1. Introduction

In a previous paper we have argued that a personal pronoun minimally exhibits the functional structure: DP > QP > NP (Cornilescu and Nicolae 2014). We have also argued that Romanian personal pronouns are inherently definite and merge as NPs, which raise to D to check [Person] and [Definiteness].

(1)  
\[
\text{DP} \quad \phi \quad \text{NP} \\
[\text{idef:__}] \quad [\text{i}\phi:__] \quad [u+\text{def:__}] \\
[\text{ipers:__}] \quad [\text{i\phi:__}] \quad [u\text{pers:__}] \\
\]

The characteristic syntactic property of Romanian pronouns is that they are inherently marked for definiteness, and therefore they are liable to agree with any modifiers, when present. This accounts for instance for the cross-linguistically unusual structure *noi bogatii* 'we rich.the', compared to the English *we rich*. Syntactic definiteness accounts for all of the properties that differentiate Romanian strong pronouns from their counterparts in other languages. Taking into account what has been said so far, the lexicon entry of a deictic personal pronoun looks as in (2).

(2)  
a. *noi*
   \[
   [+\text{D:__}] \quad [+\text{uPerson:1}\text{st} \text{P}] \\
   [+\text{N[u+def:val]}] \\
   [+\text{Gen:__}] \\
   [+\text{Num:plural}] \\
   \]
b. *noi lingvistii*
   *noi bogatii*
   *noi de la Bucuresti*

We have also shown that since pronouns do not have a nominal restriction, any descriptive (lexical) information must be supplied by a distinct nominal, for instance, a classifier phrase (ClassP) in our interpretation. This is the source of the many types of modifiers internal to the pronominal phrase (e.g. an NP, an AP, or a PP). Syntactically, when possible, these modifiers agree with the definite pronoun, getting to be marked for definiteness themselves. This is the case of adjectival and nominal modifiers.

2. Aim of the paper

In this paper, we examine pronominal DPs containing quantificational elements, as exemplified below:

(3)  
a. *noi doi*
   \[
   \text{we two,M} \\
   \text{‘the two of us’} \\
   \]

(4)  
a. *noi toti*
   \[
   \text{we all,M} \\
   \text{‘all of us’} \\
   \]
b. noi amandoi
   we both,M
   ‘both of us’

The focus is on examples of type (4), which exhibit a specific syntactic problem, that of the contrast between nouns and pronouns, regarding the position of toti/amandoi. Specifically, toti/amandoi may both precede and follow definite DPs headed by nouns, but they can only follow pronouns, as shown in the examples below:

(5) a. Amandoua studentele au primit premii.
    Both,F students,F have received awards.
    ‘Both of the students have received awards.’
b. Studentele amandoua au primit premii.
    Students,F both,F have received awards.
    ‘Both students have received awards.’

(6) a. Ele amandoua au primit premii.
    They,F both,F have received awards.
    ‘Both of them have received awards.’
b. *Amandoua ele au primit premii.
    Both,F they,F have received awards.

Standardly, toti/amandoi have been analyzed as definite quantifiers, given their co-occurrence with definite DPs, as in (5), as well as the fact that when used independently, as pronouns, they have the distribution of definite DPs, triggering for instance clitic doubling, as in (7).

(7) I-am vazut pe amandoi
    them,M.sg.Acc.cl-have seen pe.Acc both,M
    ‘I have seen them both’

This characterization is only partly correct, since it has more recently been shown that toti/amandoi are not quantifiers proper, rather they modify definite DPs. In other words, they do not semantically combine with NPs to form DPs, but modify already formed DPs (see below). Anticipating our analysis, they are adjectives with quantificational properties, the effect of combining them with definite DPs being to strengthen maximality, eliminating exceptions. Compare:

(8) a. Cainii latra . (generic)
    Dogs.the bark.
    ‘Dogs bark.’
b. Toti cainii latra.
    All,M dogs.the bark.
    ‘All the dogs bark’

Coming back to the pronominal construction, the problem is to understand the word order contrast between (5) and (6). The complement of the pronoun may be quite complex, allowing for the full range of definite quantifier constructions:

(9) a. noi toti
    we all,M
    ‘all of us’
b. noi doi
    we two,M
    ‘the two of us’

(10) a. noi toata plebea
    we.pl all,F crowd F.sg.the
    ‘we, all the commoners’
It should be obvious that understanding the syntax of (10) is impossible without clarifying the syntax of the definite quantifiers *toti/amandoi*. The latter have often been dealt with as heads selecting for the full range of definite complements, as confirmed by the examples below (Giusti, Benmamoun, 1999).

(11) a. toti copii
    All.M children.the
    ‘all the children’

    b. toti cei sapte studenti
    all.M these seven students
    ‘all the seven students’

    c. toti acesti studenti
    all.M these students
    ‘all of these students’

    d. toate acestea
    all.F.pl these
    ‘all of these’

    e. toti ai mei
    all.M of mine.M.pl
    ‘all of my family/people’

However, the definite quantifier *toti* has intriguing selectional properties, since it is sometimes felicitously followed by indefinite quantifiers, such as cardinals (12). Structure (12b) is particularly hard to accommodate under the hypothesis that *toti* is a head selecting for definite constituents, since the complement following *toti* is ill-formed (12c).

(12) a. Au plecat toate sapte.
    Have left all.F seven.
    ‘All seven of them have left.’

    b. Au plecat toate sapete fetele.
    Have left all.F seven girls.the.
    ‘All the seven girls have left.’

    c. *Sapte fetele au plecat.
    *Seven girls.the have left.

Before addressing the pronominal constructions in (9) and (10), we therefore turn to the definite quantifier constructions, headed by lexical nouns.

3. The definite quantifier construction

3.1. The semantic role of *toti/amandoi, all/both*

    The starting point is that of the semantic interpretation of *toti* ‘all’. Recently, the view that *all/both* are universal quantifiers has been challenged by Brisson (1998, 2003) and confirmed by Szabolcsi (2010 – Quantification). Let us review some of the arguments in favor of this claim.
Brisson compares all, both and each, that is the three floating quantifiers of English (13), and argues that only each is a genuine quantifier, while both/all are what she calls NP/DP modifiers.

(13) a. Both the students have come.
The students have both come.
b. All the students have come.
The students have all come.
c. Each of the students has fallen asleep.
The students have each fallen asleep.

In this paper, we are not concerned with floating quantifiers; we leave this problem for further study. Brisson (1998, 2003) argues convincingly that unlike each which is a genuine distributive quantifier, all/both are not quantifiers. All/both distributionally differ from each, in important ways. While all/both/each may directly combine with NPs, all/both also combine with definite DPs (14). The latter is the only possibility of the Romanian toti/amandoi, which thus establish a powerful contrast with fiecare (15).

(14) a. Each customer wants a reduction.
   *Each the customer wants a reduction.
b. All customers want a reduction.
c. Both customers want a reduction.
c’. Both the customers want a reduction.

(15) a. Fiecare om/*omul  isi  cunoaste interesul.
   Each  man/*man.the isi.refl.3rd knows interest.the.
   ‘Each man knows its interest.’
b. Amandoi barbati/*barbati isi  cunosc interesul.
   Both.M men.the/*men isi.refl.3rd know interest.the.
   ‘Both men know their interest.’
c. Toti barbati/*barbati isi  cunosc interesul.
   All.M men.the/*men isi.refl.3rd know interest.the.
   ‘All men know their interest.’

Therefore, toti/amandoi do not have the distribution of genuine determiners.
The evidence for treating toti/amandoi as separate from fiecare is apparent in other distributional properties as well. Toti/amandoi may co-occur with collective predicates, in contrast to fiecare (16). Moreover, toti/amandoi do not disambiguate predicates which allow either a collective or a distributive reading (17).

(16) a. Toti studentii s-au adunat in sala de curs.
   All.M students.the s.refl.3rd.sg-have gathered in hall.the of cours.
   ‘All the students have gathered in the classroom.’
b. Amandoi studentii sunt fericiti impreuna.
   Both.M students.the are happy together.
   ‘Both students are happy together.’
c. *Fiecare student era fericit impreuna.
   *Each student was happy together.
   *Each student was happy together.

(17) a. Toti studentii au carat pianele pe scari. (collective and distributive)
   All. M students.the have carried pianos.the on stairs.
   ‘All students have carried the pianos on the stairs.’
b. Amandoi studentii au carat pianele pe scari. (collective and distributive)
   Both. M students.the have carried pianos.the on stairs.
   ‘Both students have carried the pianos on the stairs.’
c. Fiecare student a carat un pian pe scari. (only distributive)
   Each student has carried a piano on stairs.
   ‘Each student has carried a piano on the stairs.’
Also, there is the use of the so-called binominal *each* (Safir and Stowell, 1989) in which it appears that the quantifier specifies a kind of function relating the parts of one plural DP to the parts of another. *Toti/amandoi* are infelicitous or impossible in this use, unlike *fiecare*.

(18) a. Copiii au cumparat trei carti fiecare.  
Children.the have bought three books each.  
‘The children have bought three books each.’

b. *Copiii au cumparat trei carti toti.  
*Children.the have bought three books all.M.

c. *Copiii au cumparat trei carti amandoi.  
*Children.the have bought three books both.M.

Very generally, in both English and Romanian, the quantificational interpretation of the DP is not expressed. In English, according to Brisson (2003), *all*+NP is generic, while *all*+definite DP is episodic (19).

(19) a. All the girls went to the gym.

b. *All girls went to the gym.

c. All girls want nice husbands.

As examples show, in episodic sentences (as opposed to generic ones), *all* is felicitous only when it is followed by the definite article. Reference to a contextually given group is thus expressed by the definite article (all the girls), while the zero article or bare NPs (in other analysis) express genericity.

Romanian *toti* necessarily occurs with the definite article, whether it is episodic or generic, since, as very well known, bare NPs cannot be used in generic sentences in Romance (20). In English generic sentences, *all* is possible, but of course not required (21).

(20) a. Toate pasarile si -au luat zborul.  
All.F birds.teh si.refl.pl.F -have taken flight.the.  
‘All the birds have flown.’

b. Toate pasarile zboara.  
All.F birds.the fly.  
‘All birds fly.’

c. Pasari zboara. (existential/*generic)  
Birds fly.  
‘There are some birds that fly in this moment’

d. Pasarile zboara. (existential/generic)  
Birds.the fly.  
‘Birds fly.’ or ‘There are some birds that fly in this moment’

(21) a. All dogs are mammal.

b. Dogs are mammal.

In other words, genericity is contributed by the definite article in Romanian or by the bare NP in English, not by the presence of *all/toti*. *All/toti* simply add the idea of exceptionlessness. In contrast, notice the examples below, where the universal distributive quantifier force is contributed by each/ *fiecare*:

(22) a. Each mother loves her child.

b. Fiecare mamă îşi iubeşte copilul.  
Each mother *îşi.refl.3rd.sg love child.the.  
‘Each mother loves her child.’

*Discourse anaphora* is another phenomenon which shows that *all/toti, both/amandoi* are not quantifiers, while each/fiecare is a quantifier (23, 24). It is well known that definite DPs freely license discourse anaphors, while quantified DPs (QPs) do not generally have this property.
In contrast, the behavior of *toti/amandoi* under discourse anaphora is that of definite DPs.

We conclude with Brisson (1999:14) that “there is ample reason for treating *all* as a modifier, rather than a quantifier. Unlike determiner quantifiers, *all* does not take a property as its first argument and when it combines with an NP or a DP the (semantic) type of the resulting constituent appears to be the same as the type of NP or DP *all* combine with.” In other words, *all* maps one type of constituent into the same type of constituent, behaving like a modifier. Remember for instance, that adjectives map <e, t> constituents onto <e, t>. (The semantic contribution of *all and both.* (maximalize cap. 2 teza brisson, 2 prop). Anca

Let us turn to the semantic contribution of *all/* both. Brisson’s proposal is that *all* is a modifier which forces a maximal interpretation of the set it modifies. This is apparent when *all* modifies definite plurals. Definite plurals are supposed to refer to maximal sets (as extensively discussed in Rullmann ()), and, indeed, this seems to be the default interpretation of definite plurals, other things being equal (25). However, definite plurals also tolerate non-maximal readings, if the maximality implicature is overtly cancelled. Such is the case of the examples given in (26).

Apparently, as shown by Brisson, exceptions are no longer tolerated if the definite plural is modified by *all/toţi* (27).
The modifier status of *toti* is also manifest when it apparently modifies cardinals, and therefore cannot be a universal quantifier (28). On the other hand, it cannot be the case that with cardinals, the definite Q cancels a maximality reading, since cardinals, do not seem to allow non-maximal interpretations (29).

(28)  

All.F [seven girls.the] have left.  

‘All the seven girls have left.’

[[All.F seven] girls.the] have danced all night.  

All of the seven girls have danced all night.

c. I -am văzut pe toţi şapte la dans.  
Them-have seen pe.Acc all.M seven at dance.  

‘I have seen all seven of them at the dance.’

(29) *Au venit 10 studenti, dar nu toti.

On the strength of such arguments, Brisson (1998) concludes that pre-nominal *all/both* should be analyzed as modifiers, mapping (non-maximal) definite DPs onto maximal definite DPs rather than Q heads and that pre-nominal all/both are adjectives.

3.2 The syntactic status of *all/both*

Ever since structuralist times *all/both*, and also their Romanian counterparts *toti/amandoi* have been described as *predeterminers* always followed by definite determiners in DPs headed by lexical nouns (30).

(30)  

a. toate fetele /toate aceste fete /toate fetele acestea  
all.F girls.the/all.F these girls/all.M girls.the these

b. amandoua fetele mele/amandoua aceste fete /amandoua fetele acestea  
both.F girls.my /both.F these girls/both.F girls.the these

Interestingly, Romanian also possesses a synonym of *amandoi*, namely *ambii*, which is an always definite adjective, followed by non-definite NPs. We expect that to the extent that it combines with pronouns, *ambii* should follow the model of definite adjectives and so it does. However, it is apparently true that, in pronominal DPs, *amandoi* is strongly preferred to *ambii* (31).

(31)  

a. ambele probleme/*problemele  
both.F problems/*problems.the

We ?both.M/both.M have left.  

You.F ?both.F/both.F may sleep at mine.  

You ?both/both may sleep at my house.

In her description of the syntax of *all* and *both*, Brisson argues that prenominal *all/both* are adjectives, while in quantifier floating structures they are adverbs.

Such a proposal is not fully acceptable for Romanian, which has a genuine quantifying adjective, *ambii*, whose properties are not identical to those of *toti/amandoi*. To mention just two obvious facts: first, *ambii* is suffixed by the definite article, which is an adjectival property, while *toti/amandoi* lack this property; secondly *ambii* is followed by an articleless NP, while *toti/amandoi* select definite DPs (32).

(32)  

a. Ambele proiecte/*proiectele  
Both.F projects/*projects.the

b. importantele proiecte/*proiectele important.the projects/*projects.the
In spite of these differences, there are reasons to claim that *toti/amandoi* are adjectives with quantificational properties. From a morphological perspective, *toti* has many adjectival properties: it is a regular four forms adjective like *bogat* ‘rich’(33).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>tot</th>
<th>toata</th>
<th>toti</th>
<th>toate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>all.sg.M</td>
<td>all.sg.F</td>
<td>all.pl.M</td>
<td>all.pl.F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bogat</td>
<td>bogata</td>
<td>bogati</td>
<td>bogate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rich.M.sg</td>
<td>rich.F.sg</td>
<td>rich.M.pl</td>
<td>rich.F.pl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also, from a syntactic point of view, *toti/amandoi* are both prenominal and postnominal (34), again like regular adjectives and unlike *ambii*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>toti copii</th>
<th>/copii toti</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>all.M children.the</td>
<td>/children.the all.M children.the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>toti</td>
<td>copii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>amandoi</td>
<td>copii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>both.M children.the</td>
<td>/children.the both.M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, unlike *bogat/ambii*, *toti/amandoi* cannot be suffixed by the definite article (35).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ambele fete</th>
<th>/fetele</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>both.F.the girls/*girls.the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>ambele fete</td>
<td>/fetele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>ambele fete</td>
<td>/fetele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>both.F</td>
<td>girls.the/*girls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>toate fete</td>
<td>/*fete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all.F</td>
<td>girls.the /*girls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>*toatele fete</td>
<td>/*fete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*all.F.the girls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under ellipsis or when it functions as noun, *tot* is suffixed. Notice the parallelism between *un/unul* and *tot/totul* (36). (For a possible account of nominal ellipsis see (Cornilescu and Niculae, 2013)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Au venit cu toti copii</th>
<th>/cu totii.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have came with all children.the/with all.the.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘They have come with the children/ They have all come.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A venit cu un copil/a venit cu unul.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has come with one child/has come with one.the.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘He has come with one child/He has come with one.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As often remarked (GALR, Barbu (), GBLR for Romanian, or by Emonds (1985) for English), adjectives may turn into quantifiers. A number of adjectives in Romanian have developed functional uses, acquiring quantificational properties. Morphologically, such adjectives lose the ability to be suffixed by the definite article (37). Since the interpretation is definite, the article occurs on the lower noun, failing to be in initial position (38):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>un intreg [+A] oras/un oras intreg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a whole [+A] town/a town whole</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>un intreg [+A] oras/un oras intreg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>intregul [+A] oras /bunul parinte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whole.the [+A] town /good.the parent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>intreg [+quant, +A] orasul / *bun [+A] parinte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whole [+quant, +A] town.the/*good [+A] parent.the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>un tot oras</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a all town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘the whole town’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>*totul oras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*all.the town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>tot orasul</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Taking into account this distribution and its morpho-syntactic properties, *toti* may be described as a quantificational adjective [+A, +quant]. At the same time, as shown above, *all/both* modify definite DPs. In syntactic terms, they select for a definite nominal constituent. We propose to analyze it as a quantificational adjective, selecting for a definite nominal (39).

(39) \( \text{toti (tentative)} \)
\[
\begin{array}{c}
[+A] \\
[\_\_\_ \; [+]\text{def}]_{\text{NP}} \\
[uQ:\_\_\_]
\end{array}
\]

We expect that *toti* merges in a position which satisfies the selectional requirement for a definite nominal. As known, in Romanian definiteness is realized either by the free-standing article *cel*, or by the suffixal definite article –*l*. Remember that the suffixal definite article occurs only on nouns and prenominal adjectives, i.e. on the first +N constituents of the DP.

(40) a. \( \text{proiectul important} \)
\( \text{project.the important} \)
\( \text{‘the important project’} \)
b. \( \text{importan
tul proiect} \)
\( \text{important.the project} \)
\( \text{‘the important project’} \)

The free-standing article *cel* occurs whenever there is a prenominal quantifier in the DP (41).

(41) a. \( \text{cei doi copii} \)
\( \text{these two children} \)
\( \text{‘the two children’} \)
b. \( \text{cel de-al doilea} \)
\( \text{this of second} \)
\( \text{‘the second’} \)
c. \( \text{cei cativa} \)
\( \text{these some} \)
\( \text{‘the few’} \)

The two articles are thus in complementary distribution.

4. The analysis.

4.1. The suffixal article constructions.

Remember that Romanian nominal stems are specified for definiteness, and that nouns suffixed by the definite article enter the derivation bearing the feature \([u+\text{def}:\text{val}]\). This feature is used to value the \([i\text{def:}\_\_]\) under D. According to the discussion above, *toti* is a prenominal adjective, selecting for a definite NP. It also needs to check its uninterpretable \([u+\text{quant}]\) feature, which it does, as the specifier of a quantificational head QP, or by adjunction to a quantifier in QP, when such a quantifier is available (as in *toate sapte fetele*). The order of projections inside the DP is as generally accepted: DP>QP>NumP>FP*>NP. The relevant structure appears to be the following:

(42) a. \( \text{Toate fetele au plecat.} \)
\( \text{All.F girls.the have left.} \)
\( \text{‘All the girls have left.’} \)
b. \( \text{Fetele toate au plecat.} \)
\( \text{Girls.the all.F have left.} \)
\( \text{‘All the girls have left.’} \)
c. \( \text{Fetele au plecat toate.} \)
\( \text{Girls.the have left all.F.} \)
‘The girls have all left.’

(43) a. Toate frumoasele fetele au plecat.
    All.F beautiful girls have left.
    ‘All the beautiful girls have left.’

b. Frumoasele fetele toate au plecat.
    Beautiful the girls all.F have left.
    ‘The beautiful girls have all left.’

c. *Frumoasele toate fetele
    *Beautiful the all.F girls

(44) a. Toate sapte fetele au plecat.
    All.F seven girls the have left.
    ‘All the seven girls have left.’

b. Fetele toate sapte au plecat.
    Girls the all seven have left.
    ‘All the seven girls have left.’

c. Fetele au plecat toate sapte.
    Girls the have left all.F seven.
    ‘The seven girls have all left.’

d. Tus -trei copiii au plecat.
    All.M three children the have left.
    ‘All three children have left.’

We start with the examples that do not contain a cardinal, but may contain an adjective. Notice that toate is higher than any other prenominal adjective (see 43c). Since toate is marked [___, [+def]_NP/DP +A, uQ:___], it will merge as an attributive adjective, selecting for a definite NP, thus satisfying its selectional property. Given its selectional feature, toate will agree with NP in definiteness. The FP (in 43) raises to Spec, NumP, to value its phi features. When a QP head merges, toate will raise to this projection to value its [uQ] feature, leaving the definite NP behind. Among other things, movement to the QP secures the higher position of the quantifiers w.r.t. to other adjectives.

In the tree diagrams below, we have represented the steps described so far. Notice that merging the QP follows from the presence of [uQ:___] on the adjective toate:

(45)   FP
      /\       F’
     /  \      NumP
    [uQ:___]  toate
               [iQ:val]
    [u:___]   [i:val]
    [u+def]
    [i+def]

(46)   FP
      /\       Num’
     /  \      F’
    [uQ:___]  toate
               [iQ:val]
    [u:___]   [i:val]
    [u+def]
    [i+def]

Consider examples (42) first. When the Q head merges the adjective toate is attracted to SpecQ, valuing its Q feature, as shown in (45) below. Assume that the D-head merges with an unvalued [ iDef ] feature. Notice that toate is in the specifier below D, it is endowed with a valued uninterpretable definite feature and thus it is in a position to value the [iDef] feature in D. Note that no further raising of the definite NP is required, since the definite NP is in a chain with the definite adjective and both of them delete their uninterpretable features once the interpretable definite feature in D is valued. The adjective toate, unlike ordinary adjectives cannot realize the definiteness feature, which is exceptionally realized lower on the noun.
If the QP is focused, the NumP scrambles to Spec, DP, allowing the QP to occupy a focus position; notice that the structure of the NumP may be quite complex:

(47) copiii toti
Children.the all.M
fetele Mariel toate
girls.the Mria.Gen all.F
fetele de la munte toate
girls.the of at mountain all.F
‘all of the girls in the mountain’

(48) AP QP Q’
[+A] Q NumP Num’
[u+def:val] [iQ:val] FP Num’ Num’
[uQ:val] AP F’ F’ Num F NP Num’
toate fetele

(49) D DP QP
[idef:val] AP Q’
[+A] Q NumP Num’
[u+def:val] [iQ:val] FP Num’ Num’
[uQ:val] AP F’ Num F NP Num’
toate fetele

(50) NumP DP D’
D [idef:val] AP QP
fetele toate NumP

Consider now the more complex DPs containing cardinals, which seem to include ungrammatical subconstituents of the form Card+definite N (sapte fetele) We suggest that the derivation is identical with the one above, except that, to verify its [uQ] feature, the adjective toate raises to adjoin to the cardinal, instead of occupying the Specifier position of the QP, as above.

(51) CardP QP Q’
sapte Q NumP
AP FP F’
toate F Num’
[+A]
[u+def:val]
[u+Q:___]
toate sapte fetele

(52) CardP QP
AP Q’
toate CardP Q NumP
sapte FP
This analysis immediately accounts for the following facts:

a. With DPs where definiteness is expressed by the suffixal article and a cardinal is present, toti floats with the quantifier.

   a. *Toate sapte fetele au pleact.*
      All.F seven girls.the have left.
      ‘All the seven girls have left.’

   b. *Fetele toate sapte au plecat.*
      Girls.the all seven have left.
      ‘All the seven girls have left.’

   c. *Fetele au plecat toate sapte.*
      Girls.the have left all.F seven.
      ‘The seven girls have all left.’

Compare

 All the seven girls have left
The girls have all seven left

b) The pattern of complex numeral formation exhibited below is regularly formed through adjunction of the bound morpheme *tus* to the cardinal head. If toti/tus were to be a predeterminer, a head higher that it is unclear how this complex cardinal would be formed, since movement to a lower position is disallowed.

   d. *Tus-trei copiii au plecat.*
All three children have left.

‘All three children have left.’

Remark: Evidence that *toti* raises from a lower position onto the cardinal is supplied by the fact that it has turned into a prefix forming complex collective cardinals (see sentence () above).

4.2. Cel

Combinations of Romanian *toti* with definite DPs introduced by the free standing article *cel* are similar to other languages and we will not consider them any further.

(11) a. toate cele sapte fete (s-au bucurat)
   All of these seven girls (s.refl – have cheered)
   ‘All the seven girls have ’
   b. all the seven girls
   c. toutes les sept filles

It is tempting to assign a unitary analysis to *toti/amandoi*, continuing to merge them as attributive adjectives, which need to satisfy a selectional definiteness feature and a quantificational feature. The difference from the preceding situation is that the noun that *toti* combines with is not suffixed by the definite article, but is modified by a cardinal. Accordingly, *toate* merges as an attributive adjective, *under the cardinal in QP*. It is the cardinal which triggers the insertion of the free-standing definite article *cel*. After the insertion of *cel*, *toate* raises to SpecD and (and possibly higher to check a P feature) and to satisfy its selectional feature or to value its definiteness feature:

(12) FP
    AP     F’
    [+A,+Q]  F NP
    [__D[i+def]]  N
    toate  fete

(ii) QP
    CardP  Q’
    Q    NumP
    AP    Num’
    [+A+Q]  Num NP
    [__D[i+def]]  toate fete

    DP
    D
    [i+def]  CardP
    Cele  sapte  Q’
    Q    NumP
    AP    Num’
    toate Num NP
    fete

    DP
    AP
    [+A,+Q]
    [__D[i+def]]  toate
    D
    [i+def]  CardP
    cele  sapte  Q’
    Q    NumP
    AP    Num’
    Num NP
    Fete
In fact, it is likely that, precisely because of its semantic interpretation (i.e. the contrast between fetele/toate fetele), toate also has a \([u+c]\) feature, checked in a CP feature.

This structure should allow/require further movement of the DP, as in

(14)  

The pronoun quantifier construction.

We can now address the pronoun maximizer construction.

Recall that the pronoun merges as an NP and has no other nominal restriction. Consequently, internal modifiers of the pronoun, which supply information about the pronoun reference, merge as classifiers. Below we indicate the steps of such a derivation.

(a)  
a.  
noi toata plebea  
b.  
*toata plebea noi

In (a) below we have shown agreement wrt the \([u+\text{def}]\) feature of the pronominal head, noi ‘we’. This is sufficient to value the uninterpretable definite feature of the quantificational adjective, toata.

In (b) the Art head has merged and the QP in the appropriately positioned specifier allows local Agree. As a result, all the valued \([u+\text{def}]\) features are marked for deletion. The pronominal NP raises to the Spec ArtP position and furthermore to Spec, \(\emptyset\)P, where it values its phi features (c).

In (d) the D head has merged and has its interpretable definite feature valued by the ArtP. Subsequently, the Pers head (=D outer) merges and the \(\emptyset\)P raises allowing the pronoun to value its \([u\text{Pers}]\) feature.
6. Conclusions.