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1. Introduction

Although very different from both the typological and the genetic point of view, Scandinavian and Romanian share two important phenomena concerning nominal structure: the enclitic nature of the definite article and its (optional) cooccurrence with a demonstrative. The two cases are exemplified in (1) and (2) respectively:

(1) a. (i) un om (ii) omul (Romanian)
b. (i) en man (ii) mannen (Mainland Scandinavian)
   a man

(2) a. (i) acest om (ii) omul acesta (Romanian)
   this man
   b. denna man%(nen) (Mainland Scandinavian)
      this man-(the)

The examples in (1) show an apparently complete parallelism between the two languages. In fact, in both the indefinite article precedes the noun while the definite article follows it in the form of a suffix. The examples in (2), however, already reveal a considerable difference between the two languages. In Romanian (2a) the optionality of the article is related to the presence of two different constructions with a prenominal (2a.i) or a postnominal (2a.ii) demonstrative. In Mainland Scandinavian (2b), on the contrary, the optionality of the article appears to be a matter of dialectal

1. This is the written version of a paper presented at the 8th Workshop on Comparative Germnian Syntax that was held in Tromsø on November 20-22. I would like to thank the audience and the organizers for comments and support. A revised version of this paper will appear in the proceedings of that conference which will be published as a special number of The Linguistic Review.
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variation.

Another important difference to be noticed in nominals concerns the position of an adjective in the string. In Romanian (3) we can have either a prenominal or a postnominal adjective in both indefinite and definite nominals. In Scandinavian (4) we can have only prenominal adjectives. In indefinite nominals (4a) they are placed between the article and the noun, in definite nominals (4b) what appears to be an expletive article is inserted at the beginning of the string:

(3) a. (i) un bătrîn om "an old man"
   (ii) un om bătrîn
b. (i) bătrînul om "the old man"
    (ii) omul bătrîn
(4) a. (i) en gammal man "the old man"
    (ii) **en man gammal
b. den gamle' man%(nen)

In (4b), the symbol % signals a dialectal variation with respect to the presence/absence of the enclitic article cooccurring with the expletive article. Interestingly this does not coincide but only overlaps with the dialectal variation noticed with the demonstrative above.

Even a rough picture such as the one just sketched suggests that a trivial unification of these facts is hardly feasible. But it also urges for parallelisms that should not get lost. A coherent analysis of these and related data should face these two aspects of the problem. This is the purpose of the paper.

In section 2., I will first propose an analysis of the syntax of the suffixed article in the two types of languages, deriving the different behaviour in the presence of an adjective from an independently motivated property of N-movement in Germanic vs. Romance. In section 3., I will turn to how this property interacts in the two types of language with the insertion of a demonstrative.

---

2. With respect to this problem it seems quite difficult to draw a clearcut between the two variants in that the occurrence of the suffixed article is banned by the academy of certain national languages but used in the spoken languages. It can be roughly stated that Swedish allows it freely, including the formal language, Norwegian allows it only in some spoken variants, while Danish does not display it at all.

3. The different ending of the adjective is independently due to the alternance strong/weak adjectival inflection in Germanic. I will not enter into this question here. For some proposals see Giusti (1992), Tappe (1990), Olsen (1989).

4. In this case, it is apparently easier to draw a clearcut between the two variants: Danish does not allow the suffixed article, the rest of the Mainland Scandinavian family does. I learn from Sigurðsson (1992) that Icelandic behaves like Danish in this respect. Unfortunately I have not enough data to investigate this language as it deserves.
2. Enclitic Articles

Dobrovie-Sorin (1988), Grosu (1988) for Romanian, Taraldsen (1989), Delsing (1988) for Scandinavian, propose that the head noun moves to D° in the syntax to incorporate the suffixal article. A straightforward prediction of this proposal is that every element found between the indefinite article and the noun be postnominal in a definite noun phrase, as is the case in Romanian (5b), but contrary to fact in Scandinavian (6b):¹

(5) a. un bătrîn om (Romanian)
    b. omul bătrîn ti

(6) a. en gammal man (Scandinavian)
    b. *mannen gamle/gammal ti
       "an old man/ the old man"

As shown in (4b) above, Scandinavian inserts a morphologically unbound article in this case, and variation is found regarding the possibility for the suffixal article to surface:

(7) a. den gamla mannen (Swedish/ Norwegian)
    b. den gamle mand (Danish)

Notice that Romanian cannot make use of this choice (8a) in all cases, even though it does display an unbound article, as is the case with a numeral adjective (8b):⁶

(8) a. *cel bătrîn om(ul)
      the old man
    b. cei trei oameni
      the three men

If we take Danish as our point of reference for Scandinavian, (7b) is suggestive that in the presence of an adjective the morphology -en of the article is not affixed on

---

5. Taraldsen (1990) discusses some variants of Norwegian in which the noun can move across a possessive element:
   a. mitt hus
      my house
      (i) huset mit
      house-the my
   I will discuss of this phenomenon in the last part of the paper. From now on, let us therefore abstract away from it.

6. Cel is the adjectival article in Romanian and functions as the adjectival nominalizer on a par with d- in Scandinavian. I will not deal with this question here. For a possible analysis see Giusti (1992).
the noun but on a dummy root $d_-$, namely the root of demonstratives which is the base of the articles in all other Germanic languages.

I do not think, however, that Danish should lead us to assume that the adjective in (7) blocks a sort of head-movement which would otherwise take place in a simple nominal, such as $manner$ in (1b.ii). In fact, unless we want to analyse adjectives as intervening heads in the nominal structure, I see no reason why a maximal projection (either an adjunct or a specifier)$^7$ should give any blocking effect for head-movement. An alternative proposal could be to assume that nothing at all moves in the syntax in Scandinavian, and in particular that (1b.ii) is not the effect of N°-movement.

In a minimalist framework such as the one presented in Chomsky (1992), the different behaviour of Romanian and Scandinavian could be trivially formulated by stating that the noun is inserted already inflected for the affixal article in the base and the affix is checked by N-movement to D before "spell-out" in Romanian and after "spell-out" in Scandinavian. Notice that the same sort of difference appears to hold independently in a broader Romance/Scandinavian comparative perspective with respect to shorter N-movement to intermediate Agr^o projections.

2.1. N-movement across Western Europian Languages. Apart from Walloon, as discussed in Bernstein (1991), all Romance languages currently dealt with in the literature appear to have postnominal adjectives. Cinque (1990, 1992) dispenses with previous analyses in terms of quite anomalous structures with adjectives right adjoined to some nominal projection or even in complement position, and proposes to view postnominal adjectives as the result of short movements of the head noun across some SpecAgrP specifiers, on line with Picallo's (1990) proposal of N-movement across genitival arguments.

In other words, Cinque assumes a unified base structure for Romance (Italian in (9) here) and Germanic (English in (10) here) with all adjectives in left-branching SpecAgrP positions and derives the postnominal position of most adjectives in Romance by moving the head N to an intermediate functional head, Agr^o in (9b). This movement appears to be disallowed in Germanic (10b):

\[
\begin{align*}
(9) & \quad a. \quad \text{un vecchio uomo} \\
& \quad b. \quad \text{un uomo vecchio} \\
(10) & \quad a. \quad \text{an old man} \\
& \quad b. \quad \text{a man old} \\
\end{align*}
\]

If Cinque is correct in analysing the impossibility of postnominal adjectives in Germanic as the result of the impossibility of short N-movement, given the local nature of head movement, it is reasonable to assume that N in Germanic cannot go

---

$^7$ I will not take stand here on the problem whether an adjective is a modifier of the noun (as proposed by van Riemsdjik (1992)) or in the Spec of intermediate AgrP projections (as proposed by Cinque (1990, 1992). For the sake of exposition I will adopt Cinque's framework in the rest of the paper.
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on long movement to D in the syntax. This is what I am assuming here. The different structures for the simple cases in Romanian and Scandinavian respectively are given in (11):

(11) a. \[ \text{DP} \ [D^* \text{ om-ult}] \ [\text{Ag} \ [\text{Ag}^* \ t.] \text{ etc.} \ [\text{NP} t_i]]] \\
     b. \[ \text{DP} \ [D^*] \ [\text{Ag} \ [\text{Ag}^* i] \text{ etc.} \ [\text{NP} \text{ man-nen}]]] \]

In (11a), N° in Romanian moves to D° in the syntax building a chain with all intermediate heads. In (11b), D° and all intermediate functional heads are coindexed with the morpheme inserted onto the head noun, which will be checked at LF.

What remains to be explained now is: a) why the adjective in Scandinavian requires lexical insertion in D° before "spell-out"; and b) what morphological property gives us the dialectal variation found in (7). I will try to answer the first question in the rest of this paragraph. The answer to the second question will be given as a substantial part of the treatment of double definiteness developed in the next section.

2.2. D° as SpecAgrP licencer. In Romanian, all prepositions except cu ("with") produce the following effect: when their complements are interpreted as definite, they cannot display a definite article if they are unmodified (12), but the article reappears if they are modified (13):^9

(12) a. \[ \text{am văzut pe profesor(*ul)} \]
    [I] him-have seen PE [the] professor

b. \[ \text{iți mulțumesc pentru scrisoare(*a)} \]
    [I] you[dat.] thank for [the] letter

(13) a. \[ \text{am văzut pe profesor*(ul) tău} \]
    [I] him-have seen PE professor-the your

b. \[ \text{iți mulțumesc pentru scrisoare*(a) interesantă} \]
    [I] you[dat.] thank for letter-the interesting

Notice that when an unmodified noun is in not embedded in a PP, it must have an article:

(14) a. \[ \text{profesor*(ul) a mers la Paris} \]
    professor-the has left to Paris

b. \[ \text{am citit scrisoare*(a)} \]
    [I] read letter-the

---

8. In this framework this is the null hypothesis, the burden of the proof is therefore set on a competing hypothesis that N in Scandinavian can exceptionally go on long movement only in the case in which D° is definite and no other element than the noun and the D itself is inserted.

9. If they are indefinite an indefinite article id regularly inserted.
The contrast in (12)-(14) can be captured by the following generalization: In Romanian, the lack of the definite article in referential noun phrases is directly linked to the presence of a preposition, while the additional presence of a modifier brings about the surfacing of the article again.

A similar phenomenon can be found in Italian prepositional circumstantial complements. Although it is by no means as regular and clear as in Romanian, in Italian, some circumstantial prepositional complements must have no article when they embed a bare noun with a particular interpretation, which for our purposes here, we may label as "salient" in some sense.\(^{10}\)

\begin{align*}
(15) \quad &a. \quad \text{vado a scuola} \\
& \quad \text{I go to school} \\
&b. \quad \text{siamo in giardino} \\
& \quad \text{we are in [the] garden} \\
(16) \quad &a. \quad \text{vado in *(una) scuola privata/ a*(lla) scuola elementare} \\
& \quad \text{I go to *(a) private school/ to *(the) elementary school} \\
&b. \quad \text{sono in *(un)/ nel giardino comunale/ fiorito/ d'inverno} \\
& \quad \text{we are in *(a)/ *(the) communal/ flowered/ winter garden}
\end{align*}

Even if it is not clear why the article should be missing in (15),\(^ {11}\) it is apparent in (16) that the presence of a modifier (either an adjective or a genitive) makes the article necessary again, and may cause a change in the selection of the preposition.

I would like to propose that the definite article is a syntactic functional element the insertion of which is not necessarily dependent on the (in)definite interpretation of the nominal itself.\(^ {12}\) I also propose to interpret the evidence presented in this paragraph as indicating that a definite article must be inserted in D\(^ {0}\) in order for the D\(^ {0}\) to licence the Spec position of the nominal AgrPs where adjectives are inserted. If no Specifier position needs to be licensed, languages may vary with respect to their realization of D\(^ {0}\).

\section*{3. Double Definiteness}

Even if the cooccurrence of a demonstrative with a definite article - often referred to as double definiteness - appears to a certain extent both in Romanian and in Scandinavian, it cannot be straightforwardly derived from the enclitic nature of the article in these two languages, since it is also found in a whole group of languages

\(^{10}\) Notice that the English glosses display an almost parallel situation, reinforcing the claim that we are facing a general phenomenon.

\(^{11}\) See Longobardi (1992) for some hints of an explanation.

\(^{12}\) Cf. [references to be quoted in the final version] for a more detailed presentation of this proposal.
very different from the point of view of the position of the article. The following examples as taken from Delsing's (1988) quotation of Lundeby (1965):

(17) a. Greek: autòs o aner
    "this the man"

    b. Macedonian: toj čovek-ot
    "this man-the"

    c. Gothic: þan wig jainan
    "the way this"

    d. Romanian: omul acesta
    "man-the this"

In (17) four possible combinations of pre/post-nominal demonstrative and prenominal/enclitic articles are represented. Notice that completely unrelated languages can fit in the pattern such as Indonesian and Hungarian, which pattern with Greek (cf. Heinrichs (1974) and Szabolcsi (1992) respectively). Notice also that those Scandinavian variants that display double definiteness appear to pattern with Macedonian.

In what follows, I will not attempt a general explanation of this phenomenon, given that we do not have sufficient information about the properties of nominal constructions in most of the relevant languages. Furthermore, we do not know whether such an account should rule out the logically possible sequences "Art Dem N" and "N Dem Art" or not. Instead, I will start with an analysis of the Romanian construction, building on what is already known of the nominal construction in this language; I will go on to show that this analysis cannot be extended straightforwardly to Scandinavian, where it is due to other properties of the nominal system.

The leading idea will be that demonstratives do not pertain to the same structural position as articles. As a consequence, wherever these two categories appear in the structure, they could - in principle - cooccur. What should be considered as surprising, then, is the number of languages in which they never cooccur. The latter cases are analysed in [references to be given in the final version] as instances of a sort of "doubly-filled DP filter". I will adopt this analysis with no further discussion here.

3.1. Double Definiteness in Romanian. Notice, first of all, that Romanian displays two semantically equivalent constructions, only one of which display[s] double definiteness:

(18) a. acest om
    "this man"

    b. omul acesta
    "man-the this"

---

Only when the demonstrative is postnominal can and must the preceding N be articulated. The position of the postnominal demonstrative is fixed: it must be second in the nominal string (19a); no other position is possible:

(19) a. omul acesta bătrîn  
   b. *omul bătrîn acesta

The second position in the nominal string, however, is not sufficient to characterise the Romanian demonstrative in double definiteness constructions: it must be specified that the demonstrative must be preceded by an articulated noun (cf. (19a) and (20b)):

(20) a. bătrînul om  
   b. *bătrînul acesta om

In previous work (cf. Giusti (1992)), I have proposed and further supported the following analysis, exemplified in (21). The demonstrative is not in D° but in the immediately lower Spec. (This accounts both for the cooccurrence of -art and Dem and for the word order). Being in a Spec position, Dem allows N°-movement to D°, as in (21a), but blocks AP-movement to Spec DP which is otherwise possible in Romanian, as in (21b). (This accounts for the impossibility of (20b) with respect to the acceptability of (20a)). The extra -a morpheme displayed by the demonstrative in second position (cf. acest in (19a) and aceasta in (19b)) is due to agreement between the trace of N movement in the Agr° of which Dem occupies the Spec position. The construction with a prenominal demonstrative, on the other hand, is due to Dem movement to Spec DP, as in (21c). This movement fulfills the requirements set on DP in the syntax and therefore blocks further N-movement to D° before "spell-out". The impossibility of double definiteness with a prenominal demonstrative, as in (21d) is due to the SpecDP Filter motivated in Giusti (1992):

(21) a. [DP [D°om°-ul] [Agr° acest-ai [Agr° t°i] etc. [NP t°i]]]  
   b. [DP bătrîn-ul [D°] [Agr° (*acest-a) [Agr°] etc. t°i [NP om]]]  
   c. [D°paclest°i [D°] [Agr°t°i [Agr°] etc. [NP om]]]  
   d. [D°paclest°i [D° om°-ul] [Agr°t°i [Agr°, t°i] etc. [NP t°i]]]

Since Romanian is completely paralell to well-studied languages with respect to the prenominal demonstrative construction, I proposed there and assume without further discussion here that Italian, French, English, etc. also have a demonstrative in SpecDP and that in these languages no alternative to Dem-movement14 to SpecDP is present.

14. Or, maybe, direct insertion to DP, since the child has no evience of a different base position for Dem.
due to independent lack of N⁰ movement to D⁰ in the syntax.¹⁵

Summing up, double definiteness in Romanian appears to be the result of N⁰ movement to D⁰ which makes it possible for a demonstrative to remain in place in SpecAgrP.

3.2. Double Definiteness in Scandinavian. In Scandinavian, matters are considerably different: First the demonstrative not only precedes the noun but also all nominal modifiers; thus it cannot be argued that it is in a Spec position lower than SpecDP. Second, its cooccurrence with the enclitic article is a matter of dialectal variation, not of different constructions. To further complicate the picture, double definiteness can also appear when the non-clitic article is inserted in D⁰ in the syntax to licence an adjective in a lower Spec.

The following chart is taken from Svenonius (1992), which takes into consideration the possessive too:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Norw.</th>
<th>Sw.</th>
<th>Dan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poss.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dem</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d-art</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let us consider first the case of the double article construction. The assumption of two DP projections, one lower and the other higher than the adjectives, would wrongly predict the possibility of a double article construction with no adjective and an unstressed d-article. It would also have difficulties in accounting for its non-occurrence in Danish. I propose that the morpheme found on the head noun in Norwegian and Swedish when the d-article is present is checked as an agreement morpheme on the noun. This approach can account for the dialectal variation just assuming that only Norwegian and Swedish have this morphological agreement of N⁰ with D⁰, while Danish does not. Since variation, especially among close related languages, is at best reduced to morphological variation, this can be taken as the null hypothesis. If we consider the enclitic article in double article constructions in Norwegian and Swedish as no D⁰, but simply as an agreement morpheme between N⁰ and D⁰, we are led to assume that this is also the case in the other double definiteness construction. The cooccurrence of Dem with the apparent enclitic article in Scandinavian, is therefore reduced to the property of Dem, in certain variants, to trigger morphological agreement with the head noun. Demonstratives and possessives are structurally in the same position, the only difference being that possessives in Spec DP do not trigger agreement on the head noun in any Scandinavian variant. The structures are given in (23):

---

¹⁵. I am talking about common nouns here. Proper nouns appear to be a completely different matter (cf. Longobardi (1992)).
(23) a. \([\text{DP} \ [\text{DP}\text{-den},]] \ [\text{APP}\text{-gamle} \ [\text{AP}\text{-manner},]]\]  
   b. \([\text{DP} \ [\text{DP}\text{-den},]] \ [\text{APP}\text{-tj} \ [\text{AP}\text{-famil},]] \ [\text{APP}\text{-gamle} \ [\text{AP}\text{-manner},]]\]  
   c. \([\text{DP} \ [\text{DP}\text{-mitt},]] \ [\text{APP}\text{-tj} \ [\text{AP}\text{-manner},]]\]

3.3. Possessive constructions in Norwegian. Up to now, I have considered the Scandinavian N° as "frozen" in its base position, abstracting away from the Norwegian cases discussed by Taraldsen (1990), in which the noun can move across a possessive:

(24) a. mitt hus  
    my house  
   b. huset mitt  
    house-the my

Although I agree with Taraldsen in considering (24b) as evidence for some kind of N°-movement, I believe that this is not the case of N-movement to D. In particular, I think that the possessive in (24b) is not in the same position as in (24a).

To show this, let us insert an adjective in the construction represented in (24a): The AP appears in prenominal position but after the possessive and requires no d-article, as in (25a), but if we insert an adjective in a construction such as (24b), it still appears in prenominal position and requires the d-article, as in (25b):

(25) a. mitt store hus  
    my big house  
   b. det store huset mitt  
    the big house-the

The parallelisms between the a.-examples on the one hand and the b.-examples on the other show that in the first case the possessive is in DP and, therefore, can and must disperse with an article. In the second case, on the contrary, the possessive can in no ways be considered as in DP. Where is it then?

In Cinque (1990, 1992), Crisma (1992), it is argued that there are two positions for the possessive adjective, one inside NP (in which the possessive is base generated and assigned a θ-role or an R-relation by the noun), and one higher in the nominal structure in which it must move for some unclear reason (possibly genitive case assignment). The first assumption is mainly drawn from theory internal reasons (θ-role and R-relation should be assigned locally by the head noun), the second is strongly supported by empirical evidence (the possessive is in well-studied languages the first or one of the first modifiers of the noun phrase).

The property of being generated in one position and moved to another is reminiscent of the behaviour of subjects in certain languages. This is a welcome parallelism, since possessives can in many ways be considered as subjects of the nominal phrase. Not in all languages must subjects be moved from their base position. In some cases they may remain where they are base generated. This is what I am going to assume for Taraldsen's cases.

When possessives are not moved to SpecDP, they cannot block insertion of the
enclitic agreement morpheme to be checked in D°, and can be crossed over by the head noun because they are so embedded in the structure. They are in fact the only evidence we have that the head noun moves one step at least in these dialects.  

4. Conclusions

In this paper, I have attempted a comparative analysis of enclitic articles and so-called "double definiteness" in Romanian and (Mainland) Scandinavian. In so doing, I have first argued for a parallel analysis of enclitic articles in the two types of language, accounting for all the differences in complex structures by means of different times of application of the same movement: N°-movement to D° applies in the syntax in Romanian and at LF in Then I have analysed double definiteness in the two types of language as the result of relatively different phenomena. This is not undesired since "double definiteness" appears to be a spurious generalization parallel to the one implicit in the term "determiner". Throughout this paper, in fact, I have assumed and only partly motivated what I have argued for in Giusti (1992), namely that different determiners occur in different position, and in particular demonstratives and possessives appear in Specifier positions while articles are heads.
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