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If we abstract for a moment from the additional possibility for the noun or an adjective to appear, with a suffixal definite determiner, in DP-initial position (see below), the word order within the Romanian DP looks like that found in other Romance languages, with the N optionally preceding or following certain classes of adjectives, and obligatorily preceding or following certain other classes (cf. Coene 1994: 10ff, 1999: 136; Dimitrova-Vulchanova and Giusti 1998: 335ff; Giusti 2002: fn14). This appears most clearly with indefinite DPs.

As in Italian (and other Romance languages), the N can either precede or follow, among others, ‘value’ ((1)a-b), ‘size’ ((2)a-b), and ‘age’ adjectives ((3)a-b):

(1) a) o bună interpretare
   a good interpretation
   b) o interpretare bună

(2) a) o enormă casă
    an enormous house
    b) o casă enormă

(3) a) un modern oraș
    a modern city
    b) un oraș modern.

As in Italian, and other Romance languages, the N instead necessarily precedes ‘classificatory’ adjectives ((4)a-b), ‘nationality/provenance’ adjectives ((5)a-b), ‘color’ adjectives ((6)a-b), and ‘shape’ adjectives ((7)a-b), among others (cf. Sandfeld et Olsen 1960: 99ff):

(4) a) un inginer agricol
    an engineer agricultural
    b) *un agricol inginer

---

*I thank Oana Ciucvara, Alexandra Comilascu, Carmen Dobrovie-Sorin, Alexander Grosu, Dumiţu Irimia, and Monica Ungureanu for sharing with me their native speaker intuitions, and for their comments on an earlier draft of this article. I am also indebted to Giuliana Giusti for her comments.

1 Romance languages actually show some degree of variation as to the classes of adjectives that obligatorily precede or follow the N. Walloon requires most classes to precede the N, and Sardinian to follow it. Dumitrescu and Saltarelli (1998: 186) report that in the Marsian dialects of Central Italy “practically no adjective precedes the noun”. We abstract from this type of variation here (referring, for discussion, and references, to Bernstein 1991, and Cinque 1994).

2 Cf. Dobrovie-Sorin (1987: 141). The only case, in Romanian (as well as in other Romance languages), where a color adjective can precede the N (at a higher stylistic level) is when it is a defining characteristic of the referent (i.e., is used non-restrictively): albastrul cer (Rom.), l’azzurro cielo (It.) ‘the blue sky’; rozul sâinge (Rom.), il rosso sangue (It.) ‘the red blood’ (Coene 1994: 20). The same appears to be true for ‘shape’ adjectives. See Cinque (2003) for discussion.
Finally (again as in Italian and other Romance languages) the N obligatorily follows ‘evaluative’ adjectives such as biet ‘pitiable’ ((8)a-b), ‘temporal’ adjectives such as fost ‘former’ ((9)a-b), and ‘ordinal’ adjectives like prim ‘first’ ((10)a-b), among others (cf. Sandfeld et Olsen 1960: 109; Lombard 1974: 99; Cornilesuc 1992: 203; Giusti 1991, 1993: 124; Coene 1994: 10f; Dumitrescu and Saltarelli 1998: 186f)3:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5) a)</td>
<td>un prieten italian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a friend Italian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>*un italian prieten</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) a)</td>
<td>o rochie roșie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a dress red</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>*o roșie rochie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) a)</td>
<td>o masă rotundă</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a table round</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>*o rotundă masă.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The same holds for definite DPs in all cases where the additional option of putting the N in initial position with a suffixed definite determiner is not exploited. See (11) through (20), which parallel (1) through (10):

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(11) a)</td>
<td>aceștia/cei trei frumoși copii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>these/the three beautiful children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>aceștia/cei trei copii frumoși</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) a)</td>
<td>această enormă casă</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>this enormous house</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>această casă enormă</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) a)</td>
<td>acel modern oraș</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that modern city</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>acel oraș modern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 With ambiguous adjectives like sârac ‘pitiable’ or ‘poor’, simplă ‘mere’ or ‘simple’ singură ‘only’ or ‘alone’, etc., the prenominal position is normally compatible with only one of the two readings (‘pitiable’, ‘mere’, ‘only’), and the postnominal one only with the other reading (Sandfeld et Olsen 1960: 110; Cornilesuc 1992: 203). Monica Ungureanu, however, pointed out to me that for her the reading found postonominally is also available prenominally if the adjective is emphasized (which recalls Giusti’s (1996, sect. 2) analysis of similar facts in Albanian in terms of movement of the AP to the Specifier of a DP-internal FocusP). Cf. also Caciocvara (2003).
A Phrasal Movement Analysis of the Romanian DP

(14) a) acest inginer agricol
    this engineer agricultural
    * acest agricol inginer

(15) a) acel prieten italian
    that friend Italian
    * acel italian prieten

(16) a) acea rochie roșie
    that dress red
    * acea roșie rochie

(17) a) acea masă rotundă
    this table round
    * acea rotundă masă

(18) a) astă biată copilă
    this poor child (fem.)
    * astă copilă biată

(19) a) cei doi foști prieteni
    the two former friend
    * cei doi prieteni foști

(20) a) acel prim succes
    that first success
    * acel succes prim.

This distribution could be taken to follow from the raising of the N to a head position intermediate between N and D, across APs found in the Spec of distinct functional projections (cf. Cinque 1994; Giusti 1993, 1995; Coene 1994; Ungureanu 2003). See, however, below for a different analysis.

In addition to this "Romance pattern", Romanian has an extra option: the apparent possibility of raising either the N or an adjective to an initial DP-like functional projection (to the left of numerals and demonstratives, if present). See (21)-(22).  

---

4 Given the relative ordering of the different classes of APs suggested by Scott’s (2002) work (Determiner/Demonstrative] > Ordinal number > Cardinal number > Subjective comment > ?Evidential > Size > Length > Height > Speed > ?Depth > Width > Weight > Temperature > ?Wetness > Age > Shape > Color > Nationality/Origin > Material > Compound element > NP), the ‘breaking’ point for obligatory raising would seem to be the head to the left of ‘nationality/origin’ adjectives (cf. fn. 2 above) while that for optional raising would seem to be the head to the left of ‘Size’ adjectives.

5 And to the right of universal quantifiers, if any. See:
  (i) Toți prieteni aceștia buni (cf. Toți aceștia buni prieteni)
    All friends-the these good ‘All these good friends’.

6 Carmen Dobrovie-Sorin and Alexander Grosu (p. c.) find (21) quite marginal unless the adjective is made heavier (modified or coordinated; for example, altă de frumoase ‘so beautiful’or frumoase și desteptă ‘beautiful and smart’ in (21)b). This might suggest that the adjective in such cases is in fact a predicative adjective deriving from a reduced relative clause. The heaviness restriction in question is reminiscent of the one noted for Italian with adjectives following the N’s complements (cf. Cinque 1994, section 3). We return to this possibility below.
(21) a) **distrugerile** acestea două cumplite ale orașului din cauza cutremurelor
destructions-the these two terrible of the city because of the earthquakes
'These two terrible destructions of the city because of the earthquakes'
(Cornilesco 1992: 212)
(cf. Aceste două cumplite **distrugeri** ale orașului din cauza cutremurelor)
b) **fetele** acestea două frumoase (Giusti 1995: 112) (cf. aceste două frumoase fete)
girls-the these two nice ‘These two nice girls’
c) **prietenii** aceștia doi vechi (Dumitrescu and Saltarelli 1998: 181)
friends-the these two old ‘these two old friends’ (cf. aceștii doi vechi
**prietenii**)
(22) a) **ultimi** (‘aceștii’) ani de studiu (Giusti 1995: 113) (cf. aceștii **ultimi** ani
de studiu)
last-the (these) years of study ‘these last years of study’
b) **bietii** (‘aceștii’) trei copii (Ungureanu 2003: 119) (cf. Aceștii trei **bietii**
copii) poor-the (these) three children ‘these three poor children’
c) **fostii** (‘aceștii’) trei directori (Ciucivara, p.c.) (cf. aceștii trei **fostii**
directori) former-the (these) three directors ‘these three former directors’
d) **frumoși** (‘aceștii’) doi copii (Ungureanu, p.c.) (cf. aceștii doi **frumoși** copii)
beautiful-the (these) two children ‘these two beautiful children’
e) **cunoscutele** (?‘aceste) două romane (cf. aceste două **cunoscute** romane)
well-known-the (these) two novels ‘these two well-known novels’.

The DP initial position of the noun is widely assumed to be brought about by
Ungureanu 2003). That of the adjective is, instead, generally taken (cf. Cornilesco 1992,
1995; Giusti 1993, 1995; and Coene 1994) to be a consequence of phrasal movement, on
the basis of Grosu’s (1988: 944) observation that a modifier of the adjective, if present, is
fronted together with the adjective. See (23)⁹:

(23) [Foarte/prea/nespus de frumoasă] prințesă
very/too/unsaid of beautiful-the princess
‘the very/ exceedingly/ineffably beautiful princess’.

Here I will explore the possibility that both cases uniformly involve phrasal rather
than head movement (to the Spec of a DP projection).

---

⁷ Both Giusti (1995: fn3) and Ungureanu (2003: fn14) note that crossing of the demonstrative by an
adjective gives rise, for some speakers, to acceptable, though slightly marginal, results (cf. also Lombard 1974:
167). Other speakers (among which Alexandra Cornilesco and Alexander Grosu) find them unacceptable. Grosu
(1994: 189) gives one such example as impossible ("niveazul acesta soldat ‘this brave soldier’). On this
variability, see fn.19 below, and relative text.

⁸ As opposed to the previous examples, here for unclear reasons the presence of the demonstrative gives rise
to a more severe unacceptability.

⁹ Ungureanu (2003, section 3.3.2), however, takes it to be an instance of head-movement because of the
parallel restrictions holding of initial Na and As, and is thus forced to assume that the bracketed constituent in
(23) is a head, with the modifiers of the adjective adjoined to the adjective (a not entirely obvious conclusion,
especially for such complex modifiers as **nespus de**).
Part of the reason for this move is the existence of independent evidence for reanalysing N-raising within the Romance DP as NP- (or XP-) raising (cf. Cinque 2003). In addition to certain interpretive generalizations that the N-raising approach is unable to capture (which cannot be discussed here), a simpler difficulty for that approach is given by the order of postnominal adjectives, which is the mirror-image of the order of English prenominal adjectives: an unexpected situation under the N-raising approach\(^\text{10}\). See (24)-(25):

(24) a) o neașteptată reacție chimică
an unexpected reaction chemical
b) o reacție chimică neașteptată
a reaction chemical unexpected
c) *o reacție neașteptată chimică
a reaction unexpected chemical
     ‘an unexpected chemical reaction’

(25) a) singura invazie americană posibilă a acestui teritoriu
(Alexander Grosu, p. c.)
     the only invasion American possible of this territory
     *singura invazie posibilă americană a acestui teritoriu
b) the only invasion possible American of this territory
     ‘The only possible American invasion of this territory’.

Romanian in this respect is not different from the other Romance languages. See, for example, (26)-(28):

(26) a) una cantante lirica occasionale (Italian)
     a singer operatic occasional
     ‘An occasional opera singer’
     *una cantante occasionale lirica
b) l’invasion américaine instantanée de l’Irak (Lamarche
1991: 224) (French)
     ‘The sudden American invasion of Iraq’
     *l’invasion instantanée américaine de l’Irak
b) una comedía musical americana (Bosque and Picallo
1996: 349) (Spanish)
     a comedy musical American
     ‘An American musical comedy’
     *una comedía americana musical.

I take the mirror image order of such postnominal APs to arise via raising of the NP to a Spec intermediate between the two APs, followed by further raising of the NP with concomitant pied piping of the immediately dominating node around the higher AP.

As a consequence of that, the adjective merged to the left of (and higher than) another adjective eventually ends up to its right, with the effect of reversing the order of (prenominal) merge of the adjectives (cf. Cinque 1996, 2000)\(^{11}\).

All this suggests a phrasal (NP, or XP containing NP) raising derivation, rather than a head (N) raising derivation, which matches the plausibly phrasal movement of the adjective discussed above. In both cases it is an XP which moves to DP initial position.

Possible additional evidence for a phrasal rather than head movement analysis of the Romanian DP comes from a coordination fact (cf. Cinque 2000: 55). If no coordination of X's is possible (Kaye 1994: 59ff), a sentence like (29) below indicates that each member of the conjunction is at least a NP (singular marking on the nouns and plural marking on the adjective should exclude the possibility that it may be a coordination of one elliptical, and one full, DP, each containing simple N-raising (i.e., *[DP Soţul precauţi] şi [DPSoţia precauţi] nu fac mai mult de un copil)\(^{12}\):

(29)  \[DP[NP Soţul] şi [NPsoţia] [ precauţi [NP ]]] nu fac mai mult de un copil

husband.the (sg) and wife.the (sg) careful (pl) not make more than one child.

Let us now consider how the proposed phrasal movement analysis can deal with the basic word order properties and restrictions found in the Romanian DP.

In addition to the (roll-up) raising of the NP around lower APs to an intermediate Spec position, which yields the “Romance” orders in (1)b-(3)b, (4)a-(7)a, (11)b-(13)b, (14)a-(17)a, (24)a-(25)a\(^{13}\), further phrasal movement appears to be needed to derive the DP-initial NP order in (21)a-b, and the DP-initial AP order in (22)y(23). These orders can be derived if the NPs moved to an intermediate position, and the APs in their merge position, are allowed to raise to the Spec of a determiner functional projection above the one hosting the demonstrative (and immediately below the one hosting universal quantifiers), as shown in (30)\(^{14}\):

\(^{11}\) This way of deriving the mirror-image order of postnominal adjectives may also make sense of Sandfeld et Olsen's (1960) observation that in Romanian a postnominal adjective to the right of another takes scope over the latter (and the N): “…le dernier des adjectives determine le groupe precedent forme par un substantif suivi d’un adjectif” (p. 113).

\(^{12}\) Thanks to Carmen Dobrovie-Sorin for providing this example. (29) also show that the suffixal article must be merged directly affixed to the N rather than separately in D from where it would attract the N (a conclusion further supported by the morphological irregularities it displays - Dimitrova-Vulcanova and Giusti 1998: 343). Were it merged in D, attracting the coordinated Ns, one would expect it to appear only on the second of the two Ns. The example (i) below (from Giusti 2002: 62) provides evidence of a different kind for the agreement nature of the Romanian suffixed article and for its direct merge with the N rather than in D. Despite the double occurrence of the article, the coordination refers to a single individual (as indicated by the singular form of the auxiliary), pointing to its pure morphological nature.

(i)  Directorul de departament şi presidentele de facultate a venit aici
director-the of department and dean-the of faculty has (sing.) come here
‘The director of the department and dean of the faculty came here’.

\(^{13}\) This raising is compatible with Relativized Minimality (Rizzi 1990, Chomsky 1995) if the feature that attracts the NP to the intermediate position to left of lower APs is not present in the intervening APs (cf. Cinque 2004 for possibly relevant discussion).

\(^{14}\) For this last movement the NP must apparently move alone, abandoning the pied piping option used to cross over the (lower) adjectives. Note that this apparent inconsistency dissolves if the adjective in (30)a is not a direct modification adjective (cf. the appendix below), but is derived from a reduced relative clause, as suggested in fn.6.

A number of languages seem to show that deictic demonstrative/reinforcers are lower than (one type of) definite determiner/demonstrative (see, e.g., Brugé 1996 on Romance, which may possibly involve XP raising around the the lower demonstrative (Bernstein 1997); Bedell 2001 on Tibeto-Burman languages; and Absh 2004, chapter 3, on
(30) a) (Toate) fetele (acestea) tăi frumoase
(all) girls-the (these) beautiful ‘All these beautiful girls’
b) ?(Toți) ultimii, (aceștii) tăi de studiu
(all) last-the (these) years of study ‘All these last years of study’.

Unless constrained, however, these movements generate ungrammatical forms like the following (from now on I will omit the higher universal quantifier):

(31) a) *omul (acesta) biet (Cornilescu 1992: 214) (cf. acest biet om)
man-the this pitiable ‘This poor man’
b) *agricolii (aceștii) ingineri (cf. aceștii ingineri agricoli)
agricultural-the (these) engineers ‘These agricultural engineers’.

The generalization that seems to characterize the permitted and non-permitted raising of the NP and the AP is the following:

The NP cannot be fronted to Spec,DP across APs which are only prenominal (like biet ‘pitiable’), or across APs under the reading which obtains only prenominally (e.g., singură in the reading ‘only’). No such blocking is found with APs which are only postnominal (e.g., nationality/provenance APs), or which can be either pre- and postnominal (e.g., frumos ‘beautiful’).

This could be taken as an argument that adjectives that are only prenominal are heads, and as such block N-raising to D (cf. Ungureanu 2003), but that conclusion is not necessary; the more so if no N-raising, but only NP/XP-raising, is available (Cinque 2003, 2004).

If we assume that what triggers NP- or AP-raising to Spec,DP is the (interpretable) definiteness feature in Spec,DP, which obligatorily attracts an agreeing (uninterpretable) definiteness feature in NP or AP, then the mentioned generalization can be seen to follow from Relativized Minimality. APs which are only prenominal (i.e., never crossed over by the NP in its partial “Romance” raising) will always be higher than the NP. Thus, in their presence, the NP will never be able to raise to Spec,DP. So, (31)a, which contains the necessarily prenominal adjective biet ‘pitiable’, will be underrivable. (31)b is similarly excluded. Since agricoli is an exclusively postnominal AP in the “Romance” partial

Kwa languages). For those languages which show the order demonstrative > definite determiner (Brugè and Giusti 1996), we leave open whether a lower determiner, or some extra raising of the demonstrative, is involved. 

15 I assume that both an AP and the NP have an agreeing (uninterpretable) definiteness feature, and that only the highest one (the one which ends up in Spec,DP) is spelled out in Modern Romanian. The assumption that both the APs and the NP have such a definiteness agreeing feature appears to be supported by the observation that in older stages of Romanian (Cornilcescu’s 1995: 36), as well as in some modern dialects (Academia R.S.R. 1966: 108), all of them are spelled out, as in, e.g.,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(i)</th>
<th>omul (a)colța bunul</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>man-the that good-the “That good man”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A similar situation is found in Arvanitovlaxika, a dialect of Aromanian spoken in Thessaly, Greece. See (ii), from Campos (2003: 8):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(ii)</th>
<th>pul’i-p1 atsel’i nits-p1…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>birds-the those small-the.. ‘the small birds…”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
raising construction, it will always be more distant from Spec,DP than the NP, and thus will never be attracted to Spec,DP in the presence of the NP to its left\(^\text{16}\).

The same mechanism will also account for such contrasts as (32)a-b:\(^\text{17}\):

\[(32) \quad \begin{array}{l}
\text{a)} \quad \text{probabilă ostilă reacție americană (Cornilescu 2003b)} \\
\text{probable-the hostile reaction American} \\
\text{‘The probable hostile American reaction’}
\end{array}
\]

\[\begin{array}{l}
\text{b)} \quad \text{*ostilă probabilă reacție americană} \quad \text{18}.
\end{array}\]

The epistemic AP *probabil* is merged higher than the manner AP *ostil*; hence it, not *ostil*, will be attracted to Spec,DP.

The fact that an AP can cross over a numeral (frumoși doi copii), and for some speakers even across a demonstrative (cf. (22)d: *frumoși acești doi copii*) seems to suggest that the (cardinal) numeral (and, for some speakers, even the demonstrative) do not necessarily come with a syntactic definite feature, as they can be crossed over by a NP or an AP with such a feature. Demonstratives, however, may optionally have such an (abstract) feature, if they raise to Spec,DP in such cases as (33)\(^\text{19}\):

\[(33) \quad \begin{array}{l}
\text{acești doi copii buni} \quad \text{‘These two good children’}
\end{array}\]

---

\(^{16}\) The double possibility found in (i) is not a problem for the proposed analysis as it contains an AP which can either be prenominal or postnominal, so that (i)a can derive from the prenominal positioning of the AP, and (i)b from the postnominal one.

1. a) frumoși (aceștia) copii 
   beautiful-the these children ‘These beautiful children’

2. b) copii (aceștia) frumoși 
   children-the these beautiful ‘These beautiful children’.

Potentially more problematic is the case of a typically prenominal AP like *ultim*, which Irimia (1997: 136) notes can still enter (ii)a and b:

\[(ii) \quad \begin{array}{l}
\text{a)} \quad \text{ultimul an} \\
\text{last-the year ‘the last year’}
\end{array}
\]

\[(ii) \quad \begin{array}{l}
\text{b)} \quad \text{anul ultim} \\
\text{year-the last ‘the last year’}.
\end{array}\]

Even this problem may be apparent, though, if the adjective (like those mentioned in fn.3) displays a different meaning depending on its pre- or postnominal positioning, as more clearly visible in such pairs as *un ultim succes* ‘one last success’ and *un succes ultim* ‘an ultimate success’. Interestingly, *ultim in ultimul success* has the meaning ‘last‘, and in *successul ultim* has the meaning ‘ultimate‘.

It should also be noted that under the standard analysis of the Romanian DP, which assumes N-raising and AP-raising, the ungrammaticality of (31)b (without the demonstrative) is unexpected. No problem should be found when the two types of movement interact with each other.

\(^{17}\) Carmen Dobrovie-Sorin does consider (ii)b below not to be completely impossible (cf. Cinque 1994: fn.17), while Grosu (1994: 171) gives (ii)b as equally acceptable.

\[(i) \quad \begin{array}{l}
\text{a)} \quad \text{Probabilă brutală invazie a Bosniei ‘the probable brutal invasion of Bosnia’}
\end{array}
\]

\[(i) \quad \begin{array}{l}
\text{b)} \quad \text{?!(Extraordinar de) brutală probabilă invazie a Bosniei} \\
\text{‘the (extraordinarily) brutal probable invasion of Bosnia’}
\end{array}\]

\[(ii) \quad \begin{array}{l}
\text{a)} \quad \text{Ultima ta senzațională idee ‘your last sensational idea’}
\end{array}
\]

\[(ii) \quad \begin{array}{l}
\text{b)} \quad \text{Senzaționala ta ultimă idee.}
\end{array}\]

We take such cases to involve the special focus fronting mentioned in fn.3 above.

\(^{18}\) (32)b becomes marginally acceptable if *ostila* is emphasized (i.e., possibly, moved to Spec,FocusP—cf. fn.3 above).

\(^{19}\) Perhaps, they necessarily have such a feature for those speakers that do not allow an AP to cross over a demonstrative (see fn.7, and the discussion around (22) above).
(Cardinal) numerals, however, never have such a feature apparently, as they are unable to raise to Spec,DP\textsuperscript{20}:

(34)  
*Doi-(f) copii buni  
two-(the) children good ‘The two good children’.

As, in such contexts, the NP cannot either (cf. (35)a, and the discussion below), the only way to satisfy the EPP feature of Spec,DP is to insert there an (adjectival) article (cf. (35)b):

(35)  
a)  
*Copiii doi buni  
children-the two good ‘The two good children’

b)  
Cei doi copii buni  
The two children good ‘The two good children’.

The ungrammaticality of (35)a is very likely not due to a violation of Relativized Minimality triggered by a definiteness feature on the (cardinal) numeral. First, because the (cardinal) numeral cannot satisfy the definiteness EPP feature of Spec,DP, as seen in (34); and more importantly because we have seen evidence that it can be crossed over by an AP (cf. (22)e, repeated here as (36)a), and apparently even a NP with such feature, provided that a demonstrative is also present – cf. (36)b:

(36)  
a)  
?Cunoscutele două romane  
well-known-the two novels ‘The two well-known novels’

b)  
Copiii aceștia doi buni  
children-the these two good ‘These two good children’.

The ungrammaticality of (35)a must thus be due to a reason other than Relativized Minimality. We tentatively submit that it may be the same reason that rules out (37), with the short form of the demonstrative, in opposition to (36)b with the long form of the demonstrative:

(37)  
*copii aceștia doi buni  
children-the these two good ‘These two good children’.

The contrast between these two appears to be reflected by the contrast between (38)a-b, where the NP is understood\textsuperscript{21}:

(38)  
a)  
aceștia doi buni

b)  
*aceștii doi buni.

Similarly, the contrast between (35)a and (36)b is mirrored by the corresponding sentences with the NP understood:

(39)  
a)  
*doi(f) buni (under the reading “the two good (ones)”)  
these two good (ones).

b)  
aceștia doi buni

\textsuperscript{20} Differently from Arvontovianu, where also numerals can bear the definiteness suffix (and can raise to Spec,DP). See (i), from Campos (2003: 23):

(i)  
do-i liitori  
two-the boys ‘the two boys’.

\textsuperscript{21} Cf. also such other contrasts as (i)a-b and (ii)a-b:

(ii)  
a)  
copiïi oei doi  
children-the two ‘the two children’

b)  
*copii doi  
*doii (f).
The cases with the NP understood could reduce to the one with the NP fronted if the abstract pronominal form were to move obligatorily to Spec,DP in (38)a and (39)b.

Under the NP-raising approach, Spec-Head agreement as the basis of the long form demonstrative (Giusti 1991, 1995) is no longer a natural option. One possibility is to take such long form to be required to license the empty NP (perhaps a trace in both cases) 22. In fact, if we compare (35)a, (36)b, (37), (38)a-b, (39)a-b, and (i) and (ii) of fn.20, it seems that the trace of the (overt or covert) NP can be licensed by the long form of the demonstrative (or by the article cel).

Needless to say, many other properties of the Romanian DP had to be left out of the present discussion. What remains to be seen is whether the analysis sketched above can naturally extend to them or not.

Appendix: APs from reduced relative clauses

In Cinque (2003) some evidence is discussed for distinguishing two different sources for attributive adjectives: a "direct modification" source (to use Sproat and Shih's 1991 terminology), where the APs are merged in the Spec of functional projections above NP, 23 and an "indirect modification" source, where they are derived from a (reduced) relative clause (cf. Kayne 1994, section 8.4). Some languages formally distinguish the two classes of adjectives. Others do not (see Cinque 2003 for illustration).

We submit that Romanian is among the languages that distinguish the two sources. Adjectives preceded by the article cel/cea/etc. only have the reduced relative clause source. 24 Evidence for this conjecture comes from a number of restrictions, noted in the literature, on the distribution of APs preceded by cel.

---

22 The question remains why the NP moving to Spec,DP in such cases as (36)b cannot pied pipe the larger constituent containing the AP(s). A second question that cases like (36)b pose concerns the potential Relativized Minimality violation given by the NP crossing over the demonstrative, endowed with the same (uninterpretable) definiteness feature. A possible way out, suggested by Alexandra Comilieascu, would consist in taking the morphologically more complex long (or 'pronominal') form of the demonstrative ([aceştia] to make the definite feature of the inner part [aceşt] invisible to Relativized Minimality.

A more radical alternative that would not face the problems just mentioned (suggested to me by Carmen Dobrovie-Sorin) would be to assume that the NP in such cases as (21) and (36)b does not move across the demonstrative at all, but is an independent DP, followed by an appositional pronominal DP (with the adjective derived from a reduced relative clause source, as conjectured above):

(i) [aceştia] [ce [înţeleg [mi [înteleag]]]] [aceştia] [înţeleg].

This might perhaps also shed some light on the fact that the construction apparently does not tolerate more than one adjective (copii aceştia doi bătători [bătători] "boys-the these two tall blond") which is furthermore subject to the limitations noted in fn.6 above. In fact, the adjective in this construction can only be a predicative one, as shown by the impossibility of (i), and the lack of ambiguity of (iii):b.

(ii) *înţeleg aceştia doi agricoli (cf. aceştii aceştia doi agricoli 'these engineers are agricultural')

(iii) a) aceştii doi măi bătători/bătători măi

b) bătătorii aceştia doi măi

drinkers-the these two big (i.e. 'who drink a lot' and 'who are big')

The adjective in (iii)b only retains the intersective interpretation of the reduced relative clause source ("who are big"), losing the adverbial reading of the direct modification source ("who drink a lot").

What remains to be understood in this way of analyzing (21)/(36)b is why the first DP can contain nothing more complex than the head N.

23 Cf. Kayne's (2003, section 2.1) notion of "functional" adjectives.

24 But we do not want to exclude the possibility that certain adjectives not preceded by cel, are also derived from reduced relative clauses. Giusti (1993: 75ff) notes that cooccurrence with cel is only possible with
Differently from (certain) bare adjectives which can be found both preceding or following the N, adjectives introduced by *cel* can only follow the N\(^25\). See (40)\(^b\)\(^26\):

(40) a) bunii prieten/rietenë/ buni
good-the friends/friends-the good ‘the good friends’
b) cei trei prieten cei bunii/*cei trei cei bunii prieten
the three friends the good/the three the good friends ‘the three good friends’

(41) a) curajosul baiat/baiatul curajos
courageous-the boy/boy-the courageous ‘the courageous boy’
b) baiatul *cel* curajos/*cel* curajos baiat
boy-the courageous/the courageous boy.

If *cel* APs derive from reduced relative clauses, this restriction simply follows from the fact the reduced relative clauses necessarily follow the N (see (42)a-b, from Drăgan 2002: 111, and (42)c, from Carmen Dobrovie-Sorin, p.c.), a feature Romanian shares with the other Romance languages (and which is not shared by the neighboring Balkan languages Greek and Bulgarian)\(^27\).

(42) a) cartile citite/*cititele* carti
books-the read.fem.pl/read.fem.pl.-the books ‘the books read’
b) copacul ars/*arsul* copac
tree-the burnt.masc.sg/burnt.masc.sg-the tree ‘the burnt tree’
c) cartile (deja) sosite/*(deja) sositele* carti
books-the (already) arrived/(already) arrived-the books ‘the (already) arrived books’.

A second restriction is that *cel* cannot appear in front of adjectives that cannot be used predicatively (with the same sense); i.e., only enter direct modification. See:

(43) a) comedia (*cea* musicală
look-the (the) last
b) literatura (*cea* ingleză
literature-the (the) English
c) ordonanța (*cea* judecătorească (Coene 1994: 18)
order-the (the) judicial
d) omul (*cel* biet (Cornilescu 1992: 222)
man-the (the) poor/pitiable

adjectives that can be found in predicate position. Comilcescu (2003a, b) explicitly suggests that postnominal adjectives preceded by *cel* derive from (reduced) relative clauses.

\(^{25}\) Unless they are in the superlative form: *cel mai bunii prieti* ‘the best friends’, *cel mai curajos baiat* ‘the most courageous boy’. Lombard (1974: 177) notes that another exception is the ordinal adjectival phrase *din urmă* ‘last’ (*cea din urmă pagină* ‘the last page’). For a possible reason why no more than one adjective can be preceded by *cel* (*baiatul *cel* înalt *cel* curajos ‘the courageous tall boy’), see Grosu (1994, section 6.5.2), where evidence is also presented of an empty N following *cel* in such cases as (40)-(41).

\(^{26}\) Note that in the well-formed variant of (41)b there are two instances of determination, one on the N (*baiatul*) and one in front of the adjective (*cel*). The latter is comparable to the “adjectival determiner” that can also occur with Greek APs, which Androutsopoulos (2001) analyses as deriving from (reduced) relative clauses.

\(^{27}\) Apparent counterexamples such as *conoscutele române* ‘the well-known novels’, *iubitori/apreciatului* *cîntăret* ‘beloved/appreciated singer’ arguably involve *adjectives*, derived from past participles of “transitive verbs denoting states and evincing a marked imperfective reading” (Drăgan 2002: 111).
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e) demnitarul cel înalt (Cornilescu 1992: 222)
official the tall*/high.

These facts follow if APs preceded by *cel only have a reduced relative clause source.
Since the adjectives in (42) are not predicative, they cannot be the predicate of a
(reduced) relative clause either, whereas their ungrammaticality.
The conclusion that *cel can only precede elements which are predicatives of a reduced
relative clause finds additional support in an observation made by Cornilescu (1992): “A
significant fact, which seems to have gone unnoticed is that, while with modifiers postnominal
*cel is grammatical, even if redundant, it is utterly ungrammatical with a PP or a DP which is
theta-marked by the head noun or subcategorized by it” (p. 222). See (44) (= her (76)):

(44) a) *fratele cel al Mariei
brother-the the of Mary ‘Mary’s brother’
b) *grosimea cea a zidurilor
thickness-the the of the walls ‘the thickness of the walls’
c) *distrugerea cea a orașului
distruiction-the the of the city ‘the destruction of the city’
d) *venirea cea a musafirilor
coming-the the of the guests ‘the coming of the guests’
e) *faptul cel că pleacă
fact-the the that he is leaving ‘the fact that he is leaving’.

This becomes understandable under a derivation of *cel phrases from relative clauses
because subcategorized PPs and DPs cannot constitute the predicate of a relative clause
modifying the N that assigns them a theta-role (*fratele care e al Mariei ‘the brother who
is of Mary’, *grosimea care e a zidurilor ‘the thickness which is of the walls’, etc.) 28.
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