreted as such even in the absence of a preposition thanks to a categorial match in the D layer of both nouns (which we will call ‘match D’), which is realized by matching the type of determiner (in our case, definite articles) in the D layer of both head and modifier.

2) a. l-i rɔt-ə l-a mako-ə/*n-a mako-ə
   DEF-PL wheels-F.PL DEF-F.SG car-F.SG/*INDEF-F.SG car-F.SG
   ‘the car’s wheels’

b. l-a kod-a l-u kan-ə/*n-u kan-ə
Indefinites require instead the presence of a preposition, thus resulting in *da na makna, do nu kana*, etc. Rohlfs (1969: 6) proposed that the preposition is present and that it undergoes absorption in intervocalic contexts. The definite articles of the Morano Calabrese variety taken into account by Rohlfs underwent the loss of the lateral, thus resulting in *a(F)/u, o(M).* However, not all Italo-Romance varieties lost the lateral in definite articles, and still, non-prepositional genitives occur anyway. Because of this, Silvestri (2012) proposes that Rohlfs’s proposal might be incorrect. Moreover, non-prepositional genitives are well attested in Old Romance (see Delfitto and Paradisi 2009 for Old Italian and Old Sicilian; Jensen 1990 for Old French). Because of this, we assume that the preposition-triggering inversion advocated by Den Dikken is not the mechanism generating non-prepositional qualitative binominals (or non-prepositional genitives) in this language. More similarities between non-prepositional genitives and non-prepositional qualitative binominal constructions can be added. Qualitative binominals seem to obey the same requirements related to the D layer we find in non-prepositional genitives, *N₁* is definite, occurs with an article, and so does *N₂* (even though definite, proper names, being bare, trigger the presence of a preposition; see footnote (X)). Qualitative binominals containing indefinite nominals require a preposition (just like non-prepositional genitives do). We will see more of this in §3.

This paper is structured as follows. §2 gives an overview of qualitative binominals in Standard Romance languages, focusing mostly on the realization of the determiner layer of each noun. §3 introduces the data on Apulian non-prepositional qualitative binominals; since Apulian non-prepositional qualitative binominals behave, in some respect, similarly to non-prepositional genitives, we will discuss them too. §3.1 deals with the role of the preposition *da* in the phrase and with syntactic operations such as extraction. §3.2 hinges on the question of interpretation: how is a qualitative binominal interpreted as such even when superficially identical to a genitival phrase?
§3.3 is an analysis of agreement patterns with qualitative binominals in Apulian, both in internal and external agreement relations. We will see how different phenomena determine the choice of goals in both internal and external morphological agreement, and especially the original category of the element embedded as N₁, distance of the probe from the goal, and the presence of [HUMAN] features in the phrase. In particular, the article preceding N₁ will be analyzed as an agreeing element, similar to an agreeing linker (see Toosarvandani & Van Urk 2014), which serves to establish N₁ as a modifier of N₂. This is especially important when N₁ is originally deficient with respect to the possibility of carrying gender features (as is the case in interjections like ‘kaspəta, lit. ‘freaking’). The article preceding N₁, by agreeing with N₂, endows N₁ with an agreement relation with N₂ thereby turning it into a modifier whose N₂ is the actual head. We will claim that while carrying an adjective-like predicative function, the first element is essentially embedded like a noun. This is relevant especially concerning the question as to why N₁ should have an article at all even when it is already an adjective (‘idiot’) and in principle already capable of modifying N₂. Embedding the predicate as a noun (which can then have its own determiner) allows the language to generalize the iterated DPs (‘match D’) strategy found in genitival modification to modification in qualitative binominals. In so doing, the language makes it possible for elements that are otherwise not modifiers (like interjections) to appear as such. In this respect, we will claim that other than allowing unusual elements to be recategorized as modifiers, the construction also allows strictly post-nominal adjectival modifiers to be linearized before the noun, which in part resembles the alternation between Greek monadic and polydefinite adjectival modification in Greek (Campos & Stavrou 2004). Finally, §4 concludes.

2) Qualitative Binominals in Romance

Romance languages generally realize qualitative binominal constructions in at least three configurations and namely the demonstrative-definite article type (3), the indefinite article-bare noun type (4)\(^\text{v}\) (which can also be realized with N₁ headed by a definite article (5)). (6)\(^\text{vi}\) shows
instead a definite article-definite article configuration. Lastly, as expected from languages where proper nouns rise to D, data containing proper names show article-less N₂ ((3a) and (7)).

3)  a. *cet imbécile de Jean*  
    DEM idiot of Jean  
    ‘that idiot of Jean’  

b. *quell’idiota del dottore*  
    DEM idiot of DEF doctor  
    ‘that idiot of the doctor’  

c. *quello schifo di canzone*  
    DEM disgust of song  
    ‘that abomination of a song’

4)  a. *o scârbă de om*  
    INDEF jerk of man  
    ‘a jerk of a man’  

b. *uno schifo di uomo*  
    INDEF disgust of man  
    ‘an abomination of a man’

5)  a. *amărât-ul de om*  
    wreck-DEF of man  
    ‘a wreck of a man’  

b. *lo schifo di libro*  
    DEF disgust of book  
    ‘an abomination of a book’

6)  a. *l’idiota del dottore*  
    DEF idiot of DEF doctor
We can see that in Romance, at least two types of qualitative binominals are found: those where \( N_2 \) never occurs with an article (we exclude cases where \( N_2 \) is a proper name, for the reason that in these languages proper names are article-less), and those in which \( N_2 \) does. In some contexts, \( N_1 \) can be article-less, too. Such is the case of exclamatives and qualitative binominals embedded in complementizer phrases, as the following examples from Italian show.

8) a. stupid \( \text{di un} \) dottore

idiot of INDEF doctor

‘Idiot of a doctor!’

b. che schifo \( \text{di canzone} \)

COMP disgust of song

‘What a terrible song’

In the Apulian variety under analysis here, qualitative binominals occur as either the type in (6) or the type in (4). The type in (8b) is also a possibility. We will describe the Apulian data in the following paragraph, where we will also touch upon non-prepositional genitives. As anticipated, non-prepositional genitives and non-prepositional qualitative binominals behave similarly in several
respects, among which the absence of a preposition, a categorial match in the D layer of both nouns, and the impossibility of undergoing syntactic operations such as extraction.

3) The Apulian data

All the Apulian data introduced in this paragraph come from the Gargano Apulian Italo-Romance language of San Marco in Lamis (Foggia) unless stated otherwise. Given that Apulian qualitative binominals behave, in some respects, similarly to non-prepositional genitives, we will introduce them here. We have no data concerning the realization of non-prepositional qualitative phrases in other Apulian varieties. However, concerning the presence of non-prepositional genitives, this is attested in at least another Gargano Apulian variety (Mattinata, Silvestri 2012: 564), although displaying micro-variation as is normal (like the possibility of proper names as genitives), the presence of non-prepositional genitives in neighboring Gargano Apulian varieties suggests that the presence of non-prepositional qualitative phrases could be possible.

We have said that this language can realize two types of genitival constructions. The difference between the two, as proposed in Massaro (2020, 2022) lies in the fact that the non-prepositional type only allows definite nouns, and that it is regulated by a categorial match in the D layer.

9) a. l-i libr-a l-a nəpot-a   San Marco in Lamis (Foggia)
    ‘his/her niece’s books’

    b. *l-i libr-a n-a nəpot-a
    ‘the books of a niece of his/hers’

    c. l-i libr-a də n-a nəpot-a
    ‘the books of a niece of his/hers’
This construction is characterized by several syntactic properties, however for the time being we will focus on two of them in that they are also relevant for the discussion on qualitative binominal phrases which will follow. One of these two syntactic properties is extraction. The question-answer example below shows that extraction out of a non-prepositional genitive is not possible, while it is for the prepositional variant.

10) a. kwant-a n.a lett-a də.l:-i padʒən-a l-a kart-a?
   how.many-PL cl. have.2.SG read of.DEF-PL page.F-PL DEF-F.SG letter-F.SG
   ‘how many pages of the letter have you read?’

b. *l-a kart-a n-evii lett-a dojə padʒən-a
   DEF-F.SG letter-F.SG PART-have.1.SG read-PL two.F page.F-PL
   ‘of the letter, I have read two pages’

a’. kwant-a n.a lett-a də.l:-i padʒən-a də.l:-a kart-a?
   how.many-PL PART.have.2.SG read of.DEF-PL page.F-PL of.DEF-F.SG letter-F.SG
   ‘how many pages of the letter have you read?’

b’. də.l:-a kart-a n-e lett-a dojə padʒən-a
   of.DEF-F.SG letter-F.SG PART-have.1.SG read.PST-PL two.F page.F-PL
   ‘of the letter, I have read two pages’

Another syntactic property is instead related to adjectival modification. Speakers seem reluctant to accept post-nominal modifiers of the head and switch to a prepositional genitive whenever this happens.

11) l-i rət-a nou-a *(də,l-a makən-a
   DEF-PL tires new-PL *(of.)DEF-F.SG car-F.SG
   ‘the new tires of the car’
The head can only be modified by a post-nominal adjective if the phrase is prepositional. The genitive can, instead, be modified by a post-nominal adjective even in non-prepositional contexts.

12) l-i ɾat-ə l-a  makan-ə nov-a

`DEF-PL tire-PL DEF-F.SG car-F.SG new-F.SG`

‘the tires of the new car’

Instead, in §4 we will see that non-prepositional binominal qualitatives allow degree modifiers to be interposed between N₁ and N₂.

In qualitative binominal constructions in this Italo-Romance language, the D-layer of the predicate can contain either a distal demonstrative or a definite article. N₂ can be article-less or headed by a definite article. Configurations with N₁ headed by a demonstrative require a preposition to relate it to N₂. On the other hand, configurations in which both N₁ and N₂ are headed by a definite article do not. Article-less N₂s require instead a preposition.

13) a. l-u ʃem-ə l-u medəkə

`DEF-M.SG idiot-M.SG DEF-M.SG doctor`

‘the idiot of the doctor’

b. l-a kaspəta l-a bul'letə

`DEF-F.SG freaking DEF-F.SG bill`

‘that freaking thing of a bill’

c. kwid:u ʃem-ə l-u medəkə

`DEM-M.SG idiot-M.SG DEF-M.SG doctor`

‘*that idiot of the doctor’

d. kwid:-u ʃem-ə da:l-u medəkə

`DEM-M.SG idiot-M.SG of.DEF-M.SG doctor`

‘that idiot of the doctor’

e. *l-u ʃem-ə medəkə
DEF-M.SG idiot-M.SG doctor
‘that idiot of the doctor’

f. l-u 'ʃem-ə də.l-u 'medəkə
DEF-M.SG idiot-M.SG of.DEF-M.SG doctor
‘that idiot of the doctor’

As mentioned, the construction obeys similar constraints to the ones we found for non-prepositional genitives, including a ban on indefinites.

14) a. l-u 'ʃem-ə l-u 'medəkə
DEF-M.SG idiot-M.SG DEF-M.SG doctor
‘the idiot of the doctor’

b. *n-u 'ʃem-ə l-u 'medəkə
INDEF-M.SG idiot-M.SG DEF-M.SG doctor
‘*an idiot of the doctor’

c. *l-u 'ʃem-ə n-u 'medəkə
DEF-M.SG idiot-M.SG INDEF-M.SG doctor
‘*the idiot of a doctor’

d. n-u 'ʃem-ə də 'medəkə
INDEF-M.SG idiot-M.SG of doctor
‘an idiot of a doctor’

e. *n-u 'ʃem-ə n-u 'medəkə
INDEF-M.SG idiot-M.SG INDEF-M.SG doctor
‘*an idiot of a doctor’

The absence of a preposition in these configurations shows that it is not feasible to suppose that the construction results from subject-predicate inversion, as suggested by Den Dikken (2006). If inversion produces a preposition, but in our case, a preposition is not present, then we are led to
exclude that such a mechanism is feasible in this language. Examples with interjections (1) also show that it is not feasible to derive the construction from an inverted copula. This would imply starting the derivation from *l-a bul'let-a ɛ 'kaspəta, ‘the bill is freaking’, which is not a possible sentence, unlike what it would appear if we only used elements such as idiot to test the inversion hypothesis (that idiot of a doctor = the doctor is an idiot). Another claim made in Den Dikken’s work is that in Dutch, the article preceding N₂ is ‘spurious’. Den Dikken reaches this conclusion because, in Dutch, qualitative binominals show number agreement mismatches between N₂ and its article, as shown in (15) (Den Dikken 2006: 170).

15) a. die idioten van een kerels  
   those idiots of a guys  
   ‘those stupid guys’

b. die idioten van een doktoren  
   those idiots of a doctors  
   ‘those stupid doctors’

According to Den Dikken, this ‘spurious’ article doesn’t belong with any of the two members in the construction, and it signals the fact that N₁ and N₂ are contained within a small clause. As discussed in length in Villalba (2007) the definite article preceding N₂ in Romance is a full-fledged determiner and does not allow for agreement mismatches. This is also what we find in Apulian. If agreement mismatches between N₂ and its article are what signals the fact that the article is spurious, and such agreement mismatches do not exist in Romance, then it is a consequence to conclude, like Villalba does, that this analysis cannot be extended to Romance (see Giannakidou & Stavrou 1999 for similar remarks on definite articles in Greek binominal qualitatives).

Surely, one of the interesting things about this construction is the behavior of determiners. In the case of Apulian, for instance, we maintain that articles in the construction realize a categorial match in the D layer (see also Tănase-Dogaru 2012, who proposes that Romanian qualitative
binominals show definiteness agreement), let us call it match \( D \) (which only includes definite articles), and that match \( D \) is what relates \( N_1 \) and \( N_2 \). Matching of the type of determiner preceding \( N_1 \) and \( N_2 \) is what relates them, i.e., this categorial match is the relator.

16) a. **Binomial Qualitative**

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREDICATE</th>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lu</td>
<td>la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'dʒənja'</td>
<td>'tșita'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(the genius)</td>
<td>(the girlfriend)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

The fact that match \( D \) occurs in both non-prepositional qualitative binominals and non-prepositional genitives can be explained if we assume that \( N_2 \), which is the individual-denoting member, has specific reference, just like possessors in non-prepositional genitives. In non-prepositional qualitative binominals \( N_2 \) is in fact a topical element. This is also what we find in other Romance languages such as Spanish. Villalba (2007: 11) shows that in Spanish qualitative binominals \( N_2 \) is usually a topical element and that it is incompatible with positions where foci are found.

17) *No hablaste con el idiota de [qué médico] Spanish

not talk.PST-2.SG with DEF idiot of which doctor

‘*you didn’t talk to the idiot of which doctor’

We can see that the same happens in Apulian, regardless of whether the qualitative binominal is prepositional or non-prepositional.

18) a. *non a par'l-atə 'ku-l-i-um' 'ʃem-ə [kwal- :u 'medəkə]

not have.2.SG talk-PST with-DEF idiot-M.SG which-M.SG doctor

‘*you didn’t talk to the idiot of which doctor’

b. *non a par'lat-ə 'ku-l-u 'ʃem-ə də [kwal- :u 'medəkə]

not have.2.SG talk-PST with-DEF idiot-M.SG of which-M.SG doctor

‘*you didn’t talk to the idiot of which doctor’
3.1 Extraction, prepositions, or lack thereof

As mentioned previously in this paper, qualitative binominals are characterized by several morpho-
syntactic properties, among which the impossibility to extract one of their members.

This was already noticed in Napoli (1989) for Italian and Den Dikken (2006) for Dutch. Napoli
described this behavior by linking it to a ‘wordlike’ property of the construction. According to Den
Dikken, extraction is not permitted because the construction is derived from a predicative phrase.

Here, we would like to suggest something vaguely related to what Napoli had in mind, but which
is also connected to the predicative properties of the construction. More precisely, we claim that
the impossibility follows if we treat $N_1$ in qualitative binominals as a modifier with an adjective-
like function (see also Aarts 1998). As a first, superficial clue, the first member can in fact be a noun
or a nominalized adjective (lu ’fema, ‘the idiot’). Unlike in genitive of-phrases, where the two
members carry different referential indexes, in qualitative binominals $N_1$ and $N_2$ share the same
index, which is what we find in adjectival modification.

20a. l- $\t_{\text{q}}$ $\text{enj}$- $\text{a}_i$ l-$\text{a}_i$ t$\text{s}$- $\text{a}_i$ towa _ $\text{Qualitative}$
    DEF-M.SG genius-M.SG DEF-F.SG girlfriend-F.SG your
    ‘that genius of your girlfriend’

20b. l- $\t_{\text{q}}$ $\text{enj}$- $\text{a}_i$ l-$\text{a}_j$ t$\text{s}$- $\text{a}_j$ towa _ $\text{Non-prep genitive}$
    DEF-M.SG genius-M.SG DEF-F.SG girlfriend-F.SG your
    ‘your girlfriend’s genius’
In generative frameworks, and especially within the Minimalist Program (Chomsky 1995), phrases not allowing syntactic operations such as extraction are referred to as *phases*. The peculiarity of phases is that they are syntactic chunks that once built cannot be accessed by further syntactic operations such as, in our case, extraction. More recently, Adger (2003), Radford (2004), Jiménez-Fernández (2012), and Chomsky (2020) have argued that definite DPs can have phasehood status, as shown in (21), where the banned syntactic operation is *wh*-extraction.

   
   b. *Which poem did you go to hear [a recital] of last night?*

Definiteness is related to topicality, and hence with what we have found for topics in (18). But also adjectival phrases constitute phases in that they do not permit extraction (*the beautiful car*→*of the car I have seen the beautiful/*of the beautiful I have seen the car*, cf. (19-20) and Bošković 2020). We claim here that merging of N₁ with a prepositional phrase (or through match D) containing N₂ (that geniusₙ₁ of a doctorₙ₂) turns it into a predicative element with adjective-like function. In particular (§3.3) we will claim that this adjective-like function is realized by generalizing to qualitative binominal phrases the iterated DPs found in genitival modification.

In qualitative binominals, N₁ is usually a property-denoting element. How N₁ is interpreted as a property-denoting element and not as the head of a non-prepositional genitive seems to also depend on the semantics of N₂. Consider first what we saw in (20), which we repeat here as (22).

22) a. l-u₁, ʰdʒːɘnj-aj₁ l-a₁ ʰsɪt-a₁ towa₁
   DEF-M.SG genius-M.SG DEF-F.SG girlfriend-F.SG your
   ‘that genius of your girlfriend’

   b. l-u₁, ʰdʒːɘnj-aj₁ l-a₁ ʰsɪt-a₁ towa₁
   DEF-M.SG genius-M.SG DEF-F.SG girlfriend-F.SG your
   ‘your girlfriend’s genius’

As we mentioned, the two structures seem superficially identical. Now consider the example in (23).
N₁, sgarːə'tonə, ‘wreck’, is usually said of cars, bikes, and barely working machines. So, in that position, it is either the head of a genitive whose modifier is [+HUMAN] (the person owning the car), with the meaning of ‘broken car owned by x’, or it is the first member of a qualitative binominal. The semantic traits of N₂ are those upon which the interpretation of N₁ is based. In the case of (23), N₂ is [–HUMAN], so it is not a case of a car owning another (broken) car. Rather, it is a property-denoting element, which qualifies N₂ in some respect. Here, the predication is that the car is a wreck. Match D (or the preposition da, ‘of’) is just a generic relator and it is underspecified with respect to the type of relationship that will take place between N₁ and N₂, i.e. whether it will be that of a qualitative binominal or that of a genitive (see Espinal and Cyrino 2021 on de as a phonological linker).

Syntactic analyses concerned with the role of the preposition in these two phrases can be divided according to whether they consider such a preposition as being generated in a shared manner in both phrases, or whether the two instances of of are to be accounted for as separated categories. Den Dikken (2006) proposes two different derivations, one for genitives and the other for qualitative binominals. Kayne (1994) suggests instead that the two instances of the preposition can be united within a single mechanism. Given what we have found about the preposition of previously in this paragraph, we maintain that such a preposition is underspecified, and that, like Kayne (1994) assumes, it is the same type of element regardless of whether the phrase is a qualitative binominal or a genitive. N₁ is then a property-denoting element, like adjectives, and it is related to the noun it modifies via a preposition (or match D, in the case of Apulian). As such, there can be no syntactic operation such as extraction. Consider further, by instance, that a qualitative noun phrase is analogous to saying, “x is a doctor and an idiot”, which takes us to what Den Dikken had in mind in relation to qualitative binominals being predicative phrases. According
to Bošković (2020), who follows Higginbotham (1985), adjunction (modification) is analogous to coordination, which would explain similarities shared by coordination and modification concerning the impossibility of extraction.

3.2 Interpretation

Another clue into how N₁ is interpreted as the predicative element and not as the head/possessum of a genitival phrase comes from number features. In the latter, head and modifier can carry different number features. In Apulian qualitative binominals, however, N₁ and N₂ must share the same number features. Remember what we have said about (23), i.e., that N₁ is interpreted as the predicate also because of the semantic traits carried by N₂. Now if N₁ has different number features from N₂, the phrase becomes agrammatical, and cannot be interpreted as a genitive or a qualitative binominal. It cannot be interpreted as a genitive because of the [-HUMAN] feature of N₁, and cannot be interpreted as a qualitative binominal because N₁ and N₂ do not have the same number features.

24) *l-i sgarːətnə l-a 'makan-a 'tow-a
   DEF-PL wreck-M.PL DEF-F.SG car-F.SG your-F.SG
   ‘*those wrecks of your car’

Remember from (1), which we repeat below, that N₁ can also be an element that is originally an interjection, like kaspəta.

25) l-a 'kaspəta l-a bul'letə
   DEF-F.SG freaking DEF-F.SG bill
   ‘that freaking thing of a bill’

Contrary to sgarːətnə (24), which is masculine, kaspəta contains no gender features. So what happens is that the gender features of kaspəta’s definite article are retrieved from those of N₂. We also assume, as in Baker (2003), that nouns are the only lexical category bearing a referential index.
Based on this, we conclude that the head of such a phrase is not $N_1$, but $N_2$ (see also Vişan 2013, Masini 2016, and Camacho and Serafim 2021, among others). Masini (2016: 109) describes nouns such as $N_1$ in this construction as light nouns (see also Giannakidou & Stavrou 1999 on Greek). This reflects the fact that despite being embedded as a noun, $N_1$ might express a “lower referentiality with respect to $N_2$,” if it expresses any referentiality at all. $N_1$ might retain its gender features (as in ‘genius’), but this does not translate into a separate reference from that of the head, which is what we see in adjectives. The fact that these elements have hybrid properties in between nouns and adjectives is a consequence of the fact that they underwent a shift (adjectives or interjections being embedded as nouns). We will see more of this in the following section.

### 3.3 Agreement patterns

Qualitative constructions of the type analyzed here, being binominal, provide a fertile ground for testing agreement patterns. This paragraph is intended to be a preliminary exploration of agreement patterns in qualitative binominal phrases in the Apulian variety under analysis here. We will investigate both agreement with external probes (participles, etc.), and agreement within the construction (on $N_1$ and D elements). This will help to shed light on how this Apulian variety instantiates agreement in contexts where binominal phrases are found, on the sensibility to certain semantic features such as animacy, or the sensibility to syntactic distance between probes and goals. Ultimately, we will see how agreement in the construction’s D layer can reflect the construction’s basic properties.
In general, when analyzing verbal agreement with complex nominals in Romance, person agreement on the auxiliary and the finite verb is used, as in the case of pseudo-partitives (see, for instance, Lorusso and Franco 2017). When it comes to qualitative binominals, however, we have seen that the number and person features of \( N_1 \) and \( N_2 \) always match (i.e., \( N_2 \) has the same index as \( N_1 \), as in adjectives and head nouns), with third-person features being the rule. Other persons can be realized with additional syntactic material, such as complementizer phrases.

Qualitative binominals per se trigger third-person agreement. Ackema and Neeleman (2019) notice, for example, that R-expressions (regular nouns) do not generally include first or second person features. As in (27), other persons can be realized only by adding additional syntactic structure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features in Apulian qualitative binominals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N₁ &amp; N₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHARING OF PERSON FEATURES (3d person features)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHARING OF NUMBER FEATURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHARING OF GENDER FEATURES When N₁ is a noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHARING OF GENDER FEATURES When N₁ is deadjectival or from another category (interjections, ‘kaspota)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since both \( N_1 \) and \( N_2 \) will trigger third person agreement, gender features are a better option for testing which of the two nouns is the goal of the agreement mechanism. Aside from person, since if \( N_2 \) is plural \( N_1 \) will be plural, number is excluded as well.

We will start with an analysis of agreement in resumptive clitics. We will find that when the complex nominal is the internal argument of a verbal phrase and undergoes resumption, the resumptive clitic might in principle agree with either noun; on the contrary adjectival modifiers of
N₂ must agree with it. This is in accordance with what proposed in the Agreement Hierarchy (Corbett 1979: 204; 2006: 235). Next, we will move to another condition imposed on agreement and namely that of the presence of an animacy feature in the binominal phrase. Another Southern Italo-Romance language where animacy is a condition on agreement is Pantîscu, as described in Idone (2018: 8).

The second part of this paragraph will instead delve into agreement on participles with binominal constructions as subjects. Agreement of the participle with subjects yields the same pattern as clitic agreement with objects. When both nouns are [-HUMAN], the participle might agree with either noun. When a [+HUMAN] noun occurs in the construction, the participle obligatorily agrees with it.

As we anticipated, the first nominal in qualitative binominals is not referential on its own, it is a predicate of the subject, like adjectives for head nouns, and as such co-indexed with it. Thus, the construction only contains one index. In non-prepositional genitives the resumptive clitic agrees with the head (i.e., the first nominal), as per usual. In qualitative binominals, however, while N₂ is the actual antecedent of a resumption mechanism, not necessarily will the resumptive clitic agree with it. The clitic can agree with either noun. Corbett (1979: 204; 2006: 235) proposed an Agreement Hierarchy, “attributive > predicate > relative pronoun > personal pronoun”, in which elements further to the right are more likely to show semantic agreement. Clitics, pronouns external to the binominal phrase, fit this description.

Whenever a [+HUMAN] noun is present, agreement with the [+HUMAN] noun is preferred.

```
28) 'kwed:-a pal:-a də libəɾ-ə non ʃə l-a/l-u ledəɾ-ə niʃən-ə
   'nobody reads that bore of a book'
```

```
29) a ˈkwed:-a pal:-a də jom-ə non l-u /əl-a kak-a niʃən-ə
   'nobody pays attention to that bore of a man'
```
Another Southern Italo-Romance language where this happens is Pantiscu, where predicative adjectives modifying qualitative binominals noun phrases agree with the [+HUMAN] noun as well (Idone 2018: 8).

30) ddhu ciuri di picciotta è propriu bbèddh-a /*bbèddh-u

DEM-M.SG flower(M).SG of girl(F).SG be.PRS.3.SG really beautiful-F.SG/*beautiful-M.SG

‘That lovely girl is really beautiful’

We can also test agreement with post-verbal subjects, and see that also in this case, participles and adjectives agree with the [+HUMAN] noun if it is present.

31) a. ɛnː ərːv-at-a l-u 'dʒːəŋja l-a ʦit-a towa /*arːv-at-ə

has arrive-PST-F.SG DEF-M.SG genius.M DEF-F.SG girlfriend-F your/arrive-PST-M.SG

‘here came that genius of your girlfriend’

b. ɛnː arːv-at-ə l-u sgarːtːon-ə l-a 'makəna də pa'pa /arːv-at-a

has arrived-M.SG DEF-M.SG wreck-M.SG DEF-F.SG car(F) of dad/arrived-F.SG

‘that wreck of dad’s car has arrived’

Pre-verbal subjects seem to yield the same pattern.

32) a. l-u 'dʒːəŋja l-a ʦit-a towa ɛnː arːv-at-a /*arːv-at-ə

DEF-M.SG genius.M DEF-F.SG girlfriend-F your has arrived-F.SG/arrived-M.SG

‘that genius of your girlfriend has arrived yesterday’

b. l-u sgarːtːon-ə l-a 'makəna də pa'pa ɛnː arːv-at-a /arːv-at-ə

DEF-M.SG wreck-M.SG DEF-F.SG car(F) of dad has arrived-F.SG/arrived-M.SG

‘that wreck of dad’s car has arrived’

We have said that predicates (N₁) have the role of a property-denoting element and that as such, they carry no real index on their own. However, these sorts of nominal predicates (sgarːtːonə) are still nouns and while they do not have a referential index themselves they do preserve their gender
features, as evident from their articles (remember instead that the number features of \(N_1\) depend on \(N_2\)); participles and adjectives will still agree with them, with the exception in which they appear with a [+human] noun, a nominalized adjective, or elements originated from interjections (as in the case of kaspata (26)). In that case, their morphology will bear the features of \(N_2\). The fact that nominal predicates like \(N_1\) can still retain their gender features (that will be copied also on their articles) is a remnant of their nominal nature (as in Baker 2003). Despite this, the whole phrase contains only one referential index (unlike genitives), which is borne by \(N_2\).

### 3.4 More on the D layer

Unlike definite articles, demonstratives may occur only once in the construction. They head the \(N_1\)-\(N_2\) phrase, where they agree with \(N_2\). The same happens in the Italian counterpart (33c).

33)a. (kwi)st-u kaspata da (\(\ast\)(kwi)st-u) 'meda\(\text{\textae}\)

\[\text{DEM(M)-M.SG} \text{ freaking of (DEM(M)-M.SG) doctor(M)}\]

\text{‘this freaking doctor’}

b. (kwi)st-u \(\acute{\text{j}}\text{em-\text{\textae}}\) da 'meda\(\text{\textae}\)

\[\text{DEM(M)-M.SG} \text{ idiot-M.SG of doctor(M)}\]

\text{‘this idiot of a doctor’}

c. quest-o caspita di (\(\ast\)quest-o) medico

\[\text{DEM-M.SG} \text{ freaking of (DEM-M.SG) doctor(M)}\]

\text{‘this freaking doctor’}

As we have seen, definite articles appear instead twice, heading each noun. The presence of a demonstrative correlates with the realization of a preposition (13c). This is true also for non-prepositional genitives in the same language (Massaro 2020, 2022). We can interpret this as follows. In non-prepositional genitives and qualitative binominal constructions, modification is realized through a categorial matching in the D layer (definite articles only). As we mentioned, qualitative binominals (34b) also require that \(N_1\) and \(N_2\) share the same number and gender features. In (34b)
we have an invariable element (the interjection), but as we saw, inflecting elements do show agreement morphology with \( N_2 \), so in (34b) we will show this agreement relation too.

\[
\begin{align*}
34a. & \quad \text{DEF-PL book-M.PL DEF-F.SG niece-F.SG} \\
& \quad \text{‘his/her niece’s books’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
34b. & \quad \text{DEF-M.SG freaking book-M.SG} \\
& \quad \text{‘that freaking thing of a book’}
\end{align*}
\]

On the other hand, when the D layer of both nouns shows no categorial matching, a modification relationship between the two nouns is realized with the preposition \( d\phi \).

\[
\begin{align*}
35a. & \quad \text{DEM(M)-PL book-M.PL of.DEF-F.SG niece-F.SG} \\
& \quad \text{‘these books of his/her niece’s’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
35b. & \quad \text{DEM(M)-M.SG freaking of book-M.SG} \\
& \quad \text{‘this freaking thing of a book’}
\end{align*}
\]

The relationship between \( N_1 \) and \( N_2 \), in which the property denoted by \( N_1 \) qualifies \( N_2 \), is then established in a twofold manner. In a case, a categorial match in the D layer is sufficient. That’s when a preposition is not needed. A categorial match in the D layer is also found in adjectival modification in Modern Greek and Aromanian polydefinites ((36a, c), Campos & Stavrou 2004: 137-
Like adjectival phrases, Greek qualitative binominal phrases also employ a polydefinite, recursive DP strategy (Alexiadou 2014: 43).

(36) a. i asimenja i pena (M. Greek, adjectival)
    DEF pen DEF silver
    ‘the silver pen’

b. to teras i adelfi mu irthe arga (M. Greek, qualitative)
    the monster the sister mine came late
    ‘that monster of my sister came late’

c. stilo-lu lai-lu (Aromanian, adjectival)
    pen-DEF black-DEF
    ‘the black pen’

d. l-kitab-u l-ʔaxdar-u š-ṣāğiir-u (Arabic, adjectival)
    DEF-book-NOM DEF-green-NOM DEF-small-NOM
    ‘the small green book’

In this sense, Apulian non-prepositional genitives and qualitative binominals are similar to polydefinites, and, like Modern Greek polydefinites, occur in a variant where no categorial match in the D layer takes place, as we noted. In these cases, merging of N₁ + da[N₂] realizes a relationship in which the properties of N₁ are applied to N₂. The preposition da then includes N₁ amongst the properties of N₂.

If our claim is that N₁ has an adjective-like function, then we should expect it to show at least some kind of adjectival behavior. If N₁ has an adjective-like function, it may not be accidental that in this Apulian variety non-prepositional qualitative binominal phrases can be superficially indistinguishable from non-prepositional genitives (as in (22)) and that they can be realized through the same strategy (categorial matching in the D layer). Cross-linguistically genitival and adjectival
modification may be realized with elements of the same category; examples include Contemporary Persian with its *ezafe*, the Cantonese associative -*ge*, ETC.

37) a. ketːb-e æˈliː:

book-LKR Ali

‘Ali’s book’

b. gonbæd-e ḏːbi:

dome-LKR blue

‘the blue dome’

The Indo-Iranian linker, the *ezafe*, is etymologically a D element. For example, the Persian *ezafe* goes back to the Old Persian demonstrative *hya* (Meillet 1931). While Persian lacks gender morphology, other Indo-Iranian languages do have inflecting linkers. The Zaza language, by instance, has linkers agreeing with the head N (Toosarvandani & Van Urk 2014: 3).

38) kutik-o girs mi vinen-o

dog.M-LKR.M.SG.NOM big 1.SG.OBL see.PRS-3.SG.M

‘the big dog sees me’

In Apulian, the article preceding $N_1$ shows two things. The first is that the predicate ($N_1$) is embedded in the same syntactic context as nouns. $N_1$’s article signals the fact that whatever its origin (from adjectives, interjections, etc.), $N_1$ is now a nominalized element, i.e., $N_1$’s article acts as a nominalizer (see also Giannakidou & Stavrou 1999). This allows the language to generalize the recursive DPs strategy found in non-prepositional genitives to adjective-like functions (see Widmer et. al 2017 for discussion on overlapping realizations of genitives and adjectival phrases; see Alexiadou 2014 for recursive DPs in Greek qualitative binominal phrases). A genitive/qualitative overlap also existed in Latin, where qualitative phrases were realized with $N_2$ in the genitive case (*monstrum mulier-is*, monster woman-*GEN*, ‘a monster of a woman’, cf. Aarts 1998: 120). Then, with $N_1$ such as ‘*kaspata*, the article preceding $N_1$ has another function, that of an agreeing element.
Embedding the first member as a noun allows for a recursive DP modification strategy, and agreement with $N_2$ on $N_1$’s article signals this modifier-head relation. The inflecting article carries the gender and number features of the head, which is similar to what we saw with linkers in (38). The agreeing linker is generally thought to form a constituent with the modifier (despite being written as graphically attached to the head, as in Persian; see Philip 2012, Widmer et. al 2017), and so does the article preceding $N_1$ in Apulian. With no matching in D and agreement morphology with $N_2$ in $N_1$’s D, the preposition $də$ has the function of linking subject and predicate.

39) a. *’kaspəta l-a bul’letː-a
   freaking DEF-F.SG bill-F.SG
   ‘freaking thing of a bill’
   b. ’kaspəta də bul’letː-a
   freaking of bill-F.SG
   ‘freaking thing of a bill’

Remember that the presence of a demonstrative requires a preposition, as in (35), which also shows that like articles, also in this case demonstratives agree with $N_2$. Demonstratives of $N_1$ never occur with articles of $N_1$. They do occur in binominal phrases where $N_2$ is a bare noun.

40) a. (kwi)st-u ’kaspəta də ’libr-ə
   DEM(M)-M.SG freaking of book-M.SG
   ‘this freaking thing of a book’
   b. (kwi)st-u ’kaspəta də.l-u /n-u ’libr-ə
   DEM(M)-M.SG freaking of.DEF-M.SG/INDEF-M.SG book-M.SG
   ‘this freaking thing of a book’
   c. *(kwi)st-u ’kaspəta ’libr-ə
   DEM(M)-M.SG freaking book-M.SG
‘this freaking thing of a book’

The demonstrative in (40a) could be seen as belonging to $N_2$. However, like $N_1$’s definite article, here the demonstrative belongs with $N_1$ (see also Alexiadou 2014 on Greek binominal phrases). $N_2$’s article is not spurious, but a regular article, which belongs with $N_2$ (see also Etxepare 2013). This is clear from (40b), where the D layer of $N_2$ is already filled with a definite article, since demonstratives and definite articles are never found together in pre-nominal position in this language. As the article, the demonstrative belongs syntactically with $N_1$ because, like the article, it signals the fact that whatever its origin (from adjectives, interjections, etc.), $N_1$ is now embedded as a noun. Then, as we noted, a modifying relationship between $N_1$ and $N_2$ is realized by match D and agreement on $N_1$’s article, whenever it applies, because while syntactically belonging with $N_1$, $N_1$’s article agrees with $N_2$, the head (as in agreeing linkers).

It should be noted that this construction also allows for a pre-nominal realization of adjectives that are otherwise strictly post-nominal when adnominal, like 'fem- (see Andriani 2018 on the linearization of adjectives in Southern Italo-Romance, and precisely in Barese Apulian). The possibility of a different realization order for adjectives recalls the Modern Greek monadic / polydefinites alternation. Monadic phrases only allow pre-nominal modifiers. In polydefinites instead, adjectives can occur both pre-nominally and post-nominally (Campos & Stavrou 2004: 137-138).

41) a. i asimenja i pena  
   DEF silver  DEF pen
   ‘the silver pen’

   b. i pena i asimenja  
   DEF pen  DEF silver
   ‘the silver pen’

   c. i asimenja pena  
   DEF silver  pen
Finally, if N has an adjective-like function, we should expect it to be gradable. This is what we find, at least when a noun (‘genius’, (41b, d)) or an adjective (‘idiot’, (41a, c)) are involved. Not so much when the first member is instead an interjection (41e). We also note here that, unlike non-prepositional genitives, non-prepositional qualitative phrases allow for modifiers to be interposed between the two nouns.

42) a. l-u ˈʃem-ə total-ə l-u ˈmedakə
   DEF-M.SG idiot-M.SG total-M.SG DEF-M.SG doctor
   ‘that total idiot of a doctor’

b. l-u ˈdʒenj-ə total-ə l-u ˈmedakə
   DEF-M.SG idiot-M.SG total-M.SG DEF-M.SG doctor
   ‘that total idiot of a doctor’

c. n-u ˈʃem-ə total-ə də ˈmedakə
   INDEF-M.SG idiot-M.SG total-M.SG of doctor
   ‘a total idiot of a doctor’

d. n-u ˈdʒenj-ə total-ə də ˈmedakə
   INDEF-M.SG genius-M.SG total-M.SG of doctor
   ‘a total genius of a doctor’

e. ? l-u ˈkaspəta total-ə l-u ˈmedakə
   DEF-M.SG freaking total-M.SG DEF-M.SG doctor
   ‘that total idiot of a doctor’
Masini (2016: 104) also tests the idea that N₁s should express gradable semantics with the following Italian example containing the noun larghezza, ‘width’, which is not possible (contrasts with bellezza, ‘beauty’, and dolcezza, ‘sweetness’), showing that not all gradable nouns are possible.

43)a. *un-a larghezz-a di tavolo
INDEF-F.SG width-F.SG of table
‘a large table’
b. un-a bellezz-a /dolcezz-a di ragazz-a
INDEF-F.SG beauty-F.SG /sweetness-F.SG of girl-F.SG
‘a beautiful girl’

3.4.1 Indefinites and bare nouns

During the course of this paper, we mostly focused on definite instances of this construction. This is due to the role that definite articles play in the non-prepositional phrase. Given this, the analysis we carried until now mostly involved readily identifiable referents (proper names included, despite them being article-less).

A logical representation of the semantic apport of definite articles is the iota operator ( IEnumerator). Iota operators restrict a set of elements having a precise property (for example that of being a table) to a single element (singleton), for example, the table. It might also restrict pluralities within sets (the tables, see also Chierchia 1998); indefinites, represented with an ∃ operator, quantify over the whole set (elements that are tables), picking any element as long as it belongs to the set (a table), or, in other words, as long as it belongs to that kind: at least one of the elements which belong to the kind table. The /∃ dichotomy has profound ramifications in sentence structure and the availability of certain configurations (prepositional/non-prepositional alternations being an example here).

Another thing worth noting here is that if N₁’s article is indefinite, then N₂ is necessarily bare.

44)a. *n-u 'ʃem-a de n-u 'medakə
INDEF-M.SG idiot-M.SG of INDEF-M.SG doctor
This can be explained if we assume that in cases like (44c) N₂ expresses a kind. To be a kind implies a “sufficiently regular behavior” (Chierchia 1998: 348), which limits the properties that characterize an element in order to be included in that kind, e.g., kind of profession = doctor. The set doctor includes any element with the property doctor (as having a degree in medicine, curing patients, etc.).

(45a. n-u tipə da [medakaₖ₁nd]  
\textit{INDEF-MSG kind of doctor}  
\textit{a kind of doctor}

b. n-u ʃemə da [medakaₖ₁nd]  
\textit{INDEF-MSG idiot-M.SG of doctor}  
\textit{an idiot of a doctor}

(45b) says that this person is an idiot when compared to what is usually expected from doctors. The distribution of determiners recalls the realization of Romance pseudopartitives ((46) from Espinal & Cyrino 2021: 5).

(46a. un kilo de manzanas  
\textit{Spanish}  
a kilogram of apples  
\textit{a kilogram of apples}  

b. un verre de bière  
\textit{French}  
\textit{a glass of beer}
a glass of beer
‘a glass of beer’
c. un bicchiere di birra  Italian
a glass of water
‘a glass of water’

Also in pseudopartitives, $N_2$ expresses a kind. $N_1$ expresses an amount, while $N_2$ expresses the fact that this can be quantified over any substance that belongs to the kind beer, for instance. In practice, this is what indefinites do. Partitives proper, instead, quantify over specific sets ($N_1$) (Rutkowski 2007, Espinal & Cyrino 2021). What (44c) says is that we have a stupid instance of the kind doctor or that somebody is stupid for the kind ‘doctor’, or, as put in Den Dikken (2006: 170), ‘in his capacity of being a doctor’.

\begin{verbatim}
  47) n-u pokə ɬi̠em-ə pə jəsə 'medəkə
           INDEF-M.SG little idiot-M.SG for be    doctor
  \end{verbatim}

‘a little stupid to be a doctor’

Den Dikken distinguishes between \textit{attributive} and \textit{comparative} qualitative binominal phrases. The first says that a referent is an idiot for the kind doctor. In the second, a precise instance of the kind doctor is described as stupid. This is the case of the definite description we analysed in the previous sections, where the iota operator restricts the set to a precise individual.

At the same time, $N_2$ refers to a kind, but it also refers to an entity that is an instance of this kind (\textit{this disgust of a song} refers to a particular instance of the kind disgusting songs, for example). As we saw in (40a), a bare $N_2$ can occur with an $N_1$ headed by a definite article. In (44c) we saw that a demonstrative is possible as well. Here $N_1$’s D layer plays another key role. In discussing cases such as \textit{that kind of animal}/\textit{a kind of animal} Chierchia (1998: 363-364) proposed the \textit{Derived Kind Predication} which states that, “when an object-argument slot in a predicate is filled by a kind, the type of predicate is automatically adjusted by introducing a local existential quantification over
instances of the kind”. So, while $N_2$ refers to a kind, the whole phrase is a predication of a particular instance of this kind, so that $N_1$ can have a demonstrative as in (40a), but also an indefinite article, as in (44c). This means that the whole phrase can be quantified over by definite or indefinite operators, because it represents an instance of the kind doctor, so that we can have that idiot of a doctor, an idiot of a doctor, etc. This is more or less what we see with adjectival modification, where the adjective modifies a definite/indefinite instance of its head, a stupid doctor, this stupid doctor, etc. Then, as we mentioned, the preposition da (or match D) links the predicate to the subject of the predication ($N_2$).

4 Conclusions

In this paper, we presented new data from the Gargano Apulian Italo-Romance language of San Marco in Lamis (Foggia) concerning the realization of qualitative binominals (the $N$-of-$an$-$N$ type). Our findings can be summarized as follows. In this language, qualitative binominals can be either prepositional, or non-prepositional. We found that the absence of the preposition depends on the make-up of the determiner layer of the two nouns. We have seen that both nouns must be preceded by a definite article for the construction to be non-prepositional. Indefinites are in fact only allowed in the prepositional variant. This overlaps with the behavior of non-prepositional genitives in the same language. In this regard, we proposed that both in non-prepositional qualitative binominals and in non-prepositional genitives the two nouns are related by matching the type of determiner preceding each of them, ‘match D’. As we said, definite articles are the type of determiner required by both phrases to be non-prepositional. As observed in Napoli (1989) and Den Dikken (2006) qualitative binominals do not allow extraction of either of the two nouns. We connected this to the fact that $N_1$ is a property-denoting element, like adjectives. Adjectival phrases do not allow the extraction of either nouns or adjectives; they are then what Chomsky (2001) called phases, i.e., phrases that once completed do not allow further syntactic operations (such as extraction) to occur.

We found that in some contexts, non-prepositional genitives and non-prepositional qualitative binominals appear superficially indistinguishable (22). We proposed that the
interpretation of a phrase as a genitive or a qualitative binominal depends on the semantics of the
two nouns (§3.2). In particular, we have established that interpretation also depends on the number
features of N₁ and N₂. Just like in the case of agreeing adjectives, if N₂ is plural, N₁ will be plural,
too. We based our conclusion that N₂ is the head of the phrase on the fact that when N₁ is a
nominalized adjective (‘jëma) or an interjection (kaspata), and thus per se void of gender and
number features, the features of N₂ will show up on N₁. In prepositional genitives, on the other
hand, there is no matching in number features between N₁ and N₂. Qualitative binominals only
trigger third person agreement (either singular or plural), just like R-expressions generally do (see
Ackema and Neeleman 2019).

In §3.3 we gave a first sketch of agreement patterns of adjectives and verbs with qualitative
binominals. We found that agreement with qualitative binominals in the language conforms to the
Agreement Hierarchy (Corbett 2006) when it comes to agreeing clitics. Another condition imposed
on agreement is the presence of a [+HUMAN] trait in either noun: while the probe might generally
have both members as its goal, this is not the case when a [+HUMAN] noun is present in the
construction. In this instance, in fact, the probe will necessarily have the [+HUMAN] noun as its
goal.

In §3.4 we focused on the determiner layer of the phrase and tried to answer two questions.
1) what is the behavior of N₁’s article, and 2) what can its behavior tell us about the nature of N₁
and its role in the phrase. We claimed that the fact that the first element is embedded as a noun
allows the language to generalize the recursive DP strategy of non-prepositional genitives to
qualitative binominal noun phrases. ‘match D’ (or the preposition ‘of’) links the two nouns, applying
the property expressed by N₁ to N₂. This seems true also of of-phrases and Latin genitive phrases. If
N₁ is not denominial (i.e., it is an adjective or an interjection like kaspata) N₁’s article will agree with
N₂, showing that it is a modifier of N₁. N₁’s article agrees with the head and forms a constituent
with the modifier. Because of this, we claim that N₁’s article has a parallel in head-agreeing
adjectival linkers of the type found in Zaza, an Indo-Iranian language (Toosarvandani & Van Urk 2014).
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1 The mechanism takes a copular phrase such as *the doctor is a jewel*, which through inversion yields *a jewel of a doctor*. The preposition is the result of this inversion mechanism.

2 Abbreviations used: *DEF*, definite article; *INDEF*, indefinite article; *CL.OBJ*, object clitic; *DEM*, demonstrative; *NEG*, negation; *PART*, partitive; *PRS*, present tense. *PST*, past tense; *PTCP*, participle. Elements whose gender is signalled by both inflection and a metaphonetic process on the root have gender glossed twice, ex. *kwis-t*a, *DEM*(M)-M.SG; *kwes-t*a, *DEM*(F)-F.SG (both meaning ‘this’). Inherent gender is glossed within parentheses, ex. *(F)*.

3 These article forms are descendants of the Latin demonstrative *ille* (M.SG), *illa* (F.SG), *illud* (N.SG), as is usually the case in Romance (two exceptions being Sardinian (Menschings 2005) and Balearic Islands Catalan (Gaspar 2013)). Languages as Verbicaro Calabrese (Silvestri 2013: 136) did not retain the lateral in *ille* (while Italian *il*(M.SG), *l-o*(M.SG), *l-a*(F.SG) and Apulian *l-u*(M.SG), *l-a*(F.SG) did).

(i) *a nučə u kʊəddə*

  DEF.F.SG nut DEF.M.SG neck

‘cervical vertebra’

4 Amongst the Romance languages with non-prepositional genitives whose article retained the lateral we can include Old French (Jensen 1990: 19, 20), Old Italian, Old Sicilian, and Lombard (Delfitto & Paradisi 2009: 62, 63). Delfitto & Paradisi also list data from Castro dei Volsci (Frosinone area, Southern Latium), another variety with non-prepositional genitives where the lateral was retained. Rio Platense Spanish is another language with articles endowed with a lateral where non-prepositional genitives occur (Silvestri 2013: 90).

5 Romanian, Old Romanian, and Catalan data from Vişan (2013) and sources quoted therein.

6 Spanish data from Villalba (2007).

7 *n*- (en in French, *ne* in Italian, *nde* in Sardinian) is a partitive clitic, roughly meaning ‘of it’, where ‘it’ = a direct object.

(ii) a. *h-o lett-o un libro*

  have-1SG read.PTCP-M.SG INDEF(M) book

  ‘I have read a book’

b. *ne ho lett-a una pagina*

  PART have-1SG read.PTCP-F.SG INDEF-F.SG page
‘I have read one page (of the book)’


The Apulian non-reinforced form of the distal demonstrative being dd-\(u/-a\) (Latin *ille*), the reinforced one being kwid-\(u/\) kwed-\(a\) (Latin *(ec)cu(m)* *ille*). The Italian counterpart being quell-o/-\(a\). Italian has a non-reinforced variant (Latin *iste*) for the proximal quest-o/-\(a\), being st-o/st-a, but lacks a non-reinforced variant of the distal demonstrative. Apulian proximal demonstratives are kwist-\(u/\) kwist-\(a\), and st-\(u/\) st-\(a\), respectively.

Cross-linguistically non-prepositional genitives and qualitative binominal phrases are reminiscent of Celtic genitives (see Widmer et. al 2017) and Semitic Construct State genitives for their juxtaposition strategy and for their definiteness requirements. Similarities with the Semitic Construct State genitive were noted in Longobardi (1995, 2001) for Italian, and author (2020, in press) for this Apulian variety.

The same happens in non-prepositional genitives: article-less modifiers are not allowed, and definite articles need to be realized at all times, resulting otherwise in the prepositional variant. On the basis of this, agreement for definiteness via D was postulated (see Massaro 2020, Massaro in press).

\[
\text{(iii) } \text{l-} \text{ libr-} \text{ Məkəla} \\
\text{DEF-M.SG book-M.SG Michael} \\
\text{‘Michael’s book’}
\]

\[
\text{(iv) l-} \text{ libr-} \text{ *(də) Məkəla} \\
\text{DEF-M.SG book-M.SG of Michael} \\
\text{‘Michael’s book’}
\]

In Den Dikken’s analysis, the article would be contained in the relator node, which also includes the preposition of. \(N_1\) and \(N_2\) are *predicate* and *subject*, respectively (tree of the Relator Phrase from Den Dikken 2006: 3).

\[
\text{(v) } \text{RP} \\
\text{SUBJECT} \text{ R’} \\
\text{RELATOR} \text{ PREDICATE}
\]

This is true of Romance non-prepositional genitives generally, and it is also confirmed by diachronic data, cf. Delfitto and Paradisi 2009 for Old French and Old Italian varieties; Jensen 2012 for Old French.

The examples analyzed here contain \(N_1\)s which are readily identifiable in the interlocutors’ shared knowledge, or *Common Ground* (see Krifka 2008). Here the definite article signals that the noun it precedes belongs to the Common Ground, and it is hence a topic or an accommodated topic (Epstein 2002 for other uses of definite articles).

Initial consonants such as the lateral in ‘ku-l-u undergo phonosyntactic doubling if preceded by voiced nasals, *cum l-u = ‘ku-l-u* (compare with the Italian counterpart *collo*, *con+l-o*).

A big butterfly = *That is a butterfly, and it is big (for a butterfly)* (Higginbotham 1985: 563).

The same reasoning applies to nominalized adjectives in the construction, as in the case of ‘\(fəmə\) (‘idiot’).

Of course, this can only be done when \(N_1\) is a noun proper, as we have done in (28-32), because in the case of nominalized adjectives \(N_1\) and \(N_2\) will have the same gender features, too.

DOM (*Differential Object Marking*, Bossong 1991) describes a phenomenon in which only a subset of direct objects receives special markings. In Persian, -\(rā\) attaches to specific direct objects only (Lazard 1982,
In Romance, the preposition *a* is the usual differential object marker, except for Romanian, which has *pe* (Bossong 1991). Like Spanish, languages of Southern Italy employ the preposition *a*. In these languages, DOM usually marks [+animate] or specific objects (Ledgeway et al 2019).