Introduction

The present paper is devoted to a study of prenominal adjectives in Romanian aiming to prove that a group of prenominal adjectives, but not all of them, encode specificity. This claim is made against a more general syntactic view of the Romanian DP claiming that there are two phases in the DP, a lexical NP phase and a functional DP phase. This claim has been supported by different arguments such as linearization, the checking of definiteness, the assignment of the genitive case, the syntax of demonstratives, etc. As we have shown in earlier works, the syntax and interpretation in nominal adjectives is also an argument for distinguishing two arias, an area of NP adjectives and an area of DP adjectives.

Romance languages are known to exhibit important correlations between the positions of adjectives and their interpretations. Researchers have claimed that there is a correlation between the following two phenomena: postnominal As would all be intersective, while prenominal As would all be non-intersective appositives. These generalizations are backed by contrast like:

(1) a. marele om
   b. rau mare din Europa

In fact, both generalizations are too strong, as recently emphasized by Morzycki (2009). There are postnominal appositive As, even if we ignore the situation of appositions marked by pauses. Appositive interpretations may be syntactically marked: an example is the ‘cel’ constructions in Romanian and its equivalents in other languages (2) and, more interestingly, there are As which only have appositive readings, since they express a subjective evaluation that has nothing to do with class intersection. An example at hand is the adjective ‘afurisit’ (damn), ‘fenomenal’ (phenomenal).

(2) a. savantul cel genial
    b. un copil afurisit mi-a spart geamul
    c. un pianist fenomenal

On the other hand, (and this is the focus of our paper) prenominal adjectives are not all appositive either. For instance, it is not possible to interpret as appositive intensional operators, like ‘former’ and ‘future’.

With respect to languages like English, where all uncomplemented As are in principle prenominal, the claim has often been made that (even if we ignore the minute details of Cinquean hierarchies), prenominal As fall into two categories. Stavrou (????) notices that As which are closer to the head denote properties inherent in the head, while As which are placed to the further right of the DP are context bound, reflecting the speaker’s judgment on the referent of the DP (3).

(3) a. a phenomenal former American president

Reinterpreting this contrast for Romance languages which dispose of prenominal as well as postnominal As, it has more recently been proposed that prenominal As express speaker bound opinions about the referent, i.e. they are specific, while postnominal As express objective properties of the nominal head. Such a view has been developed in important recent studies, such as Damonte (2008, pp. 20): “In indefinite context, DPs with prenominal As have a specific reading. On the other hand, DPs with postnominal As are ambiguous between a specific and a non-specific interpretation.” Damonte comments on (32), remarking that the DP containing the specific adjective has wide scope. In (32 a), where the nominal with indefinite article and prenominal adjective is embedded under universal quantifier, we find the referential/quantifier ambiguity characteristic of indefinites. The DP is specific in the referential reading and it takes wide scope. In (32 b), which corresponds with the same sentence with the embedded nominal constructed with the postnominal adjective, the indefinite DP has only the expected narrow scope quantificational reading.

(32) a. Ana sabe que todos lo conferenciantes se entrevistaron con una muy importante periodista. (wide scope)
b. Ana sabe que todos los conferenciantes se entrevistaron con una periodista muy importante.

The idea that (all) prenominal adjectives have specific readings in Spanish has further been developed by Ticio (2003) and especially by Jacob (2002). Like Ticio and Damonte, Jacob ultimately believes that all and only prenominal adjectives have specific readings. He connects the specific interpretation in prenominal position with information structure of the DP. Accordingly, adjective position is not triggered directly by specificity, it depends on information structure and relevance, and it is via these functional levels that it is related to specificity. His proposal is that postnominal adjectives are focus and must be restrictive; in contrast, the prenominal adjective, being non-restrictive is free for any other function that the adjective could fulfill, including specificity. Specificity depends on the fact that [–focus] adjectives are appositive. Summing up his analysis, Jacob concludes that prenominal adjectives in argumental NPs are not focused and have a specific interpretation. He equates specificity with the non-restrictive reading. (“the non-restrictive modifier is hardly compatible with a non-specific reading of the NP: it seems clear that non-restrictive modifiers require a ready-made referent”).

The claim made in the literature seems to be two-fold: prenominal adjectives are specific, postnominal adjectives cannot be specific (because, being focused, they are restrictive). A closer examination of the data shows that both of these claims are not entirely correct. One empirical fact that has been in part unnoticed is the fact that prenominal adjectives may have generic readings. This is true for all these adjectives which can only be prenominal, but which do not express subjective involvement. Classical intensional adjectives are of this type. Here are a few examples:

(4) Fostii prim ministri sunt bogati.
(5) Pretinsii oameni de stiinta au devenit tot mai numerosi.

This shows that the prenominal position is no guarantee of specificity. In fact, examples like those above, have no other variant with postnominal adjectives (*primii ministri fosti sunt bogati). On the other hand, it is also false that all postnominal As have a non-specific reading. Examining the following paradigm:

(1) (a) cele cinci fete au vorbit cu un celebru actor. (+specific)
     (b) cele cinci fete au vorbit cu un actor celebru (± specific)
(2) a) cele cinci fete au vorbit cu un actor celebrisim (+specific)

The postnominal adjective in (?) clearly has a specific interpretation.

Concluding on the discussions of the problem in the literature, we may say that position is not sufficient for determining specificity readings for Romance adjectives. We do agree that specific adjectives are appositive adjectives. In the interpretation that we propose, adjectives differ through the type of constituent they take in their scope: appositive adjectives take a DP in their scope, while restrictive adjectives take an NP in their scope. With Larson and Marusik (?), Cornilescu and Nicolae (2007), we thus distinguish between NP adjectives and DP adjectives. Specific adjectives are DP adjectives. The distinction between NP and DP adjectives is interpretable as a difference in semantic type indicating in fact different modes of syntactic construction. DP adjectives introduce predicats of already identified individuals, therefore they map individuals onto individuals, of type <e,e>. NP adjectives are more varied and may at least be intersective (<e,t>) or intensional (<<e,t>,<e,t>>). Our first claim is that specific As are functions from individuals into individuals and thus, predicate on DPs. Expectedly, As are not homogeneous in the class of interpretations they allow: some As always have specific readings, irrespective of their position, some other As are always intensional and prenominal, but a majority of quality denoting As allow different readings, depending on their syntax. A second goal of the paper is to propose a syntax of DP internal As, which is transparent for their interpretation, since a major claim on quality As is that they have a core of meaning which is sharpened according to configuration where the A merges.
The claim that there is a strong correlation between position and interpretation is undeniable, it must however be qualified. We will accept that ‘prototypically’, prenominal As are appositive and, thus, specific, while postnominal As are typically restrictive. Prototypical readings can be overridden whenever there is specific formal marking which indicates this (such as the presence of an internal operator, the presence of a syntactic construction that singles specificity such as N of N constructions, etc.).
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4. Semantic interpretation of specific As <e,e> operators

Morzycki:
The generalization, though, takes a slightly different form. While in English postnominal adjectives are unambiguously restrictive, in Spanish prenominal adjectives are unambiguously nonrestrictive:2
(7) los
the
sofisticados
sophisticated
amigos
friends
de
of
María
Maria
(Mackenzie 2004)
a. **Restrictive**: those of Maria’s friends who are sophisticated
b. **Nonrestrictive**: Maria’s friends, all of whom happen to sophisticated

Italian works the same way:3
(9) Le
the
noiose
boring
lezioni
le lezioni di Ferri se ricordano tutti.
lectures of refl le pron remember all
(Cinque 2003)
a. **Restrictive**: Everybody remembers just Ferri’s classes which were boring.
b. **Nonrestrictive**: Everybody remembers Ferri’s classes, all of which were boring.

(10) Lelezioni noiose di Ferri se le ricordano tutti. (Cinque 2003)
a. **Restrictive**: Everybody remembers just Ferri’s classes which were boring.
b. **Nonrestrictive**: Everybody remembers Ferri’s classes, all of which were boring.
The difference between Romance and English in this respect is expected, given that Romance nouns move higher in their projection than they do in English.

Chris Kennedy (p.c.) suggests one alternative route. Potts’ proposal, and consequently the proposal here that builds on it, would place the burden of relating expressive and at-issue meaning squarely on the shoulders of the semantics. Instead, one might place more of the explanatory burden on the syntax, thereby simplifying the semantics. Rather than a separate rule of Expressive Predicate Modification or CI Application, one might instead suppose there is a functional head E, that takes APs as specifiers and NPs as complements, or AdvPs as specifiers and VPs as complements. Semantically, it would do what Expressive Predicate Modification does:

\[
E \_  \\
\_ [  \\
\_ [ f \_ g \_ f : _e_a_ , t_a_  \\
\_ [ f \_ g \_ (\sup( f )) : t_c  \\
\_ ] ] ]
\]

\[(48)\] EP
AP

unsuitable
This has several advantages. First, and most relevant here, it is more semantically conservative – it doesn’t commit to any notion that the semantics must be sensitive to linear order. Second, the place where linear order is expressed on this view is in the syntax of E, which seems natural. Third, this accounts for cross-linguistic variation in a fairly direct way. Languages that differ in the positions in which nonrestrictive modification is possible can be understood to differ either in the position in the sentence E occupies or in its headedness. And perhaps the greatest advantage of this approach is that it is consistent with a stronger notion of compositionality. Expressive PredicateModification introduces elements of semantics – such as the supremum operator – that correspond to no linguistic expression and nothing in the syntax. These are significant, of course. But of course they don’t come for free. Most obviously, while this alternative approach is clearly more conservative in terms of the architecture of the grammar, it is certainly less syntactically conservative. Of course, if an overt expression of E could be discovered – or some other independent syntactic evidence could be brought to bear on the issue – this would be an appealing approach. And taking a syntactic leap in this way has the methodological advantage of compelling one to look for such evidence. Precisely because of that, though, it removes any pressure to look harder for evidence of semantic sensitivity to linear order, so this methodological argument could cut either way.

**Final remarks**
The core empirical argument here has been that both adjectives and adverbs can receive nonrestrictive interpretations only in leftward positions, and that they contribute expressive meaning (just as nonrestrictive relatives do).
Our proposal:

Instead of representing at semantic level two distinct interpretations (denotational / expressive), as in Morzycki (2009), we propose that the syntactical configuration alone determines the semantic type of the As and their mode of combination. As Morzycki himself notices, this has several advantages. First, and most relevant here, it is more semantically conservative – it doesn’t commit to any notion that the semantics must be sensitive to linear order. Second, the place where linear order is expressed on this view is in the syntax of E, which seems natural. Third, this accounts for cross-linguistic variation in a fairly direct way. Languages that differ in the positions in which nonrestrictive modification is possible can be understood to differ either in the position in the sentence E occupies or in its headedness. And perhaps the greatest advantage of this approach is that it is consistent with a stronger notion of compositionality.

Summing up:

1. **NP As** (adjuncts, they combine by predicate modification):
   a. **Intersective** *mar rosu, red apple*:

   ![Diagram of NP As combination](image)

   b. **Intensional <<e,t>,<e,t>> type, fost ministru, former minister**:

   ![Diagram of intensional combination](image)

2. **DP As** have <e,e> type and combine by functional application: *un celebru ministru, a famous minister*:

   ![Diagram of DP As combination](image)
where \( f \) is a function that takes as argument a property and returns an individual.

### 3. Combination: *un celebru fost ministru, a famous former minister*

\[
\text{DP}_{\text{deixis}}(e) \\
\text{D}' \\
\text{f}[[\text{minister }]](x) \\
\text{D}(<e,t>, e) \\
\text{NP}(<e,t>) \\
\lambda P. (\text{ministru}) \\
\lambda x. [[\text{minister}]](x)
\]

Claims, the problem

1) A class of prenominal adjectives encode specificity: i.e. they express the pov of the speaker or of the subject of some attitude verb on the referent. Generally these are appositive adjectives, whose semantic type is \(<e, e>\).

(i) a. Au intalnit un celebru actor [specific].
   b. Se bucura ca putea discuta macar o data cu un asa de celebru actor.
   c. Dupa cata reclama se face, si-au imaginat ca este vorba de un actor celebru. [± specific]

Not all prenominal adjectives encode specificity, even in languages like Romanian, where adjectives are allowed to occur pre-nominally, as well as postnominally. A case in point is that of generic adjectives

(ii) *Marii actori sunt rari* (kind level predicate).

Aim, to understand the syntax and semantics of prenominal specific and generic adjectives. From a semantic point of view, it is easy to imagine why pre-nominal As engender specificity effects:

1) Identify adjective types that signal genericity
   a) operator adjectives \( \rightarrow \) subclasses
   b) evaluative degree adjectives

2) Identify specificity signaling syntactic configurations
   a) prenominal plain adjectives are specific in pre-nominal position
   b) not ordered, coordinated
   c) Identifying configurations A de N / N de N

Claim The prenominal space is uneven

1) Identify adjective types that signal genericity
   a) operator adjectives \( \rightarrow \) subclasses
   b) evaluative degree adjectives

2) Identify specificity signaling syntactic configurations
   a) prenominal plain adjectives are specific in pre-nominal position
   b) not ordered, coordinated
   c) Identifying configurations A de N / N de N

Claim The prenominal space is uneven

Aim, to understand the syntax and semantics of prenominal specific and generic adjectives. From a semantic point of view, it is easy to imagine why pre-nominal As engender specificity effects:

(i) a. Prostul valet isi supara stapanul.
   b. Proslul de valet si-a suparat stapanul.

Claim The prenominal space is uneven

1) Identify adjective types that signal genericity
   a) operator adjectives \( \rightarrow \) subclasses
   b) evaluative degree adjectives

2) Identify specificity signaling syntactic configurations
   a) prenominal plain adjectives are specific in pre-nominal position
   b) not ordered, coordinated
   c) Identifying configurations A de N / N de N

Claim The prenominal space is uneven

Aim, to understand the syntax and semantics of prenominal specific and generic adjectives. From a semantic point of view, it is easy to imagine why pre-nominal As engender specificity effects:

(i) a. Prostul valet isi supara stapanul.
   b. Proslul de valet si-a suparat stapanul.

Claim The prenominal space is uneven

1) Identify adjective types that signal genericity
   a) operator adjectives \( \rightarrow \) subclasses
   b) evaluative degree adjectives

2) Identify specificity signaling syntactic configurations
   a) prenominal plain adjectives are specific in pre-nominal position
   b) not ordered, coordinated
   c) Identifying configurations A de N / N de N

Claim The prenominal space is uneven

Aim, to understand the syntax and semantics of prenominal specific and generic adjectives. From a semantic point of view, it is easy to imagine why pre-nominal As engender specificity effects:
a) binding to the SP
b) binding of the event variable of the noun, prenominal eventive participles
c) binding of qualia

Morzycki  Degree modification of gradable nouns
(i)  mare, enorm
     mare dobitoc/ marii actori
(ii)  bunii bucatari

2. Two generalization.
a) The degree reading of a size adjective seems unavailable in predicative position.
   (7)  a. The big stamp collector
        b. %That stamp collector is big

b) The degree reading is also impossible postnominally
   (9)  a. a bigger stamp collector than I’ve ever seen
        b. % a stamp collector bigger than I’ve ever seen

b) Spanish
   %Este idiota es enorme

(18)  The Position Generalization
Degree reading of size adjectives re possible only in attributive position

2.2. The Bigness Generalization
The other basic generalization is that adjectives that predicate bigness, upward monotonic size adjectives are able to receive degree readings, but this is not the case for adjectives that predicate smallness.

big
enormouse
george is a huge
idiot
colloosal
mammoth
saragantuan

%small
%tiny

(19)  George is a &minuscule idiot

%microscopic
%diminuitive
%minute

Romanian exceptions   Micii producatori/mica burghezie/ micii industriasi/ mici economii

2.3 Not just vagueness, not just metaphor
Not metaphor, because of sensitivity to syntactic position.
It looks like ambiguity.

(36)  a. He isn’t very big, but he is a big stamp collector
     b. Harry isn’t enormous, but he is an enormous idiot.
(37)  a. #This chair isn’t very big, but it is a very big chair
     b. #That building isn’t enormous, but it is an enormous building.

2.4 Abstract size reading
There are two other uses of size adjectives that must be distinguished from the true degree use. In the first of these, an ordinary adjective has a roughly degree-like flavor because of the nature of the modified NP:

(38)  a. an enormous mistake
     b. a huge problem
     c. a big catastrophe

These are not genuine degree readings. Rather they are size readings that make reference to size along a possible abstract dimension – one that may correlate to some intuitive sense of extremeness or severity. That is readings
seem to be genuinely metaphorical. They pattern with ordinary size readings rather than with degree readings in several respects.

First, they occur in predicative position.

(39) a. That was a mistake and it was enormous.
   b. That was a snowstorm and it was huge.
   c. a catastrophe bigger than any other

Secondly, these reading is possible in predicative position.

(41) That is a small/ minute mistake

2.5 Significance readings


(43) a. the big political figure of the century
   b. a small little man
   c. some puny judge somewhere

The contribution of the size adjective is hard to articulate and seems to involve the speaker’s attitude. Often it involves the speaker’s estimation of the importance of the modified NP’s referent, as worthy of regard, consideration, admiration, scorn or dismissal.

They don’t involve degrees on a scale provided by the head noun (degrees of idiocy), but always degrees of significance.

However, like degree readings, significance readings are sensitive to syntactic position (with exceptions).

(44) a. *?These political figures were big
   b. *? This man is little.

3. The grammar of gradable nouns

3.1 They possess an internal degree variable. Gradable nouns are those for which a single criterion can be distinguished from the others as the most salient. For idiot it stupidity, for smoker, the frequency or affinity for smoking.

3.2 Assumptions about the extended adjective

(49) Cycle is [POS tall]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{DegP (e, t)} \\
\text{DegN <e, d, et>} \\
\text{NP <e, d>} \\
\text{Pos} \\
\text{idiot}
\end{align*}
\]

3.4. Further evidence for adnominal degree morphemes

Assuming an adnominal degree morpheme has support: The most compelling of these involve overtly spelled-out adnominal degree morphemes: real, true, absolute

(55) a real/ complete/ total/true idiot

Assigning them to DegN makes two predictions: They shouldn’t occur predicatively:

(56) The idiot is %real/true/#absolute

The second predictions is that these As will not occur with degree modifiers.

4.3 Licensing degree readings

The analytical intuition is that these adjectives are like measure phrases in that both measure phrases and size adjectives predicate of a degree that it has a certain minimum size. Their syntax is similar.

(72)

Damonte Violeta
Mening form Correlation s and Adjective position in Spanish (2008)
1. Introduction

The difference in meaning bet pre-/post- is restrictive/ non-restrictive.

(1) Am luat vechile chei/ cheile vechi.

One can subsume the difference between direct modification and and implicit relative reading: In the implicit relative reading the adjective does not modify N directly, but through an implicit RC:

(3) a. He considered la salida possible at the back side
(He considered the way out as possible for him).
   Considera iesirea posibila prin spate/

b. He received all the visitors it was possible for him to attend
   A primit toti vizitatorii posibili.
(implicit relative reading Larson 2000b)

c. He considered the possible way out at the back side.
   (He considered the possible/potential way out at the back side)
   Se gandi la vreo posibila iesire pe la spate

I will also assume the non-intersective and intersective as have preferred positions, the prenominal and post-nominal ones respectively.

(4) a. el buen abogado
b. el abogado bueno (ambiguous)

The ambiguity persists only if the non-intersective reading is independently excluded:

(5) a. Buscate un buen abogado
a. Buscate un abogado buen. (amb)

b. Irina es una atractiva bailarina (amb: attractive/person/dancer (preferred)
   Irin es una bailarina atractiva (only attractive person).

b’. Fernando es un eficaz colaborador. (only as a coworker)

c’. Fernando es un colaborador eficaz.

Proposal: the ambiguity lies in the N, the relative reading is the result of event modification. The presence of the non-intersective reading in (5a’) may be the effect of prosodic reasons.

Other apparent problems  a NR reading may be post-nominal for pragmatic reasons

(i) Imi plac mainile moi/ recîi(R)
   Imi plac mainile reci ale Mariei

Similarly, in (9) an R interpretation is pre-nominal, because of contrastive focus:

Claim: there is a systematic correlation between syntactic position and logical type. As interact with the N.

2. Logical types

Prenominal adjectives modify components internal to N. Nouns contain referential and eventive variable that can be saturated by different types of predicates, and they also contain qualia structure. Both can be modified by adjectives.

(a) Adjectives can modify the denotation assignment function of Nouns, or even the possible world, and “indicate” that some postulated assignment may not be present in the current world or may even be false. This is the case of modal and epistemic adjectives”

(10) the possible/ necessary/alleged, supposed, false, presumed murderer.

(b) As can also modify one or more central properties(i.e reference modification) of N, asserting either they are completely or exclusively satisfied by N- or that the noun – which must have a perfectly identified referent – can efficiently fulfill such property/ies. The first function corresponds to Quirk’s restrictive As like perfecto 9perfect), real, complete; the second one corresponds to qualitative-evaluative adjectives like good, little, gentle, kind and color-form-taste adjectives like, verde, and acido.

(11) restrictive and degree/quantifying adjectives { complete, rotundo, perfecto, tru, simple, pure, mere, exclusive, unico} failure

(qualitative – evaluative adjectives : el {buen/pobre} abogado, (as lawyer), el despiadado critic (nemilosul critic), la ultima suave curva (the last gentle curve), los blancos palacios
Following standard assumptions, it might be difficult to accept that these two sets of adjectives belong to the same logical type since restrictive As, and those of degree, are usually considered predicate modifiers (functions from properties to properties). What I want to emphasize with this regrouping is that most adjectives in (11) license the entailment ‘NP is N’, but they do not license the entailment NP is A.

Different are qualitative evaluative adjectives, specifically sensorial quality adjectives (white, acid, round), which also license NP is A. They are sometimes called epithets, as they emphasize the prototypical elements in the meaning of the noun, and this is the main characteristic of the attributive NR interpretation with these As:

(12) a la blanca paloma, la roda redonda, la olorosa rosa the strong-smelling rose, the green meadows.

In fact these adjectives cannot be prenominal in certain Romance languages like French (Laenzlunger 2005, Knittel 2005). In Spanish they are not frequent in prenominal position, except with the literary effect just mentioned. When they are used prenominally, they are not used to assert the intersection between the two classes, but rather that od ‘affecting’ the denotation of the unique object(s expressed by N.

(13) Me gustaban los amaragas hojas del arce y los sabores decididos de las primeras fresas de junio

I loved the maple leaves, which are naturally bitter, and the early June strawberry flavours that are acid.

Both taste As occur in a very similar contexts; they are both predicates that denote properties of N, but the first one has to be glossed through an appositive relative clause, while the prenominal one is equivalent to a restrictive relative. We might claim, as in P, that every category expresses a qualia structure. In this framework, restrictive degree modifiers and qualitative epithetic adjectives can be considered of the formal quale of N, namely “the aspect of word’s meaning that distinguishes the object within a larger domain.

Finally, the class of prenominal As that I describe as modifiers of a central property can have this function only when the DP identifies unique referents. This is why they tend to appear in definite DPs and they require modifiers restricting the reference of NP. (14a). Without the modifier, the sentences are acceptable if the DP refers to a previously referent. In the same vein, they are normal in singular and plural indefinite expressions (14b), since these DPs introduce referents in the discourse:

(14) a. Mostraron los hermosos libros #de medicina).
   They showed the beautiful books of medicine.

b. Mostraron un hermoso libro/ unos hermosos libros.

(c) In (15), As modify a temporal interval of N. This is the class of deictic and event temporal modifier adjectives:

(15) la future reina, el antiguvo acuerdo, el actual presidente, los nuevos coches (the new cars), mi anterior marido, un largo viaje “a long trip”

(d) In (16), we have the logical type of extreme degree adjectives: horrible, necto(stupid), espantoso (awful) and qualitative superlative ones ➔ maravillos, hermosisimo, magnifico. We may call them appositive, since they serve a central property of N, as if it were added to its denotation.

They are predicative non-restrictive non-restrictive modifiers always

(17) a. Asist a un (horrible) concierto (horrible)

b. La (debil) voz (debil) apenas se oia.

Summarizing, the adjectives in the first three subgroups, from (a) to (c) can be argued to form a single group from a semantic pov. They scope over subparts of the meaning of the noun.

Alternatively, postnominal As and class D modify the individual

2.2 Some diagnostics for the logical types of adjectives.

There are at least 4 diagnostics which distinguish between As in classes (a)-(c).

2.2.1 Occurrence with copulas

Human dispositions are SLP with copulas and ILP prenominally.

(20) a. El critico despiadado no la saludo/
   The critic who was merciless did not greet her

b. El despiadado critico no la saludo. ILP

The remaining As appearing in prenominal positions: modal, restrictive (mero), degree/quantifying (total), deictic, futuro are either banned or have different meaning

2.2.2 The subset property
Only DPs with post-nominal As answer the question What kind of an N is X? What kind of lawyer is Rodrigo?

2.2.3 Degree modification of pre and post-nominal As

2.2.4 The distinction of specificity

DPs in indefinite contexts with prenominal As have a specific reading. Consider now the sentences in (32):

(32)  

 Petro Sleeman Verbal and adjectival participle: position and internal structure (Lingua 2011)

Types of past participle

(1) The door opened by John (eventive) usa deschisa de Ion
(2) well-written book (resultative) carte bine scrisa
(3) learned man (stative) om invatat
(4) recently opened (eventive) o recent deschis expozitie

2. Three types of participles

Embick distinguishes two types of stative participles → resultative, which denote the result of an event and stative → a closed/open door

Tests for distinguishing statives from resultatives
a. resultatives allow modification by manner (and other) adverbials

(b) The package remained carefully opened/*open
(8) the carefully opened/*open package

Statives can be secondary predicates:

(10) the door was kicked open/*opened

Claim → Two kinds of eventive participles, prenominal/postnominal

Prenominal (more reduced, with agreement) and postnominal

3. The syntactic representation of participles

Post-nominal participles → root> vP> AspP> CP
In a raising analysis of post-nominal participles the antecedent nominal raise to the spec of this CP.

Properties
- projection of a clausal structure including vP, AspP (perfectivity) and CP
- antecedent noun (direct internal argument) raises to Spec, CP
- v contains an event feature
- v does not assign accusative case
- v is the locus of agentivity
- v licenses an indirect argument a by phrase

(44) [DP the [CP [book] [ SdpP[vp [sent [ti to John by Mary]]

In these examples, the direct internal argument is moved to Spec, CP arguably for reasons of Case. Kayne assumes that the raised noun receives Case though an incorporation relation with the determiner.

(ii) Prenominal eventive passive participles are merged in the specifier of a functional projection dominated by DP:
- no CP: only vP and AspP (perfectivity)
- the participle does not project a direct internal argument
- v contains an event feature
- v does not introduce an external argument
- v is the locus of agentivity (the agent can be expressed in a by –phrase)
- v licenses an indirect argument
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(iii) Tesultativa (prenominal) participles
- no CP, only vP dominating the feature become and an AspP (state)
- the participle does not project a direct internal argument
- v contains an event feature
- v is not agentive
- v dominates the semantic primitive ‘become’
- v does not license an indirect internal argument

(52) [DP the [FP [AspP [vP (carefully) [ v’become’ [closed ]]]] [ F’ [door]]]

(iv) Stative prenominal participles
- no vP, but only AspP (state)
(53) [DP the [Fp [aspP [astonished]] F’ [F [man]]]]

Marcin Morzycki Non-restrictive modifiers in non-parenthetical positions

Claim: non-restrictive non-truth conditional meaning is fundamentally quite different from ordinary meaning.

5.2 The phenomenon
Romance Spanish prenominal A are unambiguously non-restrictive, with the postnominal position ambiguous

(7) los sofisticados amigos de Maria
(8) los amigos sofisticados de Maria
restrictive
NR

5.3 Some analytical possibilities
5.3.1 Blaming Focus ➔ restrictive modifiers are focused
Problem: E and S do not seem to differ regarding the placement of focus
prenominal A in S may be focused even if they are nonrestrictive

A second possibility ➔ a Cinquean analysis

(20) A more or less Cinquean Possibility
Nonrestrictive P

NR A
Nr' SizeP
size A Size'
+size colorP

Perhaps, but there are reasons to think that these facts about non-restrictive readings are of a different sort.
One is that the R/NR distinction cuts across adverb/adjective classes/ Both the subject-oriented adverb accidentally and
the pure (manner) adverb softly manifest the contrast

(21) a. Clyde softly/ accidentally muttered something offensive/
b. Clyde muttered something offensive softly/ accidentally/

Secondly the R/NR divide targets multiple modifiers at a time, putting together members of different classes:

(22) I’m positively tickled pink to meet your charming lovely Norwegian wife.

5.4 Modifier position in computing expressive meaning
5.4.1 Expressive meaning
Crucial to what needs to be captured is the sense of double assertion. NR modifiers have expressive meaning.
Expressive meaning is:
a) it is speaker oriented, in the sense that it conveys the S’s commentary on what is being said.
b) it takes wide scope ➔ it cannot occur under the scope of any scope bearing expression
c) unlike CIs, expressive meaning does not arise from the context of use and principles such as the Gricean maxims.
Indeed it is often associated with one particular lexical item. At least for current purposes, one can identify expressive
meaning with conversational implicature.

5.4.2 Potts 2005: Some theoretical machinery and damn expressive adjectives
Potts ➔ CI and ordinary truth conditional meaning is computed along distinct dimensions of semantic representation.
In these representations, a syntactic tree such as the one in (23a) is understood to correspond to a semantic one as in (23b)

(23a) a. DP
   D  NP
   the damn Republicans

b. republicans : < e^a, t^* >
c. damn(republicans); t^c

damn: << e^a, t^c > t^c >

Importantly, the node in (23b), corresponding to damn (republicans) has two tiers separated by a bullet.

5.4.4 Building an alternative: an analogy to definite description

An essential problem → A CI can’t contain a variable inside it bound from the outside.

“The way around this is to suppose that non-restrictive modification always involves reference, or at least some form of quantificational independence. The problem faced here is that in, damn Republican, the modified expression is property denoting.

The old intuition → two distinct utterances.

(35) a. Every unsuitable word was deleted.
   b. Every word was deleted. They were unsuitable

The linguistic trick is to use they to refer back to a plural individual consisting of the set quantified over by every. Maybe what these restrictive modifiers modify is a potentially plural discourse referent such as the one the pronoun in 35 refers to.

Importantly, the anaphora (35b) would not be possible with a singular pronoun:

(36) *Every word was deleted. It was unsuitable.

They is an E-type pronoun, and consequently it is interpreted like a definite description (Heim, 1990). This approach helps avoid an interpretation that includes an element such as “words were unsuitable”, because, unlike kinds, definite descriptions involve a contextual domain restriction.

(37) Every word was deleted. The words were unsuitable.

What’s being quantified over in the unsuitable-words example is not, of course, all words, but only the contextually relevant ones – a fact I’ll reflect here using contextually supplied resource domain variables.

(38) a. Every unsuitable word_C was deleted.
   b. Every word_C was deleted. The words were unsuitable.
   c. “For every word x in C, x was deleted, and the sum of the words in C was unsuitable.

(39) a. ∀ x [[ word(x) & x ∈ C ] → deleted (x) ] : t^c
   b. unsuitable (sup (λy. words(y) & y ∈ C)) : t^c

5.4.5 Expressive predicate modification

The problem remains → building up the interpretation in the previous section compositionally, and of doing so in a way that captures syntactic constraints on where such non-restrictive readings are available.

The rule Specifically, maybe rules that introduce expressive meaning can be directly sensitive to prevedence in a way ordinary non-expressive meaning is not. This would account naturally with the intuition that non-restrictive modifiers are in some sense secondary or additionally, extra comments on the current utterance that happen to be interleaved with it.

Adopting (42) maintains the parallelism between functional application and the rule of Conventional Implicature Functional Application by adding an expressive counterpart to a rule of intersective modifier interpretation.

(42) Expressive Predicate Modification

β: < e^a, t^* >

α (sup (β)); t^c

α: < e^a, t^* > β: < e^a, t^* >
…where the relative order is as indicated

This rule does 3 things:

- The sup operator picks out the largest plural individual in the extension of the modified expression (β).
- The denotation of the modifier α is predicated of this plural individual. Crucially, this happens in the expressive dimension of interpretation.
- The ordinary descriptive meaning of the modified expression is simply passed up as the ordinary descriptive meaning of the whole.

An illustration

\[\text{(43) a. [Every [unsuitable wordC] ] was deleted.}\]
\[\text{every (λx. word (x) & x} \in \text{C) (deleted) : t}^0\]
\[\text{every (λx. word (x) & x} \in \text{C) deleted: }<\text{e}^0, t^0>\]
\[\text{unsuitable (sup (λx. word (x) & x} \in \text{C)) : t}^c\]
\[\text{unsuitable: }<\text{e}^c, t^c>\]

“It bears pointing out here that I am assuming that C is interpreted on the head noun rather than on the determiner. This is crucial. It is this that ensures that the extension of the NP is whittled down appropriately before the nonrestrictive modifier applies to it.

In fact, the way 43/44 is formulated requires that it target only intersective modifiers. This makes a substantive prediction should be possible only for intersective modifiers. This seems to be the case. Certainly, it is difficult to see how the modifiers in (45) could get non-restrictive interpretations:

\[\text{(45) a. Every alleged mistake was deleted/}\]
\[\text{b. Most possible students visited for a few days.}\]

This may actually serve as a useful diagnostic for intersective modification in cases which remain unclear, such as subsective adjectives generally.

Kennedy: One might propose that syntax should take some of the burden. Rather than a separate rule of Expressive Predicate Modification or CI Application, one might instead suppose there is a functional head E, that takes APs as specifiers and NPs as complements, or AdvPs as specifiers and NPs as complements. Semantically, it would do what Expressive Predicate Modification does:

\[\text{(47) E λf.λg. f: }<\text{e}, t^0>\]
\[\text{λf.λg. g (sup (f) : t}^c\]

\[\text{(48) AP EP E'}\]
\[\text{unsuitable E NP word}_c\]

The correct generalization for Romance is that the prenominal space is non-restrictive, while the post-nominal space is restrictive or non-restrictive.

Robert Truswell Attributive Adjectives and Nominal Templates LI 525-532

1) Adjective orders are not completely free. One robust restriction emerges, namely that subsective adjectives dominate intersective adjectives.

2) Two theses should be given up⇒ that attributive adjectives occupy unique functional specifier positions and that a single highly articulated yet rigidly ordered functional sequence can derive adjective orders in addition to morphosyntactic and semantic properties of non-adjunct elements in noun phrases.