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Abstract

In this paper, we will analyze several morphosyntactic properties related to qualitative binominal constructions (complex noun phrases of the type $a\ jewel_{NP1} of\ a\ village_{NP2}$) from a Southern Italo-Romance language spoken in the Apulian town of San Marco in Lamis (Foggia). The language realizes QBCs in two ways: prepositionally (with $da$), allowing both definites indefinites, and non-prepositionally, only allowing definite nouns. We will suggest that in the latter type $N_1$ and $N_2$ are related by a categorial match of the determiners dominating them (therefore, only definite articles are allowed in the non-prepositional construction). We will propose that $N_1$ is a property-denoting element, functioning as an adjectival modifier. This derives the impossibility for the construction to undergo syntactic operations such as extraction (which we connect to the notion of phase). With respect to interpretation, will suggest that a phrase is interpreted as a qualitative binominal if $N_1$ and $N_2$ share the same number features, and if the features of $N_1$ do not allow for it to be interpreted as the head/possessum of $N_2$. Finally, we will spend a couple of words on agreement with either noun of the construction, and we will see that the data confirm the relevance of $[ + \text{human}]$ features re 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 or an adjectivized nominal) 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 ($N_2$) generally hosts an indefinite article in its D position, $a\ jewel_{N1} of\ [a\ doctor_{N2}]$ (qualitative) vs. $a\ jewel_{N1} of\ [the\ doctor_{N2}]$ (possessive). In the first case, the usual meaning is that $N_1$ is a quality being predicated...
about N₂, i.e. the fact that the doctor is a jewel. In the second, the interpretation is instead that N₁
is possessed by N₂.

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 i 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) a. l-u ʼjam-ə l-u ʼmedəkə  
   Apulian (San Marco in Lamis, Foggia)
   DEF-M.SG idiot-M.SG DEF-M.SG doctor
   ‘the idiot of the doctor’

 b. l-a ʼkaspo k-a bul'letə:
   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 definiteness agreement ii, 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-ı rot-ə l-a ımakən-a/*n-ə ımakən-a
   ‘the car’s wheels’

b. l-a kod-a l-u ıkan-ə /*n-u ıkan-ə
   DEF-F.SG tail DEF-M.SG dog-M.SG/ INDEF-M.SG dog-M.SG
   ‘the dog’s tail’

Indefinites require instead the presence of a preposition, thus resulting in da ına makənə, da nu kanə, etc. Rohlfs (1969: 6) proposed that the preposition is present and that it undergoes absorption in intervocalic contexts. The definite articles of the Calabrese varieties taken into account by Rohlfs underwent in fact 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, articulated, and so is N₂. 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 relator 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 draws instead a first sketch of agreement patterns with qualitative binominals in Apulian. 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)iii (which can also be realized with N₁ headed by a definite article (5)). (6)iv 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 (7).

3) a. quell’idiota del dottore

DEM idiot of DEF doctor

‘that idiot of the doctor’

b. cet imbécile de Jean

DEM idiot of Jean

‘that idiot of Jean’

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

‘that disgust of a 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  
   ‘the idiot of the doctor’

b. el idiota del médico  
   DEF idiot of DEF doctor  
   ‘the idiot of the doctor’

7) a. el babau de Joan  
   DEF idiot of Joan  
   ‘the idiot of Joan’

b. lo scemo di Michele  
   DEF idiot of Michele  
   ‘the idiot of Michele’

We can see that in Romance, at least two types of qualitative binominals are found: those where $N_2$ is never articulated (we exclude cases where $N_2$ is a proper name, for the reason that in these languages proper names are not articulated), and those in which $N_2$ is articulated. In some contexts, $N_1$ can be articleless, too. Such is the case of vocatives and qualitative binominals embedded in complementizer phrases, as the following examples from Italian show.
8) a. *stupido di un dottore*  vocative
   idiot of INDEF doctor
   ‘Idiot of a doctor!’

b. *che schifo di canzone*  complementizer phrase
   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 share several mechanisms, among which the absence of a preposition, definiteness agreement, 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. The Romance variety we are focusing on in this work can realize possession in two fashions. The first sees the preposition *da* relating head and modifier, as generally in Romance. In a second type, however, no preposition is realized. The first account on non-prepositional genitives in the languages of Southern Italy goes back to Rohlfs (1969), who analyzed non-prepositional genitives of the Calabrese type and proposed that the lack of a preposition is due to its absorption in an intervocalic context (vocalic word end for the head, and the vocalic definite article for the possessor).

Contrarily to other Romance varieties of Italy, whose articles retained the lateral from *ille*, the definite article of the Calabrese varieties taken into account by Rohlfs only retained gender and
number morphology, thus resulting in a(f)/u(m). The fact however that in several Romance varieties whose definite articles retained the lateral (such as the Apulian variety we deal with in this paper) non-prepositional genitives occur anyway, is the reason behind Silvestri’s (2012) proposal that Rohlf’s hypothesis might not be on the right track, because the lateral in the definite article assures that no inter-vocalic absorption takes place. Moreover, non-prepositional genitives are attested in early Romance varieties, as well (see Delfitto and Paradisi 2009 for Old French and Old Italian varieties; Jensen 2012 for Old French; Poletto 2014 for Old Italian).

We have said that this language can realize two types of genitival constructions. The difference between the two, as proposed in Massaro (2020) lies in the fact that the non-prepositional type only allows for definites, and that it is regulated by an agreement mechanism for definiteness.

9) a. l-i li:b-ra l-a napot-a
   ‘his/her niece’s books’

b. *l-i li:b-ra na napot-a
   ‘the books of a niece of his/hers’

c. l-i li:b-ra də na napot-a
   DEF-pl book- mpl of INDEF-F.sg niece-F.SG
   ‘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. Extraction out of a non-prepositional genitive is not possible, while it is for the prepositional variant.

10)a. *l-a kart-a n-e’ let-e dojə paɾdɛ:ən-e
   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

b. daːl-a kart-a n-e letːə doja paðaŋ-ə

do-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’

The other syntactic properties are 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-ə nov-ə *(dəː)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 rət-ə l-a makən-a nov-a
DEF-PL tire-PL DEF-F.SG car-F.SG new-F.SG

‘the tires of the new car’

Now we might go back to 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 reinforced 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 N₂ require instead a preposition.

13) a. l-u ʃem-ə l-u ‘medakə
DEF-M.SG idiot-M.SG DEF-M.SG doctor

‘the idiot of the doctor’

b. l-a ʃ'aspətə 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 ˈmedakə

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

‘*that idiot of the doctor’

d. kwid:u ʃem-ə da-l-u ˈmedakə

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

‘that idiot of the doctor’

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

14) a. l-u ʃem-ə l-u ˈmedakə

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

‘the idiot of the doctor’

b. *n-u ʃem-ə l-u ˈmedakə

INDEF-M.SG idiot-M.SG DEF-M.SG doctor

‘*an idiot of the doctor’

c. *l-u ʃem-ə n-u ˈmedakə

DEF-M.SG idiot-m.sg INDEF-M.SG doctor

‘*the idiot of a doctor’

d. n-u ʃem-ə da ˈmedakə

INDEF-M.SG idiot-M.SG of doctor

‘an idiot of a doctor’

e. *n-u ʃem-ə n-u ˈmedakə
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 not feasible in this language. Another claim made in Den Dikken’s work is that in Dutch, the article preceding \( N_2 \) is ‘spurious’. Den Dikken reaches this conclusion because, in Dutch, qualitative binominals show number agreement mismatches between \( N_2 \) and its article, as shown in (15) (Den Dikken 2006: 170).

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

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

According to Den Dikken, this ‘spurious’ article doesn’t belong with any of the two members in the construction\(^{\text{viii}}\), and it signals the fact that \( N_1 \) and \( N_2 \) are contained within a small clause. As discussed in length in Villalba (2007) the definite article preceding \( N_2 \) 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 \( N_2 \) 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. 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 agreement for definiteness (see also Tănase-Dogaru 2012, who proposes the same for Romanian qualitative binominals), and that agreement for definiteness is what relates \( N_1 \) and \( N_2 \). The articles themselves are regular
determiners, with no ‘spurious’ connotation whatsoever, but matching of the type of determiner preceding $N_1$ and $N_2$ is what relates them, i.e. agreement is the relator.

16) a. $BQ$
   b. $BQ$

The fact that qualitative binominals require definiteness agreement like non-prepositional genitives do 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\(^a\). 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 in fact 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]
   Spaniard

   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 finding replicates in Apulian, regardless of whether the qualitative binominal is prepositional or non-prepositional.

18) a. *non a par’l-atə ’ku-l-u ’fem-ə [’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’

b. *non a par’lat-ə ’ku-l-u ’fem-ə da [’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.
19)  b. *(də-l):l-u  'medəkə e  vist-ə l-u  ʃəm-ə
    (of-)DEF-M.SG doctor  have.1sg seen-M.SG DEF-M.SG idiot-M.SG
    ‘of the doctor I have seen the idiot’

c. *é (də-l):l-u  'medəkə ke e  vist-ə l-u  ʃəm-ə
    is (of-)DEF-m.sg doctor that  have.1sg seen-m.sg DEF-m.sg idiot-m.sg
    ‘it’s of the doctor that I have seen the idiot’

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 related to the predicative properties of the construction. More precisely, we claim that the
impossibility follows if we treat \( N_1 \) in qualitative binominals as an adjectival modifier (see also Aarts
1998). As a first, superficial clue, the first member can in fact be a simple noun, or a nominalized
adjective (lu 'ʃemə, ‘the idiot’). Unlike in simple of-phrases, where the two members actually carry
different referential indexes, in qualitative binominals \( N_1 \) and \( N_2 \) share the same index, which is
what we find in adjectival modification.

20) a. l-u,  ʃənj-ə, l-a,  ʃət-a,  towa,  Qualitative
    DEF-M.SG genius-M.SG DEF-F.SG girlfriend-F.SG your
    ‘that genius of your girlfriend’

b. l-u,  ʃənj-ə, l-a,  ʃət-a,  towa,  Non-prep genitive
    DEF-M.SG genius-M.SG DEF-F.SG girlfriend-F.SG your
    ‘your girlfriend’s genius’
In generative frameworks, 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. “phases are propositional: verbal phrases with full argument structure and CP with force indicators” (Chomsky 2001: 12).

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.

\begin{align*}
21 \text{a. } & * \text{Which poem did you hear [Homer’s recital] of last night?} \\
21 \text{b. } & \text{Which poem did you go to hear [a recital] of last night?}
\end{align*}

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 assume here that merging of N\(_1\) with a prepositional phrase (or through definiteness agreement) containing N\(_2\) (that genius\(_{N1}\) of a doctor\(_{N2}\)) turns it into a predicative element on a par with adjectival modifiers. In qualitative binominals N\(_i\) is usually a property-denoting element. How N\(_i\) 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 N\(_2\). Consider first what we saw in (20), which we repeat here as (22).

\begin{align*}
22 \text{a. } & \text{l-u}}_{i} \quad ‘\text{that genius of your girlfriend’} \\
22 \text{b. } & \text{l-u}}_{j} \quad ‘\text{your girlfriend’s genius’}
\end{align*}
As we mentioned, the two structures seem superficially identical. Now consider the example in (23).

\[
\text{DEF-M.SG wreck-M.SG DEF-F.SG car-F.SG your-F.SG}
\]

'that wreck of your car'

N₁, *sgarːət'ɔnə*, '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. Definiteness agreement (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. 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 proper, and it is related to the noun it modifies via a preposition (or definiteness agreement, 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 re
 qualitative binominals being predicative phrases. According to Bošković (2020), who follows Higginbotham (1985), adjunction (modification) is analogous to coordination\(^3\), which would explain similarities shared by coordination and modification concerning the impossibility of extraction.

### 3.2 Interpretation

Another clue into how \(N_1\) 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, \(N_1\) and \(N_2\) must share the same number features. Remember what we have said about (23), i.e. that \(N_1\) is interpreted as the predicate also because of the semantic traits carried by \(N_2\). Now if \(N_1\) has different number features from \(N_2\), 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 \(N_1\), and cannot be interpreted as a qualitative binominal because of the absence of number feature sharing between \(N_1\) and \(N_2\). Let us say that the two nouns have to agree for number.

\[24\] *l-i sgarːətˈːon-ə l-a 'makan-a 'tow-a

\[
\text{DEF-M.PL wreck-M.PL DEF-F.SG car-F.SG your-F.SG}
\]

‘*those wrecks of your car’

Remember from (1), which we repeat below, that \(N_1\) can also be an element that is originally an interjection, like \textit{kasp\text{"a}ta}.

\[25\] l-a 'kasp\text{"a}ta l-a bul'letːa

\[
\text{DEF-F.SG freaking DEF-F.SG bill}
\]

‘that freaking thing of a bill’

Contrarily to \textit{sgarːət\text{"o}na} (24), which is masculine, \textit{kasp\text{"a}ta} is never inflected, and contains no gender features. So what happens is that the gender features of \textit{kasp\text{"a}ta}’s definite article are retrieved from
those of $N_2$\textsuperscript{\textdagger}. We also assume, as in Baker (2003), that nouns are the only lexical category bearing a referential index.

26) a. l-u 'kaspəta l-u 'libr-ə

DEF-M.SG freaking DEF-M.SG book-M.SG

‘that freaking thing of a book’

b. l-i 'kaspəta l-i 'libr-a

DEF-M.PL freaking DEF-M.PL book-M.PL

‘the freaking books’

Based on this, we conclude that the head of such a phrase is $N_2$ (see also Vişan 2013, Masini 2016, and Camacho and Serafim 2021, among others).

In the following paragraph, which deals with verbal and adjectival agreement with qualitative binominals, we will see more about the features involved in the make-up of the construction.

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 just that.

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.

27) l-a 'ʃem-a l-a presəo'r-essa [ke 'sə 'gi:] /[ke 'si 'təi]/etc.

DEF-F.SG idiot-F.SG DEF-F.SG professor-F.SG [COMP am I] /[ COMP are you] /etc.

‘the idiot of a professor that/I am/you are/etc.’
Qualitative binominals per se trigger third-person agreement. Ackema and Neeleman (2019) notice, for example, that R-expressions (nominals) 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></th>
<th>N₁ &amp; N₂</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHARING OF PERSON FEATURES (3d person features)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHARING OF NUMBER FEATURES</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHARING OF GENDER FEATURES</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1 Features in Apulian qualitative binominals*

Since both N₁ and N₂ 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 N₂ is plural N₁ will be plural, too, number is excluded as well.

We will start with the interplay between agreement for gender and [+human] features in qualitative binominal constructions, and specifically with the case of resumptive clitics. We will find that when the complex nominal is the internal argument of a verbal phrase and undergoes resumption, the resumptive clitic agrees in gender features with the [+human] noun. We will see the latter also happens within another Italo-Romance language, and namely Pantiscu, as described in Idone (2018), confirming what is predicted under Corbett’s (2006) Agreement Hierarchy. 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 $N_2$ is the actual antecedent of a resumption mechanism, not necessarily will the resumptive clitic agree with it. The clitic can agree with either noun.

But the choice of goals in agreement relations in qualitatives is not exactly constraint-less. Whenever a [+human] noun is present, agreement with the [+human] noun is preferred, as expected from the Agreement Hierarchy.

The same happens in qualitative binominals in another Southern Italo-Romance language, and namely Pantiscu, where adjectives modifying qualitative binominals noun phrases agree with the [+human] noun as well (Idone 2018: 8).

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.
b. ɛnːə arːəv-at-ə l-u sgarːəton-ə l-a 'makəna de pa'pa /arːəv-at-ə

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 ˈdʒənjə l-a ʦit-a towə ɛnːə arːəv-at-ə /ˈarːəv-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 sgarːəton-ə l-a 'makəna de pa'pa ɛnːə arːəv-at-ə /arːəv-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 (sgarːətonŋ) 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 N₁ depend on N₂); 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 kaspəta (26)). In that case, their morphology will bear the features of N₂. The fact that nominal predicates like N₁ can still retain gender features (that will be copied also on their determiners, agreeing adjectives, and verbal predicates) is a consequence of their indexical nature (as in Baker 2003). However, in this case, N₁ does not bear the index of the referent of the phrase, which is bore by N₂. This is similar to the Slavic honorifics discussed in Corbett (2006). Plural honorifics, despite not carrying the number feature of the referent (which is singular) still trigger plural agreement in auxiliaries and past verbal forms, as in Bulgarian.

Accordingly, we might define agreement in Apulian qualitative binominal constructions along the following lines. The projection of the verbal phrase and its arguments is completed first, i.e. the
probe (a past participle or an adjectival modifier in our case) is still not valued with respect to the

gender and number features of one of the two available goals. The probe will stop as soon as it finds

a [+human] noun, resulting in the realization of agreement we have reviewed in the previous

pages.

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 focused on the latter. We found that the absence of the

preposition depends on the make-up of the determiner layer of the two nouns. In particular, 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. 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 one of the two

nouns. We connected this to the fact that N₁ 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).

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 $N_1$ and $N_2$. Just like in the case of agreeing adjectives, if $N_2$ is plural, $N_1$ will be plural, too. We based our conclusion that $N_2$ is the head of the phrase on the fact that when $N_1$ is a nominalized adjective (ˈʃema) or an interjection (kaspəta), and thus per se void of gender and number features, the features of $N_2$ will show up on $N_1$. In prepositional genitives, on the other hand, there is no matching in number features between $N_1$ and $N_2$. Qualitative binominals only trigger third person agreement (either singular or plural), just like R-expressions generally do (see Ackema and Neeleman 2019).

Finally, in §4 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) and that 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.
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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.

Here the term agreement is not used with its prototypical meaning (that of probes bearing inflectional morphology according to those of the goal). Rather, it refers to the fact that the determiner layer of N₁ hosts the same type of determiner of N₂. However, later in the paper we will see that N₁ can also show proper agreement morphology with N₂, both in the determiner layer and in the inflectional morphology (see exx. (13a) and (26)).
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Spanish data from Villalba (2007).

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

(i) a. h-o le-tto un libro Italian
    have-1SG read-PST INDEF book
    ‘I have read a book’
    b. ne ho le-tta una pagina
    part have-1SG read-PST INDEF page
    ‘I have read one page (of the book)’


In this case, the term ‘reinforced’ refers to the diachrony of Romance demonstratives, with *(ec)cu(m) illum and *(ec)cu(m) istum being the reinforced ones, yielding Ita quell-o/-a, and Apulian kwid-u/- kwed-a, the Apulian non-reinforced form of the distal demonstrative being dd-u/-a (illum). Italian only has a non-reinforced variant (istum) for the proximal quest-o/-a, being st-o/st-a. Apulian has kwist-u/kwest-a, and st-u/-a, respectively.

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).

(ii) *l-u libr-o Məkela
    DEF-m.sg book-m.sg Michael
    ‘Michael’s book’

(iii) l-u libr-o *(da) Məkela
    DEF-m.sg book-m.sg of Michael
'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).

(iv) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{RP} \\
\text{SUBJECT} \quad \text{R'} \\
\text{RELATOR} \quad \text{PREDICATE}
\end{array}
\]

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.

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 ‘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 receive special markings. In Persian, -rā attaches to specific direct objects only (Lazard 1982, Samvelian 2018); In Romance, the preposition *a* is the usual differential object marker, except for Romanian, which has *pe* (Bossong 1991). Like Spanish, the languages of Southern Italy employ the preposition *a*. In these languages, DOM usually marks [+animate] or specific objects (Ledgeway et al 2019).