1. Introduction

(1) illustrates a special type of NP-construction in Sardinian where the head noun is introduced by de and placed to the right of a modifier or complement which, in other constructions, would normally follow the head noun (cf. Jones, 1993):

a Préstami sa tua de pinna.
   lend-me the your of pen
   ‘Lend me YOUR pen (i.e. not his).’

b Keljo comporare sa ruja de mákkina.
   want-1SG to-buy the red of car
   ‘I want to buy the RED car (i.e. not the blue one).’

(1) illustrates a special type of NP-construction in Sardinian where the head noun is introduced by de and placed to the right of a modifier or complement which, in other constructions, would normally follow the head noun (cf. Jones, 1993):

(2) a Appo postu sa manna de ampulla in mesa.
   have-1SG put the big of bottle on table

b Sa manna appo postu de ampulla in mesa.
   the big have-1SG put of bottle on table
   ‘I have put the BIG bottle on the table (i.e. not the small one).’

The crucial observation is that the modifier complex can be detached from the NP:
(3) a "Su tuo travallat bene de theraccu.
the your works well of servant
'YOUR servant works well (i.e. mine doesn't).'
b "Su meu at appeddatu de cane.
the my has barked of dog
'MY dog has barked (i.e. yours hasn't).'
(Jones, 1993:79)

(4) a Su meu sink'est andatu de theraccu.
the my away is gone of servant
'MY servant has gone away (yours hasn't).'
b Su tuo no'est ghiratu de cane.
the your not is returned of dog
'YOUR dog has not returned (i.e. mine has).'
(Jones, 1993:79)

The nature of such constructions is poorly understood and they are rarely reported, possibly because they are often, if not always, part of colloquial registers. Consequently, they have received very little attention and as far as I am aware they have not been investigated in any Romance languages other than Sardinian. Split-adjectives are possible in Polish and Russian (cf. Sekerina, 1997, a process she refers to as 'split scrambling', a term which I will use in this paper) and appear to involve contrastive stress as well, but no word equivalent to de appear in these languages:

(5) on ljubit kofe.
black-ACC he-NOM likes coffee-ACC
'He likes BLACK coffee (i.e. not white).'

In this paper, I will explore whether the theory I have been developing for split-DP constructions (cf. self-reference) can be extended to the cases of Sardinian. In the first instance, my aim is to show that split-adjectival constructions of the type described above are much more widespread than previously thought. For example, they are available in colloquial French (these sentences have a special intonation pattern, the split adjective receives heavy stress while the stranded nominal is unstressed):

(6) a La rouge j' ai acheté de chemise.
the red I have bought of shirt
'I have bought the RED shirt (i.e. not the blue one).'
b Le mien il est beau de jardin.
the mine it is beautiful of garden
'MY garden is beautiful (i.e. not yours).'

Intriguing facts about these constructions abound. Some adjectives can split, while others cannot:

(7) "Ma future je veux embrasser de femme.
my future I want to kiss of wife
‘I want to kiss my future wife (i.e. not my ex).’

Like in Sardinian, we find an ergative/unaccusative dichotomy with respect to subject extraction:

(8) a  *La rouge a disparu de chemise.
the red has disappeared of shirt
‘The RED shirt has disappeared (i.e. not the blue one).’

b  ??La mienne a disparu de chemise.
the mine has disappeared of shirt
‘MY shirt has disappeared (i.e. not yours).’

(9) a  La rouge est arrivé de voiture.
the red is arrived of car
‘The RED car has arrived (i.e. not the blue one).’

b  La mienne est tombé de boucle d’oreille.
the mine is fallen of ring of ear
‘MY earring has fallen (i.e. not yours).’

Other puzzles include the facts that (a) in a ditransitive construction, the adjective can be split from the theme/direct object, but not from the goal/indirect object position; (b) adjectival-splitting is much better with stage-level than with individual-level predicates; (c) an adjective part of an adjunct cannot be split.

I will argue that these curious properties can be made sense of if we view the stranded nominal as a semantically incorporated noun. It will be demonstrated that the syntactic distribution of incorporated nouns is very similar to that of stranded indefinites in split-DP constructions. Whereas in previous work (cf. self-reference) I have concentrated on the scope properties of stranded nominals and pointed out that their limited scope resembles that of incorporated nouns, the present paper concentrates on the syntactic distribution of such stranded NPs. I have not discussed split-adjectives in my work on split-DPs before in any great detail. This paper can thus be viewed as an extension of the semantic incorporation theory of stranded nominals. Finally, it will be shown that lack of participial agreement in Romance split-DP constructions is a reflex of (semantic) noun incorporation. Anti-agreement is a typical consequence of noun incorporation.

I shall proceed as follows: section 2 introduces the basic facts about semantic incorporation. In section 3, the main hypothesis of the paper is presented: the stranded nominal in a split-adjectival construction is semantically incorporated. Section 4 concentrates on why should some adjectives split, but not other. Section 5 concludes with a brief summary.

2. Stranded nominals in Romance

2.1 Semantic Incorporation

In previous work (self-reference), I have noted that there are striking similarities between the semantic properties of the stranded nominals in the constructions
in (10) and certain nouns (i.e. incorporated nouns in West Greenlandic, bare nominals and split-topics in German) discussed by Van Geenhoven (1998).

(10) **Combien**, as-tu lu t, de livres]
how-many have you read of books
’How many books have you read?’

However, before I proceed to the semantic similarities between stranded nominals and those nouns discussed by Van Geenhoven, I simply want to introduce the data that will be relevant to us. Consider the following fact: (10) is the split variant of (11):

(11) **Combien de livres**, as-tu lus t?
how-many of books have you read-MAS.PL
’How many books have you read?’

(10) and (11) mean the same (they have the same truth conditions), yet they differ syntactically. In (11), the nominal *de livres* (‘of books’) is adjacent to its operator, while in (10) it is not: the operator has raised while the nominal is stranded. This type of constructions will be referred as split constructions. They are well-known in the literature on French and Romance (see Obenauer, 1976; 1983, 1994; Rizzi, 1990; de Swart, 1992; Dobrovie-Sorin, 1994; Doetjes, 1997).

There is another important syntactic difference between (10) and (11): in (11) the verb agrees with the object (cf. Kayne, 1989), but in (10) it does not. The past participle agreement pattern cannot normally be heard. However, if the past participle ends with a consonant, then the past participle agreement is phonologically spelt-out:

(13) **Combien de boites**, as-tu ouvert t?
how-many of cans have you open-PL.FEM.
’How many cans have you opened?’

The agreement in (13) is, nevertheless, optional. (14) is perfectly acceptable:

(14) **Combien de boites**, as-tu ouvert t?
how-many of boxes have-you open
’How many boxes have you opened?’

According to Obenauer (1994), when agreement is instantiated the interpretation is specific (a set of cans is presupposed), whereas when no agreement shows up on the verb, the reading is one according to which there is no existential presupposition associated with cans (see also Déprez, 1998). For reasons that will become clear later in the paper, I want to argue that (14) is equivalent to a split construction (the *de boites* part automatically reconstructs at LF – for motivation of this idea see Frampton, 1991; Dobrovie-Sorin, 1994; Williams, 1994; Cresti, 1995; Heycock, 1994).

Let us now turn to the nouns discussed by Van Geenhoven (1998). She demonstrates that split topic nominals in West Germanic languages (Van
Riemsdijk, 1989), incorporated nouns in West Greenlandic (Sadock, 1980) and bare plurals (Carlson, 1977) share common properties. In a split-topic construction, if a universal quantifier intervenes between the raised nominal and the adjectival numeral, the scope of the indefinite is fixed. It cannot achieve scope over the universal quantifier (cf. (15)):

(15) a Jedes Kind hat fünf Katzen gesehen.
   every child has five cats seen
   (i) ‘As for cats, every child saw five such animals.’
   (ii) ‘There are five cats such that every child saw them.’

   b Katzen, hat jedes Kind fünf tigious worden.
   cats has every child five seen
   (i) ‘As for cats, every child saw five such animals.’
   (ii) * ‘There are five cats such that every child saw them.’
   (Van Geenhoven, 1998:125)

When full movement occurs, then the sentence is ambiguous, but crucially in this case the whole phrase is a topic (or a focus depending on how one views the Spec-CP position in the language under discussion), not simply the nominal Katzen:

(16) Fünf Katzen, hat jedes Kind tigious worden.
      five cats has every child seen
      (i) ‘As for cats, every child saw five such animals.’
      (ii) ‘There are five cats such that every child saw them.’

Second, while (17a) means ‘There are some black spiders that Lisa didn’t see in the cellar’, (17b) is ungrammatical:

(17) a Lisa hat im Keller einige schwarze Spinnen nicht gesehen.
    Lisa has in-the cellar some black spiders not seen.
    ‘Lisa has seen some black spiders in the cellar.’

    b *Schwarze Spinnen hat Lisa im Keller einige nicht gesehen.
      black spiders has Lisa in-the cellar some not seen
      Intended: ‘As for black spiders, Lisa has seen many in the cellar.’

As noticed by Van Geenhoven (see also Bittner, 1994) the scope of incorporated nouns in West Greenlandic (WG) is also fixed.² (18) can mean ‘It is not the case that Juuna got one letter from Kaali’ but not ‘There is one letter from Kaali that Juuna did not get’:
Finally, bare plurals contrary to non-bare plurals cannot receive wide scope (this was first noticed by Carlson, 1977). Compare (19) with (20):

(19) Everyone read books on linguistics.
   (i) ‘Everyone was reading different books on linguistics.’
   (ii) ‘There were books on linguistics that everyone was reading.’

(20) Everyone read some books on linguistics.
   (i) ‘Everyone was reading different books on linguistics.’
   (ii) ‘There were books on linguistics that everyone was reading.’

The contrast between singular indefinites and existential bare plurals comes out clearly when the predicate is negated. (21) can mean ‘It is not the case that John saw spots on the floor’, but not ‘There were spots on the floor such that

(21) John didn’t see spots on the floor.

Van Geenhoven (1998) distinguishes indefinites that introduce a property and indefinites that denote an open proposition. Property-denoting indefinites receive their existential interpretation through the verb. They are interpreted as predicates and are absorbed by the verb as the predicate of that verb’s internal argument’s variable. This absorption process is what she calls ‘semantic incorporation’. The idea is that the valence of the verb which incorporates the noun is reduced by one. A transitive sentence becomes intransitive (x does y

Evidence for the idea that stranded/incorporated nominals denote properties comes from the fact that they cannot yield partitive readings:

(22) Jensi marlun-nik manni-tu-ssa-a-q.
   Jensi-ABS two-INSTR.PL egg-eat-FUT-IND-[TR]-3SG
   ‘Jensi will eat two eggs.’
   (Van Geenhoven, 1998:44)

(23) I bought books.

(22) cannot mean that Jensi will eat two of a set of eggs previously mentioned in the discourse any more than (23) can mean that I bought specific books. In short, incorporated nominals have a different (more restricted) semantics than an unincorporated object, as the incorporated element is usually interpreted as non-specific in reference.

Incorporated nouns introduce a novel variable. Evidence for such a claim comes from the fact that they may serve as the antecedents of anaphora:
(24) Suulut timmisartu-rior-p-u-q.  
Soren-ABS airplane-made-IND-[TR]-3sg  
Suluusa-qar-p-u-q aquute-qar-llu-ni-lu.  
wing-have-IND-[TR]-3SG rudder-have-INF-3SG-PROX-and  
Soren made an airplane. It; has wings and it; has a rudder.  
(Van Geenhoven 1998:48, original example from Sadock, 1980)

(25) John saw two films; at the movies today. He saw them; at the Curzon Mayfair.

The idea that the existential quantifier is provided by the verb explains why incorporated and bare nouns are scopeless. They can never take wide scope over, say, negation or universal quantifiers, because the existential quantifier is too low in the structure.

### 2.2 Stranded indefinites as property-denoting

I relate the scope freezing properties of the constructions Van Geenhoven describes to the scope freezing properties of stranded nominals in split *combien de* constructions (cf. de Swart, 1992) (also to French WH in situ, cf. self-reference, and negation forthcoming):

(26) a *Combien* ont-ils tous *de livres*?  
how-many have they all read of books  
b *Combien de livres* ont-ils tous lus *t*?  
how-many of books have-they all read-AGR  
‘How many books have they all read?’

As noticed by de Swart (1992), (26b) is ambiguous whereas (26a) is not. In (26b) the universal quantifier can take wide scope: we ask for all persons how many books they have read. Under the narrow scope interpretation, we ask for a single number, i.e. how many books are such that everyone has read them. This is the so-called individual reading. On the other hand, (26a) has only the reading according to which the universal quantifier takes scope over the WH phrase.

Note that according to Obenauer (1992), the two readings in question (wide scope for the universal or wide scope for the existential) are projected on two distinct forms: presence or absence of past participle agreement. When agreement is present, the WH-phrase takes wide scope over the universal. When agreement is absent, the universal takes wide scope over the WH-phrase. I assume that the non-agreement version of (26b) has the same syntactic structure as (26a), and is therefore a split-DP.

In addition, negation is an intervention effect inducer when *combien de livres* is split:

(27) a *Combien de livres* n’ as-tu pas lus *t*?  
how-many of books NE has-you not read-AGR  
b ‘*Combien* n’ as-tu pas lu *t*? *de livres*?  

how-many NE have-you not read of books
'How many books haven’t you read?'

On the basis of these facts, I want to argue that stranded nominals in split combien de and French WH-in-situ constructions are semantically incorporated. They denote a property. The scope freezing property of stranded nominals thus follows naturally from the fact that they are predicative indefinites. Suppose that Van Geenhoven’s account is correct, namely that the existential quantifier is provided by the verb, for the examples above that show intervention effects, the idea is thus that the existential quantifier is too low in the structure to take scope over the negative operator, on the one hand, and the universal quantifier, on the other.

Further evidence for the idea that stranded nominals of the type described in this section are semantically incorporated comes from the fact that, like incorporated nominals in West Greenlandic, stranded indefinites in split-DP constructions are not compatible with a partitive reading. This has been independently noticed by Obenauer (1994:193):

(28) a ? *Combien i as-tu lu t de mes articles?
   how-many have-you read of my articles
b Combien de mes articles i as-tu lus t?
   how-many of my articles have-you read
   'How many of my articles have you read?'

Third, like incorporated nouns stranded nominals in split combien de constructions introduce a discourse referent. Evidence for such a view comes from the fact that they too can serve as antecedents for discourse anaphora:

(29) Combien as-tu mangé de pommes i aujourd'hui?
    how-many have-you eaten of apples today
    Elles, ont toutes disparu!
    they have all disappeared
    'How many apples have you eaten today? They’ve all disappeared!

To summarise this section: it was shown that stranded nominals in split constructions behave like incorporated nouns. It was thus argued that stranded nominals are semantically incorporated. In the next section, we provide more yet evidence for this idea.

2.3 Further evidence for semantic incorporation of stranded indefinites

The first observation/claim of this section is that the lack of past participle agreement in French correlates with semantic noun incorporation. Following my basic assumptions so far in this paper, when semantic incorporation does not take place, past participle agreement is instantiated; when semantic incorporation does take place, no past past participle agreement can be seen. Recall that I assumed in earlier sections that when the agreement is absent in
the case of full WH-movement we were in fact dealing with a split construction (the *de*-phrase automatically reconstructs).

(30) \[\text{[CP Combien (de boites) as-tu ouvert (de boites))?}\]
\[\text{[CP Combien as-tu ouvert de boites)?}\]
\[\text{[CP Combien de boites as-tu ouvertes)?}\]

‘How many cans have you opened?’

In short, lack of agreement is the mark of semantic incorporation. Interestingly, when nouns incorporate in languages like WG, this anti-agreement phenomenon shows up as well. In (31), the verbal inflection lacks object agreement otherwise shown when incorporation does not take place:

(31) Arnajaraq  eqalut-tur-p-u-q.
Arnajaraq-ABS salmon-eat-IND-[TR]-3SG
‘Arnajaraq ate salmon.’
(Van Geenhoven, 1998:15)

Anti-agreement of this kind has also been reported for Mohawk. Baker (1996:316) reports that when noun incorporates, absence of object agreement is normal, and its presence is rare or impossible:

(32) a Shako-núhwe'-s (ne owirá’a).
MAS-SG/3PL-O-like-HAB NE baby
‘He likes them (babies).’

b *Ra-núhwe’-s (ne owirá’a).
MAS-SG-like-HAB NE baby
‘He likes them (babies).’

c *? Shako-wir-a-núhwe’-s.
MAS-SG/3PL-O-baby-∅-like-HAB
‘He likes babies.’

d Ra-wir-a-nuhwe’-s.
MAS-SG-baby-∅-like-HAB
‘He likes babies.’

Second, I note that noun incorporation is impossible with agents (cf. Baker, 1996), and so is DP splitting:

(33) a **Combiendepersonnes, ont éternué?**
how-many of persons have sneezed

b **“Combiendepersonnesontéternuédepersonnes?”**
how-many have sneezed of persons
‘How many people have sneezed?’

Third, whereas unergative verbs never allow noun incorporation, unaccusative verbs do (cf. Baker, 1988). Again, I note that this is exactly what we find in DP-splitting (the DP subject is a theme):

(34) a En tout, **combiendepersonnes,** t’i sont arrivées t’i en
Fourth, adjunct extraction of *combien* is not possible. Noun incorporation out of an adjunct is not possible either for incorporated nouns (cf. Baker, 1988: 60) – I owe this example to Sophie Heyd:

(35) a En *combien* d’années, tu as fini ta thèse? in *how-many* of years you have finished your thesis

b ‘En *combien* tu as fini ta thèse d’années? in *how-many* you have finished your thesis of years

‘In how many years have you taken to finish your thesis?’

Finally, splitting with *combien* is much better with stage-level predicates than with individual-level predicates. Noun incorporation is possible with stage-level predicates, but not with individual-level predicates:

(36) a *Combien de personnes* adores/connais/détestes-tu? *how-many of persons* adore/know/detest-you

b ‘*Combien* de personnes adores/connais/détestes-tu? *how-many* of persons adore/know/detest-you

‘How many people do you adore/know/hate?’

To summarise, here are the properties of stranded nominals that were reviewed in section 2:

(37) 1. Obligatory narrow scope.
2. Non-specificity.
3. Anti-agreement.
4. If a subject, cannot be an agent.
5. But can be a theme or a patient.
6. Cannot be an indirect object if a direct object is present.
7. Cannot be an adjunct.
8. Is better with stage-level predicates than with individual-level predicates.

3. Hypothesis: the stranded nominal in a split-adjectival construction is semantically incorporated

In order to test the hypothesis according to which the stranded nominal in a split-construction is semantically incorporated, I propose to run through the
properties described in (37) and see whether they are relevant for the case of extracted adjectives.

First, a caveat is in order. As is well-known, definites differ from indefinites in that it is quite difficult to obtain narrow scope readings for the former, whereas such readings are perfectly natural for the latter (cf. Geurts, 1999). It is not that narrow scope of definites is impossible, but as argued by Geurts, such examples are not easy to come by:

(38) That wasn’t Fred’s wife, you blockhead: Fred isn’t even married!

(Geurts, 1999:5)

Geurts concludes that although definites and indefinites are quite similar in the way they interact with scope-bearing expressions, their preferences in this regard are different. Definites: wide scope < intermediate scope < in situ. Indefinites: in situ < wide scope < intermediate scope.

This means that it is not easy to test split-adjectival constructions for scope if the adjective is accompanied by a definite determiner. I thus propose to test potential scope effects with adjectives that are accompanied by an indefinite determiner. Split-adjectival constructions with indefinite determiners are indeed possible in French. Such a construction is also possible in Sardinian. As Jones (1993) points out, such structures require a clitic. In French, however, a clitic is required only in the in-situ alternative:

(39) a J’ en ai trouvé une belle de chemise.
    I of-it have put a beautiful of shirt

b Une belle, j’ ai trouvé de chemise.
    a beautiful I have found of shirt
    ‘I have found a BEAUTIFUL shirt (i.e. not a horrible one).’

If negation intervenes between the split adjective and the stranded nominal, then the sentence is ungrammatical (the sentence is well-formed if une belle is interpreted as a topic – as for a beautiful shirt, I haven’t found any-, but not if it is interpreted as contrastively focused, that is the interpretation we are after):

(40) *Une belle, j’ ai pas trouvé de chemise.
    a beautiful I have not found of shirt
    Intended: ‘I haven’t found a BEAUTIFUL shirt.’

This indicates that the scope of the stranded nominal is obligatorily narrow.

Although split-adjectives (both those with a definite and an indefinite determiner) tend to yield a definite/specific reading, I want to argue that this is because of the nature of the extracted complex itself, which is contrastively focused. Such structures are interpreted partitively, since there are at least two alternatives involved. I want to argue, however, that the noun refers, not to an object, but to a kind.

The argument goes as follows. Note first that in the case of WH interrogatives, the question word is interpreted as informational focus, and it is clear that in an example such as (41) the stranded nominal cannot be interpreted as specific:
(41) **Combien** est-ce que tu as lu *ti* de livres?
   how-many is-this that you have read of books
   ‘How many books have you read?’

Other WH phrases like quell ‘which’ in French can split, but these are inherently partitive. However, I have noticed elsewhere that there is a subtle meaning difference between the split and non-split variant of these elements. The hypothesis is that an example such as (22a) is used to mean ‘which particular book out of a set of books are you reading’ while (22b) is used to signify something like ‘what kind of book are you reading with respect to a presupposed set of book kinds’ (e.g. a detective novel).:

(42) a **Quel livre** est-ce que tu as lu *ti*?
   which book is-this that you have read

   b **Lequel** est-ce que tu as lu *ti* de livre?
   which is-this that you have read of book
   ‘Which book have you read?’

van Geenhoven discusses such readings in WG and shows that in WG an object-partitive question is realized as a transitive (i.e. non-incorporating) configuration while a kind-partitive question is realized as an intransitive (i.e. incorporating) one:

(43) a Illu sorleq pisiari-v-ıuk?
   house-ABS which-ABS buy-[INTER-[+TR]-2SG.3SG
   ✓ ‘Which of the houses did you buy?’
   * ‘What kind of house did you buy?’

   b Sorlem-mik illu-si-p-i-t?
   which-INST house-buy-[INTER-[-TR]-2SG
   * ‘Which of the houses did you buy?’
   ✓ ‘What kind of house did you buy?’

There is, thus, evidence that the stranded nominal refers not to a specific object, but to a kind. In effect, this makes to noun non-specific. Further evidence that in a split-adjectival construction the stranded nominal denote a non-specific entity comes from existential contexts. As has been shown by Milsark (1977), Heim (1987), Keenan (1987) and McNally (1992), so-called strong/definite quantifiers cannot combine with the existential predicate:

(44) a *There is every book on the table.
   b *There is the book on the table.
   c There is some book on the table.
   d There is a book on the table.

Since *de*-phrases can appear in existential contexts, they must be non-definite:

(45) **Combien** est-ce qu’il y a *ti* de films c’soir
how-many is-this that it there has of films this evening à la télé?
at the telly
‘How many films are there on TV tonight?’

Similarly, *de*-phrases in split-adjectival constructions are perfectly felicitous appear in existential environments:
(46) **La/une rouge, il y avait de chemise dans l’armoire.**

‘There was a red shirt in the wardrobe (i.e. not a blue one).’

Agreement of the past participle is not very natural when the adjective has been extracted:

(47) a **Une rouge, j’ avais mis de chemise ce jour-là.**

‘I had put a RED shirt on that day.’

Although the detachment of the *de* phrase is possible from the subject position of unaccusative verbs, it is not from the subject position of ergative verbs:

(48) a **La grande fille a éternué de fille.**

‘The TALL girl has sneezed (i.e. not the short one).’

b **La tienne fille a éternué de fille.**

‘YOUR daughter has sneezed (i.e. mine hasn’t).’

(49) a **La grande fille est arrivée de fille.**

‘The TALL girl has arrived (i.e. not the short one).’

b **La tienne fille est arrivée de fille.**

‘YOUR daughter has arrived (i.e. not mine).’

Extraction of an adjective is possible from a direct, from not from an indirect position:

(50) a **J’ ai donné la grande enveloppe à la secrétaire.**

‘I have given the big envelope to the secretary.’

b **La grande enveloppe j’ ai donné à la secrétaire.**

‘I have given the big envelope to the secretary.’

c **J’ ai donné un cadeau à la nouvelle secrétaire.**

‘I have given a gift to the new secretary.’

d **À la nouvelle j’ ai donné un cadeau de la secrétaire.**

‘I have given a gift to the NEW secretary.’
The extracted adjective cannot be an adjunct:

(51) a  J’ ai peint un mur en rouge.
I have painted a wall in red
‘I have painted a wall in red.’

b  En rouge j’ai peint de mur.
in red I have painted of wall
‘I have painted wall in red (i.e. not in green).’

Finally, split adjectives are better with stage-level predicates than with individual-level predicates:

(52) ?*La nouvelle je connais de fille.
the new I know of girl
‘I know the NEW girl (i.e. not the old one).’

In sum, these facts indicate that stranded nominals in split-adjectival constructions are semantically incorporated. The curious property in (3) and (4), namely that although the detachment of the de phrase is possible from the subject position of unaccusative verbs, it is not from the subject position of ergative verbs, now receives a principled explanation. In the next section, I return to one constraint on adjective extraction that was mentioned at the outset, but which has been ignored since then: not all adjectives can be split.

4. Not all adjectives can be split

Recall from the introduction that adjectives such as future cannot be split from the nominal with which it is otherwise associated:

(53) *Ma future je veux embrasser de femme.
my future I want to kiss of wife
‘I want to kiss my FUTURE wife (i.e. not my ex).’

It has been observed that those adjectives that cannot split in languages like Polish are those that cannot be used predicatively (cf. Nowak, 2000; Partee, 2002). This exactly what we find in French. The adjective future cannot be used predicatively, only attributively:

(54) a  Ma future femme est arrivée.
my future wife is arrived
‘My future wife has arrived.’

b  *Ma femme est future.
my wife is future
‘*My wife is future.’

Adjectives like rouge (a typical adjective that can extract) can be used both predicatively and attributively:
(55) a Ma chemise rouge est sale.  
my shirt red is dirty  
'\(\text{My red shirt is dirty.}'\)
b Ma chemise est rouge.  
my shirt is red  
'\(\text{My shirt is red.}'\)

Other examples include: supposé ('alleged') and potentiel ('potential'):

(56) a *Le supposé, ils ont arrêté de meurtrier.  
the alleged they have arrested the murderer  
'\(\text{They have arrested the ALLEGED murder.}'\)
b *Le potentiel j’ ai rencontré de gagnant de la série.  
the potential I have met of winner of the series  
'I have met the potential winner of the series.'

These adjectives cannot be used predicatively:

(57) a Le supposé meurtrier est arrivé.  
the alleged murderer is arrived  
'\(\text{The alleged murderer has arrived.}'\)
b *Le meurtrier est supposé.  
the murderer is alleged  
'*The murderer is alleged.'

(58) a Le potentiel gagnant est arrivé.  
the potential winner is arrived  
'\(\text{The potential winner has arrived.}'\)
b *Le gagnant est potentiel.  
the winner is potential  
'*The winner is potential.'

Adjectives such as alleged and potential are described by Partee (2002) as nonsubsective, and one would be tempted to think that all such adjectives cannot split, but other adjectives that are do not appear to be nonsubsective cannot split, e.g. cardiaque 'cardiac':

(59) *La cardiaque, il a eu de maladie.  
the cardiac he has has of disease  
'\(\text{He had the CARDIAC disease.}'\)

Again, cardiaque cannot be used predicatively:

(60) a Les maladies cardiaques sont fréquentes.  
the diseases cardiac are frequent  
'\(\text{Cardiac diseases are frequent.}'\)
b *Ces maladies sont cardiaques.  
these diseases are cardiac
‘These diseases are cardiac.’
To summarise: it appears that those adjectives that cannot split are those that cannot be used predicatively. At this point, this is only a generalization. I leave the question as to why this generalization should hold for further research. The curious properties that such constructions exhibit received an account once it was made clear that the stranded nominal has the same distribution as incorporated nouns. It was argued, following Van Geenhoven’s (1998) theory of narrow-scope indefinites, that stranded nominals in both split _combien de_ constructions and split-adjectival constructions were semantically incorporated. In addition, a correlation was made between lack of past participle agreement in French and (semantic) incorporation. Finally, it was shown that those adjectives that cannot split are those that cannot be used predicatively.

5. Conclusion

I hope to have shown that split-adjective constructions are more-widespread than previously thought. I have introduced some new data from French. The conclusion is that Sardinian is not the only Romance language to allow such structures. I have argued that the curious properties that such structures exhibit stems from the fact that the stranded nominal is semantically incorporated. I have not only discussed split-adjectival constructions, but also split- _combien de_ constructions and have motivated an account according to which lack of past participle agreement in French interrogatives is a reflex of noun incorporation. Finally, I focused on why some adjectives should split, but not others, and concluded that those adjectives that can split can be used predicatively, and those that cannot split cannot be used predicatively.
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**Notes**

1. Split-adjectival constructions are also possible in Modern Greek (cf. Androutsopoulou 1997). They were very productive in Classical Greek, Devine & Stephens, 2000). They have also been reported in Dyirbal, Kalkatungu, (Siewierska, 1988).

2. When nouns do not incorporate, they automatically take wide scope.

3. When splitting *quel* 'which' has to be accompanied by a determiner. The reason for this is explained in self-reference.