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This paper brings diachronic and synchronic evidence for the claim that the Parameter of Definiteness coined by Danon (2010) is active in the syntax of the Romanian nominal phrase. We analyze the status of the definiteness feature in the typology of grammatical features put forth by Kibort (2010), and show that definiteness is realized as a grammatical suffix and behaves like a morphosyntactic feature in Romanian as it is involved in syntactic agreement and, marginally, in licensing. The morphosyntactic nature of definiteness opens the way towards a proper parameterization. We then thoroughly discuss the patterns of definiteness realization which indicate that the definite article starts low, as a suffix on the noun (as chiefly shown by the “low definite article” of Old Romanian identified by Cornilescu and Nicolae 2011a), and its (sometimes multiple) realization is driven by Agree.

1 Introduction

The goal of this paper is to support, with diachronic and synchronic evidence coming from Romanian, the claim put forth by Danon (2010) (see also Ledgeway 2013) in the analysis of Hebrew, namely that there exists a Parameter of Definiteness whose specification accounts for some of the most radical dis-analogies between the DP-syntax of languages like Hebrew and Arabic or, as claimed here, Romanian (see also Nicolae 2013d), specified as positive for this parameter, and languages like English or French, in which definiteness is a morphosemantic feature with a very reduced degree of narrow syntax significance.

* This paper starts from the intuitions expressed in Cornilescu & Nicolae (2011a) and brings cross-linguistic evidence for the analysis advocated there, which is exclusively based on (Old) Romanian data. In the present paper, we provide additional diachronic and synchronic evidence for the claims advanced in Cornilescu & Nicolae (2011a), through a formal analysis of multiple definiteness agreement.
We will be mostly concerned with the analysis of Romanian definite DPs, focusing on the patterns of definiteness in Old Romanian (henceforth, OR) and Modern Romanian (henceforth, MR) and with the (highly diversified and syntactically distinct) patterns of multiple realization of the definite suffix within the same DP from the same double, synchronic and diachronic, perspective.

Other phenomena, for example the emergence of the genitival marker *al, a, ai, ale* (specific to Romanian in Romance, see Dragomirescu & Nicolae 2015a) or the suffixation of the definite article onto indefinite quantifiers (e.g. *unul one. def, altul other.def*), also bring support for our analysis. However, a proper account of these phenomena involves a thorough discussion of the syntax of Romanian genitives (for Rom. *al, a, ai, ale*) (see Cornilescu 1992, 2003) and of the syntax of nominal ellipsis (for Rom. *unul* and *altul*) (see Cornilescu & Nicolae 2012, Nicolae 2013a: ch. 3), two chores which are beyond our space limitations here, but are addressed in Giurgea (this volume).

Following previous literature, we adopt the DP-hypothesis (Abney 1989, Longobardi 1994), and assume that the DP consists of (at least) the functional projections in (1) (following Longobardi 2001; Giusti 2005; Borer 2005; Julien 2005; Stan 2009 and Tănase-Dogaru 2009 for Romanian).

(1) \[ \text{DP} > \text{QP} > \text{NumP} > \text{NP} \]

Adjectives are assumed to merge as specifiers of functional projections in the space above NP (Cinque 2010); however, the prenominal space in which the adjectives merge is not uniform (Cornilescu 2006, 2009a), and adjectives from different classes merge in distinct areas of the prenominal space (Cornilescu & Nicolae 2011b).

The outline of the paper is as follows: section 2 is devoted to the introduction of the theoretical ingredients on which the analysis is based; section 3 presents the empirical data which indicate that the Romanian definite article starts out as a suffix on the noun; section 4 analyzes the patterns of (multiple) definiteness realization of Old and Modern Romanian; finally, section 5 draws the conclusions.

We start by introducing the theoretical ingredients necessary for the analysis, the most important of which are the following: (i) Pesetsky & Torrego’s (2007) distinction between valuation and interpretability of features and their feature-sharing model of Agree; and (ii) a finer-grained typology of features, modelled on recent work by Corbett and his collaborators (see especially Corbett 2011, 2012; Kibort 2010; Kibort & Corbett 2010). We thus bridge the gap between two traditions of research, linguistic typology and generative grammar,
endeavouring to formally implement the typological results, a fact which opens the way to place them in a minimalist approach to parameterization (cf. Roberts 2012; Kayne 2013).

2 Theoretical Framework

2.1 Interpretability and Valuation

Minimalist research as well as linguistic typology regard features as being ordered pairs of type <Attribute, Value> (Adger & Svenonius 2011: 38) or <Feature, its Value> (Kibort 2010: 66). This perspective on feature is convergent with the Pesetsky & Torrego (2007) theory of Agree, which manipulates two featural dimensions: valuation and interpretability.

The framework assumed here, the second variant of Minimalism (Chomsky 2000 and ssq. work), disposes of the Spec-Head agreement operation and refines the conception on feature mechanics: features are no longer checked, but valued. The operation that drives feature valuation is Agree. Pesetsky & Torrego (2007) distinguish between interpretable and uninterpretable features, on the one hand, and valued and unvalued features, on the other hand. The syntactic derivation is driven by the need to delete uninterpretable features (Chomsky 2000, 2001). In Pesetsky & Torrego’s (2007) framework, Agree is conceived as a form of feature sharing (see also Frampton & Gutmann 2006 for a similar proposal).

---

1 In the current minimalist framework, there are two mainstream approaches to parameterization, not necessarily antagonistic (cf. Gallego 2011): the macroparametric approach (Baker 2008) and the microparametric approach (Roberts 2012; Kayne 2013). While not dismissing microparameters whose source are the lexical properties of functional items (The “Borer–Chomsky” Conjecture, formulated by Baker 2008: 353), the macroparametric approach advocates the existence of macroparameters whose source of variation is the grammatical component of the faculty of language, delineable by a major comparison of languages from different families (Baker 2008). By contrast, in the microparametric framework, macroparameters are not dismissed; rather, they come about as clustering effects (aggregates) of microparameters, and thus the source of parametric variation is still lexical (Roberts 2012). For example, assuming that the canonical UG ordering is head-complement (Kayne 1994), rigidly head-final languages (e.g. Japanese, Korean, Dravidian) are characterized by the presence of a head-final feature (i.e. a diacritic which triggers comp-to-spec movement) on all heads (Roberts 2012: 320–321).
Agree (Feature sharing version) (Pesetsky & Torrego 2007)

(i) An unvalued feature F (a Probe) on a head H at syntactic location \( \alpha \) (F\( _\alpha \)) scans its c-command domain for another instance of F (a Goal) at location \( \beta \) (F\( _\beta \)) with which to agree.

(ii) Replace F\( _\alpha \) with F\( _\beta \), so that the same feature is present in both locations.

Agree is initiated by some head at a location \( \alpha \) (the Probe), provided with an unvalued, uninterpretable or interpretable feature F\( _\alpha \); the c-command domain is scanned for another instance of F, in some (Goal) phrase \( \beta \), F\( _\beta \), with which it agrees. Conceived of as feature sharing, Agree consists in replacing F\( _\alpha \) with F\( _\beta \), so that the same feature is present in both locations. A link accessible throughout the derivation is thus established.

By combining valuation and interpretability, Pesetsky & Torrego (2007) arrive at a fourfold typology of features, given below (feature participating in Agree will bear the same numerical index; an empty pair of brackets signals that a feature has not participated in Agree).

\[
\begin{align*}
[uF] & : \text{uninterpretable, valued} & [iF] & : \text{interpretable, valued} \\
[uF] & : \text{uninterpretable, unvalued} & [iF] & : \text{interpretable, unvalued}
\end{align*}
\]

Adger & Svenonious' (2011) propose a slightly different minimalist perspective on features, according to which a valued feature is a feature whose attribute is satisfied by a value chosen from a set of values, as in (4).

(4) Valued feature:

a. A valued feature is an ordered pair <Att, Val> where
b. Att is drawn from the set of attributes, \{A, B, C, D, E, \ldots \}
c. and Val is drawn from the set of values, \{a, b, c, d \ldots \}

If we correlate (3) with (4), there are two logical possibilities to supply a value for an attribute: Agree or Merge. Note that the second option, Merge, is not directly included in the system established by Pesetsky & Torrego (2007) (Ian Roberts, p.c.), but has been however advocated by several authors, most prominently by Rouveret (2012).

Assume that, in UG, the D head is minimally endowed with an interpretable unvalued definiteness feature [def _ ] and with interpretable unvalued \( \varphi \)-features [i\( \varphi \) _ ].
In structures with freestanding articles, the definiteness requirement on D is satisfied by the direct merger in D of the respective articles; e.g. the freestanding definite and indefinite articles of English (6a, b), or the freestanding indefinite article of Romanian (6c).

(6) a. the man (English)  
   b. a man  
   c. un om (Romanian)  

These articles are lexically specified as uninterpretable valued [+ / – definite], as in (7), while the φ-feature requirements are satisfied via Agree with the head-noun.

(7) DP  
  D  [i+def] [1]  [iφ] [SG, MASC] [2]  Δ  
  NP  

Affixes may also mark definiteness, either as suffixes, as in (8) for Romanian, Scandinavian varieties like Norwegian, Swedish, and Faroese (Julien 2005: ch. 2), or as a prefix, as in (9), for Hebrew (Danon 2010) or Arabic (Hoyt 2008). In these structures, the Agree relation established between the definite noun and the D head suffices to satisfy the requirements of D (Cornilescu & Nicolae

---

2 The realization of definiteness by means of affixation is richly attested cross-linguistically; in the WALS map devoted to definite articles, Dryer (2005a) documents 84 languages with definiteness affixation.
2011a), as shown in (10). Agree may or may not involve movement of the affixed noun to Spec, DP; this is subject to parametric variation (see the discussion in Ledgeway 2013: section 3.3).

(8) a. \textit{carte-a} \quad \textit{Romanian}
\text{book-DEF.F.SG} \\
'\text{the book}'

b. \textit{skjort-a} \quad \textit{Norwegian}
\text{shirt-DEF.F.SG} \\
'\text{the shirt}'

c. \textit{hus-et} \quad \textit{Swedish}
\text{house-DEF.N.SG} \\
'\text{the house}'

d. \textit{kettlingur-in} \quad \textit{Faroese}
\text{kitten-DEF.M.SG.NOM} \\
'\text{the kitten}'

(9) a. \textit{ha-sepr} \quad \textit{Hebrew}
\text{DEF-book} \\
'\text{the book}'

b. \textit{'al-kitāb-u} \quad \textit{Arabic}
\text{DEF-book-NOM} \\
'\text{the book}'

(10) \\
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\textit{Agree}
Cross-linguistically,\(^3\) indefiniteness may also be marked by grammatical affixes (11) (see Dryer 2005b); [\(i\text{-def}\)] valuation as [\(i\text{-def}\)] is assumed to proceed in a similar manner.

(11) \(abül\text{-fe}kha\) Korowai 
\(\text{man-}^{\text{INDEF(SPECIFIC)}}\) ‘a (certain) man’

However, not all features may be syntactically manipulated in the same manner. In the next section, we present Kibort’s (2010) typology of grammatical features and discuss the variable status of the definiteness feature.

2.2 Features. The Status of Definiteness
Kibort (2010) puts forth a threefold typology of features and distinguishes between morphosemantic / morphological / morphosyntactic features, taking as criteria the availability of the respective feature to participate in agreement and government / assignment in a given language, and its semantic import.

*Morphosemantic features* do not participate in agreement phenomena, but have semantic effects; semantic tense features like [Past] / [Present] fall into this class. *Morphological features* do not participate in agreement phenomena and they do not have semantic implications; inflectional class features (e.g. [Conjugation 1] of Latin verbs) are purely morphological features: they do not have semantic correlates, and they do not morphosyntactically infringe upon their dependents (i.e. there is no “agreement in conjugation” or the like).

*Morphosyntactic features* are defined as features whose values are involved in either syntactic agreement or assignment / government. A few comments are in order with respect to the notion assignment / government. Kibort (2010) employs the concept *government*, also glossed as *assignment*, in the traditional GB sense: a governor is a head which assigns a certain grammatical value to a governor. This process is illustrated with Case assignment. As shown by Pesetsky & Torrego (2004, 2011) and Pesetsky (2013), Case assignment is actually resolved also by means of the Agree relation established by a nominal endowed with [\(uT\)] features against a [\(iT\)]-bearing head (a verb, a preposition, etc.). Thus, if both syntactic agreement and assignment / government are driven by Agree, then Kibort’s definition of morphosyntactic features can be simplified as follows:

(12) *Morphosyntactic features* are features whose values are involved in Agree.

---

\(^3\) The map in Dryer (2005b: 160–161) documents 31 languages in which the indefinite article is affixal, all of them outside Europe.
This perspective on features neatly corresponds to Corbett’s (2011: 448) definition of canonical morphosyntactic features:

(13) A canonical morphosyntactic feature is one that has robust formal marking and is manipulated by the rules of syntax.

The affixal status of the definite article (in Romanian, Norwegian, Swedish, Faroese, Hebrew and Arabic) (see section 3.1 below for evidence that the Romanian definite article is a suffix and not a (second position) clitic) proves important in deciding whether the definiteness feature is morphosyntactic, as the inflectional realization of a certain feature is indicative of its status, as noted by Corbett (2011: 458): “another perspective on canonical [morphosyntactic] features […] is that they be realized by canonical inflectional morphology”. Affixation represents a canonical mechanism of encoding morphosyntactic information.

From this featural perspective, we can now turn to definiteness. It has been observed that “definiteness is a particularly difficult feature since the need for it, or not, in various languages is the source of some disagreement” (Kibort & Corbett 2010: 2).

In Kibort’s (2010: 83) survey of the status of grammatical features across the world’s languages, definiteness is qualified as rarely participating in agreement; participation in assignment / government is not attested.

Danon (2010) advocates the existence of a parameter of definiteness distinguishing languages like Hebrew and Arabic (in Danon’s formulation; we may add to this list at least Romanian, Norwegian, Swedish, and Faroese⁴), in which definiteness is a morphosyntactic feature, from languages like English and French, in which there is definiteness marking, but the definiteness feature is morphosemantic. Danon characterizes morphosyntactic definiteness as being a privative / monovalent feature: thus, the alternation is between having a [+definite] feature and lacking it, not between [+definite] and [-definite]. Lacking morphosyntactic definiteness is not equivalent to being semantically indefinite; semantic definiteness is supplied by freestanding articles or other definite determiners.

The discussion above indicates that there is an important correlation between the realization of a grammatical feature and its status in the typology of grammatical features, which opens the possibility of a proper parameteriza-

---

⁴ This Romanian-Scandinavian similarity was first noticed by B.P. Hașdeu (1879 [1984]).
tion. With respect to definiteness, the affixal status of the definite marker along-
side its morphosyntactic manifestation (participation in syntactic agreement) 
qualifies definiteness as a morphosyntactic feature in a given language. This 
correlation is supported empirically: a language like Bulgarian, in which the 
definite article is a second position clitic (see Dobrovie-Sorin & Giurgea 2006 
and references therein), displays neither syntactic definiteness agreement of the 
sort found in Old Romanian, see (14) (Croitor 2008) and Modern Romanian, see 
(15) (Nicolae 2013a: ch. 3; cf. also Iordan 1956), Hebrew, see (16) (Wintner 2000) 
and Arabic, see (17) (Hoyt 2008); nor double definite constructions in which def-
initeness is marked by different elements (an affixal article and a freestanding 
article / a demonstrative determiner), found in Old Romanian, as in (18) (Stan 
2013) and in Modern Romanian, as in (19) (Nicolae 2013b), or in Scandinavian, 
as in (20) (Julien 2005).

- Definiteness agreement

(14) a. pântru sufletul răposatului jupânului Predei
   for soul.DEF late.DEF.gen master.DEF.gen Preda.gen
   ‘for the soul of the late master Preda’ (DÎ.1600: lvi)

   b. zidul cetăţii marei şi frumoasei
   wall.DEF city.DEF.gen big.DEF.gen and beautiful.DEF.gen
   ‘the wall of the big and beautiful city, (Cantacuzino, apud Croitor 2008)

(15) a. bietul bărbatul meu
   poor.DEF man.DEF my
   ‘my poor husband’

   b. muncitorul ală vrednicul
   worker.DEF that hardworking.DEF
   ‘that hardworking worker’

(16) ha-sepr ha-gado (Hebrew)
   DEF-book DEF-big
   ‘the big book’

(17) ʾal-kitāb-u l-kabīr-u (Arabic)
   DEF-book.m.sg-nom DEF-big.m.sg-nom
   ‘the big book’
Double definites

(18) **popa** **cela** greșitul\(^5\)
    priest.DEF that make-mistake(PPLE).DEF
    'that priest who made a mistake' (CPrav.1560–1562: 9\(^t\))

(19) **cartea** **cea**/aceea interesantă
    book.DEF the that interesting
    'the / that interesting book'

(20) a. **den** gul-e **skjort-a** (Norwegian)
    DEF yellow-W⁶ shirt-DEF
    'the yellow shirt'

b. **det** gul-a **hus-et** (Swedish)
    DEF yellow-W house-DEF
    'the yellow house'

c. **tann** svart-i **kettlingur-in** (Faroese)
    DEF black-W kitten-DEF
    'the black kitten'

Recent theorizing indicates that affixation (in our case, the suffixation of the definite article) is a pre-syntactic phenomenon; in other words, lexical items may bear the definite affix at Merge. This idea is well-captured by Faarlund (2009), as in (21), and is further supported by Kibort (2010), who clearly indicates that inflection (and, implicitly, affixation) is a **lexical** property (22).

(21) "inflectional forms of the word are created by morphosyntactic feature specification, rather than just added as separate morphemes"
    (Faarlund 2009: 623, building on Stump 2001 and Corbett 2006)

(22) "the 'rule' that determines which elements have to realize particular inflections is found in the **lexicon** in the form of a generalization over the relevant part of speech or a subclass within a part of speech"
    (Kibort 2010: 69)

\(^5\) Old Romanian also has the option of active past participles with subject externalization; this option is lost in Modern Romanian, being replaced by a relative clause strategy (see Dragomirescu & Nicolae 2015b).

\(^6\) "W" stands for **weak inflection** in the Scandinavian examples.
To sum up, the hypothesis that we entertain, which will be supported throughout the paper, is that the parameter of definiteness proposed by Danon (2010) translates as the ability of lexical items to be specified as [+definite] at Merge. The highly diversified patterns of definiteness agreement in Romanian will be shown to follow from this assumption in conjunction with the regular syntax of Romanian DP-internal constituents (adjectives, demonstratives and possessives).

3 On the Status and Merger of the Romanian Definite Article

3.1 The Suffixal Status of the Definite Article

A series of distributional, inflectional as well as phonological characteristics indicate that the Romanian definite article is a suffix (Lombard 1974: 2; Halpern 1992; Ortmann & Popescu 2000; Dobrovie-Sorin & Giurgea 2006; Nicolae 2012a), not a second position clitic (Renzi 1993).

3.1.1 Distribution

(i) In Modern Romanian, with the exception of the definiteness agreement constructions in (15), the definite article occurs in a constant position, i.e. on the first noun (23a) or adjective (23b) in the group. Its distribution is thus limited, being hosted only by constituents of a certain type, i.e. [+N] constituents.

A formal implementation of the suffixation of the definite article onto pre-nominal adjectives will be discussed in section 4.1 below.

(ii) In coordination, the article attaches to both conjuncts, an unexpected repetition for a clitic (cf. Zwicky & Pullum 1983; Dobrovie-Sorin & Giurgea 2006).8

---

7 In a HPSG framework, Barbu (2004: 84, fnt. 48) also suggests that definite affixation is a Lexicon property. With reference to Swedish, Hankamer & Mikkelsen (2005) also adopt the idea that definite affixation is a pre-syntactic process.

8 Consider again the contrast with the Bulgarian definite article, which is a second position clitic (Dobrovie-Sorin & Giurgea 2006): the Bulgarian article occurs only once, on the highest adjective.
(24) a. frumosul și marele oraș
beautiful.DEF and big.DEF city
‘the big and beautiful city’

b. *frumosul și mare oraș
beautiful.DEF and big.DEF city

By contrast, with stacked prenominal adjectives, the definite article surfaces on the highest one:

(24) a. frumosul mare oraș
beautiful.DEF big city
‘the big beautiful city’

b. *frumosul marele oraș
beautiful.DEF big.DEF city

(iii) The article is not always string-second in DP, since degree words may intervene between the D position and the adjectives to which the article attaches:

(25) atât de lungile drumuri
such of long.DEF roads
‘the very long roads’

(iv) In contrast to clitics, which exhibit a low degree of selection with respect to their hosts, affixes exhibit a high degree of selection with respect to their stems. The Romanian definite article attaches to nouns and φ-complete adjectives. Suffixation is blocked with cardinal numerals, which are φ-deficient

(i) a. novata i interesna kniga (Bulgarian)
    new.DEF and interesting book
b. *novata i interesnata kniga
    new.DEF and interesting.DEF book

(ii) a. *noua și interesantă carte (Romanian)
    new.DEF and interesting book
b. noua și interesanta carte
    new.DEF and interesting.DEF book
(26a), and definiteness valuation is satisfied by the merger of the freestanding definite article *cel* (‘the’) in D.

(26) a. *cincile fete*
    five.DEF girls

b. *cele cinci fete*
    DEF five girls
    ‘the five girls’

With “quantifying adjectives” (quantifiers with adjectival morphology) (Pană Dindelegan 2003; Cornilescu 2009b), both patterns of definiteness valuation are available:

(27) a. *foarte puţinii elevi de aici*
    very few.DEF schoolchildren of here

b. *cei foarte puţini elevi de aici*
    DEF very few schoolchildren of here
    ‘the very few schoolchildren here’

The property which appears to be relevant is φ-completeness. Except for certain simple numerals which may encode gender distinctions (see Stan 2010 for extensive discussion), Romanian numerals are morphologically defective: they can neither bear the definite suffix (26), nor be inflected for Case; in the Genitive and Dative, quantified phrases headed by numerals are introduced by the prepositions *a* and, respectively, *la* (28).

(28) a. *la trei copii*
    of / to the three children

In languages in which numerals are not morphologically impoverished (e.g. Modern Standard Arabic), they can bear Case inflection (29a) and be affixed by the definite article (29b) (Bardeas 2009: 37–38).

(29) a. *fataataani itnataani* (Arabic)
    girls.F.NOM two.F.NOM
    ‘two girls’
b. an-nisaaʔu at-talaʔatu
DEF-women.F.NOM DEF-three.NOM
‘the three women’

3.1.2 Inflection
(i) Allomorphy. The definite article changes its form depending on the gender of the noun’s stem and on the last phoneme. For example, masculine nouns whose final segment is the singular inflectional ending -e (30a) take the allomorph -le (30b), while singular masculines with a final consonant (31a) reactivate the ancient singular inflectional ending -u and take the allomorph –l (31b).

(30) a. frat-e
   brother-SG

b. frat-e-le
   brother-SG-DEF

(31) a. băiat
   boy

b. băiat-u-l
   boy-SG-DEF

Singular feminine nouns present an even more complex situation: the singular inflectional ending -ă (32a) is replaced by the definite allomorph -a (32b); the definite allomorph -a directly attaches (32d) to nouns whose singular inflectional ending is the full vowel -e (32c) (but not to those ending in a yod+[e] sequence like odaie [odaje] ‘small room’); by contrast, in the case of feminine nouns whose singular is marked by a silent allomorph (33e), the definite article allomorph is –ua (33f).

(32) a. fat-ă
   girl-SG

b. fat-a
   girl-DEF
c. cart-e
    book-SG

d. cart-e-a
    book-SG-DEF

e. pijama-Ø
    pyjama-SG

f. pijama-Ø-ua
    pyjama-SG-DEF

The suffixation of article onto prenominal adjectives strengthens the claim
that the article is an allomorph of the stem on which it surfaces, not a clitic
which raises to the topmost position of the DP. Singular masculines ending in
a consonant take the allomorph -l (33a); when preceded by adjectives whose
singular inflectional ending is -e (corresponding to the nouns in (30)), the de-
finite allomorph is -le (34b).

(33) a. băiat-u-l    tenac-e
    boy-SG-DEF    tenacious-SG

b. tenac-e-le    băiat
    tenacious-SG-DEF    boy
    ‘the tenacious boy’

(ii) Genitive-Dative inflection. The definite article may shares the Genitive-
Dative inflectional endings with demonstrative, indefinite and relative pro-
nouns. Compare the paradigms in (34) and (35).

(34) a. băiat-u-lui
    boy-SG-DEF.GEN/DAT

b. acest-ui
    this-GN/DAT.SG
    un-ui
    one-GN/DAT.SG
    căr-ui
    which-GN/DAT.SG

(35) a. băieţ-i-lor
    boy-PL-DEF.GEN/DAT.PL

b. acest-or
    these-GN/DAT.PL
    un-or
    one-GN/DAT.PL
    căr-or
    which-GN/DAT.PL
3.1.3 Phonological Evidence
The suffixation of the definite article has the effect of turning semi-vocalic endings into full vowels, thus altering the syllabic structure of nouns (36).

(36) a. leu [leŭ] → leul[le-ul]
    lion.SG    lion.DEF

    b. lei [leî] → lei[le-i]
    lion.PL    lion.PL.DEF

Definite affixation also has the reverse effect, that is, it may turn full vowels into semivowels (37).

(37) floare [floare] → floarea [floarêa]
    flower.SG  flower.SG.DEF

One other phonological effect of definite affixation is stress shift (38).

(38) radio → radioul
    radio.SG  radio.SG.DEF

3.1.4 Summary
The tests presented in this section indicate that the Romanian enclitic definite article is a suffix, not a second position clitic. According to Corbett’s (2011) definitions, this item qualifies as the marker of the morphosyntactic [definiteness] feature. The lexical base to which the enclitic article attaches consists of adjectives and nouns (most inflectional classes of adjectives overlap with the inflectional classes of nouns; Brăescu 2013).

3.2 The Article Starts Out as a Suffix on the Noun
There are numerous diachronic and synchronic empirical facts indicating that the Romanian definite article starts out as a suffix on the noun, and its (sometimes multiple) realization on adjectives represents a syntactic agreement phenomenon driven by Agree. Such an approach, developed in this section, allows one not only to properly account for definiteness agreement, but also to account for the situations in which definiteness agreement is not available, ultimately providing a correct characterization of the distribution of definiteness in Romanian.
3.2.1 The Low Definite Article of Old Romanian

The first piece of evidence indicating that the definite article starts out as a suffix on the noun is the “low definite article” of Old Romanian, first discussed by Cornilescu & Nicolae 2011a). This construction is attested since the 16th century texts, and is present both in original documents and in translations.

In this construction, the noun suffixed by the definite article may be preceded by constituents that in Modern Romanian count as interveners in definiteness valuation. These constituents are of several types: prenominal non-definite adjectives (39), prenominal genitives (40), and prenominal quantifiers (41); there are instances in which more than one constituent precedes the definite noun (42).

\[(39)\]
\[
a. \text{cu } [\text{DP} \text{cinstită cartea marii tale]}
\]
\[
\text{with honoured letter.DEF highness.DEF.GEN your 'with your highness' honoured letter'} \text{ (DÎ.1596: CVI)}
\]
\[
b. \text{tu tinde cumilă cătră noi [DPsvântă mâna ta]}
\]
\[
\text{you extend with mercy towards us holy hand.DEF your 'extend your holy hand towards us with mercy'} \text{ (FT.1570–1575: 3v)}
\]
\[
c. \text{că văzuiu [DPluminată fața ta]}
\]
\[
\text{that see.REFL=PS.ISG bright face.DEF your 'that I saw your bright face'} \text{ (A.1620: 58v)}
\]
\[
d. \text{s-au oploșit în [DPvicleană făgăduința lui]}
\]
\[
\text{REFL=has sheltered in sly promise.DEF his 'he took shelter in his sly promise'} \text{ (CLM.1700–1750: 186v)}
\]
\[
e. \text{iară [DPascunsă giudetul lui Dumnedzeu]}
\]
\[
\text{and hidden judgement.DEF GEN God toate gândurile omenesti le strămută}
\]
\[
\text{all thoughts.DEF human CL.ACC.3PL moves 'and God's hidden judgement troubles all human thoughts'} \text{ (CLM. 1700–1750: 242v)}
\]
\[
f. \text{să potoale Vasilie vodă [sunate zarvele]}
\]
\[
\text{subj mitigate Vasilie prince noisy quarrels.DEF 'in order for Prince Vasilie to mitigate the noisy quarrels'} \text{ (CLM. 1700–50: 234v)}
\]
(40) a. au aflat cap și începătura moșilor[...]
    have.3= found head and beginning ancestors.DEF.GEN
cia să nu se înecă [DP a toate târâle]
    so SUBJ not REFL drown GEN all countries.DEF
anii trecuți]
    years.DEF passed
‘They found the origin and the beginning of their ancestors so that the
history of all countries may not be drowned into oblivion’ (ULM.~1725:
A-I f.2)

b. Umblăm după [DP la lumii înselătoare fața]
go.ipl after GEN world.DEF.GEN deceitful face.DEF
‘We are after the world’s deceitful face’ (CVL.1672: 34°)

(41) a. deade Dumnezeu [DP zeace cuvintele sale]
gave God ten words.DEF his
‘God gave his ten commandments’ (CCat.1560: 4°)

b. arătarea [a dooa venirea lui]
    showing.DEF second coming.DEF.GEN his
‘the showing of his second coming’ (CC².1581: 536/16)

c. însă [câte trei morții] nu sunt închipuiri
    but each three deceased.DEF not are illusions
‘but the three deceased each are not illusions’ (AD.1722–1725: 131°)

(42) închinra-se vor înraintea-i [DPtoată a moșilor limba]
    bow=REFL=will before=DAT.1SG all GEN ancestors people.DEF
‘all the ancient people will bow before him’ (PH.1500–1510: 18°)

The low definite article occurs overwhelmingly in configurations in which the
definite noun is followed by a genitival phrase, a demonstrative adjective or
another DP-internal modifier. Occurrence without postnominal dependents is
rare, but not unattested (see (39f), (40b), (41c), (42)).

Prenominal adjectives may take over the definite article in Old Romanian
(43), similarly to Modern Romanian, and the multiple realization of the de-
dinite article is richly attested in Old Romanian as well (44) (Croitor 2008).

(43) pân nu s-au săvârșit [DPsfința slujbă]
    until not REFL=has ended sacred.DEF service
‘until the sacred service ended’ (CLM.1700–1750: 161°)
As such, with non-definite prenominal adjectives, the realization of the suffixal definite article onto the post-adjectival noun is syntactically required for economy reasons: in Old as well as in Modern Romanian, post-nominal inflectional genitival phrases need not be introduced by the genitival marker al if they are strictly adjacent to the definite article (affixed onto a noun or an adjective); similarly, post-nominal demonstratives are also licensed in the presence of the definite article to their left. Thus, in the phrases in (40), it might be that prenominal adjectives undergo definiteness agreement with the noun and satisfy [idef_] on D via Local Agree, but the definite article is realized onto the lower noun for syntactic reasons.

However, a larger picture, which takes into consideration quantifiers and prenominal genitives points to the fact that in Old Romanian it is indeed possible to value definiteness across an intervening phrasal constituent which may itself value definiteness (the prenominal genitive, the cardinal and ordinal numeral) or take over the definite suffix (the prenominal adjective).

Consider the DP in (41a) and its derivation given in (45): definiteness valuation takes place via Long Distance Agree, across the intervening quantifier in D. Definiteness agreement of the quantifier and the lower realization of the definite suffix is not an option, as Romanian quantifiers are incompatible with the definite suffix or with other inflectional markers (see example (26) and the discussion surrounding it).

(41) a. zece cuvinte sale
ten words.DEF his

(45) DP
    D
    [i-def] [1]
    CardP QP
    Q' NP
    [m-def] [2]
    zece cuvinte

Agree
Given such facts, all the examples in (39)–(42) above, including those with a non-definite prenominal adjective, may be interpreted as displaying Long Distance Agree: a phrase situated between the probe in D (the [\texttt{idf}_\_] feature of D) and the goal lower down in the structure (the [\texttt{u-def}] feature of the noun) does not give rise to defective intervention effects. Cross-linguistically, there are other cases of definiteness agreement across an intervening phrase; consider (46) from Icelandic, which features the same Long Distance Agree option.

(46) \textit{gamli maður-inn}  
old man.\textsc{def}  
\textquoteleft the old man\textquoteright (from Stroh-Wollin 2009: 4)

The conclusion that Agree could operate long distance in Old Romanian is further supported by the existence of Long Distance Movement in Old Romanian (Cornilescu & Nicolae 2011a). Long Distance Movement is shown by the existence of constructions in which specifiers can be crossed over by phrasal constituents. The examples in (47) below feature long phrasal demonstratives preceded by complex phrasal constituents; (48) illustrates prenominal determiner genitives (see Cornilescu & Nicolae 2011c on the determiner genitive of Old Romanian) crossed-over by complex adjectival phrases; in (49), an adjectival suffixed by the definite article by-passes a cardinal numeral and reaches Spec, DP. Note also that the demonstrative adjective in (47a) and the prenominal genitives in (48) are the sole bearers of definiteness in the respective DPs; they too value definiteness by Long Distance Agree.

(47) a. \textit{arătându-i [DP mare treabă aceasta]}  
showing=him.DAT big affair this  
\textquoteleft showing him this big affair\textquoteright (CLM.1700–1750: 166\textsuperscript{v})

b. \textit{pă [DP ticălosul pământu aceasta] să vină}  
DOM wretched.\textsc{def} earth this SĂ come.\textsc{subj}  
\textquoteleft that he should come on this wretched earth\textquoteright (Greceanu.1711: 99)

c. \textit{până la domniia lui aceasta}  
until reign.\textsc{def} his this  
\textquoteleft until this reign of his\textquoteright (CLM.17500–1750: 203\textsuperscript{v})
(48) a. \([DPfrumos \ mirostoare \ a \ dragostei \ flori] \ a \ răsări\)
   \(\text{sweetly smelling} \ \text{gen love.def.gen} \ \text{flower} \ \text{fut} \ \text{spring}\)
   ‘the sweet-smelling flower of love will spring’ (Cantemir.1705:11:4)

b. \(\text{pre} \ [DPmai mare \ a \ vicleşugului \ căptușală]_i\)
   \(\text{pe} \ \text{more big} \ \text{gen guile.def.gen} \ \text{hiding}\)
   \(\text{i.t.acc} \ \text{made.imperf.3sg}\)
   ‘he resorted to a deeper hiding of his guile’ (= ‘he hid his guile deeper’)
   (Cantemir.1705:307)

(49) cântecele \([DPsfintilor \ trei \ feciori]\)
   \(\text{songs.def} \ \text{sacred.def.gen} \ \text{three} \ \text{sons}\)
   ‘the song of the three sacred sons’ (CP1,1577:307)

If internal merge is preceded by Agree (Chomsky 2000), then the examples
(47)–(49) featuring movement across a phrasal specifier further testify to the
availability of Long Distance Agree in the Old Romanian DP.

In conclusion, the low definite article of Romanian indicates that the de-
finite article starts out as a suffix on the noun. The Long Distance Agree option
of Old Romanian allows the definite article to value the \([\text{idef}_-]\) feature of D
across a potential intervener, and to remain on the noun when it is syntacti-
cally required to license post-nominal genitives, demonstratives or other mod-
ifiers (more rarely, it may remain on the noun even without being syntactically
required to do so).

The overall diachronic change from Old to Modern Romanian is the loss of
the Long Distance Agree option in DPs. Thus, the low definite article of Old
Romanian (examples (39)–(42)) has been totally eliminated; relics may be
found in frozen phrases characteristic of the ecclesiastical style. The construc-
tion in (39), which features a non-definite adjective preceding a definite noun,
has been replaced by structures in which the definite article surfaces on the
prenominal adjective of the type illustrated in (43). Low definite article struc-
tures featuring a prenominal quanti-
def
   (Nicolae 2013a: ch. 3); the Modern Romanian examples in (50a) and (50b) cor-
respond to the Old Romanian DPs in (41a) and (41b).

(50) a. cele zece cuvinte ale sale
   \(\text{the ten words} \ \text{gen} \ \text{his}\)
   ‘his ten words’
b. cea de-a doua venire a lui
   the second coming GEN his
   ‘his second coming’

The loss of this option also affected the constructions based on Long Distance Movement. Phrasal movement across demonstratives of the type exemplified in (47) is no longer permitted (see (51b), (51b’)), except for the restricted case of affective adjectives which authorize multiple definiteness realization in Modern Romanian (discussed in section 4.3 below); the standard option of Modern Romanian is head-movement of definite nouns across the phrasal demonstrative (51a) (Cornilescu 2005).

\[(51)\]
\[
a. \text{treaba aceasta mare}
   \text{affair.DEF this big}
   ‘this big affair’
\]
\[
b. \ast[\text{treaba mare}]\text{ aceasta b’.}\ast[\text{marea treabă}]\text{ asta}
   \text{affair.DEF big this big.DEF affair this}
\]

Structures of the type (48) and (49) have been completely lost in Modern Romanian.

3.2.2 Morphologically Defective Adjectives and Definiteness Realization
Let us now turn to the Modern Romanian data indicating that the definite article merges low, as a suffix on the noun.

Romanian possesses a restricted class of morphologically defective (i.e. φ-defective) adjectives with superlative meaning and evaluative semantics which cannot take over the definite suffix: *ditamai, ditai, cogeamite, coscogeamite ‘huge, very big’. Despite being obligatorily prenominal, these adjectives cannot be inflected for definiteness (52b) like regular, non-defective adjectives (52a) and trigger definiteness realization on the post-adjectival head noun (52c). However, they do not block definiteness valuation, and thus contrast with cardinal numerals, which count as interveners in definiteness valuation by a definite noun (53a) and call for the insertion of the freestanding definite article cel ‘the’ (53b).

\[(52)\]
\[
a. \text{frumoasele}\quad (\phi: F.PL +def) \quad \text{case (F.PL)}
   \text{beautiful.DEF houses}
   ‘the beautiful houses’
\]
b. *cogeamitele (φ: −, *def) case (f.pl)
very-big.def houses

c. cogeamite (φ: −) casele (f.pl, +def)
very-big ’the very big houses’ houses.def

(53) a. *două casele
two houses

b. cele două case
the two houses
’the two houses’

Definiteness realization on the lower noun with defective adjectives also constitutes evidence that the definite article merges as an affix on the noun.

3.3  Summary
In this section, we brought evidence for two distinct but related claims: (i) the Romanian definite article is part of the inflection of Romanian nominals; in other words, Romanian nominals may be lexically specified for definiteness; (ii) of the two possible candidates that may be suffixed by the definite article at Merge, i.e. nouns and adjectives, it appears that nouns enter the derivation in this manner, and the realization of the definite article on adjectives represents a syntactic agreement phenomenon.

4  Definiteness: Spell Out and Agreement

The results of the previous section allow us to investigate, in this section, how definiteness is substantiated in Old and Modern Romanian DPs. In particular, the conclusion that definiteness is involved in syntactic agreement phenomena driven by the Agree is taken as an indication that definiteness is a morphosyntactic feature in Romanian—which is the line of analysis we pursue.

4.1  Spelling Out Definiteness on Prenominal Adjectives
As already mentioned, the definite article may surface on prenominal adjectives, in both Old (54a) and Modern Romanian (54b).
In what follows, we illustrate definiteness marking on prenominal adjectives with Modern Romanian examples; the distributional features discussed below are characteristic of Old Romanian as well.

Definiteness marking on prenominal adjectives represents a phenomenon of agreement in definiteness. The position of the adjectival head in the DP is highly relevant: not all configurations with adjectival modification allow definiteness agreement. Actually, only attributive (qualifying or intensional) prenominal adjectives can undergo definiteness agreement (55). In the Modern Romanian DP, the definite article generally surfaces only once, on the highest [+N] constituent, see (55b–c); DP-internal adverbials (i.e. [-N] categories) can precede the constituent with the enclitic definite article and do not trigger (defective) intervention effects, see (55a). Note that intensional adjectives (like former, poor, etc.) are exclusively prenominal, see (55d, e).

(55) a. **(foarte) frumosul** trandafir
   very beautiful.REFL rose
   'the very beautiful rose'

b. *frumos trandafirul
   beautiful rose.DEF

c. *frumosul trandafirul
   beautiful.DEF rose.DEF

9 Certain prenominal adjectives like sărac may also be post-nominal, but the reading is different; e.g., post-nominal sărac 'impecunious' versus prenominal evaluative sărac 'poor, pitiable'; evaluatives are exclusively prenominal, e.g. fost ('former'), viitor ('future') or biet ('pitiable').
d. fostul șef
   former.DEF  boss
   'the former boss'

e. *șeful fost
   boss.DEF  former

Post-nominal adjectives, be they qualifying (56a) or relative (56c), are excluded from definiteness agreement, see (56b, d).\textsuperscript{10}

(56) a. trandafirul frumos
   rose.DEF  beautiful
   'the beautiful rose'

b. *trandafirul frumosul
   rose.DEF  beautiful.DEF

c. comedie  americană
   comedy.DEF  American
   'the American comedy'

d. *comedia americana
   comedy.DEF  American.DEF

Predicative adjectives do not undergo definiteness agreement either (57):

(57) a. Trandafirul este frumos.
   rose.DEF  is  beautiful
   'The rose is beautiful'

b. *Trandafirul este frumosul.
   rose.DEF  is  beautiful.DEF

c. *Trandafir este frumosul.
   rose  is  beautiful.DEF

\textsuperscript{10} The class of relative adjectives includes thematic (e.g. \textit{British} victory) and classifying (e.g. \textit{romantic} poem) adjective (see Cornilescu & Nicolae 2011b for details).
Focusing on prenominal adjectives, we point out that there is a relevant difference between coordination and stacking (see also Scott 2002): with stacked prenominal adjectives, the article surfaces only once, on the highest adjective, as in (58a) versus (58b) and (58c), whereas, with coordinated adjectives, the article surfaces on both conjuncts (59).

(58) a. marele bătrân continent, Europa
   big.REF old.REF continent Europe
   'the big old continent, Europe'

   b. *marele bătrânu continent, Europa
      big.REF old.REF continent Europe

   c. *mare bătrânu continent, Europa
      big old.REF continent Europe

(59) a. lungă și călduroasa vară
   long.REF and warm.REF summer.REF
   'the long and warm summer'

   b. *lungă și călduroasă vară
      long.REF and warm summer.REF

   c. *lungă și călduroasa vară
      long and warm.REF summer.REF

The relevance of the disparity between stacking and coordination proves relevant, as stacking involves hierarchical structure (Scott 2002), whereas coordination is essentially a phenomenon of symmetry (Munn 1993).

In order to derive definiteness agreement, we assume that definiteness is among the agreement features of the adjective. This affirmation finds support first and foremost in the inflectional behaviour of adjectives (see Brăescu 2013: 410–414). Modern Romanian possesses four inflectional classes of adjectives: four-form adjectives, three-form adjectives, two-form adjectives, invariable adjectives. All these adjecival inflectional classes dissolve into the inflectional classes of the noun, as also remarked by Brăescu (2013: 410): “[a]djectives share a series of inflectional affixes with nouns, and the variation of the stem generally displays morpho-phonological alternations common to both classes”. The inflectional relation between adjectives and nouns is actually a set-superset
relation: there is no adjectival inflexion which is not present in the noun set of inflexions, but not vice versa. On morphological grounds, the assumption that definiteness is among the agreement features of the adjective is thus well supported. The definiteness feature on adjectival heads will be unvalued uninterpretable [definite] and the feature set contains the unvalued uninterpretable [φ] and [definiteness].

According to Cinque (2010), prenominal adjectives merge as specifiers of functional projections. Consider example (55a), repeated here, whose internal structure is given in (60) (only the relevant features are present in the tree). The noun enters the derivation with the suffixed definite article.

(55) a. frumosul trandafir
    beautiful.DEF rose
    'the beautiful rose'

(60) 

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{frumos} \\
\text{beautiful} \\
\end{array}
\quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{trandafir} \\
\text{rose.DEF} \\
\end{array}
\]

In this configuration, the adjective c-commands the noun and takes over the values of the matching features on the noun. In its turn, the adjectival head equipped with matching features is probed by the features on the D-head: Agree between the higher c-commanding D-head and the lower c-commanded adjective ensures that the features of D get valued, and the uninterpretable features on the adjective and the noun get deleted, so the derivation converges.

---

11 As also remarked by Brăescu (2013: 410): “there also exist dissimilarities between the inflection of the noun and that of the adjective: some inflectional endings [of nouns] (-uri for plural, -o for vocative) never occur with adjectives.”
The derivation of stacked adjectives featuring the definite article on the DP-initial adjective (62a) is similar (62b) (only the final step of the derivation is shown): successive Agree relations ensure that the [+definite] specification is transmitted upwards from the definite noun to the highest prenominal adjective; Agree between D and the highest prenominal adjective ensures well-formedness.

(62) a. marele bătrân continent, Europa
    big.DEF old continent Europe
    ‘the big old continent, Europe’

b. [\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{DP} \\
& D \quad [i+\text{def}] [2] \\
& \quad [\pi\varphi] [1] \\
& \quad \text{AP} \\
& \quad [\pi\varphi] [1] \\
& \quad [\pi+\text{def}] [2] \\
& \quad \text{frumosul} \\
& \quad \triangle \\
& \quad \text{trandafir} \\
& \quad \text{Agree} \\
& \quad \text{Agree} \\
& \quad \text{Agree} \\
& \text{NP} \\
& \quad [i\varphi] [1] \\
& \quad [\pi+\text{def}] [2] \\
& \text{marele} \\
& \text{bătrân} \\
& \text{continent}
\end{align*}
\]}
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This analysis makes important predictions that are supported by our data:

(i) Predicative postcopular adjectives do not display definiteness agreement. If we agree that copular sentences involve a small clause (den Dikken 2006 and references therein) in which the specifier is occupied by a DP subject and the complement position is occupied by the predicative adjective, then at no point in the derivation, prior to the valuation of D features, does the predicative adjective c-command the noun. Therefore, Agree between the adjective and the noun fails, and definiteness agreement does not take place. This holds for both Modern (Dragomirescu 2013) and Old Romanian (Guruianu 2005: 31–35; Carabulea 2007; Frâncu 2009: 162–165; Dragomirescu mss. for the 16th–18th centuries; Zahui 2012: 303–305 for the 19th century).

(ii) It is important to distinguish between the presence of the definite article and the valuation of definiteness. While definiteness is phonologically realized only once, on the highest [+N] constituent of the phrase, it is present on all [+N] heads in the extended projection of the noun. Evidence for the presence of the definiteness feature on all [+N] heads is given by the existence of multiple realization of the definite article, both in Old Romanian (section 4.2) and in Modern Romanian (section 4.3).

4.2 Multiple Definiteness Marking in Old Romanian

So far, the analysis accounts for the relatively high frequency of multiple definite constructions in Old Romanian, and for the distribution of multiple definites (Croitor 2008; Stan 2013): the multiple marking of definiteness takes place in structures with prenominal adjectives, i.e. in A + N structures (63a,b) or in stacked adjectival A + A + N structures (63c); the structures of the form N + A in which both the N and the A bear the article are very rare (attested only with DPs in the Genitive Case) (64).

(63) a. și naintea [sfințului popei] and before saint.def.gen pope.def.gen
    ‘and before the saint pope’ (DÎ.1600: /1.9is9//.9is9/P.9is9/V.9is9/I.9is9 pope.//.9is9/P.9is9/V.9is9/I.9is9)

b. Țăcan la [cumplita domniia lui Aaron vodă] until at terrible.def reign.def gen Aaron prince
    ‘until Prince’s Aaron terrible reign’ (CLM.1700–1750: 159²)

c. moaștiile a [sfinți prepodobnei Paraschevei] relics.def gen saint.def beautifully-adorned.def Parascheva.gen
    ‘the relics of the holy beautifully-adorned Parascheva’ (CLM.1700–1750: 233²)
The fact that the multiple realization of the definite article occurs almost exclusively with prenominal adjectives verifies the mechanism proposed above to derive the realization of the definite article in Modern Romanian: the definiteness feature percolates upwards via Agree from the lower definite noun to the higher c-commanding adjectives, being thus present as an agreement feature on all prenominal [+N] heads. Rare examples like in (64), where multiple definiteness marking occurs with post-nominal adjectives, are not problematic: if DP-internal adjectives merge as specifiers of prenominal FPs (Cinque 2010), then the structures featuring post-nominal adjectives are derived via movement of the definite noun across the adjective. Thus, before the completion of the DP-phase and the valuation of definiteness, the adjective and the noun are in a c-command configuration, ensuring definiteness agreement.

The contrast between Old and Modern Romanian lies in the spell out of the definite article. In Old Romanian, the article may be phonologically realized on all these heads, while in Modern Romanian spell out is restricted to the DP-initial adjectives. This is presumably related to the diachronic shift form analyticity to syntheticity present throughout the history of Romance and Romanian, characterized in the nominal domain by a tendency towards the single marking of the grammatical categories on the first element of the DP (Repina 1971; Stan 2008).12

The multiple spell out of the definite article briefly discussed here was present throughout the entire period of Old Romanian (Croitor 2008: 213). Certain relics survive at the beginning of the 19th century (Nicolae 2012b: 117).

4.3  **Multiple Definiteness Spell Out in Modern Romanian**

In this section, we show that the multiple spell out of the definite article is still available in some contexts in Modern Romanian. This is highly significant, as it validates the idea that definiteness agreement targets all the prenominal [+N] heads in the extended projection of the DP.

---

12 In the verbal domain, the change from synthetcity to analyticity is most prominently visible in the replacement of the Latin synthetic verb forms by the modern Romance analytic verb forms; in the adjectival domain, the change from synthetic to analytic has affected the marking of intensity, with the synthetic markers being replaced by analytic marker (see Ledgeway 2012: ch. 2 for details).
The multiple spell out of the definite article in Modern Romanian is triggered by post-nominal demonstratives and by post-nominal genitives or possessive adjectives. The examples below illustrate two different patterns: the first pattern, in (65), features a definite A + a definite N + a post-nominal demonstrative / possessive adjective or genitive DP; the second pattern, in (66), illustrates a definite N + a post-nominal demonstrative + a definite A.

(65) a. săracul băiatul ăla
   pitiable.DEF boy.DEF that
   'that pitiable boy'

   b. bietul bărbatul meu / ei / Mariei
      poor.DEF man.DEF my her(GEN) Mariei.GEN
      'my poor husband'

(66) a. muncitorul ăla vrednicul
      worker.DEF that hardworking.DEF
      'that hardworking worker'

   b. fata asta mica
      girl.DEF this little.DEF
      'this little girl'

In the remainder of this section, we focus on the post-nominal demonstrative constructions, and keep in mind that the same analysis can be extended to the possessive adjective / genitive DP pattern, which is derivationally similar (modulo the different projection hosting the genitive / possessive adjective).

The relevant interpretative characteristic of both patterns in (65a), (66) is that they are pragmatically marked: in both cases, the nominal phrase expresses the speaker’s evaluation. Intensive research on the Romanian demonstratives has shown that, from a functional perspective (Tasmowski 1990; Manoliu 2000; Cornilescu 2005; Vasilescu 2009), the post-nominal demonstrative is an emphatic element (possibly endowed with a specificity feature), and thus behaves like a focus. The presence of evaluative adjectives in these structures is thus not surprising.

As shown by previous research (Cornilescu 1992; Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Giusti 1998; Cornilescu 2005), the derivation of the simple post-nominal demonstrative construction (67) standardly relies on head-movement of the definite noun across the demonstrative in the case of Romanian.
Without going into details regarding the derivation of the two definiteness agreement patterns presented above, it follows from structure (67b) that both are derived by movement across the demonstrative. The essential point is that only adjectives that are or may be prenominal (intensional and qualifying adjectives) are allowed to occur in these constructions.

The first pattern (definite A + definite N + post-nominal demonstrative) in (65a) allows only intensional, evaluative adjectives which are restricted to the prenominal position (biet 'piteous', pretins 'alleged'), see (68), or which display intensional, evaluative meanings only in prenominal position (sărac 'piteous' versus 'poor, penniless, impecunious'), as in (69).

\[(67) \ a. \ muncitorul \ acesta \ \text{worker.def} \ this \ 'this worker'
\]

\[(68) \ a. \ bietul \ băiat \ \text{piteous.def} \ boy \ 'the pitiable boy'
\]

\[b. \ *băiatul \ biet \ \text{boy.def} \ piteous\]
(69) a. săracul băiat  
    piteous.DEF boy  
    ‘the piteous boy’  

b. băiatul sărac  
    boy.DEF penniless  
    ‘the penniless/impecunious boy’

The derivation of the first multiple definiteness pattern in (65a) can be accounted for as follows: the prenominal adjective c-commands the noun and agrees with it, and thus takes over the morphosyntactic specification for definiteness. Subsequently, there is phrasal movement of the [definite A + definite N] sequence across the demonstrative, yielding the word order A > N > Dem. The obligatory presence of the definite article on both constituents is due to economy considerations (similar to those responsible for the realization of the low definite article in Old Romanian; see section 3.2. above): on the one hand, post-nominal demonstratives are licensed only in the presence of the definite article to their left (thus, the definite article has to surface on the noun in order to license the post-nominal demonstrative); on the other hand, the locality condition for Agree forces the article to surface on the prenominal adjective as well, in order to satisfy featural requirements on D (Local Agree).

The second pattern, in (66), with the sequence definite N + post-nominal demonstrative + definite A) allows for typical qualifying adjectives which may be placed both prenominally (70b) and post-nominally (70a), with no differences in meaning; however, prenominal adjectives encode speaker evaluation.

(70) a. muncitorul vrednic  
    worker.DEF hardworking  

b. vrednicul muncitor  
    hardworking.DEF worker  
    ‘the hardworking worker’

In prenominal position, as in (70b), these adjectives take over the definite article, c-commanding the noun. The prenominal configuration (71b) feeds the multiple definiteness configuration in (66). As in the simple [definite noun + demonstrative] construction in (67), there is head movement of the definite noun across the definite adjective and across the demonstrative, yielding the order [definite N > Dem > definite A]. The mechanics of this derivation is more
complex: in order for the definite noun to crossover the adjective placed in Spec, FP, an equidistant derivation in the sense of Lasnik (2009) has to apply. The noun undergoes movement to the F0 head (in whose Specifier we find the definite adjective). At this point, the adjective and the noun are in the same minimal domain and equidistant from the target of movement, since head movement extends the domain of a head (Chomsky 1995; Roberts 2011). A natural question at this point is why the reverse order, [definite A > Dem > definite N], is not possible (as in (71)). In other words, what makes the definite noun a better candidate for movement than the definite adjective, since they are both equidistant to the target?

(71) *vrednicul ală muncitorul
    hardworking.DEF that worker.DEF

The solution adopted by Cornilescu (2005) in the derivation of the post-nominal demonstrative construction can be successfully extended to the construction analyzed here as well. For example, in (72), the two candidates for movement have a different structural status: the noun is a head, while the demonstrative is phrasal (for evidence that post-nominal demonstratives are phrasal, while prenominal demonstratives are heads, see Cornilescu 2005; Nicolae 2013c). The preference for head movement (N0) over phrasal movement (AP movement in this case) follows from an economy principle requiring the piping of only as much material as is needed for convergence (Pied Pipe Less Weight, Stateva 2002; or Attract / Move Smallest, Akiyama 2004).

(72) muncitorul ăla vrednic
    worker.DEF that hardworking.DEF
    ‘that hardworking worker’

Mention should also be made of the fact that the post-nominal adjective structure in (70a) feeds a construction without definiteness agreement (this is because post-nominal adjectives do not c-command the noun, so there is no agreement).

More interestingly, the two minimally different structures correlate with the expected interpretative contrast: while the structure with multiple

---

13 As in Lasnik (2009): “If α, β are in the same minimal domain, they are equidistant from γ”.

14 Chomsky (1995) formulates this idea with respect to verbal head movement.
definiteness marking in (66a) expresses focus and speaker evaluation, the structure in which the definite suffix is expressed once, as in (72), expresses only focus. This interpretative contrast validates our assumptions with respect to which structure lies at the basis of the post-nominal demonstrative patterns: structure (70a), with a post-nominal adjective which does not express speaker evaluation, constitutes the basis for (72) (in which the definite suffix is realized only once), while the basis for (66a) is (70b), a structure in which the adjective expresses speaker evaluation.

To conclude, the multiple spell out of the definite article is triggered by the presence of the post-nominal demonstrative in the structure, which are licit only in the presence of the definite article to their left. Compare the examples in (73).

(73) a. muncitorul acesta
    worker.DEF this
    'this worker'

b. *muncitor acesta
    worker.DEF this

The same reasoning applies to constructions of type in (65b), where the definite article surfaces both on the prenominal adjective and on the post-adjectival noun when the A + N sequence is followed by a possessive adjective. It is well known that, in Romanian, possessive adjectives or genitival DPs may be introduced directly only in the presence of the definite article to their left (74a); in the case of non-adjacency (resulting either from the fact that the selecting head is indefinite (74b) or from the presence of an intervening constituent (74c)), the insertion of the genitival marker al is required.

(74) a. caietul fetei / meu
    notebook.DEF girl.DEF.GEN my
    'the girl's / my notebook'

b. un caiet al fetei / al meu
    a notebook GEN girl.DEF.GEN GEN my
    'a notebook of the girl / of mine'

b'. *un caiet fetei / meu
    a notebook girl.DEF.GEN my
4.4 Summary

In this section, we have discussed the following phenomena: definiteness marking on DP-internal prenominal adjectives and multiple definiteness marking in Old and Modern Romanian. We have shown that these data can be easily accommodated by the analysis put forth in the previous section: the definite article starts low, as a suffix on the noun, and its propensity towards the left edge of the DP is syntactically driven by Agree.

\[ c. \text{cai} \text{etul} \quad \text{de matematică} \quad \text{al fetei} \quad / \text{al meu} \]

notebook.DEF of mathematics GEN girl.DEF.GEN GEN my
‘the girl’s / my mathematics notebook’

\[ c'. *\text{cai} \text{etul} \quad \text{de matematică} \quad \text{fetei} \quad / \text{meu} \]

notebook.DEF of mathematics girl.DEF.GEN my

All these facts amount to the conclusion that the multiple spell out of the definite article in the post-nominal demonstrative construction and in the possessive adjective / genitival DP construction is due to economy considerations: in the former construction, the lower definite article licenses the post-nominal demonstrative, while in the latter, it permits the direct insertion of the possessive adjective / genitive DP, without the mediation of the genitival marker AL. Constraints of the similar type also license the low definite article of Old Romanian (section 3.2.1 above): recall that the spell out of the definite article on a lower noun occurs overwhelmingly in the presence of post-nominal genitive / possessive or of a post-nominal demonstrative (see the statistics in Cornilcescu & Nicolae 2011a: 208). At the same time, the strengthening of the locality conditions on the application of Agree requires that the definite article be spelled out on the first [+N] constituent of the DP whenever possible.\(^{15}\) The multiple marking of the definite article is, of course, possible due to its presence on all the [+N] constituents of the DP which c-command the noun.

\(^{15}\) Violations of this condition occur in two situations, discussed in the previous sections: (i) with prenominal quantifiers, which block definiteness valuation and call for the insertion of the freestanding article cel (see (26) in section 3.2.1); (ii) with φ-defective adjectives, which cannot inflectionally realize the definite article, but do not block definiteness valuation (see (52) in section 3.2.2).
In this paper, we argued for the following analysis:

(i) The definite article is a suffix in Romanian; nouns are lexically equipped with the definite suffix at Merge. From this perspective, the traditional idea that there exists a “definite declension” in Romanian (see Rizescu 1966: 85–88) is justified.

(ii) The realization of the definite article on prenominal adjectives, a pattern characteristic for both Old and Modern Romanian, represents a syntactic agreement phenomenon, driven by Agree. The fact that definiteness is manipulated by the basic rules of syntax indicates that it is a morphosyntactic feature in the sense of Kibort (2010), Danon (2010), Corbett (2011, 2012).

(iii) The multiple spell out of the definite article signals that, despite the typical presence of the article on the first [+N] constituent of the DP, the article is computed on all the [+N] heads in the extended projection of the noun. A second, lower spell out of the definite article is required syntactically, to introduce post-nominal demonstratives and genitive DPs / possessive adjectives without the mediation of the genitival marker. From this perspective, the definite article is involved in “licensing”: Romanian thus helps complete Kibort’s (2010) characterization of definiteness as a morphosyntactic feature, as it illustrates an option (participation in government / licensing) which, according to Kibort (2010: 83), is not attested.16

The morphosyntactic status of definiteness allows one to properly parameterize this feature. The view on parameterization adopted here is the microparametric one (see footnote 2); the source of parametric variation is the Borer-Chomsky Conjecture:

(75) The Borer–Chomsky Conjecture (Baker 2008: 353)

All parameters of variation are attributable to differences in the features of particular items (e.g. the functional heads) in the lexicon.

Thus, definiteness is a lexical property of nominals, present as a private morphosyntactic feature in the lexical make up of Romanian nominals (and also, Hebrew, Arabic, Norwegian, Swedish, etc.). All the languages specified for this

---

16 Recall that the table in Kibort (2010: 83) qualifies definiteness as rarely participating in agreement; the participation of definiteness in government/licensing is described as not attested.
parameter present a cluster of properties: definiteness agreement, double definite constructions, multiple definiteness spell out.

(iv) The main diachronic change from Old to Modern Romanian in the nominal domain is the restriction of Agree, from Long Distance Agree to Local Agree. This change has led to the disappearance of the low definite article of Old Romanian (see section 3.2.1 above) and to the general condition that determiners occupy the DP-initial position. Another consequence of this change is the emergence of the freestanding article cel in contexts in which θ-defective quantifiers act as defective interveners and block definiteness valuation (see the discussion surrounding example (50)). Yet another consequence is the disappearance of the structures based on Long Distance Movement (illustrated in (47)–(49)): if Move is preceded by Agree (Chomsky 2000), then the disappearance of Long Distance Movement is predicted by the disappearance of Long Distance Agree.
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