1. Aims of the talk
a) to discuss the syntax of the definite article(s) in Romanian. Romanian has two definite articles the bound morpheme –l (Lat. *ille*) and the free standing morpheme *cel* (a reduced form of the demonstrative *acel* ‘that’). It is the bound morepheme article -l which is the focus of the talk.

b) to discuss the role of suffixal definite article in the evolution of the Romanian DPs, as determined by what we have called the low definite article.

2. The basic data
2.1 A complementary set

Since the 19th century (Cipariu 1869-1877), it has been noticed that Romanian possesses two definite articles, occurring in complementary distribution (Cornilescu 2004): the suffixal definite article (-l/u-le, -a, -i, -le) and the freestanding definite article *cel* (*cea, cei, cele*).

(1) a. băieți
   boys.DEF
   ‘the boys’

b. cei doi băieți
   CEL two boys
   ‘the two boys’

To understand the distribution of –l/ceI, one should notice that –l also occurs on prenominal adjectives, i.e. it combines with [+N] constituents. Moreover if a DP contains two [+N] constituents (2b), the definite article occurs on the first. As to *cel*, it selects quantificational constituents and it rejects [+N] constituents:

(2) a. băiatul
   boy.DEF
   ‘boy’

b. *frumosul băiat
   beautiful.DEF boy
   ‘beautiful boy’

(3) a. cei doi băieți
   CEL two boys
   ‘the two boys’

b. cei câtiva băieți
   CEL few boys

c. *cel băiat
CEL boy
d. *cel frumos băiat

Analysing the structures in (22) from the perspective of the DP-hypothesis (Abney 1987, Longobardi 1994), a significant generalisation emerges:

(4) **Definiteness realisation in Modern Romanian** (informal)
   a. A definite determiner **occupies the DP-initial position.**
   b. The choice of the definite determiner is categorically determined. [+N] constituents (i.e. nouns and adjectives select –l; [–N, +Q] constituents (i.e. quantifiers: cardinals, ordinals, degree quantifiers) select **cel**.

A long noticed confirmation of this hypothesis is the dual behavior of degree quantifiers like *mulți* ‘many’/*puțini* ‘few’, which, morphologically have dual adjectival and quantifier behavior. If they are treated as φ-complete adjectives, they combine with the definite article –*l* and are inflected for case. Prenominal *mulți/puțini* may be Qs, when embedded under a Deg head, i.e. **cel** selects DegPs, which are quantificational and can be treated as invariable for Case. Generally, constituents selected by **cel** do not vary for Case.

(5)
   a. {[A *puțină]} bani pe care i-a câștigat
      few.the money.PL which them has (he) won
      ‘the little money he has made’
   b. *cei puțini* bani pe care i-a câștigat
      CEL few money.PL which them-has(he) won
   c. {[A omniparte *puțină]} bani pe care i-a câștigat
      very few.the money.PL which them-has(he) won
   d. *cei [DegP foarte puțină]* bani pe care i-a câștigat
      CEL very few money.PL which them-has(he) won
   e. *cele niscaiva parale*
      CEL few farthings “the few coins”

**Cel** selects QP[ - Case] or DegP ( in superlatives)

2.2 **An intriguing diachronic variation**
In Old Romanian (=OR) the definite article variably occurs either **on the first N or A**, or on a lower N, so that another nominal constituent, for instance, an (indefinite) A, may precede the definite N:

(6) **OR:**  spre **tîcăloase cuvinte ale mele** audzul îți pleacă… (Cantemir)
         to vicious words.the my hearing your turn
         ‘Lend your ear to my vicious words.’
   (MR: spre **tîcăloase cuvinte ale mele** audzul îți pleacă…)

It is the second aim of this talk to explore this type of variation and to examine its significance for the evolution of the Romanian DP. The article which appears on a constituent different from the first N or A will be referred to as “the lower article” for convenience.

3. **The status of the article, a clitic or a suffix**

Linguists working on the Romanian definite article have variously argued either that it is a second position clitic (e.g. Renzi, 1993, 1997) or that it is a suffix (e.g. Halpern, 1992). This dual analysis is a
consequence of the fact that its basic distribution (occurrence on the first [+N] constituent of the DP) is consistent with both analyses.

3.1. Arguments for the clitic hypothesis (Renzi, 1993)

a) The clitic hypothesis is supported by the basic distribution of the article: assuming that it is projected under D since it appears on the first A or N of the DP, it appears to combine with the second constituent of the phrase. The article occupies its D position throughout syntax and is lowered on the first nominal constituent following it.

\[(7) \ [\ D \ u] \ [[\ AP \ frumos]u\ trandafir] \]
\[\ [\ D \ u] \ [[\ NP \ trandafir]u] \ frumos]]\]

b) A second argument favouring the clitic interpretation is that (in stacking) configurations where more than one adjective preceedes the noun, the article is realized only once on the highest adjective:

\[8() \ a. \ importanta \ recent\u0103a \ descoperire \]
important.the \ recent \ discovery
\nb. *importanta \ recenta \ descoperire \]
important.the \ recent.the \ discovery

3.2 The article is a suffix hypothesis

There are other properties of the definite article which place it in the class of suffixes, rather than clitics, as has been argued for in a number of discussions on this topic (Lombard, 1974: 192; Halpern, 1992; Ortmann and Popescu, 2000; Dobrovie-Sorin & Giurgea)

a. Halpern (1992) notices, as a problem for the clitic analysis of the Romanian definite article, the multiple occurrence of the article within the same DP – for instance, when there are coordinate adjectives (iib). Romanian and Bulgarian form a minimal pair on this point: in Bulgarian, the article occurs only once on the highest adjective (9a), while, in Romanian, the article occurs on all coordinate adjectival heads (10b).

\[9() \ a. \ novata \ i \ interesna \ kniga \] \[new.the \ and \ interesting \ book \]
(bulgarian)
\nb. *novatai \ interesnata \ kniga \]
new.the and \ interesting.the \ book
\nc. *noua \ i \ interesnata \ kniga \]
new \ and \ interesting.the \ book

\[10() \ a. \ *noua \ \ si \ interesant\u0103a \ carte \] \[new.the \ and \ interesting \ book \]
(Romanian)
\nb. noua \ si \ interesanta \ carte \]
new.the and \ interesting.the \ book
\nc. *nou\u0103a \ si \ interesanta \ carte \]
new \ and \ interesting.the \ book

b) The article does not always occupy the second position. Degree words (11a) and other modifiers of an adjective (11b, c) may intervene between the D position and the adjective to which the article attaches (Dobrovie-Sorin and Giurgea (2006: 75-76)

\[11() \ a. \ at\u0103t de \ lungile \ drumuri \] \[such of \ long.the \ roads \]
*the so long roads
\nb. foarte \ lungile \ drumuri \]
very long. the roads
‘the very long roads’
c. **realmente** **plicticoasele** **dezbateri**
really **boring.** **the** debates
‘the really boring debates’

c. Clitics need *not be sensitive to the category of the head* or phrase they cliticize on, while affixes are always selective regarding the category of the stem they attach to. The article is sensitive to the stem it attaches to, which should be [+N]. Hence it occurs N and A, not on Qs. In contrast, the Bulgarian article may attach to N/A/Q/Poss etc. For example, the Romanian definite article cannot be suffixed on cardinal numerals (12b), while the Bulgarian one attaches to uninflected cardinal numerals (12a) as well.

(12) a. *pete* knigi (Bulgarian)
    five. the books
b. *cinci* cărţi (Romanian)
    five. the books

d. **Allomorphy** is Popescu and Ortmann’s (2000) main argument for rejecting the clitic analysis. It is instructive to contrast the allomorphy of the definite article (a suffix) with the allomorphy of its (etymologically) cognate 3re person (-l-) pronominal clitic.

Thus, pronominal clitics (Popescu 2000) have allomorphs which are *phonologically conditioned* and do not produce changes in the host.

(13) a. *îl* văd
    him see. 1st P.Sg
b. *l*-am văzut
    him-have.1st P.Sg seen

The distribution of the clitic is freer than that of the suffixed definite article. The pronominal clitic occurs on *any* head of the extended projection of the verb (for instance, it cliticizes on the main verb in T, on an auxiliary verb, on negation, on the subjunctive mood particle (să), on the complementizer , etc.). This shows that pronominal clitics are independent syntactic heads.

(14) a. nu*-l* văd
    not-him see 1st P.Sg
b. sâ*-l* văd
    SA(subj)-him see 1st P.Sg
c. că*-l* văd
    that-him

The Romanian definite article is suffix-like since it only attaches to [+N] categories, namely nouns (15a) and adjectives (15b). Adjectives should be φ-complete; when they are not, they cannot combine with the article (15c), which shows up on the noun (15c’). In conclusion, affixes have a **high selection degree for their hosts** (Ortmann & Popescu 2000: 784, Zwicky and Pullum, 1983: 504):

(15) a. *omul*  
    man. the
b. *marele* om  b’. *mare* *omul*
    big. the man  big man. the
c. *ditamaiul* om  c’. *ditamai* *omul*
    huge. the man  huge man. the
The allomorphy of the article is also very different from that of a clitic.

In the first place, which particular allomorph is selected depends on the properties of the stem (Ortmann and Popescu, 2000); for instance, masculine nouns ending in a consonant take the basic allomorph -l, preceded by the singular inflectional ending -u, as in copil (child) → copil-u-l (child.SG.DEF), while masculine nouns ending in -e take the allomorph -le, as in perete (wall) → perete-le (wall.the).

Secondly, the article produces changes in the vocalic and syllabic structure of the stem (GBLR 2010: 88-90). For instance, the suffixation of the article turns semivocalic endings into full vowels leu [leŭ] - le-id [leul], and full vowel endings into semivowels floare [floare] – floarea [floarěa]. It may also produce stress shift: radio – radiu-l.

Conclusion
It is safe to say that researchers now agree on the suffixal nature of the definite article.

The article as a suffix hypothesis has been strengthened by the “discovery” of the low definite article.

4. The syntax of the article. The Noun+ article structure

4.1 N-to-D (Dobrovie-Sorin 1987)
Either N or A move to D. The N moves as a head. The adjective moves as a phrase.

(16) a. copacul
tree.the

b. [DP [D -l] [ NP [N copac]]] (basic structure)

c. [DP [D [N copac]+ [D –ul]]] [ NP [N t copac]] (derived structure)

(17) a. fostul președinte foarte popular
former.the president very popular
‘the former very popular’

b. DP
D
AP1
F’
F Num NumP Num
AP2
F’
F NP foarte popular
-1 fost președinte

N-to-D was consistent with a set of assumptions regarding the syntax of the DP, in particular with the hypothesis on how to derive the post-nominal order of adjectives.

In a structure like (17b), under the hypothesis of partial N-movement to Number (N-to-Num), AP₁ becomes post-nominal and the N targets the Num head. The Adjectives is a [+N] and can in principle target D.

It has been known since Grosu (1988) that adjectives move as phrases, since when the AP is the complement of a Degree head, the Degree head cannot be left behind, but is pied-piped with the adjective.

(18) a. [DP [Degp foarte inteligentul] D [DegP foarte [AP intelligent] [Nump student ]]]
4.2 The Affix lowering hypothesis

4.2.1 This hypothesis has been formulated by Carmen Dobrovie& Ion Giurgea 2006 in the general framework of early Minimalism, adopting Distributed Morphology (Halle & Marantz, Embick and Noyer, 2001).

Under these assumptions suffixation is the effect of a postsyntactic operation and it need not be uniform across languages. “The suffixation of the definite article need not be a unified process across languages. Some languages could be based on N-to-D raising. Whereas others could involve Det-lowering.” Dobrovie & Giurgea argue that in Romanian, suffixation is the result of Determiner-lowering (Affix Hopping).

4.2.2 The authors explicitly argue against the N-to-D analysis, emphasizing the lack of displacement effects.

The main argument against deriving the suffixation of the definite article by N-to-D is the lack of word order contrasts such as those invoked for V-to-T. Adjectives retain their subcategorized position irrespective of definiteness.

(19)  a. o fată frumoasă
      a girl beautiful
      b. fata frumoasă
      girl.the beautiful

(6)  a. o fostă elevă
      a former pupil
      b. fosta studentă
      former.the student

(20)  a. goljamo momće  Bulgarian
      big boy
      b. goljamo momće
      big.the boy
      d. *momceto golijamo
      boy-the big

Conclusion:

(21)  Ns suffixed with a definite article do not occupy a position that is higher than that occupied by Ns governed by other determiners (indefinite, demonstrative, cardinals, etc.).

A second insurmountable difficult for the N-to-D hypothesis is the mirror image order of adjectives (see Shlonsky 2004, Cinque 2010, among money)

(22)  a. un ospitalier albastru cer
      a hospitable blue sky
      b. un cer albastru ospitalier.
      a sky blue hospitable
      c. *un cer ospitalier albastru
4.2.3 The Analysis
Suffixation of the definite article is analysed as an instances of Affix Hopping. Affix Hopping is an instance of Lowering, a rule which has the following properties. a) It affects heads. b) It attaches a head to the head of its complement. c) Since it is sensitive to syntactic structure, it must be assumed to apply at an early stage of PF derivation, prior to Vocabulary Insertion and linearisation, where some structural information is still available.
Essentially the analysis makes the following claims.

(23) a. *an excellent novel Romanian
b. un excellent roman romanesc

(24) D-lowering to Num in Romanian.

(i) Def Lowering Targets the Number head.

(ii) D lowers to a morpheme marked with full φ-features.

(iii) φ features attach to Number.

These assumptions are sufficient to derive the basic facts presented in (1)-(2) above.

(25) (i) Definite nouns
a. The N raises to Num in (syntax) (N to Num). This is an instance to of head movement and occurs in narrow syntax.

\[
\text{LF} \quad [\text{DP}_D \rightarrow \text{I}_{\text{NumP}} [\text{Num}[N] + [\text{Num}]] \quad [\text{NP} \text{N}]]
\]

b. The article targets Num at PF (affix lowering), since Num contains at constituent that has phi features (the head noun).

\[
\text{PF} \quad [\text{DP}_D \rightarrow \text{I}_{\text{NumP}} [\text{Num}[N] + [\text{Num}] \text{-l}] \quad [\text{NP} \text{N}]]
\]

(ii) Definite adjectives
a. If an adjective is prenominal, it is the AP rather than the N which raises to Spec, NumP. The adjective values its φ-features against the Number head, in narrow syntax.

b. At PF the article targets the adjective which has a complete φ- set.

(iii) Quantifiers
Cardinals, on the other hand, are merged in an intermediate position, in between D and NumP, and as such they can host neither φ features nor the definite article. The assumed functional structure is that of Borer (2005):

(26) DP QP NumP NP

*-ul [φcardinal] [φ]

cel [φ cardinal] [NumP]NP
Advantages:
The analysis beautifully accounts for:
a) the complementarity of –l/cel;
b) the occurrence of the article on prenominal adjectives, not on postnominal ones.

Problematic aspects
The analysis can be extended to certain double definite constructions, which imply a Split D analysis (cea mai frumoasa fată, ‘the most beautiful girl; al doilea roman ‘the second novel)
More problematic for the lowering approach are instances of multiple definites, where several copies of the definite article occur in the same DP (e.g. multiple definite in stacked structures)

(27) a. săracul copilul ăla
   poor.the child.the that
   ‘that poor child’
b. săracul fratele Mariei.
   poor.the
   ‘Mary’s poor brother’

4.3 An Agree account, definiteness as a morphosyntactic on nominal stems
4.3.1 The definiteness parameter
   The latest proposal advanced in a number of papers exploits the properties of the feature of definiteness in Romanian, putting to use an idea which was first advanced (to my knowledge) by Hagit Borer (1999) in her analysis of construct state constructions. Her idea is that in certain languages the nominal stem is specified as [+definite] in the numeration, since, in those languages definiteness is a syntactic feature.
   In order to account for the special distribution of the [+definite] feature, Danon (2010: 145) puts forth the idea that Hebrew nouns and adjective possess in their lexical matrix the [+definite] feature, with definiteness being a morphosyntactic feature. Danon (2010) takes up Borer’s proposal that Hebrew N and A may be specified as [+definite] in the lexicon, and adds the specification that in Hebrew type languages definiteness is is morphosemantic, as opposed to being (merely) morphosyntactic.

   The distinct status, morphosyntactic vs. morphosemantic, of a certain feature concerns the phenomena in which the respective feature can participate. Specifically, in Anna Kibort’s (2010) formulation:

(28) “A morphosyntactic feature is a feature whose values are involved in either syntactic agreement or government”, in opposition to morphosemantic features “whose values are not involved in either syntactic agreement or government but are inherent only”.
   In more recent syntactic feature, one can reinterpret Kibort’s proposal in (28) as follows:

(29) A morphosyntactic feature is a feature whose values are involved in c-command / Agree.

   The definiteness parameter instantiates the Chomsky-Borer minimalist approach to parametic variation.

(30) The Borer-Chomsky Conjecture
   All parameters of variation are attributable to differences in the features of particular items (e.g. the functional heads) in the lexicon.
Furthermore, in the parameter typology proposed by Roberts (2012), the definiteness parameter, which affects only [+N] heads is nanoparameter (as opposed to mesoparameter (e.g. the head parameter) or a macroparameter, like the null subject parameter.

In a series of papers comparing Romance and Germanic DPs, Rohers (2006, 2012) expresses the same intuition about the role of the definite article in different types of languages:

(31) Generalization on Romance and Germanic languages

(i) Romance
Article insertion is a morpho-syntactic process

(ii) Germanic
Article insertion is a semantico-pragmatic process

4.3.2 Detecting morpho-syntactic definiteness

Danon (2010) for Hebrew, Nicolae (2013) for Romanian argue that there are specific phenomena which identify the presence of a morpho-syntactic definiteness feature on nominal stems. Among these, the following are directly relevant for this discussion: definiteness agreement and multiple definites.

(32) definiteness agreement

săracul fratele Mariei.
poor.the brother. the Mary’s
‘Mary’s poor brother’

(33) double definite constructions

copilul cel fericit
child.the CEL happy
‘the happy child’

4.3.3 A local agree account of the suffixal definite article

Similarly to Pesetsky and Torrego’s proposals on the featural make-up of the T-head, assume that in UG, the D-head is uninterpretable [φ] and interpretable definite (uφ, indef) (as in Cornilescu 2010 ff)

(34) 

In a language like English, [idef] is valued by Merge of the freestanding definite article the, while the φ-feature of D are valued via Agree with the c-commanded nominal restriction.

(35) the rose

D

NP
[idef] [1]
[uφ] [1]
[iφ] [1]
In a language like Romanian, which has a suffixal definite article, in a simple structure where the DP consists only of a definite noun, the \([u+\text{def}]\) feature of the noun, acting as a Goal, will value the \([i\text{def}]\) feature of D Probe via Agree:

(36)  
\[
\begin{align*}
elevul & \\
\text{pupil.DEF}
\end{align*}
\]

Let us concentrate on attributive adjectives, assuming Cinque’s (2010) view that they merge as specifiers of functional projections.

(37)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{frumosul} \quad \text{trandafir} \\
& \quad \text{beautiful.DEF} \quad \text{rose} \\
& \quad \text{‘the beautiful rose’}
\end{align*}
\]

(38)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{D} & \quad \text{FP} \\
\text{[i\text{def}] []} & \quad \text{AP} \\
\text{[u\varphi] []} & \quad \text{F'} \\
\mid & \quad \text{F} \\
\mid & \quad \text{[i\varphi] []} \\
\mid & \quad \text{frumos} \\
\mid & \quad \text{trandafirul}
\end{align*}
\]

In this configuration, the adjective is an appropriate position for undergoing agree (i.e. feature sharing, in the acceptation of Pesetsky and Torrego 2007), with the adjective taking over the values of the matching features on the noun.

After agreement, the adjectival head is duly equipped with features matching those in D, and in an appropriate configuration to serve as a Goal for the D-head, occupying the specifier position immediately under D: the D-head gets its features valued and the derivation is convergent.

(39)  
\[
\text{DP}
\]
The derivation of stacked adjectives featuring the definite article on the DP-initial adjective (34a) is similar (34b) (only the final step of the derivation is shown):

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

b. DP
   marele bătrân continent
   big.DEF old continent

Thus, the definiteness realisation requirement stated in (4) can be restated in terms of agree:

(41) Definiteness valuation in Modern Romanian (Local Agree)
The [+def] Goal Phrase which values [i+def] in D must be a [+N] phrase immediately below D.

One more comment is in order at this point: it is important to distinguish between the realisation of the definite article and the valuation of definiteness. While definiteness is phonologically realised only once, on the highest [+N] constituent of the phrase, it is present on all [+N] heads in the extended projection of the noun. Evidence for the presence of the definiteness feature on all [+N] heads is given by the existence of multiple realisation of the definite article, both in Modern Romanian (32) and in Old Romanian (see below).

5 The Lower Definite Article, a second pattern of definiteness valuation in Old Romanian
Old Romanian (OR) (i.e. XVI\textsuperscript{th} to (end of) XVIII\textsuperscript{th} century, Ghetie 1975) also allows Long Distance Agree, alongside of Local Agree. This means that the article, and more generally other constituents which incorporate definiteness, do not necessarily occupy first position in the DP, against the basic generalization in (4) above. Definiteness is valued across an intervener.

(42) D[\text{def:___}] XP NP[\text{u-def:val}]

This variation in the distribution of the article had not been noticed in important histories of Romanian. (Gheție 1975, Rosetti 1968, Densusianu 1961, Dimitrescu, 1978, Brancuș 2004, Niculescu 1990).

\textit{The Low Article in OR}

(43) \textit{ca mare scârşnetul roatelor} (Cantemir)
like great grinding.the of the wheels
‘like the strong grinding of the wheels’

(44) \textit{Definiteness valuation in Old Romanian – Long Distance Agree (LDA):} The goal that values the probe in D is a [+N] phrase (NP, AP) c-commanded by D, a phrase which need not be the first (nominal) phrase c-commanded by D.

This amounts to saying that the [+def] feature is realized either on the first or on a lower nominal constituent of the DP. (i.e., what we called “lower definite article”).

5. 1. \textit{The extension and range of the Lower Definite Article}

The lower definite article is present from the earliest OR texts of the XVI\textsuperscript{th} century until the first half of the XVIII\textsuperscript{th} century.

(45) a. \textit{...au venit egumenul de Bistrița cu cinstită \textit{cartea mării tale} (XVI\textsuperscript{th} – DİR)}
\textit{has come abbot.the of Bistrița with honoured letter.the highness.the\text{Gen} your}
\textit{‘...the Abbot of Bistrița came with your highness’ honoured letter’}

b. \textit{au aflat cap și începătura moșilor [...] ca să nu se încee} (they) had found head and beginning ancestors.the\text{Gen} so that not be drowned
\textit{\textbf{a toate ţăriile anii trecuți} (XVII\textsuperscript{th}, 1641 – Ureche )}
\textit{of all countries.the years.the passed}
\textit{‘They found the origin and the beginning of their ancestors so that the passed years of all countries may not be drowned into oblivion’}

c. \textit{plecat (=umil) robuț \textit{Măriei Tale}, Radu logoft...} (XVII\textsuperscript{th}, 1688 – Biblia)
\textit{humble servant.the highness.the\text{Gen} Your, Radu Chancellor}
\textit{‘your highness’s humble servant, Radu Chancellor’}

d. \textit{Umblăm după a lumii înşelătoare fața} (XVII\textsuperscript{th}, 1671 – Costin)
\textit{Go we after \text{Al}\text{genitival article world’s deceitful face.the}
\textit{‘We are after the world’s deceitful face’}

\textit{e. Aşa, fără veste el în \textit{virajași colții crocodilului aflându-se} (XVIII\textsuperscript{th}–Cantemir)}
\textit{thus suddenly he in inimical teeth.the crocodile.the\text{Gen being}
\textit{‘Thus, suddenly, he was in the crocodile’s inimical teeth’}

\textit{Range of the constituents} that precede the low definite article:
a. adjectives
b. pre-nominal genitives (Gens).

(A) an (indefinite) adjective

(46) Așa, fără veste el în vrâjmași colții crocodilului aflându-se (Cantemir)
thus suddenly he in inimical teeth.the crocodile.the Gen being
“Thus, suddenly, he was in the crocodile’s inimical teeth”

(B) Gen Phrase (Gen DP)

(47) ...ca să nu se încee a toate țările anii trecuți (Ureche)
so that not be drowned of all countries.the years.the passed
“...so that the passed years of all countries may not be drowned into oblivion”

Note: In ModR a pre-nominal Gen is followed by a non-definite N. Just as in English, a DP containing a pre-nominal Gen is interpreted as [+def], and it is the pre-nominal Gen DP which checks the [idef] feature of the DP. The pre-nominal Gen DP in MR functions as a definite Determiner Gen (Huddlestone & Pullum 2002). It also occurs in the first position of the DP, presumably in [Spec, DP], since it incorporates the definite article.

(48) a. al regelui fiu
   ALgenitival article king.the.Gen son
   ‘the king’s son’
   b. fiul regelui
      son.the king.the.Gen
      ‘the king’s son’

Examples like (47) contrast with MR (48a), and are no longer found in MR.

The lower definite article raises several questions:
1. What is the interpretation of this phenomenon in the framework sketched above? 2. What are the contexts that favored the occurrence of the lower article? 3. What are the causes that led to the elimination of this pattern? 5. Are there other OR DP structures which relate to the existence of LDA? In the following sections of the paper we supply tentative answers to these questions.

5.2. Interpreting the facts of Old Romanian in the framework sketched in Section 1
Two morpho-syntactic properties of Romanian N/A have combined to produce the strict locality conditions on definiteness valuation in MR. The first is the suffixal nature of the article which allows Ns to be valued for definiteness, even if their definiteness feature is uninterpretable (i.e., [u+def]).

The second significant property is that, at some point in the evolution of Romanian, As must have acquired the possibility of optionally incorporating an uninterpretable unvalued definiteness feature [udef]. This feature was valued through Agree with the N, as shown above. Since Agree was/ could be long distance, and the nominal valued for definiteness did not need to be the first NP/AP below D, we expect the following alternations in OR, all of which are attested:

(i) The definite article shows on the first NP or AP of the DP (the MR pattern, available in all attested stages of Romanian)

(49) au purces fără numai din vechea și rânceda pizmăluire (Cantemir)
   (it) happened only out.of old.the and rancid.the envy
   “It all happened out the old and rancid envy”

(ii) The definite article shows on an NP which is not the first phrase of the DP (this is the lower article)

(50) spre ticleoase cuvintele mele audzul îți pleacă… (Cantemir)
to vicious words. the my hearing your turn
‘Lend your ear to my vicious words’

(iii) Sporadically, the definite article could also be present on more than one constituent, i.e., the DP shows *multiple definites* (cf. Croitor 2008). This is consistent with the view that definiteness had become a *concord features* in OR, and Romanian morphology allows it to be uninterpretable but *valued* and realized on both Ns and As. Multiple definites are present both in the order A+ N (examples (51), from Croitor 2008), and (very infrequently) in the order N+ A (examples (52), likewise from Croitor 2008); apparently, multiple definites were lost (in these patterns) at the end of the XVIIIth century:

(A) **Multiple definites: A+N**

(51) a. Ce i-au tăiat atuncea curând puternica mâng lui Dumnedzeu zilele (Costin)
that to-him have cut then soon mighty.the hand.the of God days.the
“God’s almighty hand took his/her days”

b. …moaștele a sfintei prepodobnii Paraschevei, în (Costin)
…the relics.the of saint.the beautifully-adorned.the Parascheva, in
“…the relics of the holy, beautifully-adorned (Saint) Parascheva”

(B) **Multiple definites: N+A**

(52) zidul cetății marei și frumoasei în Spania (Cantacuzino)
wall.the city.the big.the and beautiful.the GEN in Spain
“the wall of the big and beautiful city in Spain”

It is reasonable to assume that it was precisely *the possibility of valuing definiteness on pre-nominal As that led to stricter locality conditions on Agree*, that is, to the MR requirement that the constituent that values the [idef] feature of D should be the first AP/NP below D.

Gradually, as a result of a general tendency towards economy, the constituent that values [idef] in D (i.e., which has an LF effect) got to be the only one which *phonologically realizes definiteness*. This was either a definite pre-nominal A or a definite N. Multiple occurrences of the suffixal article are generally ruled out now.

Moreover, only *pre-nominal* As are ever suffixed by the definite article, since only pre-nominal As can be closer to D than the N. Definiteness thus turns into an *exclusive property of attributive As* as opposed to predicative ones. This means that As that merge as attributes (specifiers or pre-nominal adjuncts) are obligatorily specified as [u def]. This is what guarantees that if the head N is [u+def], and there is a pre-nominal A in the DP, definiteness will be realized on the pre-nominal adjective immediately below D.

**5.3. Contexts of occurrence of the Lower Definite Article**

A relevant question, already formulated above, is what contexts require or allow the use of a lower article. To answer this question, a body of texts ranging from the earliest Romanian writings of the XVIth century to the first half of the XVIIIth century was examined. The texts show *variation* between the ‘high’ article, used in most cases, and the ‘lower’ article. The lower article predominantly occurs when the definite head N is followed by another constituent (especially by a Gen(itive)). It is for modified and complemented (by a Gen) DPs that we have checked the *relative frequency of the high vs. lower article* (see (53) below).
The examination of the data shows that a lower definite article on N appears overwhelmingly (87.5%) in contexts where the head N is followed by a **Gen DP complement**. Other post-nominal modifiers may also sometimes trigger the presence of the lower article as in (56b). If there is no complement or modifier, the article emerges on the pre-nominal A, as in MR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>A_\text{DEF} + N + Gen DP (high article)</th>
<th>A + N_\text{DEF} + Gen DP (lower article)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miron Costin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letopisețul Cantacuzinesc</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Popescu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Greceanu</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantin Cantacuzino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantemir</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| High article: 6 (12.5%) | Lower article: 47 (87.5%) |

This distribution signals a tight relation between the inflectional Gen (and other modifiers) and the lower article, a fact which should be accounted for.

### 5.4 Remnant lower article

(A) **A\_\text{[+def]} + N\_\text{-def]** (no complement/modifier)

\[(54)\]

\text{au purces fără numai din vechea și rânceda pizmăuire} (Cantemir)

(it) happened only out of old.the and rancid.the envy

“It all happened out the old and rancid envy”

(B) **A\_\text{-def} + N\_\text{[def]} + GenDP**

\[(55)\]

\text{a. \ldots ca mare scîrșnetul roatelor} (Cantemir)

like great grinding the of the wheels

“…like the strong grinding of the wheels…”

\text{b. \ldots Corbul de ușcate vinele goalearoi ciolane clioțul și-ar ciocni} (id.)

the Raven against dried-up veins.the empty.the\_\text{Gen} bones bill hid would knock

“The Raven might knock his bill against the dried-up veins of his bones.”

\text{c. \ldots de dulce otrav Hulpii tare se amețiră} (Cantemir)

…with sweet poison.the of the Vixen much (they) got drunk

“…they got quite drunk from the sweet poison of the Vixen”

(C) **A\_\text{-def} + N\_\text{[def]} + Modifier** (PP or AP modifier)

\[(56)\]

\text{a. însă nu puține asuprele despre vrăjitorii vremii trasă} (Cantemir)

but not few injustices.the from the magicians of the times (he) endured.

“...but he endured many injustices from the magicians of the times…”

\text{b. Neștiutor omenesc gândul [...] la ce merge..?} (Cantemir)

Ignorant human thought.the what is heading for?

“What is the ignorant thought of man aiming at?”

This distribution signals a tight relation between the inflectional Gen (and other modifiers) and the lower article, a fact which should be accounted for.
In MR, i.e., after 1780, the lower article disappears. There are, however, two types of motivated exceptions.

a. The lower article is still part of religious and other obsolete texts (57), and in such case it is again mostly followed by the Gen.

b. Secondly, there is a small group of quantificational or evaluative As that may function as definite quantifiers, and may or must be followed by definite Ns (see also GALR 2005, Barbu 2004): întreg (‘whole’), singur (‘unique’) ditamai (‘big’), gogeamite (‘big’), as in (58). No Gen modifier is required.

(57) Miluieşte-mă, Doamne, după mare milă Ta!
Have-mercy-on-me God, according to great mercy.the Your
“God, have mercy on me, according to your great mercy.”

(58) a. întreg oraşul / întregul oraş
whole city.the whole.the city
b. ditamai prostul / *ditamaul prost
big fool.the

Conclusion one significant change in the syntax of the Romanian DP relates to the locality conditions of definiteness valuation. The definite feature strengthens requiring to be valued by a strictly local nominal constituent (N or A). Long Distance Agree is ruled out.

5. 5. The (Lower) Article and the Significance of the statistical correlation between the Lower Definite Article and the inflectional Genitive

The correlation between the lower article and the post-posed inflectional Gen should be viewed from a narrowly distributional perspective.

Bare Genitive vs AL-Genitive

It is known that the inflectional Gen in Romanian is realized either by a bare inflected DP (= the bare Genitive (39b)), or as an inflected DP preceded by the genitival article AL (39a) (for a description of the Gen article see Cornilescu 1995, 2005). The two forms are in complementary distribution.

Roughly, the AL Gen occurs whenever the head N is indefinite (59a), while the bare Gen occurs when the head N is definite and the Gen is adjacent to the head N (59b):

(59) a. doi prieteni ai copilului
friend.the child.theGen
“two friends of the child”

b. prietenul copilului
friend.the child.theGen
“the child’s friend”

It is the syntax of definite DPs containing Gens that is of interest. With definite heads, the AL Gen occurs in two situations: (i) when there is an intervening modifier between the definite head and the Gen (60a); (ii) when the Gen is adjacent to the head, but the article is on a pre-nominal A (60b).

(60) a. prietenul bun al copilului
friend.the child.theGen
“the child’s good friend”

b. bunul prieten al copilului
good.the friend AL-genitival article child.theGen
“the child’s good friend”

c. *bunul prieten copilului
good.the friend child.theGen
Generalizing, the bare Gen occurs only when it immediately follows a definite N, while the AL Gen occurs elsewhere. The bare Gen is the preferred form since it is more economical (economy of representation). The preference for the bare Gen clearly must have been felt in OR as well. This is what explains the use of the lower definite article with inflectional Gen.

If the article is placed on the N, instead of being placed on the higher A, the Gen is adjacent to the definite article and it is possible to employ the more economical bare Gen (61a) (= 17a), replacing the AL Gen (61b):

\[(61) \quad \begin{align*}
a. \quad & \text{OR: } \text{cu cinstită carte} \ mării \ tale \quad \text{(Bare Gen)} \\
& \text{with honoured letter.the highness.the}_{\text{Gen}} \ your \\

b. \quad & \text{MR: } \text{cu cinstită carte} a \ mării \ tale \quad \text{(AL genitive)} \\
& \text{with honoured.the letter AL}_{\text{genitival article}} \ highness.the_{\text{Gen}} \ your
\end{align*}\]

Thus both formal economy considerations and functional semantic considerations may be invoked to account for the preference for the lower article in the context of an inflectional Gen.

The same preference for the bare genitive is responsible for some of the multiple definite that survive in ModR:

\[(62) \quad \begin{align*}
a. \quad & \text{săracul} \ fiul \ tău \\
& \text{poor.the son.the yours} \\
& \text{‘your poor son’} \\

b. \quad & \text{?? săracul} \ fiu al tau \\
& \text{poor.the son AL you.Gen} \\
& \text{‘your poor son’}
\end{align*}\]

5.5 What the Lower Article suggests about the emergence of the enclitic article

5.5.1 An open question

This account relies on the contrast between languages which value definiteness in D by merging a determiner and languages which value D by means of a *lexical category* morphologically marked as valued for definiteness. From a Romance comparative diachronic perspective, the puzzles is how the same Latin demonstrative *ille* (cf. Iordan & Manoliu 1965) led to *proclitic free-standing articles* in other Romance languages, but to an *enclitic article* in Romanian.

The lower article tilts the balance to the hypothesis that the enclitic article developed out of the post-nominal Latin Dem *ille* rather than out of a pre-nominal demonstrative, as in Giusti’s analysis of the history of the definite article in Romance. Both proposals have been advanced for Romanian as well (see Renzi 1993 for the pre-nominal demonstrative hypothesis, and Coteanu 1956 and Graur 1967 for the post-nominal demonstrative hypothesis).

The lower article matters in this on-going debate, since it is the so far only attested construction that does not show the Romanian definite article on the head of the first NP/AP of the DP. The standard “high article” is consistent with analyses where the article merges in D and is lowered on the first [+N] constituent (as recently proposed by Dobrovie & Giurgea, 2006), or where the article merges in D and there is movement into the D-area (N-to-D, AP-to-Spec, DP) as assumed in older studies (Dobrovie-Sorin 1987, Grosu 1988).

The lower article may construed as evidence that the article *merges low*, and “moves” higher through Agree reaching the position below D.

5/5.2 A possible path
In understanding the passage from post-nominal Demonstrative to enclitic definite article, it is convenient to adopt a DP architecture currently which distinguishes between a low Art(icle)P and a the high DP position.

A number of researchers (Borer 2005, Giusti 1993, Julien 2005, Roehrs 2006), assume that determiners, merge lower in an Art(icle)P (valuing the $[\emptyset]$ and $[\text{def}]$ features of the Art head), and then move to D or [Spec, DP] to value the features there (deixis, specificity, definiteness, $[\text{up}]$). The space between DP and ArtP may (but need not) host other projections (e.g. quantificational projections), as in the proposal put forth by Roehrs (2006):

(63) \[ \text{DP} \rightarrow \text{CardP} \rightarrow \text{ArtP} \rightarrow \text{NumP} \rightarrow \text{NP} \]

It follows that the Demonstratives merge in Spec,ArtP, under the assumption that they are phrasal. We also accept that pre-nominal As in Romance merge as specifiers of functional projections (Bernstein, 1991, 1993), while post-nominal As merge as adjuncts (Giurgea 2008). Recall that OR has both local as well as non local Agree and Move.

**Hypothesis** The enclitic article emerged through the reanalysis of the Dem *ille* in the context of the post-nominal Dem construction; reanalysis amounted to a change in its c-selection properties. This hypothesis is supported by the existence of post-nominal Dems in all written phases of Romanian (64):

(65) a. *Au trimis Pașa* pe *tâlmaciu* *aclea*  
    have sent Pasha PE translator.the that  
    “Pasha sent that translator”  
    (Costin)

b. *și au căzut în războiul acela*  
    and have fallen (they) in war.the that  
    “And they fell dead in that war”  
    (Ureche)


The post-nominal position of As, possible in Latin, was reinforced by the contact with the local Dacian idioms, which strongly preferred to post-cause the A, including the (adjectival) Dem (Brâncuș 2004, Graur 1967). In all attested stages of Romanian, the pre-nominal or post-nominal position of the Dem depended on its textual, prosodic role (deictic or anaphoric). Consequently, it may be believed that either the NP or the DemP alternatively moved to [Spec, DP] to check the unvalued features there, thus deriving the alternative orders ((66a) and (66b)).

(66) a. \[ \text{DP} \rightarrow \text{NP} \rightarrow \text{D'} \rightarrow \text{D} \rightarrow \text{[+def]} \rightarrow \text{DemP} \rightarrow \text{ArtP} \rightarrow \text{Art'} \rightarrow \text{NumP} \rightarrow \text{t}_{\text{NP}} \rightarrow \text{Num'} \]

b. \[ \text{DP} \rightarrow \text{DemP} \rightarrow \text{D'} \]
As known, in two-member structures like *omul acesta* (‘man.the this’) the post-posed Dem is normally focused (Bernstein 2001 a.o.), and may have a [locative-deictic] feature, while the Romanian pre-nominal Dem (*acest om* ‘this man’) is mostly anaphoric (Manoliu-Manea 1993). It is, then, more plausible to assume that the re-analysis of the Dem as an article occurred in a three-term construction, which would shift the nuclear stress on the last (most deeply embedded) third term (Cinque, 1993). Graur (1967) thus suggested as a basis for re-analysis the three-term construction: *homo ille bonus*, *N* + Dem + Adj. Since the Dem is not in focus, and thus probably not stressed, it is likely that it was “weakened” and re-analyzed as a head moving to D⁰ rather than to [Spec, DP], following the general evolution of Romance or Germanic (Roehrs 2006 for Scandinavian).

Unfortunately, since in the earliest Romanian texts the article is already fully grammaticalized, there is no decisive piece of evidence that re-analysis occurred in the three term structure. The demonstrative might perhaps have been distressed as a result of its anaphoric function in the simpler two-term construction as well. The change from a phrase to a head moving to the D-head position would have been the same. The often made suggestion that re-analysis is based on structures including post-nominal modifiers probably takes into account the fact that the definite article is still required to license a post-nominal modifier/argument in prepositional constructions, where the nominal head is otherwise determinerless (Isac 2006):

\[(67) \quad \text{a.} \quad \text{Cartea este pe masă.} \quad \text{b.} \quad \text{Cartea este pe masa rotundă.} \]

\text{book.the is on table} \quad \text{book.the is on table} . \text{the round}

\text{“The book is on the table”} \quad \text{“The book is on the round table”}

Head movement of Dem to D frees [Spec, DP] for NP-movement; suffixation takes place in this Spec-Head configuration. Re-analysis of the Dem as a suffix represents a change of its c-selection feature, which becomes [+N---], satisfied by combining it with a nominal head (an N⁰, A⁰ constituent). Head-adjunction of the Dem-article to the N causes the former to undergo phonological reduction, dropping its first syllable \text{ILLE} \rightarrow -(U)L. Significantly, the pre-nominal definite article of French, which has developed out of a pre-nominal demonstrative (Iordan&Manoliu 1965, Giusti 1993, 1998), has also further developed from an independent head into a prefix in some of the creoles based on French (Mauritian Creole), being reanalyzed as part of the noun stem (Lyons 1999: 331; examples from Lyons 1999):

\[(68) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{le lit} \quad \text{the bed} \\
& \quad \text{‘the bed’} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{lili la} \quad \text{the.bed there} \\
& \quad \text{‘that bed’}
\end{align*} \text{(Standard French)}$$

\text{(Mauritian Creole)}
The change from Dem to article also meant a loss of semantic features (bleaching), from the richer matrix of the Dem [(locative)-deictic, definite, anaphoric, 3rd/6th person, adjective, pronoun] to the more reduced feature matrix of the article [definite, anaphoric, adjective] (cf. Giusti 1998, Lyons 1999).

The lower article preceded by an A is a precious missing link in the chain leading from a post-nominal Dem to an article placed on the first nominal constituent of the DP.

6. Conclusions

1. In OR, the definite article suffixed to the noun / adjective may occupy the first position of the DP, but also a lower position. In particular, indefinite constituents such as indefinite adjectives or indefinite Gens may precede the definite noun. OR alternates Local and Long Distance Agree in the valuation of definiteness. Distributionally, the lower article is conditioned mostly by a post-nominal Gen or modifiers.

2. The lower article is evidence that the Romanian enclitic definite article originates in a post-posed demonstrative, following the same steps as suggested for Scandinavian by Roehrs (2006). It also confirms that the article should be viewed as a suffix combining with the N in the lexicon.

3. At some point in the evolution of Romanian, definiteness became a concord feature for adjectives; the latter optionally entered the derivation with uninterpretable unvalued definite feature, valued by Agree with the noun. It is reasonable to assume that it was precisely the possibility of valuing definiteness on pre-nominal adjectives that ultimately led to the Modern Romanian requirement that the constituent that values the [idef] feature of D should be the first AP/NP below D.

4. In OR, Long Distance Agree apparently co-exists with Local Agree, a factor that may cause ambiguity. Consequently, Romanian settles for Local Agree, selecting the more restrictive grammar.

5. While in Old Romanian there is Long Distance Agree and Modern Romanian loses this option. Changes in this parameters lead to the disappearance of a number of DP structures involving Long Distance Agree. Thus, all patterns involving valuation of definiteness across another constituent (a genitive, an adjective) are lost.
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