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1. Introduction. Recent trends of syntactic research on noun phrases have drawn attention on those elements that have usually been grouped under the generic label "Determiners", namely quantifiers, articles, demonstrative, and possessives, opening up various possibilities for structural analyses.

In this paper I would like to question the assumption, to be often found in the literature, that all so-called determiners have the same categorial status. This assumption is mainly based on the observation that these elements are in complementary distribution with each other in some languages. But the fact that in other languages some of them can co-occur, should immediately cast doubts on such a simple way of looking at the matter. I will claim that the unification operated under the term "determiner" obscures the crucial distinctions regarding both the structural position and the categorial status of these elements.

The evidence to be discussed in this paper is mainly syntactic. In section 2., we will see that a quantifier can either be the head of a quantified expression or a modifier of the noun. In the first case it embeds a "full nominal"; in the second case it is in some specifier position inside the "full nominal". In none of the two cases they can be assumed to be in D. In section 3., I will focus on demonstratives that will turn out to be modifiers in a high Spec, and not in D. The same will be claimed of possessives in section 4. In section 5., we will follow recent studies assuming that articles are in D. From what will have been argued in 2. through 4., it will turn out that articles are the only elements that can function as head of DP.

2. Quantifiers. Abney (1987), following Szabolcsi (1987), claims that quantifiers are adjectives. With this, he tries to unify two different strings such as those in (1):

(1) a. the many children
    b. many children

¹ This paper is a revised section of my doctoral dissertation, quoted in the references as Giusti (1992). I wish to thank A. Cardinaletti, G. Cinque, R. Kayne, G. Longobardi, and the audience of the Venice section of the conference "Linguistica Romena Oggi", July 6, 1992, for discussion and helpful criticism.
Abney assumes an empty determiner in (1b) that would be identical to the lexical determiner in (1a). Such a unification obscures rather than explains the syntactic behaviour of the two constructions, which appears to be different in many respects and should therefore be kept separate, as will be briefly sketched in 2.3 below.

Differently from Abney, Shlonsky (1991), reformulating Sportiche’s (1988) proposal on floating quantifiers, claims that universal quantifiers are the head of the quantified nominal construction. Shlonsky analyses the postnominal position of the Q in (2b) in Hebrew as derived by movement of the DP embedded under Q’ into SpecQP. From SpecQP the DP can move further, giving rise to the floating construction as in (2c), or the entire QP can move to Spec IP, giving (2a-b):

(2) a. kol ha-yeladim ohvim le-saxek
    all the-boys like to play
b. ha-yeladim kulam ohvim le-saxek
    the-boys all-them like to play
c. ha-yeladim axlu kulam lexem
    the-boys ate all-them bread
d.  
    \[
    \begin{array}{c}
    \text{QP} \\
    \text{Spec} \\
    \text{Q'} \\
    \text{Q}^o \\
    \text{DP} \\
    \text{ha-yeladim\_ kul-am} \\
    t_i
    \end{array}
    \]

Shlonsky does not consider existential quantifiers, since they do not generally appear in the floating construction.

The headedness of Q in partitive constructions has also been proposed by Cardinaletti and Giusti (1989, 1991), who attribute to the position linked to the Italian partitive clitic *ne* the status of a maximal projection, which is the complement of Q:

(3) a. vengono molti ragazzi
    come many boys
b. ne vengono molti
    NE come many
c.  
    \[
    \begin{array}{c}
    \text{QP} \\
    \text{Spec} \\
    \text{Q'} \\
    \text{Q}^o \\
    \text{DP} \\
    \text{ne\_ ................ molti} \\
    t_i
    \end{array}
    \]
Cardinaletti and Giusti, however, limit their treatment to partitive constructions and do not consider other quantified expressions.

Giusti (1991) shows that the two proposals that view quantifiers either as heads or as modifiers are not incompatible with each other, on the contrary, each of them reveals only half of the truth. There, it is proposed that a quantifier in the first nominal position is the highest head of the nominal construction, in the case of both universal and existential quantifiers, and that a quantifier preceded by a determiner functions as a modifier of the noun, parallel to adjectives. Since not all quantifiers can appear in configuration (1a), it is necessary that those which can are specifically marked for that in the lexicon.

Recourse to lexical specification predicts that the list of the quantifiers that can function as adjectives is open to quite a lot of cross-linguistic variation. This prediction may appear problematic if the investigation is limited to English, German, or Italian, since in those languages the quantifiers that can occur in configuration (1a) appear to be a subset of existential quantifiers, including almost only many/ few/ and numerals. But if we consider other languages, we see that this generalization does not hold at all. On the contrary, we find that there are universal quantificational adjectives and, furthermore, that the class of quantificational adjectives intersects the class of quantifiers rather than being a subset of it. This observation reinforces the apparently problematic proposal that for each quantifier the speaker must learn whether it can have the function of the head of the quantified construction, or that of a modifier, or both. The lexicon is therefore the only place where this can be done.

We will go on to review suggestive evidence from Romanian and German.

2.1. Romanian. Romanian has two different lexical entries for the dual universal quantifier: amîndoi and ambii. The former clearly behaves like the universal quantifier toți, while the latter is parallel to a prenominal adjective such as bieți ("poor"). We will now see some tests that show this Q-vs.-AP distinction.

Universal quantifiers in Romanian are followed by an articulated element, as in (4) while prenominal adjectives are articulated themselves, as in (5):

(4) a. au venit toți băieții frumoși
    have come all boys-the nice
b. *au venit toții băieții frumoși
    have come all-the boys nice
(5) a. *au venit bieți băieții
    have come poor boys-the
b. au venit bieții băieți
    have come poor-the boys

Amîndoi in (6) patterns with the quantifier toți in (4) while ambii in (7) patterns with the prenominal adjective biet in (5):
(6) a. au venit amândoi băieții frumoși
    have come both boys-the nice
   
b. *au venit amândoi băieți frumoși
    have come both-the boys nice

(7) a. *au venit ambi(i) băieții frumoși
    have come both-(the) boys-the nice
   
b. au venit ambii băieți frumoși
    have come both-the boys nice

In Romanian, as well as in Hebrew, quantifiers can appear in postnominal position. This can be analysed, following Shlonsky’s (1991) proposal on Hebrew, as movement of the complement of Q to Spec QP. Again, amândoi behaves as a quantifier, allowing movement of its complement to SpecQP in (8a), parallel to toți in (8b), while ambii, does not in (9a), neither does an adjective like biet in (9b):

(8) a. au venit vecinii amândoi
    have come neighbours-the both
   
b. au venit vecinii toți
    have come neighbours-the all

(9) a. *au venit vecini(i) ambi(i)
    have come neighbours-(the) both-(the)
   
b. *au venit vecini(i) bieți(i)
    have come neighbours-(the) nice-(the)

With respect to the discontinuous position of the quantifier, the two items again display the same Q vs. A asymmetry. Universal Qs can appear in discontinuous position (as in (10)), adjectives cannot (as in (11)):

(10) a. vecinii au venit amândoi
    neighbours-(the) have come both
   
b. vecinii au venit toți
    neighbours-(the) have come all

(11) a. *vecini(i) au venit ambii(i)
    neighbours-(the) have come both-(the)
   
b. *vecini(i) au venit bieți(i)
    neighbours-(the) have come poor-(the)

The same happens for quantifiers linked to clitics:

(12) a. i-am văzut pe amândoi
    [I] them-have seen both
b. i-am văzut pe toți  
[I] them-have seen all 
(13) a. *i-am văzut pe ambi(i)  
[I] them-have seen both-(the) 
b. *i-am văzut pe bieți(i)  
[I] them-have seen poor-(the) 

Romanian therefore provides us with evidence that universal quantifiers can have the function of modifiers of the noun, and furthermore that there are some quantificational adjectives that are not homomimous to a quantifier.

2.2. German. Romanian is not the only language with lexical items specialized to function as quantificational adjectives. German, has two of them: *ganzen and *meisten. In (14a) they clearly display the adjectival weak ending -en and in (14b) they appear to be unable to be the head of a quantified nominal, in the first nominal position, nor can they appear in discontinuous position in (14c):

(14) a. ich kenne die ganzen/meisten Kinder in dieser Schule  
I know the all/most children in this school  
b. *ich kenne ganze/meiste/Kinder (in dieser Schule)  
I know all/most children in this school  
c. die Kinder kenne ich alle/*ganze(n)/*meisten  
the children know I all/all/most 

German also displays a universal quantifier which can have both functions, namely the dual beide. Beide can appear either in the first nominal position or after a determiner:

(15) a. beide Gäste sind weg  
b. die beiden Gäste sind weg  
"both guests have gone"

Adjectival beide in (15b) crucially has the weak adjectival ending -en which is missing in (15a), and may even be preceded by an adjective such as erst ("first") in (16a), on a par with other numeral adjectives, as in (16b):

(16) a. die ersten beiden/ die beiden ersten Bücher  
the first both/ the both first books  
b. die ersten zehn Bücher/ die zehn ersten Bücher  
the first ten books/ the ten first books 

The evidence from Romanian and German clearly shows that the observation which seemed true for Italian and English that quantificational adjectives are a subset
of existential quantifiers is spurious.

Notice, in passing, that comparing English *most* with the German *meisten*, we can assume that *most* in English is actually preceded by the empty determiner that Abney (1987) assumes for all quantified expressions. The impossibility in English vs. the necessity in German for a definite article to appear will be due to independent properties of the two languages. The generic null article in German, as a matter of fact, has a much more restricted application than its counterpart in English. This can solve a longstanding problem, mentioned in De Jong (1987) of classification of *most*, which appears to behave as a "weak" quantifier (in the sense of Barwise and Cooper (1981)), namely as a quantifier preceded by a definite article.

2.3. *The structural position of quantifiers.* The data briefly discussed so far neatly distinguish two classes of quantifiers. None of them can be unified with other so-called determiners. This is trivial for quantificational adjectives, given that they can co-occur with determiners; but it appears to be correct for quantifier heads as well, according to the following tests.\(^2\)

Quantifiers have selectional properties over the nominal projection, while determiners do not:

\[(17) \quad \text{a. many/ three/ some of the boys}\]
\[\quad \text{b. *the/ these of the boys}\]

As Cardinaletti and Giusti (1989, and subsequent wairk) argue, existential quantifiers can select an indefinite partitive nominal (*boys*, in *many boys*) or a definite partitive PP (*of the boys* in *(17a)*). Determiners, as other functional projections, on the contrary, do not have selectional properties on the lexical entry they embed.

Quantifiers can embed personal pronouns, which are possibly DPs, while determiners cannot:

\[(18) \quad \text{a. you all/ you three}\]
\[\quad \text{b. **you the/ you these}\]

This follows if the DP does not include the quantifier phrase.

No determiners other than quantifiers can appear in discontinuous position. This last property is expected if we assume Shlonsky's reformulation of Sportiche's (1988) proposal that the discontinuous position of the *Q* is the effect of movement of its complement, complemented by a rather reasonable restriction of movement to "perfect projections" in the sense of Grimshaw (1991):

\[\quad \text{For a more detailed description cf. Giusti (1991).}\]
(19) a. children are all noisy
    b. *children are many noisy
    c. *children are these noisy
(20) a. li ho visti tutti
    [I] them saw all
    b. ne ho visti molti
    [I] of-them saw many
    c. **li/ne ho visti i/ questi

In (19a) and (20a), we see movement of a full projection (a lexical noun such as children in (19a) and a clitic pronoun such as li in (20a). The unacceptability of (19b) can be accounted for by Cardinaletti and Giusti’s proposal that existential quantifiers assign partitive case to their complement DP, complemented by the assumption that a partitive DP cannot land in the prenominal subject position. This is supported by comparison with (20b) where a partitive clitic is allowed, because the clitic is not moved to a case assigning position. The unacceptability of (19c) and (20c) is due to the fact that the determiner is included in the nominal projection and cannot be left in place after this has moved.

The structure we obtain from the discussion above is the one in (21):

(21) [QP [QQ QD [DP [DD DQ [AgrP QP [AgrQ ccc. NQ]]]]]]

In (21), the categorial status of a quantified nominal is QP; Q embeds a perfect nominal projection (DP); while quantifiers preceded by D are internal to DP like adjectives. I shall remain vague with respect to the position of other classes of adjectives. For the rest of the paper I will rely on Cinque’s (1990) and Crisma’s (1991) analysis of the position of the adjectives inside the noun phrase. I will therefore assume intermediate AgrPs between DP and NP without discussion.

3. Demonstratives. In English and other well-studied languages, demonstratives appear to be in complementary distribution with articles. This is not true in a whole series of other languages, not necessarily related to each other, a sample of which includes Greek, Hungarian, Gothic, Romanian, Macedonian, Indonesian, according to Lundeby (1965) and Heinrichs (1954):

(22) a. Greek: autós o aner ("this the man")
    Javanese: ika n anak ("this the boy);
    Hungarian: ez a haz ("this the house")
    b. Macedonian: toj covek-ot ("this man-the")
    c. Gothic: pan wig jainan ("the way this")
    d. Romanian: omul acesta ("man-the this")
Notice that it is very difficult to find another property of the determiner system of these languages that can correlate with this. In (22a) we see the order Dem - Art - N; in (22b) Dem - N+Art; in (22c) Art - N - Dem; in (22d) N+Art - Dem. In other words, demonstratives appear to be pre- or post-nominal regardless of the nature of the article.

This variation in word order reminds us of the variation found in the position of the adjectives which can also appear pre- or post-nominally in various languages. The minimal assumption is therefore that demonstratives are adjectives (namely modifiers inside DP, and not in the head D) at least in those languages in which they co-occur with determiners. A further step will be to extend this analysis to languages in which they do not co-occur with the article.

Romanian is particularly interesting in this respect because it displays a construction with no article (23a) parallel to the one we find in English, together with a construction with an article, as in (23b). It thus allows us to compare the two constructions abstracting away from other language specific properties:

(23) a. acest/ acel băiat
    this/ that boy
b. băiatul acesta/ acela
    boy-il thisA/ thatA

Notice that in (23b) the demonstrative is postnominal and carries the invariable morpheme -a which also appears when the demonstrative is pronominalized.

Following Grosu (1988), I will assume that the articulated noun is the result of movement of the head N to D in which the article is inserted. This movement is strongly supported by the fact that the articulated noun is always in the first nominal position:

(24) a. un frumos băiat
    a nice boy
b. băiatul frumos
    boy-the nice

Prenominal adjectives are possible, but in that case they must host the enclitic article:

(25) a. frumosul băiat
    nice-the boy
b. *frumos băiatul
    nice boy-the

Notice that in all cases there is only one occurrence of the enclitic article. Reduplication of category DP to treat cases like (22d)/(23b) is therefore not justified
in Romanian. In what follows I will claim that it is not justified in other languages as well, and possibly in all languages.

Movement of the noun across the position of acest is supported by the observation that the position of acest remains invariant with respect to the other elements of the nominal phrase:

(26) a. aceste două frumoase fete
    these two nice girls
b. fetele acestea două frumoase
    girls-the these two nice
c. *fetele două acestea frumoase
    girls-the two these nice
d. *fetele două frumoase acestea
    girls-the two nice these

(26) clearly shows that the demonstrative does not move from its basic position and that the postnominal position is an effect of N movement to D, which is independently needed in Romanian. Interestingly the demonstrative cannot be crossed over by an ordinary adjective (27a), even if this adjective can appear in prenominal position when the demonstrative is not present, regardless of the presence of another adjective (27b):

(27) a. *importantele acestea (recente) măsuri
    important-the (these) (recent) measures
b. importantele recente măsuri

It is rather straightforward to treat the contrast between (26a) and (27a) as a minimality effect. This amounts to saying that the demonstrative is in a Spec position in all cases in Romanian and can be crossed over only by a head (N), and not by a maximal projection such as an AP. The -a morpheme that we find in the postnominal demonstrative is therefore to be taken as a Spec-head agreement marker that signals the presence of a trace in the intermediate head modified by the demonstrative.

If this is correct we expect that, if there are modifiers of the noun generated in a position higher than the demonstrative, these elements will be able to appear at the left side of the demonstrative and, furthermore, without triggering Spec-head agreement. This prediction is born out. The examples in (28) are attested in the descriptive work by Lombard (1974): ³

³ My informants have judged the phrases in (28) as marginal, however they made a significative distinction with respect to the inacceptability of (27a) above).
(28) a. ambi sec vecini/ *acești ambi(i) vecini
    both these neighbours/ these both neighbours
b. ulti ari an de studiu/ acești utimi ani de studiu
    last-the these years of study/ these last years of study

As was noted above, the quantificational adjective *ambi is always articulated. This can be taken as evidence to assume that *ambi is directly generated in Spec DP. This is supported by the fact that *ambi is one of the very few adjectives that can precede a demonstrative in Romanian, and is the only one that cannot follow it, as shown in (28a). Something very similar can be claimed for *ulti in the first part of (28b). The only difference between *ambi and *ulti is that the latter does not have to be generated in SpecDP; on the contrary, as most other adjectives is preferably inserted in a lower Spec, as is apparent in the second part of (28b). Crucially in all cases of (28) Spec-head agreement with the demonstrative is not triggered, given that in any case nothing moves.

The basic position of a demonstrative in Romanian can therefore be taken to be lower than DP, and in an intermediate functional projection, whose head hosts the trace of the moved noun:

(29) 

What remains to be explained is why prenominal acest may not co-occur with a
definite article. I propose that *acest can move to Spec DP if DP is not filled by a lexical element. A sort of doubly-filled DP Filter can account for the non existence of *acest bâiatul with *acest in SpecDP and bâiat moved to D to incorporate the enclitic article -ul.

In (29c) I am not assuming that the head D incorporates into the head of the AP in its Spec, but - more in line with current assumptions on the relation within a head and its Spec - I assume that the adjective has a marker of Spec-head agreement. This richness in the morphology of the Spec allows, therefore forces, the head to be empty. The impossibility of *acestul follows from the same assumption: *acest is already marked for non-oblique case and does not need any further morpheme to allow Spec-head agreement with the head D. When the DP is assigned oblique case, the demonstrative is inflected for it: acestui (*cf. acestului). If we take D to be a marker of case, and not of definiteness or referentiality, we expect that elements of different lexical classes can minimally differ with respect to inflectional morphology. What is always important is that the case features are shared by the head and the Spec in the appropriate way.

If this is true in Romanian, we have no reason to think that it should not be true in other languages. The only difference between Romanian and English can therefore be the possibility in Romanian to have a demonstrative in SpecAgrP, while we can think that in English the demonstrative must always be in Spec DP.

4. Possessives. The same reasoning can hold of possessives. We need not to go as far as Romania to encounter adjectival possessives! Italian provides us with a clear example:

(30) a. la mia penna
   b. *mia penna
      my pen

And yet, even in Italian, there are cases in which a possessive cannot co-occur with an article. With kinship terms, the Italian possessive apparently behaves like a determiner, as its English cognate, as in (31). However, if a modifier is added to the construction, the article shows up again, as in (32). This happens also when the head noun is modified by a diminutive, as in (33), or even when the number is plural, as in (34):

(31) a. (*il) mio padre/ fratello/ nonno/ cugino/ zio
    b. my father/ brother/ grandfather/ cousin
(32) a. (?)?mio fratello minore/ (?)?il mio cugino di Venezia
    b. il mio fratello minore/ il mio cugino di Venezia
(33) a. *mio fratellino/ cuginetto
    b. il mio fratellino/ cuginetto
       my little-brother/ little-cousin
(34) a. *miei fratelli/ cugini/ zii/ nonni
    b. i miei fratelli/ cugini/ zii/ nonni

I shall not discuss why this is so. I will just take the contrasts between (31) and
(33)-(34) as an argument to claim that the lack of the definite article in (31) cannot be
taken as evidence for the D status of the possessive, since this sharply contrasts with
minimally different cases.

Parallel to what has been said above for demonstratives, I propose that the
possessive, in all languages discussed here and hopefully much more in general, is in
SpecAgrP when it co-occurs with the article and in SpecDP when it is in
complementary distribution with it. Due to a "doubly-filled DP Filter", the possessive
cannot precede the article in the languages we have observed. The different
distribution of the possessive in various languages is therefore to be reduced to the
movement or the base generation of the possessive in Spec DP or in SpecAgrP.
Further research is needed to motivate this difference in each case.

For example, in German the possessive must move when Spec DP is empty, but
it can appear in SpecAgrP if SpecDP is filled by a demonstrative. This is shown by
the contrast in (35), which would be quite mysterious if possessives, demonstratives
and articles in German were all to be inserted in the same position:

(35) a. *die meine Frage
    b. diese meine Frage

Notice that the unacceptability of (35a) cannot be reduced to a trivial structural
complementarity between the possessive and the article specific to German, since in
this language we find cases like (35c) in which the possessive can co-occur with an
article when the noun is null:

(35) c. deine Fragen wurden beantwortet, meine/ die meinen jedoch nicht
    your question was answered, mine-[strong]/ the my-[weak] however not

Even if, once again, I am not yet in the position of explaining why this is so, the
possibility of the co-occurrence of the possessive with the definite article, and the fact
that in this case the possessive displays weak adjectival morphology can be taken as
supporting evidence for the independently proposed hypothesis that possessives are
not determiners, even in those languages where they do not co-occur with an article
in most cases.

5. Articles. What is left for the head of DP is the article. This is not so surprising
if one considers that functional categories build closed classes. And DP is considered
by all studies as a functional projection. Let us now review some properties attributed
to DP in recent literature.

According to Grimshaw (1991) DP is the perfect projection of N in a fashion
parallel to that in which CP is a perfect projection of V. This is in agreement with Szabolcsi’s (1992) claim that both DP and CP have the function of saturating a predicate, namely of turning a predicate (VP or NP) into an argument.

We can go further in the parallelisms between the two projections with the observation made above that in certain languages, both DP and CP appear to undergo the restriction expressed by the doubly-filled COMP Filter of Chomsky and Lasnik (1977). In other words, even if it can be assumed that they have two positions, a Spec and a head, on a par with other maximal projections, in certain languages they can only be filled by one element, either a maximal projection in Spec, or a head.

One can conjecture that this common property is to be derived from their status of "perfect projections", or "saturators". It could be thought that in all languages saturators need to be instantiated by one element and that in some language the condition turns into one and only one element. Why this should be so has been the topic of much literature, but no much consensus has ever been reached on this problem. 4

The analysis that has been presented so far implies that D is instantiated for syntactic reasons. It therefore predicts that in at least some cases the element filling D is not inserted for semantic purposes.

I will now present some evidence from German, Romanian and Mainland Scandinavian that appears to support this claim.

5.1. *German*. In German, mass nouns generally lack a lexical article, on a par with English:

(36) a. Ich liebe Kaffee
    b. I like coffee

If, however, the mass noun is in an oblique case, the article must appear:

(37) a. Ich ziehe Kaffee *(dem) Tee vor
    b. I prefer coffee to tea

Vater (1991) claims that the dative article *dem* in (37a) is inserted to mark the indirect object in order to disambiguate the two complements of the predicate *vorziehen* ("prefer"). As a matter of fact, the generalization to be made is stronger than that: Even if the sentence is unambiguous, a mass noun assigned oblique case (genitive or dative) must be articulated:

---

(38) a. die Zubereitung *(des) Kaffees
    b. the preparation of coffee

In (38a), Kaffee is the only possible complement of Zubereitung, since no other argument is present. Notice also that genitive is the only case that could be assigned in that context and, furthermore, that it is recoverable from the -s ending on Kaffees. Nevertheless, all this is not sufficient to allow in (38a) the null determiner that appears in accusative contexts like (36a). In a framework in which an article is the syntactic realization of Case, as the one developed in Giusti (1992), the contrast between (36a) on the one hand and (37a) and (38a) on the other can be derived by just stating that oblique case in German cannot be null.

5.2. Romanian. In several respects, the (non)-occurrence of the definite article in Romanian is not related to the (in)definite meaning of the noun phrase and only dependent on the syntactic requirements of, possibly, case assignment, as shown by the contrast between (39)-(40) and (39)-(40):

(39) a. profesorul a mers la Paris
    b. *profesor a mers la Paris
       professor-the went to Paris

(40) a. am citit cartea
    b. *am citit carte
       [I] read book-the

(41) a. l-am văzut pe profesor
    b. *l-am văzut pe profesorul
       [I] saw PE professor(*the)

(42) a. iți multumesc pentru scrisoare
    b. *iți multumesc pentru scrisoarea
       [I] thank you for letter(*the)

In (39)-(40) we see noun phrases in subject and object position. In these positions we cannot find a singular bare noun. The article is obligatory. In (41)-(42) we see noun phrases in the position of object of preposition. The interpretation of these noun phrases is definite, but the article cannot appear. It is not difficult to reduce this phenomenon to some case marking property of the preposition. In (39)-(40) the article is present not (only) to allow the definite interpretation, but to signal nominative/accusative Case. In (41)-(42) this is not necessary since the preposition can accomplish the same function. Because it is not necessary, the article is not allowed, as is often the case in syntax and differently from what happens with semantically relevant elements.

Interestingly the article is obligatory again when the complement of the preposition is modified in some way, as shown in (43)-(44):
(43) a. l-am văzut pe profesorul tău
     b. *l-am văzut pe profesor tău
     [I saw PE professor-the your
(44) a. îți multumesc pentru scrisoarea interesantă
     b. *îți multumesc pentru scrisoare interesantă ecc.
     [I thank you for letter-the interesting

Given that D may (and therefore must) be lexically empty when a preposition properly governs DP in (41)-(42), and given that in the framework assume so far the adjectives in (43)-(44) cannot interfere in any way in the relation between the preposition and D, the licencing of D cannot be different in the two cases. The contrast between them must therefore be due to something else.

A possible reason for the necessity of the article in (43)-(44) could be a requirement that the specifer where the adjective is inserted be properly governed by a lexical D. This analysis is not only plausible; it also captures an independent phenomenon that is found in Scandinavian and that will be discussed in 5.3. below.

Romanian presents further evidence to claim that at least in some cases the article cannot be related to semantic interpretation. Consider (45):

(45) a. am cumpărat un ziar
     I bought a newspaper
     b. am cumpărat unul
     I bought one
(46) a. n-am cumpărat niciun ziar
     I didn’t buy any newspaper
     b. n-am cumpărat niciunul
     I didn’t buy anyone

The b.-sentences in (45)-(46) are the pronominalized versions of the a.-sentences. In (45), we see that the existential indefinite quantifier un(ul) (a/ one) is pronominalized by the morpheme -ul that is exactly identical to the definite article and can hardly be claimed to be something else. The same happens to the negative existential niciun(ul) ("none") which for sure cannot be claimed to be referential or even definite in any sense.

This data would be mysterious if we took -ul to be a semantic element that signals definiteness or referentiality. However, if we take the article as a marker for case, we can explain its presence in (45b) and (46b) by claiming that the empty complement of the quantifier must be identified by some features in D, such as gender, number and case, which are realized on the noun in (45a) and (46a).

5.3. Mainland Scandinavian. Danish, Swedish and Norwegian display an enclitic definite article on a par with Romanian:
(47) a. un om/ omul
   b. en man/ mannen
      a man/ man-the

Taraldsen (1988) for Norwegian, Delsing (1988) for Swedish proposed, in a DP framework, that the head N moves to D to incorporate the article, parallel to Grosu’s proposal for Romanian. However, if we consider a more complex noun phrase, we immediately notice some crucial difference between Mainland Scandinavian and Romanian that cannot be captured by such analysis:

(48) a. un båtrín om/ omul båtrín
     an old man/ the old man
   b. en gammal man/ den gamle mannen (Swedish/Norwegian)
      an old man/ the old man-the

As was noted above, Grosu’s N-movement analysis in Romanian is strengthened by the different word order of the two parts of (48a), where it is apparent that the head N is displaced from its basic position to the position of the article. But in (48b) we find that the articulated noun has not been displaced with respect to other elements of the phrase. Furthermore, in (48b) an extra definite article is inserted before the adjective.

Delsing (1988) analyses the second phrase in (48b) as an instance of double definiteness, parallel to the co-occurrence of a demonstrative with an article, which is also possible in Scandinavian. However, there are some problems with this analysis. As a matter of fact, the second phrase in (48b) must be distinguished from its counterpart (49) with a demonstrative for two reasons:

(49) a. denna (gamle) mannen (spoken Swedish and Norwegian)
     b. denna (gamle) man (Standard Swedish)

According to what is said in Delsing (1988), Holmberg (1986), the demonstrative denna contrary to the definite article den may co-occur with an article only in spoken Swedish and in Norwegian, however not in Standard Swedish. Furthermore, the co-occurrence of the demonstrative denna with an articulated noun is not dependent on the presence of an article, contrary to what is observed for the unbound article den:

(50) a. *den mannen
     b. denna mannen (Spoken Swedish and Norwegian vs. *Standard Swedish)

It seems worthwhile trying to give an alternative analysis. Let us consider the Danish counterpart of (47b) and (48b):

(50) a. en man/ mannen (cf. (47b))
     b. den gamle man(*nen) (cf. (48b))
From (50a) we can safely claim that Danish can be paired with the other Scandinavian languages in that it has an enclitic definite article. A crucial difference arises in (47b), however, where the presence of the adjective forces the article to be an unbound morpheme.

The comparison between Romanian and Danish suggests that the adjective somehow blocks the incorporation of the noun into the article in Danish but not in Romanian.

At first sight, this would force us to assume that adjectives are intervening heads between D and N, contrary to what has been assumed all along in this paper. However, this is not necessary if we make an independently needed distinction.

Germanic languages, contrary to Romance languages, do not display postnominal adjectives. This difference in word order is analysed by Cinque (1990) starting from the same basic structure for both types of languages, and assuming N-movement to intermediate functional heads only in Romance:

(51) a. un vecchio uomo/ un uomo vecchio ti
    b. an old man/ *a mani old ti

The fact that the order A N is basic for Italian as well as for English is shown in the first part of (51a). In (51b) the noun has moved skipping over the adjective. In English this movement is not possible.

Romanian and Danish are not exceptional in this respect: In (52) they display the same contrast that we just found between Italian and English in (51):

(52) a. un bătrîn om/ un omi bătrîn ti
    b. en gammal man/ *en mani gammal ti

In definite noun phrases movement of the noun goes further in Romanian, and appears to be blocked in Danish:

(53) a. omul bătrîn
    b. *cel bătrîn om
    c. *bătrîn omul

(54) a. *mommen gamle
    b. den gamle man
    c. *gamle/gammal mannen

---

5 In Romanian cel is very near Mainland Scandinavia den in that it appears as a nominal article in a few cases (cf. cei trei băieți, "the three children"), and is used to nominalize adjectives (cf. cel bătrîn, den gamle, "the old one"). I will not go into this comparative question here.
We have now some reasons to assume that N does not move in Danish, contrary to what happens in Romanian.

If we dispense with N-movement *tout court* in Danish, the incorporation of the enclitic article with the noun in the simple case (47b) can alternatively be analysed as lowering of D to N. Lowering of the article leaves a trace in D that will be governed by its antecedent at LF in the usual way (cf. Chomsky (1988)). The sequence in (47b) is therefore permitted by the principles of the grammar. What appears to be unallowed is an adjective in the complement of a non-lexical D, as in (54b). This is the case in Romanian as well, as was pointed out in (43)-(44) above.

The insertion of *den* in all Mainland Scandinavian languages is required to licence the Spec where the adjective is inserted. This requirement forces insertion of the enclitic article plus movement of the noun in Romanian object of prepositions seen in (43)-(44) above.

Let us now go back to the Swedish example (48b). Given that Mainland Scandinavian languages are so similar to each other in so many respects, it would be very peculiar to assume that Swedish and Norwegian are so different from Danish to display an extra projection of DP to be inserted at some point in the structure. Furthermore, such an assumption would miss important general properties of the structure of noun phrases across languages. I propose to analyse the apparent enclitic article in (48b) as an Agr morpheme on the noun, parallel to the -s morpheme we found in German on the noun *Kaffes* in (38a). A structure with intermediate AgrP projections such as the one I have implicitly assumed along the paper and is motivated in various pieces of literature (cf. among others Piccallo (1990), Ritter (1991)) will provide the position for such a morpheme without any additional assumption.

5.4. *Some conclusions*. In this section we have seen clear cases in which an article is necessary or impossible for syntactic reasons, regardless of the referential/definite status of the nominal in question. In particular we have seen that the article must be inserted to instantiate DP, when nothing else is inserted in this projection. But when the head of DP is allowed to be null for some other reason (as is the case of PPs in Romanian) the article cannot be inserted. We have also seen that the article must be inserted, if nothing else is in DP, to allow the Spec of the lower projection to be filled (possibly to be generated at all).

In so doing, I have provided a simple and principled analysis for the different word orders to be found in the noun phrase in Romanian and Scandinavian, and for some minimal morphological variation among the Mainland Scandinavian languages.
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