ADJECTIVES AND PROPER NOUNS IN ROMANCE AND ENGLISH

Ion Giurgea

Université Paris VII

0. Abstract

My contribution examines some problems raised by adjectival restrictive modification of proper nouns. I begin with a contrast between the way in which this modification is achieved in English and in Romance, particularly in Romanian: while English uses the same structure for proper and common nouns, in Romance, in the case of the definite article, other structures are preferred (and in Romanian obligatory), which have the form PN+Art+Adj (structures which I call "identificatory appositions"). After briefly examining the types of conversion of PNs to CNs and the behaviour of determiners with PNs, I discuss some possible solutions to the contrast between Romance and English, and conclude that Romance uses the identificatory apposition for a special type of restrictive modification of PNs, one in which a selection among familiar entities is involved. In Romanian instead of preference we find obligatoriness for morphological reasons. Then I sketch an analysis of the structure of identificatory apposition, associating it to a special semantic rule from which we can derive most of its properties. In the end I present some further applications of the structure I have proposed.

1. The problems

In the standard use, proper nouns directly refer to individuals, coming from the lexicon with the semantic type <e>, so they don't admit restrictive modification. However, sometimes a selection has to be made among entities sharing the same name, in which case a restrictive modification is needed. When the restrictive modifier is an adjective, in English it suffices to insert a definite article (or another determiner) before Adj+N. However, Romance languages, in these cases, prefer another strategy, illustrated in (3)-(4). In Romanian, this is more than a preference: a construction of the type (1)b is completely excluded.

- (1) a. the tall boy b. the tall John
- (2) a. (rom.) băiatul înalt (it.) il ragazzo biondo/alto (fr.) le garçon grand/blond boy.the tall the boy blond/tall the boy tall/blond

b. (rom.) *Ionul blond / înalt Ion.the blond / tall	(it.) ?(?) il Gianni biondo / alto the G. blond tall
	*cel Ion blond/înalt	(fr.) ?(?) Le Jean blond / grand
	the Ion blond /tall	the J. blond/tall
(3)	a. (rom.) Ion blondul	b. Ion cel blond/înalt
	I. blond.the	I. the blond/tall
(4)	a. (it.) Gianni il biondo / alto	b. (fr.) Jean le blond/grand
	G. the blond / tall	J. the blond / tall

The problems I want to address are:

- (i) Where does this difference come from, and
- (ii) How are the structures in (3) to be analyzed?

2. Preliminary observations

Before addressing these problems, some observations are in place about the general issue of restrictive modification of proper nouns, and the behavior of determiners with proper nouns.

2.1. Proper nouns and restrictive modification

In their standard use PNs (proper nouns), functioning as rigid designators, lacking descriptive content, take neither determiners (ex. 5)¹ nor restrictive modifiers (ex. 6):

- (5) a. *(The/a) boy came in b. (*The/a) John came in
- (6) a. * John whom I met in Bilbao is ugly
 b. John, whom I met in Bilbao, is ugly
 c. (fr.) Le journaliste se promenait dans Sarajevo devasté
 "The journalist walked through Sarajevo devastated"
 d. I don't like John mad

Examples (6)b-d show various modifiers of proper nouns which have in common the property of not being restrictive: an appositive relative clause in (6)b, adjuncts presumably having the structure of small clauses with a PRO subject coindexed with the N in (6)c and d. Notice that the adjective in (6)c is not used to contrast a devastated Sarajevo with other parts of that town or other towns called like that which are not devastated, but simply says that at the time of the main clause event, that city was devastated.

¹ More precisely, they don't take meaningful determiners. They allow at most an expletive determiner, which is a definite or a specialized, "proprial" article. Some languages make extensive use of such an article (definite in colloquial German and Portuguese, proprial in Catalan). In other languages the definite article is taken by subclasses or individual PNs marked as such in the lexicon. These PNs are never "prototypical" (the most prototypical PNs being antroponymes), and always take the article. Ex. eng. London vs. The Hague (individual items), fr. Paris, Londres etc., vs. la France, le Mexique (a class contrast).

In special cases (always marked), PNs come to behave as common nouns, admitting determiners, restrictive modifiers, plural. Then they are no longer rigid designators, but translate as a predicate. Researchers have identified several types of meaning that can be obtained in these contexts. The list of types that I present here is based on the French school, especially Gary Prieur (1994):

(i) "denominative": the PNs is converted to the predicate "entity called N" (this is the prototypical case of PN-conversion):

- (7) a. There are three Maries in our class
 - b. (fr.) Le Muller que j'ai connu à Bonn "The Muller which I met in Bonn"

(ii) spatial/temporal parts (sections, or stages): a class is formed from the spatial or temporal parts of an individual designated by N in its standard use:

(8)	a. (fr.) Le vieux Paris	c. (fr.) La Rome antique
	"Old Paris"	"Ancient Rome"
	b. Young Mozart	d. (sp.) La España medieval
	-	"Medieval Spain"

(iii) images of the referent: in some cases, the parts of the entity that constitute the class are harder to define. They may be subjective images of that referent, or types of situations linked to that referent —for example, socially defined urban environments or urban life in (9)b, or emotional states of a person in (9)d:

- (9) a. The Paris that I read about
 - b. (fr.) Le Paris populaire, le Paris des pauvres "The Paris of the common people, of the poor"
 - c. Le Pierre que j'aime n'est plus "The P. I love doesn't exist any longer"
 - d. Ce jour-là, j'avais vu un Arsène Lupin que j'ignorais, faible, abattu, les yeux las de pleurer...

"That day I saw an Arsène Lupin which I never knew, weak, depressed, the eyes tired of crying"

e. (sp.) Esta mañana me encontré con una María muy rejuvenecida this morning (me) met.1sg with a Mary more rejuvenated

(iv) metaphorical: here, the predicate formed may be translated as "person sharing a set of relevant properties with N, being, from a certain point of view, an equivalent of N"; in this case, the modifier doesn't refer to the bearer of the name in its standard use, but to the referent metaphorically defined as a counterpart of it:

(10) a. (fr.) Le Gorbatchev albanais
"The Albanian Gorbatchev"
b. (fr.) La Christophe Columb des temps modernes
"The(fem.) Cristopher Columbus of modern times"

(v) metonymical: on names of famous creators or producers, predicates can be formed meaning "object produced / created by N":

(11) a. I bought a Van Gogh and several Picassos
b. (fr.) J'ai ecouté du Bach
"I heard some Bach"²

2.2. Modified proper nouns and determiners

We have seen that in their different uses as CNs (common nouns), PNs generally receive determiners like ordinary CNs, the difference pointed out in (1)-(4) concerning only the definite determiner and the denominative use of PNs.

However, examples (12)-(13) show another difference between Romance and English: while in Romance even non-restrictive prenominal adjectives, when used with a standard PN, require the definite article, in English non-restrictive prenominal adjectives don't require any determiner, thus opposing to the restrictive ones:

(12)	a. I saw tall Mary	Appositive, depictive
	b. I saw the tall Mary	Restrictive, denominative
(13)	a. (fr.) * J'ai vu belle Marie	b. J'ai vu la belle Marie
	I have seen beautifu	I have seen the beautiful M.

An explanation for this contrast may be found in Longobardi (1994). This case, as well as other differences between Germanic and Romance, is covered, according to him, by the following parameter: D is strong in Romance and weak in Germanic. It is commonly assumed that D is the locus of referentiality in the noun phrase. The referential element in (12)a and (13) is, obviously, the N. In (12)a D can check referentiality by covert movement, while in Romance, as seen in (13), this movement has to be overt. When no prenominal adjective is present, no determiner is necessary because the PN moves to D:

(14) J'ai vu (*la) Marie. I have seen (the) M.

Of course, this explanation, which uses the theoretical apparatus of the early 90's, can be translated in current minimalist terms by putting an EPP-feature on D in Romance.

Longobardi offers the following arguments for his view:

(i) The absence of the determiner is possible in Romance with modified PNs provided that the PN occupies the first position:

(15) a. (it.) *antica Roma	b. l'antica Roma	c. Roma antica
ancient Rome	the ancient Rome	Rome ancient

² In (11)b the partitive article, impossible with PNs in the standard use, signals the type shifting (compare to (i)). A similar contrast appears in Romanian —in the metonymical use the N may appear as a mass noun ((ii)a), while in the standard use a PN has to receive, in this context (direct object), a prepositional accusative marker ((ii)b-c):

- (i) (fr.) J'ai écouté Jean "I listened to John"
- (ii) a. (rom.) Am ascultat Bach have.1 listened Bach

b. *Am ascultat Vasile have.1 listened V. c. L-am ascultat pe Vasile him-have.1 listened Ac. V. For (15)c N-to-D is assumed.

(ii) In the construction PN+Adj, the adjective may have a reading available only prenominally with CNs:

(16) a. la sola ragazza	b. la ragazza sola	c. Maria sola = la sola Maria
the <i>solo</i> .fem girl	the girl solo.fem	M. solo.fem the solo.fem M.
"the only girl"	"the lonely girl"	"only Mary"

This fact too would be explained by assuming raising of the PN to D in (16)c.

(iii) The same D-strength parameter explains the distribution of argumental bare nouns in Romance and Germanic: thus, in Romance, they appear only in lexically governed position, and have only existential interpretation, while in Germanic they are unrestricted, and they may also acquire a generic reading, functioning as "names of kinds":

(17) a. I bought apples	b. I like apples	c. Apples are good
(18) (rom.) a. Am cumpărat mere	b. Îmi plac mere*(le)	c. *Mere sunt bune
have.1 bought apple	s me.D like apples(the)	apples are good

The explanation relies on the following assumptions: in argumental positions only DPs are allowed (the D-level must be projected). A null D, as all empty heads, must be lexically governed. That's why the null D specified for mass/(weak) indefinite plural can appear only in object position in Romance. Generics, as a special type of PNs —"names of kinds"—, are based on a chain between N and D, like PNs, the difference being that in their case the base position (N) is interpreted, while for PNs D is interpreted. Thus generics may appear bare in Germanic, where D is weak. In Romance a definite article is necessary since D is strong and the noun, lexically specified as CN, lacks the +ref feature that determines raising to D in the case of PNs. Hence the following contrast:

(19) a. (*The) wolfs are mammals b. (it.) *(I) lupi sono mammiferi the wolfs are mammels

This explanation is not without problems. First, the construction PN+Adj, which was taken to show N-to-D, is very restricted in Italian: it appears only with possessives, ordinals and the adjectives *vecchio, giovane, antico, solo*. For other adjectives it is very marginal with a restrictive reading and impossible with an appositive reading:

(20) ??*Gianni simpatico* (judgement from Longobardi 1994). G. friendly

Secondly, in other Romance languages all postposed modifiers require a determiner:

(21) a. (fr.) Je pense à (*la) Rome	b. Je pense à *(la) Rome antique
I think of the Rome	I think of the Rome ancient

It is not clear why movement of the PN to D is blocked in (21)b while it is possible in (21)a.

A possible answer, inspired from the analysis to be presented in 3.1, is that (ordinary) adjectival modification requires an <e,t> type, intersective adjectives combining with the nouns (NPs) by the rule of Predicate Modification (Heim and Kratzer 1998, see (22) below), while only <e> type nouns raise to D. This would explain why PNs converted to CNs require a determiner, but not why even non-restrictive adjectives with standard PNs do so, as we have seen in (13). The answer lies perhaps in the position of the non-restrictive adjectives with regard to the N: in Romance, they are generally preposed. We could suppose that their position relative to the N must be preserved in order to maintain their special meaning (non-restrictive). So the N must not overpass them. Then the only solution remains the insertion of an expletive article. Formally, this could be represented by assigning prenominal adjectives to special functional projections which the noun should not be able to overpass. It has been in fact proposed (Bernstein 1993, Coene 1999) to treat these adjectives as heads, a proposition which we will not adopt, since such adjectives don't show the usual properties of functional heads (for instance, they are an open class, which is typical for lexical items), and the structures we talk about are obviously nominal extended projections, not adjectival ones.

3. Solutions to the problem in (1)

3.1. A syntactico-semantic solution (Cornilescu 2004a,b)

Turning back now to the problems presented in section 1, I will present the account for the facts illustrated in (2)-(3) (reproduced below for convenience) given by Cornilescu (2004) for Romanian:

(2)	a. (rom.) băiatul înalt boy.the tall	b. *Ionul blond / înalt *cel Ion blond/înalt	
(3)	a. (rom.) Ion blondul I. blond.the	b. Ion cel blond/înalt I. the blond/tall	

Cornilescu starts by distinguishing two types of adnominal adjectives: NP-adjectives and DP-adjectives. NP-adjectives combine with an <e,t> type (which is the denotation of NPs) as follows: intersective adjectives (type <e,t>) combine by the rule of Predicate Modification (Heim and Kratzer 1998) (or Theta-Identification; Higginbotham 1985):

(22) $[[\alpha \beta]] = \lambda x [[\alpha]](x)$ and $[[\beta]](x)$

Non-intersective (intensional and relational) adjectives, which are of the type <e,t> (predicates of predicates of individuals) combine by the normal Functional Application rule.

Since all NP-adjectives require an <e,t> type to combine with, they can't modify PNs. Adjectives in (2) are NP-adjectives, hence the ungrammaticality of (2)b.

DP-adjectives combine with an <e> type, in a predicative construction (small clause). PNs are of type <e>, so they allow DP-adjectives. The structures in (3) reflect DP-level adjectives, in a predicative structure:

(3') $b \left[_{DP} DP \left[_{D'} + def \left[_{CP} t_{DP} \left[_{C'} \left[_{PredP} t_{DP} \left[_{Pred'} cel \left[AP\right]\right]\right]\right]\right]\right]$

Cornilescu bases her analysis of (3)b on the following arguments: first, relational adjectives, which typically apply to the intension of the N-function and not to the entity denoted by the DP, are impossible in the structure (3)b:

(23) a. societatea (cea) bogată	b. societatea (*cea) astronomică
society.the (the) rich	society.the the astronomical

Secondly, the structure (3)b requires a definite determiner:

(24) a. muntele cel înalt	b. * un/fiecare/alt munte cel înalt
mountain.the the high	a/each/another mountain the high

This second constraint is explained by analyzing *cel* as a predicative head with a deictic feature (hence its interpretation, see section 4, (39)-(40)), requiring a definite subject.

As for structure (3)a, which is not available for CNs, she assumes that the adjective checks definiteness and the PN moves to SpecDP_{max} , as ordinary PNs do (see Longobardi 1994, presented in 2.2. above).

This analysis has several problems. First, why is the structure Det+Adj+NP possible?

(25) frumoasa Maria

beautiful.the Maria

To see if we can answer this, we have to give a closer look to prenominal adjectives. As other Romance languages, Romanian has three kinds of prenominal adjectives (putting aside determiner-like adjectives like *prim* "first", *ambii* "both", which we won't discuss here, since they don't involve restrictive modification):

(i) most adjectives appearing in this position are non-restrictive (when they are restrictive, they appear after the noun); they usually express inherent, familiar properties, and often have an affective, emotional connotation (ex. (25));³

- (rom.) *BLONDUL băiat a venit, nu cel brunet
 - blond.the boy has come not the dark-haired
- impossibility of generic use:

(ii)

(rom.)a. * Îmi plac înaltele case b. Îmi plac casele înalte

me.D like high.the houses me.D like houses.the high

each beautiful day beautiful me delights "Each beautiful day delights me" — impossibility to be used as an answer to a which- question:

(iv)	(it.) — Quale ragazza è venuta?	# — La bionda ragazza	— La ragazza bionda
	which girl is come	the blond girl	the girl blond
See Z	Lamparelli (1993), a.o.		

³ Various tests indicate that ordinary quality adjectives are non-restrictive in Romance when anteposed:

[—] impossibility of contrastive focus:

⁽i) (it.) * Il biondo ragazzo è venuto, non il bruno

the blond boy is come not the dark-haired

[—] impossibility to appear in quantificational DPs:

⁽iii) (rom.) Fiecare (*frumoasă) zi (frumoasă) mă bucură

(ii) a small number of ordinary quality adjectives may be restrictive (function as selectors):

(26) a. tânărul Petre

young.the Petre

(iii) some are non-intersective modalizers (or intensional adjectives) (type "former, alleged, possible, mere, true"), which are always restrictive and appear only in this position:

(27) a. pretinsul Grigore alleged.the Grigore

For type (i) we may say, given the meaning, that they are DP-level adjectives, in the left-periphery of DP, either topical or focal.

In (ii) we may have to deal with an appositive structure, since *tânărul* "the young" may also function as a noun (these are adjectives that allow (lexical) nominalization):

(28) Tânărul a intrat în cameră

young.the has entered in room

But what about (iii)? The adjective is surely NP-level (being of the type <e,t><e,t>). We could say that the PN is converted to a CN. But why can't this conversion apply in the case of postnominal adjectives, as we have seen in (2)-(3)?

Here we should observe that this conversion is available in Romanian, as for other Romance languages, for most types of determiners and meanings of the converted N, as shown throughout 2.1. The only problematic case, presented in (2)-(3), involves a different type of restrictive modification, one in which an acquaintance with the members of the class PN is supposed, which is not the case in (27), for example, where the N is purely "denominative". So I would propose the following generalization

(29) Romanian applies conversion PN→CN when PN must denote a class except for the case of unique selection from familiar individuals; in this latter case, a special structure (which I will call "identificatory apposition" - see ex. (3)) is used

For a usual conversion of the denominative type, see also:

(30) Sunt un Ion si trei Marii la cursul nostru are a Ion and three Maries at course.the our

A further problem for Cornilescu's analysis is that PNs which are specified in the lexicon as requiring a definite article do admit the structure D+PN+Adj:

(31) Parisul vechi Paris.the old

Also the analysis of examples (3) as instances of raising reduced relatives faces a series of problems, which I will present in section 4, when I discuss the analysis of these structures, proposing an alternative view.

3.2. A morphological solution

Since the impossibility of having a determiner concerns only the definite article, and does not arise when this article comes from the lexicon, as shown in (31), we could simply assume that the reason for the impossibility of (2)b is the fact that some PNs don't allow an enclitic definite article. This is plausible because the Romanian enclitic definite article has affixal status —forming a true definite declension:

(32) a. lupul (m.sg.N-A.) b. câinele (m.sg. N-A.) wolf.the dog.the

In (32) we see how the forms of the article for the same gender, number and case may vary according to the declensional type of the N, which is a indisputable sign of the inflectional status of the article.

So the ability of having or not having definite forms is a morphological matter.

However, in other cases where an enclitic article is possible, Romanian uses a proclitical form, which is clitic but not affixal (see (33)). Then why isn't this form used in the case under discussion (34)?

(33) a. *doiii copii	c. *maii mari copii
two.the children	more.the big children
b. cei doi copii	d. cei mai mari copii
the two children	the more big children "the biggest (eldest) children"
(34) a. *Ionul blond	b. *cel Ion blond
Ion.the blond	the Ion blond

3.3. Conclusion: a compromise

(33)-(34) show that a purely morphological explanation is difficult to maintain. So I will adopt (29), which also covers other Romance languages (see ex. (4)), with the amendment that the preference in (29) is stricter for Romanian due to the affixal status of the ordinary definite article in this language.

In conclusion, when speaking of restrictive modification of PNs and type-shifting from PN to CN, we have to distinguish two types of selection from a class denoted by the N:

- (35) (i) $PN=\{(the.PN)_1, (the.PN)_2...\}$ (selection among familiar individuals)
 - (ii) PN = {x: entity called "PN"} (denominative), or
 - = {x: (spatial/temporal) part of PN}, or
 - = {x: image of PN}, or
 - = {x: entity resembling to PN} (metaphorical), or
 - = {x: entity produced by PN} (metonymical) etc.

The representation in (35)(i) gives us a clue for the analysis of the structures in (3), to which we may proceed now.

4. The structure used by Romanian to avoid (1): the "identificatory" apposition (IA)

The structures illustrated in (3) are an instance of a wider type, which can be encountered in many languages, including Germanic: (36) a. Richard the Lion-Hearted

b. (fr.) Philippe le Bel P. the handsome

Based on the results reached in 3.3 and formalized in (35), I propose the analysis in (37) for this structure, with the associated semantic rule (38):



 $(38) [[DP^1 DP^2]] =$ the unique x. x= $[[DP^1]]$ and x= $[[DP^2]]$

The rule (38) explains why DP¹ may be only a PN or a definite description (see (24)), and DP² is always a definite description (see (39)), and why this structure is used for selection among *familiar* referents (hence it is not felicitous for generics, see (40)):

(39)	(rom.) a. Mihai cel blond	c. Mihai profesorul
	Mihai the blond	Mihai professor.the
	b. *Mihai un blond	d. * Mihai un profesor
	Mihai a blond	Mihai a professor

(40) (rom.) a. Apa caldă nu e bună de băut

water. the warm not is good to drink "Warm water is not good to drink"

- b. Apa cea caldă nu e bună de băut water.the the warm not is good to drink #generic, OK selection from contextually salient bottles of water, for ex.
- c. Îmi plac casele (??cele) înalte me.D like houses.the the high

Notice that (37) is not a symmetrical structure: since according to standard minimalist view the object formed by Merge has to be the projection of one of the merged elements, we have an asymmetry between DP^1 and DP^2 , in that DP^1 is the head, while DP^2 is a non-head (an adjunct, unless further refinement of the structure is introduced, a problem which I will not further develop here).

The order between DP^1 and DP^2 is pragmatically established: DP^2 identifies a referent from all the possible DP^1 . Thus, (41)a below is appropriate as an answer to the question "Which Dumitru?", while (41)b is appropriate as an answer to the question "Which professor?":

(41) (rom.) a. Dumitru profesorul	b. Profesorul Dumitru
Dumitru teacher.the	teacher.the D.

I will now present some reasons to prefer my analysis to that proposed by Cornilescu, and presented in section 3.1.

First, Cornilescu's analysis of the structure in (3)a (PN Adj+Art) cannot explain why the article is obligatory in this case. She considers that the PN and the Adj start

from a SC, and then the adjective inflected for definiteness checks definiteness on D while the PN, being referential, moves to SpecDP:

(42) $\begin{bmatrix} DP & PN \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} D & Adj-Art \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} DP & t_{PN} & t_{PN} & Pred^0 & t_{Adj-Art} \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} DP & IOn \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} D & blond-ul \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} DP & t_{IOn} & t_{Pred^{D}} & t_{IOn} & Pred^0 & t_{blond-ul} \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$

But if the article is necessary to check some feature on D in this case, despite the raising of the PN, why isn't it necessary with unmodified PNs (where, let us recall, it is forbidden)?

(43) a. Mihai Viteazul	b. Mihai(*ul)
Mihai brave.the	Mihai the

Secondly, according to her analysis of (3)b (see (3')b above), *cel* would have to be split into two words: a Pred⁰ when preceded by a N, a D⁰ elsewhere (that is in cases of N-ellipsis, cardinals, superlatives, see (33)).

Thirdly, structure (3)a is in fact possible only with adjectives that can be nominalized (ex. (44)-(45)):

(44) a. Maria blonda	b. M-am întîlnit cu blonda
Maria blond.the	me-have.1 met with blond.the(fem) "I met the blonde"
(45) a. *Maria roșia Maria red.the b. Maria cea roșie Maria the red	c. *M-am întîlnit cu roșia me-have.1 met with red.the(fem)

This follows from our analysis, in which the definite adjective is part of a second DP. In Romanian only nominalized adjectives can take the enclitic definite article. In the elliptical constructions ($[_Ne]+Adj$) only the proclitic definite article *cel* may be used. So the second DP of the IA may either appear as *cel*+Adj, if the adjective is not nominalized (case (3)b), or as Adj+Art, with nominalized adjectives (case (3)a). In Cornilescu's analysis, where the adjective is the predicate of a SC, the restriction of the structure (3)a to nominalized adjectives remains a mystery.

The existence of two structures for this sort of PN modification, (3)a and (3)b, is thus better explained by our analysis than by Cornilescu's. Moreover, our analysis unifies structure (3)a to another structure, not discussed by Cornilescu, PN CN-Art:

(46) a. Maria profesoara Maria teacher.the

We see that in the structure PN X-Art, X must always be nominal, a N or a nominalizable adjective, which directly follows from our analysis of X-Art as a separate DP.

5. Problems for our analysis

Our analysis doesn't explain why in Romanian CNs too are allowed in the structure (3)b, while this is impossible in other Romance languages, and also in Romanian for the structure (3)a:

(46) (rom.) a. fata cea blondă	c. (fr.) *la fille la blonde
girl.the the blond	the girl the blond
b. *fata blonda	d. (it.) *la ragazza la bionda
girl.the blond	the girl the blond

An economy principle could easily rule out (46)b-d. The difficulty remains the structure (46)a. Cornilescu explains this structure by the selectional properties of the predicative head *cel*: it takes as a subject any definite DP (hence also CNs). In (3)a only PNs are allowed because only they can raise to SpecDP_{max}, above the determiner -L.

An answer in the lines of our analysis (37)-(38) would be that Romanian has further developed the marking of selection among familiar entities, as opposed to ordinary restrictive modification.

The agrammaticality of (46)b can further be related to the impossibility of having CNs in the second member of IAs after a CN (see (47)). If the adjective in (46)b is nominalized, as we proposed, the two cases can be covered by the same rule.

(47) a. Maria profesoara	b. * Femeia profesoara
Maria teacher.the	woman.the teacher.the

As to where this rule comes from, I propose that the answer is that in an IA-structure involving CNs the N must be interpreted as the same in the two DPs:

(48) a. the x {x=the {y:N(y)} and x= the {y: N(y) and A(y)}}
b. * the x {x=the {y:N(y)} and x=the {y: M(y) and A(y)}}, with M≠N

This is a natural restriction, which simply says that *a thing cannot be identified as two sorts of things*. It doesn't operate on PNs because there only one sort of things is involved (only one of the DPs contains a predicate).

The structure (3)b, as all structures of type *cel*+Adj, relies on an ellipsis:

(49) $\left[_{\text{DP}} \text{ cel } \left[_{\text{NP}} \left[e \right] \text{ AP} \right]\right]$

In IA, [e] in the second DP is identified with the N in the first DP.

Thus the structure (3)b, with N-ellipsis in the second member, is the only way for an IA involving CNs to satisfy the condition stated in (48).

A further structure apparently involving IA is the structure Def+CN+PN:

(51) a. (rom.) profesorul Popescu	b. (fr.) le professeur Ducange
professor.the Popescu	the professor Ducange

In this structure the determiner has to be definite, which seems to indicate an IA:

(52) a. (rom) *un profesor Popescu a professor Popescu b. (fr.) *un professeur Ducange a professor Ducange

But, unlike in the IA cases treated above, DP_1 is not familiar. Moreover, D may be absent in English, which recalls the behavior of modified PNs:

(53) professor Smith

Stowell (1991) and Giusti (2002) have proposed that the CN is an (adjectival) modifier in such cases. But that doesn't explain why it appears only with PNs. I leave this problem for further study.

The strong limitations on IA (for instance, only PNs and personal prounouns in Romance languages other than Romanian) could be seen as a general problem for my analysis. The answer I can give is that wherever ordinary restrictive modification is available (by Predicate Modification or Functional Application), it is preferred.

6. Further applications of the structure proposed for IA

The same IA could be represented in the structure *personal pronoun+definite DP*, which appears in languages where the personal pronoun can't be a transitive D (a-b below vs. c-d):

(54) a. (rom.)	noi lingviştii	c. we linguists
	we linguists.the	d. (it.) noi linguisti
b. (fr.)	nous les linguists	we linguists
	we the linguists	

The structure of IA apposition could explain the arousal of structures with multiple determiners, which are found in many languages:

(55) (old rom.)	locul cela strimtul	(got.) jains wigs sa raihta
	place.the that-one narrow.the	that way the right
(alb.)	burr i i madh ⁴	(norv.) skogen den grønne
	man.the Agr.msgN big	forest.the the green
(gr.)	o anthropos o kalos	
	the man the good	

The structure in (37)-(38) explains why in multiple determiners constructions the determiner is always definite. No other theory of multiple determiners, as far as I know, does this (usually, two D-layers are posited, but why should those layers always be definite?).

A further interesting related problem is the arousal of Germanic adjectival weak declension, which appears when the adjective is preceded by definite determiners. In the first attested stages of Germanic languages, the adjective took weak declension only when combined with the definite article (*sa, so, pata* everywhere except ON, which has *inn*), and the definite article was only anaphorical. Historical grammarians trace back the weak declension to nominalizing suffix. The Germanic weak declension is formed by adding the suffix *-n-* to the adjectival stem, and a similar *-n-* suffix (in the form *-o:n-*) is used, in Latin and Greek, to build nouns meaning "entity (usually person) having the property P".

⁴ In Albanian the so-called "adjectival article" has lost all its determiner properties, functioning as a mere agreement marker (it appears, with most adjectives, in all positions —predicative, in indefinite or quantified DPs, when the adjective is nominalized, etc.). However, as the example shows, it reproduces the forms of the definite article, so the two probably have the same source.

Putting all this together, we could explain the origin of the weak declension as follows: when having to select among familiar entities, Germanic used a form of IA, nominalizing the adjective, and also using a deictic determiner. As the deictic determiner evolved in the direction of the definite article, the -n- suffix on the adjective, continuing to be associated with the determiner, was reinterpreted as a simple definiteness agreement marker, losing its nominalizing capacity:

- (56) a. sa goda b. ains gods wairs
 - the good-N(ominalizer) one good man
 - c. wairs sa goda selection from familiar entities, hence IA allowed man the good-N
 - d. *sa gods wairs \rightarrow (by ways of analogy) sa goda wairs

Instead of (56)c we find in the attested Germanic languages (56)d as a result of the generalization of the order Adj-N in Germanic, which was used with all the other determiners.

References

Bernstein, J., 1993, Topics in the Syntax of Nominal Structure Across Romance, CUNY Diss.

- Coene, M., 1999, Definite Null Nominals in Romanian and Spanish, diss., Universiteit Antwerpen.
- Cornilescu, A., 2004a, «Modes of semantic combination: modification, predication and the syntax of the Romanian adjective, paper presented» at the *Annual Conference of the English Department of the University of Bucharest, june 3-5 2004.*
- —, 2004b, «Modes of semantic combination: NP/DP adjectives and the structure of the Romanian DP,» conference held at LLF/Paris VII, December 2004.
- Gary P., M.-N., 1991a, «Le nom propre constitue-t-il une catégorie linguistique?», *LFr* 92, 4.26. 1991b, «La modélisation du nom propre», *LFr* 92, 4.26.
- 1994, Grammaire du nom propre. Presses Universitaires de France, Paris.
- Giusti, G., 2002, «The functional structure of noun phrases: a bare phrase structure approach». In Cinque, G. (ed.) *Functional Structure in DP and IP*, Oxford U. P., 54-90.
- *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, 1999, Bosque, I. and Demonte, V. (eds.), Espasa Calpe, Madrid. Vol. I chap. II *El nombre proprio* by J. Fernández.
- Heim, I. and Kratzer, A., 1998, Semantics in Generative Grammar. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Higginbotham, J., 1985, «On semantics», LI 16: 547-593.
- Jonasson, K., 1991, «Les noms propres métaphorique: construction et interprétation», *LFr* 92, 64-81. —, 1994, *Le nom propre. Constructions et interprétations*, Louvain, Duculot.
- Krahe, H. and Meid, W., 1969, Germanische Sprachwissenschaft, Sammlung Goeschen, Berlin.
- Longobardi, G., 1994, «Reference and Proper Names: A Theory of N-Movement in Syntax and Logical Form», *LI* 25:4, 609-665.
- 2001, "The structure of DPs." In Baltin, M. and C., C. (eds.) Handbook of Contemporary Syntactic Theory.
- Marit, J., 2003, «Double definiteness in Scandinavian», Nordlyd 31.1:230-244
- Noailly, M., 1991, «L'énigmatique Tombouctou: nom propre et position de l'épithète», LFr 92, 104-113.
- Stowell, T., 1991, «Determiners in NP and DP» in Leffel, K. and Bouchard, D. (eds.), *Views on Phrase Structure*, Dordrecht, Kluwer, 37-56.
- Zamparelli, R., 1993, «Prenominal Modifiers, Degree Phrases and the Structure of the AP», University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics 3, 138-161.