Diachronic Variation in the Syntax of Romanian Demonstratives

1. Aim of the paper

Romanian has a rich set of demonstrative forms, exhibiting morphosyntactic, etymologic and stylistic diversity (see the overview in GR 2013, RGR 2013). This paper is restricted to presenting the evolution of the syntax of the Romanian demonstratives, a problem that has not been dealt with in any detail, since most of the literature has focused on the evolution of the inventory of the demonstratives (cf. Dimitrescu 1978, Giurgea 2013), highlighting forms which have been inherited from Latin, as opposed to forms which have been created in Romanian and investigating their dialectal, functional and stylistic distribution. Since, as far as we know, these variants are homogeneous regarding their syntax, in the first part of the paper we discuss only the system of the standard Modern Romanian forms acest(a), the proximity demonstrative, acel(a) the distal demonstrative, reviewing their properties from a cross-linguistic perspective.

Romanian apparently shows both prenominal (high) demonstratives and postnominal (low) demonstratives.

These forms are differentiated through more than their position: phrasal status, morphology, selectional properties, and definiteness (we claim that only one of them is inherently definite).

The evolution of the demonstrative basically takes us from undifferentiated demonstratives to differentiated demonstratives in the sense mentioned above.

An important background property of MRom is related to definiteness: if there is a definite constituent in a DP, it should occupy the DP-initial position (hence valuing definiteness via Local Agree), as apparent in the following examples:

(1)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>fema</td>
<td>frumoasă</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>girl.DEF</td>
<td>beautiful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>frumoasă</td>
<td>fată</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>beautiful.DEF</td>
<td>girl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>cei doi copii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEF</td>
<td>two children</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2)  

```
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[u]</td>
<td>[u]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[def]</td>
<td>[u-def]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fată</td>
<td>girl.DEF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Local Agree

Also, in Modern Romanian, movement is Local: no more than one specifier is crossed.

---
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2. Some significant cross linguistics properties

2.1. The traditional view

Demonstratives have traditionally been analyzed as strong determiners (Milsark 1977), alongside of the definite article and in complementary distribution with it: the man/this man/ *this the man. Their complementary distribution followed from the fact that they merged in the same D area, usually viewed as occupying the Spec, DP position, or the D position. Unlike articles which are not available everywhere, demonstratives are present in all languages, spelling out features like [person], [definiteness] [location] [deixis]. More recent research has come to a richer and more diversified picture of the syntax of demonstratives, as well as of the relation between articles and demonstratives.

2.2. Low Merge

As far as their merge position is concerned, it has been repeatedly proposed that they merge in a position below D. Thus, as early as the nineties, Giusti (1993) argued that in Romanian, demonstratives, which are phrasal, merge below D and target Spec DP, if the D-head is empty. In which case, the determiner is pronominal. Alternatively, if there is a clitic/suffixal article in D, the N targets the D-head leaving the demonstrative behind.

Giusti’s proposal that demonstratives merge below D is directly supported by the postnominal demonstratives occurring immediately below D.

Examining a larger set of languages, Brugè (2002) proposes that demonstratives originate in a position not only below D, but also below all the functional projections hosting prenominal adjectives; this would explain the facts of Spanish, assuming N-Movement to a position below D. Notice the position of the demonstrative in both Spanish and Greek. In Spanish there is N-movement, so the demonstrative is both post-nominal and post-adjectival. Greek is the most transparent, regarding Brugè’s proposal, since the demonstrative occurs below prenominal adjectives, but still in prenominal position.

Brugè’s ideas that demonstratives merge in a projection of their own, the first projection above little n, and below pre-nominal adjectives has been adopted by a majority of researchers. A follow-up question is what the nature of this position is and which other property correlates with occurrence of the demonstrative in a low position. An elegant answer is provided by Roberts (2012), who exploits the parallel structure of DPs and clauses. Roberts’s interesting proposal is that, given its merge position right above the nP, the demonstrative may be interpreted as an external
argument of the nP projection. An important correlation he established is that there seems to be a link between verb-initial clausal order and LD (=low demonstrative) order. LD languages like the Celtic languages, Spanish, Greek have VSO or VOS order. VS order seems to be the property which correlates with the possibility of LDs, as illustrated above.

2.3 On the relation between D and Dem

Guardiano (2010) systematically investigates the relation between demonstratives and articles. There is a complex distributional pattern of Dem and Ds: (i) there are languages where the two never co-occur (English); (ii) there are languages where the always co-occur either higher or lower than the articles (Greek, Hungarian); (iii) languages where they partially co-occur, for instance only the non-DP initial demonstrative requires the presence of the article (Spanish, Romanian). Taking into account (a) the initial/non-DP initial position of the Dem and (b) its pattern of co-occurrence with the definite article, Guardiano (2010) identifies 6 types of languages. In Guardiano’s typology, Spanish and Romanian are alike and represent types 6 languages: when the Dem is DP initial it does not co-occur with the article, when it is non-DP initial, occurring post-nominally, the article is obligatory (Guardiano 2010: 106).

(6) a. 
este professor / el profesor este
this professor the professor this
b. acest profesor / profesorul acesta
this professor professor.DEF this

The demonstrative-definite article co-occurrence raises the following problems: if demonstratives are definite, so that the information supplied by the article is already present in the demonstrative, why should definite articles and demonstratives co-occur? Most answers to this question vary and tend to be syntactic.

(A) The article solves an anti-locality problem (Grohman & Panagiotidis, 2004)

In demonstratives doubling languages, the article is not present in the numeration. The demonstrative merges in a low position in the agreement domain. The demonstrative, coming from the Φ-domain (=agreement domain) first lands in the article position (= the lowest position of the discourse domain), before moving to its surface position (FocP); since the second movement is too local (within the discourse domain), the violating copy is spelled out in the form of the article, fully agreeing with the demonstrative in number, gender, case.

(11) [Ω Δ ……afta…[αΝ Ω ta [φΔ nea [afta [φΔ fenomena..]]]

The most attractive feature of this analysis is that the article is not present in the numeration, but is inserted because of a syntactic and interpretative reason. Both the determiner and the focus position are required at LF. The lower D position is “motivated by the need to anchor the constituents in discourse. […] The Focus position above it also provides information crucial to the interpretation of the demonstrative, hence its anti-local overt movement to Spec Foc in Greek.”

(B) The co-occurrence of the article and the Dem may be due to definiteness agreement as clearly seen in Hebrew.

(12) a. bayit ze (from Guardiano 2010:105)
house this
b. ha-bayit ha-ze
the house the this
‘this house’

(C) A third reason invoked for co-occurrence of the article and a LD is that in languages that have articles, the D position must be filled and interpreted at least for argumental DPs, the demonstrative actually combines with a DP.
What is striking is that in these languages, low demonstratives have **deictic readings**, independently combining with a definite DP”.

(D) There are also researchers who believe that the co-occurrence of the article and the demonstrative is semantically justified, if not downright required (Elbourne 2008, Roberts 2012, Lewis 2013) Thus Lewis argues that if both DemPs and DetP would be determiners having the same \(<e, t> e\) type, the former could not take the latter as its argument. He suggests that Dems “need to be of type \(<e, e>\), taking a Det(P) as argument even if the Det is unpronounced”.

2.4. **Definiteness, emphasis, deixis**

While, semantically, Dems behave as strong determiners, recent research on their distribution, has shown that demonstratives are not necessarily definite (familiarity for S and H), but they may also be interpreted as indefinite [+specific], as shown for English by Ionin (2006). Here is an examples, the referent of an English *this*-indefinite is available in the speaker’s worlds and may introduce *hearer-new information*.

(14) I was walking down a city street, and suddenly *this* big teapot! It was thrown out of somebody’s window! (from Ionin 2006: 238)

The more general property shared by demonstratives is that they are always “emphatic” or contrastive. Hence, the almost unanimous suggestion that they occur in a Focus Projection (Bernstein 1997, 2001, Bhattacharya 1998). As shown by Bhattacharya (1998: 13), historical studies of IE pronouns (e.g., Hamp 1980) support a focus analysis of demonstratives in general. “These studies broadly conclude that the deictic particles attached to IE pronouns were “emphasizing” particles. For instance, the demonstratives of Bangla “are derived from personal pronouns plus the (emphatic) particle –*i*” (1998: 13). Some other authors (e.g. Julien 2002, Ishane and Puskas 2001) suggest that since they always check specificity, even if they are indefinite, they should merge in/ move to Topic position above D. A way out of this dilemma is to treat them as periphery elements and adopt a Split D analysis of the nominal peripheries, where the one quantificational projection of the periphery is a Contrastive Phrase, as proposed in López (2009).

3. **Properties of Romanian demonstratives**

3.1. **The inventory of the (standard) demonstratives in Romanian: double forms**

The chart below presents the set of demonstratives of proximity and of distance, with their short (weak) forms and with their augmented (strong) forms. Augmentation is achieved either through the presence of the final vowel -\(a\) (cf. (1a) vs. (1b), (1c) vs. (1d)) or through word-internal processes, as apparent in (2).

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
(15) & a. & acest & elev \\
& & this & pupil \\
& b. & elevul & acesta \\
& & pupil.DEF & this-A \\
& c. & acel & elev \\
& & that & pupil \\
& d. & elevul & acela \\
& & pupil.DEF & that-A \\
(16) & a. & acea & fată \\
& & that & girl \\
& b. & fata & acea \\
& & pupil.DEF & that-A \\
& & girl.DEF & that-A \\
\end{array}
\]

The two forms are thus in complementary distribution in Modern Romanian, a property which should follow from their feature composition and properties.
Demonstratives vary for gender, number, and case, and, in Romanian have the distribution of **definite phrases**. Thus, they occur in partitive constructions (17a), after the definite quantifier *toţi* ‘all’ (17b), and are systematically doubled by clitics, not only when the DP is preverbal (CLLD) (17c), but also when it is postverbal (CD) (17d).

(17) a. două dintre ele / **aceste** creioane / **acelea**
    two of them these crayons these-A
    ‘two of the
b. toate **aceste** creioane / toate **acestea**
    all these crayons all these-A
Pe **acestea** două le prefer. DOM these-A two CL.ACC.3PL I-prefer
Le prefer pe **acestea** două. CL.ACC.3PL I-prefer DOM these-A two
    ‘I prefer these two’

The table below summarizes the inventory of Romanian demonstratives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M. Sg</th>
<th>F.sg</th>
<th>M.Pl</th>
<th>F.Pl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-distal, weak</td>
<td>acest</td>
<td>aceasta</td>
<td>aceşti</td>
<td>aceste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+distal, strong</td>
<td>acea</td>
<td>aceasta</td>
<td>aceştia</td>
<td>acestea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ distal, weak</td>
<td>acel</td>
<td>acea</td>
<td>acei</td>
<td>acele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+distal, strong</td>
<td>acela</td>
<td>aceea</td>
<td>aceia</td>
<td>acelea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of Guardiano’s typology:
(a) Romanian is a languages which exhibits both DP-initial and non DP-initial, postnominal demonstratives (=Low Demonstratives).
(b) Romanian exhibits demonstrative doubling by the definite article for postnominal demonstratives.
(c) While for properties (a) and (b) Romanian behaves like Spanish and Catalan, unlike these latter languages, Romanian shows a form specialization of the morphological form according to position and function.

The weak form appears only prenominally and cannot function as a pronoun. The strong form appears only postnominally and may function as a pronoun.

(21) a. **acest** creion / *acest**
    this pencil this
b. caietul **acesta** / **acesta**
    pencil.DEF this-A / this-A

3.2. The weak demonstrative is a head, the strong demonstrative is phrasal

As announced, MRom formally distinguishes the prenominal from the postnominal determiner.

(22) a. **Acest** copil este Ion.
    this child is Ion.
b. Copilul **acesta** este Ion
    child.DEF this-A is Ion

The prenominal demonstrative *acest, acel* has been shown to have head/article behaviour. Article/Head-behaviour is apparent in that the short demonstrative cannot appear alone, either as an argument or as a predicate.
(23) a. **Aceasta** este Ion.
   this-A this is Ion
   ‘This (child) is Ion.’

   b. *"Acest* este Ion.
      this is Ion
      ‘This is Ion’

(24) a. *"Ion este acest*.
     Ion is this
     ‘Ion is this one.’

     b. *Ion este acesta*.
        Ion is this-A
        ‘Ion is this one.’

Given the impossibility of using these forms as pronouns (23a) / (24a), the weak forms may be said to be Dem-heads which select for a *lexical complement* with which they agree in gender/number.

Secondly, like a clitic or an article, the short demonstratives cannot be coordinated:

(25) a. A adus acest caiet și această carte.
    AUX.PERF.3SG bring.PPLE this notebook and this book

    *A adus aceast și acela caiet.
    AUX.PERF.3SG bring.PPLE this and this book

b. A adus caietul acesta și acela.
   AUX.PERF.3SG bring.PPLE notebook.DEF this and that
   Le-a adus pe acesta și pe acela.
   CL.ACC.3PL=AUX.PERF.3SG bring.PPLE DOM this and DOM that

*The distribution of the weak demonstrative*

This Dem has a very extended distribution. It is a definite determiner which covers all of the contexts of both definite articles –ul and cel. Like –ul (26b, e) it is compatible with [+N] constituents, i.e. nouns and adjectives (26a, d). From this point of view the demonstrative contrasts with the definite article cel, which is incompatible with [+N] constituents (26c, f).

(26) Mi-a adus
‘He brought me…’

   a. acest caiet
      this notebook

   b. caietul
      notebook.DEF

   c. *cel caiet e*.’
    CEL notebook
    CEL two notebooks

   d. acest nou caiet
      this new notebook

   e. nou
      new.DEF

   f. *cel nou manual
      CEL new textbook

Like the definite article cel, the short demonstratives are compatible with quantifiers:

(27) a. aceșt/acei doi elevi
     these those two students
     ‘these / those two students’

   b. cei doi elevi
two students
‘the two students’

The short demonstrative may be followed by all types of DP-internal adjectives, in particular it co-occurs with always prenominal (intensional) adjectives. It also co-occurs with high periphery adjectives, which appear above cardinals.

(28) a. acest fost ministru
   this former minister
   ‘this former minister’

b. acești simpatici doi miniștri
   these nice two ministers
   ‘these two nice ministers’

Concluding on weak demonstratives like acest / acel, in MRom they are X⁰ categories which select for a lexical NP [-definite]; they are definite and deictic, occupying a Top/Foc position in the LP.

3.3. More on the postnominal demonstrative

The contrast between prenominal and postnominal demonstratives goes far beyond their position with respect to the noun. Postnominal demonstratives are augmented and move as XPs (not as heads). Postnominal demonstratives occupy a high left periphery position, as will be seen from their distribution with respect to quantifiers and, in particular, to cardinals. Since we adopt the suggestion that demonstratives merge in a projection of their own above NP, the hypothesis is that demonstratives enter the derivation below quantifiers and must move to a LP position above quantifiers. Movement raises specific locality problems, the raising demonstrative can skip over not more than one specifier (equidistance). To satisfy locality, any other potential prenominal constituents should be and actually are excluded.

At this point, we should remember that while in Romanian, prenominal adjectives may be definite (see (1)), postnominal adjectives are non-definite. Because of its consistent postnominal position, the demonstrative was assimilated to a postnominal adjective, therefore bleaching its definiteness feature. Hence, the necessity to bring in DP-initial position a definite constituent, realized as a definite head-noun.

In the following we present the properties of postnominal demonstrative DPs.

3.3.1. Adjacency

The most striking of these is the adjacency constraint. Namely, while the prenominal demonstrative may be separated from the nominal head by any number of constituents (29a, 30a), the postnominal demonstrative requires a definite noun as its antecedent (29b, 30b) and it is always strictly adjacent to this antecedent (29c, 30c):

(29) a. aceste două foarte recente evenimente
   these two very recent events
b. evenimentele acestea două foarte recente
   events.DEF these-A two very recent
c. *evenimentele importante acestea
   events.DEF important these-A

(30) a. acest frumos fiu al lui Ion.
   this beautiful son of Ion
b. fiul acesta al lui Ion
   son.the this-A of Ion.
c. *fiul lui Ion acesta
   son.the of Ion this-A
Adjacency also differentiates between demonstratives and the barely different adjectival article construction: the adjective article *cel* may be preceded by phrasal constituents:

(31) a. rochia Mariei *cea nouă*
dress.DEF Mary.DEF GEN CEL new
b. rochia *aceasta nouă* a Mariei
dress.DEF this-DEF new of Mary.DEF

### 3.3.2 The structure of the postnominal constituent

Even if, at first sight, the only difference between the pre-nominal and the postnominal construction lies in the (in)definiteness of the noun and its relative position with respect to the demonstrative, once we go beyond the core facts, systematic differences of structure emerge at once. The core facts are as presented below:

(32) a. *acel* copil
that child
b. copilul *acela*
child.DEF that-A

(33) a. *acest* măr roșu / din livadă
this apple red from orchard
b. mărul *acesta* roșu / din livadă
apple this-A red from orchard

(34) a. acest rege al poeziei
this king of poetry.DEF.GEN
b. regele *acesta* al poeziei
king.DEF this-A of poetry.DEF.GEN

A first significant difference regards admissible adjectives. By and large the correct generalization is that all and only postnominal adjectives are allowed in the postnominal demonstrative construction.

(35) a. *comedia* *aceasta* americana
comedy.DEF this-A American
b. *aceasta* (*americană) comedie americana
this American comedy American

Thus, one may not have prenominal intensional adjectives (36) or periphery adjectives higher than cardinals (37). Also, intensional or evaluative, point of view, readings of the adjectives are lost in the postnominal demonstrative construction (38). Only descriptive interpretations survive: *singura* can only mean ‘alone’ in the postnominal demonstrative construction.

(36) a. *ministrul* *acesta* fost
minister this-A former
b. *acest* fost minister
this former minister

(37) a. actorii *aceştia* doi simpatici
actors.DEF these-A two nice
b. *actorii* aceştia simpatici doi
actors.DEF these-A nice two
c’. aceştii simpatici doi / doi simpatici actori
these nice two two nice actors

(38) a. femeia *aceasta* singură (*only ‘*/alone’*)
this woman alone
b. **aceasta** singură femeie (‘only’/ ‘* alone’)
   this only woman

Very significant evidence for the analysis of the demonstratives is supplied by cardinal numerals. Cardinals are functional elements and considered prenominal in UG, adopting Borer (2005) and Cinque (2005). In Romanian, they are also always prenominal as well: there are two (apparent) exceptions, one of which is the postnominal demonstrative construction (the other one the adjectival article construction).

\[(39)\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>aceşti doi copii</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>these two children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>doi copii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>two children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>*copii(i) doi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>children(DEF) two</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. copiii aceştia doi
   children.DEF these-A two

The significance of the cardinal data is multiple: in the first place, the distribution of postnominal demonstratives above cardinals shows that Romanian postnominal demonstratives are high in the DP-structure. Secondly, in the postnominal demonstrative construction, cardinals are strictly ordered with respect to adjectives, invariably preceding them:

\[(40)\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>aceste două importante legi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>these two important laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>aceste importante două legi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>these important two laws</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[(41)\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>legile acestea două importante</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>laws.DEF these-A two important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>*legile acestea importante două</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>laws.DEF these-A important two</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fact that adjectives and cardinals are strictly ordered, with the cardinals preceding the adjectives proves DP-adjectives (in the sense of Larson & Marusik 2004) are barred and only postnominal interpretations of adjectives occur. This suggests that demonstratives merge in a low position, and force the movement of the noun past them so that there is no space for any prenominal modifiers. The projection where demonstratives merge hosts formal [+Emphasis] features, checked by merging the demonstrative.

The augmented form was interpreted as having incorporated a locative reinforcer\(^2\) (see Giurgea 2013 and references therein). The incorporation of the locative adverbial is a possible

\(^2\) The interpretation of the postnominal demonstrative is linked to its composition. As shown in Giurgea (2013: 170), *acesta* (i.e. *acest+a*) is etymologically a reinforced demonstratives, a demonstrative augmented through the incorporation of a deictic locative particle – *a*. “Acest-a fost sigur un adverb deictic (ca fr. –ci, -la) probabil illac ((type) acolo), cu evolutia fonetica, illa > a, ca la articolul feminin” (p. 170). Strong demonstrative incorporate a locative deictic adverb, being endowed with a [locative] feature. In his investigation of Germanic languages, Leu (2008) had hypothesized that certain spatial elements are an integral part of determiners. Leu thus claims that demonstratives consist of a definite marker (*d*), a demonstrative adjective (here adj), and an Agr head. Roehrs (2010) disagrees that there is incorporation of a locative adjective (here), but also considers that demonstratives are “complex composite structures that consists of a definite marker (e.g. *d*+, -*th*, a deictic suffix/ a deictic element (*th+ is*) – and an agreement suffix.” Unlike Leu, he assumes that the deictic element is not an adjective, but a suffix. –IS in English is inherently proximal with regard to the speaker (Lyons, 1999: 19, 107). “If a spatial element is present, the deixis is specified accordingly, if no spatial element is
explanation for the apparent absence of another grammaticalised reinforcer³. A deictic locative PP, the equivalent of the Romance PP reinforcers, is possible with both prenominal and postnominal demonstratives, but enjoys free word order, differing from its counterpart in other Romance languages (see Roehrs 2010). Romanian reinforcers thus apparently violate one of the generalizations established by Roehrs (2010) for postnominal reinforcers, namely nothing can intervene between the demonstrative and the reinforcer.

(42) a. *cartea aceasta interesantă de aici de pe masă*
   book.DEF this-A interesting of here on table
b. *cartea aceasta de matematică de aici*
   book.DEF this-A of mathematics of here
c. *cartea asta de aici de matematică*
   book.DEF this-A of here of mathematics
d. *cartea asta de aici de a Mariei, cartea lui de acolo*
   book.DEF this-A of here of Mary book.DEF his of there

(43) a. *această carte interesantă de aici*
   this book interesting of here
b. *aceasta carte de aici interesantă a Mariei*
   this book of here interesting of Mary

Thus the examples in (42) show that the reinforcing deictic PP has the same privileges of occurrence as other PPs, preferably appearing after adjectives.

It is tempting to interpret the low position of the reinforcing deictic PP as indirect evidence that demonstratives merge in this low area and independently move to the periphery position or, alternatively, pied-pipe the reinforcing PP along. This hypothesis is supported by the fact that reinforcing PPs are normally followed by argumental DPs and PP arguments or modifiers:

(44) a. *cartea aceasta frumoasă de aici a Mariei*
   book.DEF this beautiful of here of Mary
b. *?cartea aceasta frumoasă a Mariei de aici*
   book.DEF this beautiful of Mary of here

Results:
Augmented demonstratives are phrasal, as apparent from the locality effects on movement.

Given their position above cardinals, augmented demonstratives are not low demonstratives remaining in their base position. Assuming that they merge low, augmented demonstratives select definite complement NPs, probably they select an ArtP.

The definiteness first position requirement (1) is satisfied by the definite noun; augmented demonstratives are not involved in definiteness valuation, rather, they behave like indefinite postnominal adjectives.

4. Postnominal demonstratives in Spanish/Romanian

---
³ Hence, Roehrs’s hypothesis that it is not clear whether or not Romanian has the demonstrative-reinforcer construction
In this section we provide evidence that the postnominal demonstrative occupies different positions in Romanian in Spanish/Catalan, supporting the view that both the weak and the strong form occupy the same high LP position.

(45) a. **este** libro interesante  (Spanish)
    this book interesting

    b. il libro interessante **este**
    the book interesting this

4.1. The high deictic reading

A first difference with Spanish is that in Romanian it is the postnominal demonstrative which typically has the *deictic gestural interpretation*; this interpretation is almost exclusively associated with the postnominal demonstrative; this is also related to the fact that the high deictic reading occurs in spoken language, and spoken language makes little use of the prenominal demonstrative (see Manoliu 2000, Nicula 2008). If the generalization that the indexical function is associated with the highest overt/or LF position of the demonstrative is correct, then the Romanian post-nominal demonstrative position occupies a high LP position.

(46) Ia *cartea ACEEA* de pe primul raft și pune-o pe masă.
    Take book.DEF that of on the first shelf and put-it on the table
    ‘Take that book from the first shelf and put it on the table’

    Spanish associates the indexical function with the *prenominal position*, while the low demonstrative is referential, with an anaphoric or cataphoric use, as explicitly stated in David (2007): “The postnominal use is strictly referential in origin, meaning that it refers back to entities within a discourse, *it is not a gestural use*. It is significant that the postnominal demonstrative is not emphatic”. “A strong [high deictic] feature attracts the demonstrative in prenominal position.”

(47) a. **este** hombre  (Spanish)
    this man

    b. el hombre **esse**
    the man this

    In Romanian, too, the prenominal demonstrative, if contrastively stressed, may be used indexically, but this is infrequent, the prenominal form being a written language form, employed as a means of securing discourse cohesion (Manoliu 2000, Nicula 2008 among many).

    This clear contrast between Romanian and Spanish is a first indication that the postnominal demonstrative occupies a periphery position in Romanian.

4.2. Qualifying adjectives

These adjectives also show the different position of the demonstrative in Romanian versus Spanish. Remember that in both languages demonstratives merge above the noun and below the FPs where adjectives merge. In both languages, through some linearization mechanism involving NP-movement as described in Bernstein (2001), qualifying adjectives will occur postnominally and in mirror image order (with respect to English). In Romanian the demonstrative moves to the LP leaving the adjectives behind, while in Spanish the demonstrative remains in its merge position, being precede by the NP+AP constituent:

(48) a. el libro interessante **esse**  (Spanish)
    the book interesting this

    b. *cartea asta* interesantă  (Romanian)
Compelling evidence that the two low demonstratives occupy different positions is provided by cardinals. Crucially they occur in their standard position in Spanish (examples from Brugè 2002), i.e. below the definite article and necessarily above the noun (+adjectives) and the demonstrative. In Romanian, cardinals occur below the demonstrative (and naturally above adjectives), clearly indicating movement of the demonstrative past the cardinal. By the same token, the Romanian noun must have moved to a position higher than the demonstrative in FocP, let’s say TopicP.

\[(49)\]

\(\text{a. } \text{esas dos rezones principales (no son suficeintes para disculparle).} \)
\(\text{b. } \text{las dos rezones principales esas (no son suficeintes para disculparle)}\)

\[(50)\]

\(\text{a. } \text{aceste două motive principale (nu sunt suficiente pentru a-l disculpa)}\)
\(\text{b. } \text{motivele acestea două principale (nu sunt suficiente pentru a-l disculpa)}\)

Expectedly, always prenominal adjectives may precede the noun in Spanish, not in Romanian, as shown above. This contrast is expected.

\[(51)\]

\(\text{a. } \text{el último cuadro redondo este el suyo (Spanish, Giusti 2002)} \)
\(\text{b. } \text{tabloul acesta (*ultim) rotund al său (Romanian)}\)
\(\text{c. } \text{acest ultim tablou rotund al său (Spanish, Giusti 2002)}\)

\(\text{Concluding on this comparative discussion: in Romanian both demonstratives occupy a high left periphery position, and Romanian does not appear to be a low demonstrative language.}\)

5. Deriving pre- and postnominal demonstratives in Modern Romanian

5.1. The prenominal demonstrative

The analysis that we adopt stresses the different selectional properties of the strong and the weak demonstrative. Essentially, they have different phrasal status and select different types of complements.

The short demonstrative is a head, which merges in the fused ArtP+DemP and selects a non-definite lexical NP. Acest has the features \ [+D, + definite, + contrast, (+deictic)]\ . It undergoes head-movement through the functional heads, valuing definiteness in D_{inner}, and contrastivity in ContrP. It may also value the definiteness feature in D_{outer}, overtly raising to this position, depending on the structure of the DP. When there is no other constituent in the left periphery, D_{inner} (=D) does not split and contains both definiteness and contrastivity features.

5.2 The postnominal demonstrative

The augmented demonstrative is a phrasal constituent. It merges in Spec, DemP and selects a definite ArtP, as its complement. The suggestion that we advance is that at the current stage in the evolution of Modern Romanian, the long demonstrative is assimilated to a postnominal adjective, i.e. it is not inherently definite. Its complement (the NP) must be definite and it is the NP that regularly checks definiteness. Its featural make up is thus \ [+D, +contrast, (+deictic), +locative].
Here is the suggested derivation of a postnominal demonstrative construction:

(52) cartea aceasta interesantă
    book.DEF this interesting

(53) a. FP
    AP
    F’
    F
    NP
    interesantă cartea
    interesting book.DEF

b. AgrP
    NP
    Agr’
    Agr
    FP
    AP
    F’
    F0
    tNP
    cartea interesantă
    book.DEF interesting

c. DemP
    DemP
    Dem’
    Dem
    ArtP
    NP
    Art’
    [i+def] Art
    ... FP
    aceasta cartea interesantă
    this-A book.DEF interesting
d.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\text{D} \\
\text{N+D} \\
\text{DemP} \\
\text{DemP} \\
\text{Dem'} \\
\text{Dem} \\
\text{ArtP} \\
\text{t}_\text{NP} \\
\text{Art'} \\
\text{Art} \\
\text{... FP} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{cartea} \\
\text{aceasta} \\
\text{AP} \\
\text{interesantă} \\
\end{array}
\]

**Remark:** movement of the whole ArtP would have led to the following configuration, out of which the NP could have raised only by an undesirable subextraction out of a specifier

(54)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ContrP} \\
\text{DemP} \\
\text{Contr'} \\
\text{Contr} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{ArtP} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{Art'} \\
\text{D} \\
\text{...} \\
\text{Art} \\
\text{... FP} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{aceasta} \\
\text{cartea} \\
\text{book.DEF} \\
\text{interesting} \\
\end{array}
\]

The noun now head-raises to value the definiteness feature of Douter.

(54)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP}_{\text{outer}} \\
\text{D} \\
\text{N+D} \\
\text{DemP} \\
\text{ContrP} \\
\text{Contr'} \\
\text{Contr} \\
\text{DP}_{\text{inner}} \\
\text{t}_\text{D} \\
\text{DemP} \\
\text{t}_\text{DemP} \\
\text{Dem'} \\
\text{Dem} \\
\text{ArtP} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{Art'} \\
\text{t}_\text{N} \\
\text{Art} \\
\text{... FP} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{cartea} \\
\text{aceasta} \\
\text{book.DEF} \\
\text{this-A} \\
\text{interesting} \\
\end{array}
\]
Consider an example containing a postnominal demonstrative and a cardinal:

(55) copiii aceștia doi
children.DEF these two
‘these two children’

The null hypothesis is that the cardinal occupies its usual position (DP > QP > DemP > ArtP > NP). Recall also that at the time when the cardinal merges, the noun has valued its definiteness feature and needs to value the definiteness feature in D, since in Modern Romanian, the strong demonstrative is inherently non-definite. To reach the D-domain the definite NP should cross two specifiers, in an instance of Long Distance Movement, composed of Long distance Agree + Copy). Still in Modern Romanian, definiteness valuation relies on strictly Local Agree. There is no way for the definite NP to move to Spec, DP across two specifiers; this configuration forces N-movement, as a Last Resort for definiteness valuation:

(56)

Avoidance of subextraction from specifiers, avoidance of long-distance movement are all reasons for adopting the Last Resort solution of N-movement for definiteness valuation.

The derivation continues as above, with demonstrative undergoing XP movement to focus projection (Spec, Contr), where values the deictic, locative features. At this point, the demonstrative is still non-definite, and the structure is ill-formed, since it violates the requirements of DP-initial definite constituent. N-movement solves the problem, the noun from D\textsubscript{inner} to D\textsubscript{outer}, passing through the head of the projection which hosts the demonstrative. It is likely that the demonstrative becomes definite through specifier-head agreement.

**Conclusion:** the individualizing property exhibited by Romanian is the existence of specialized forms regarding phrasal status, type of movement and, especially, selectional restrictions.

### 6. Major differences in the syntax of Old Romanian demonstratives

#### 6.1 Source

From a diachronic perspective the Romanian demonstrative system *acest(a)/ acel(a)* has much in common with other Romance languages: French, Italian, Sardinian, Catalan and Spanish:

(1) Latin a. *hic* *iste* *ille*
In the passage to Romance the original Latin material (1a) is reconstituted in various ways. In specific case of Romanian (1f), the tripartite Latin system (1a) of the type near speaker / near addressee / neither was not preserved (Dimitrescu 1975: 161, Fischer 1985: 100, Salvi 2011: 325). Instead, Romanian has developed a system where demonstratives are distinguished along the proximity dimension. The proximity distinction is encoded in the demonstrative lexeme itself (*acesta ‘this’ vs. *acela ‘that’), and not by demonstrative particles (e.g. Fr. *celui-ci ‘this one’, *celui-là ‘that one’) (Reinheimer Rîpceanu 2001: 167-8).

In the same way, the postnominal demonstrative construction in Spanish, Catalan and Romanian, ultimately derives from Latin source material as shown in the example below (from David 2007: 130-1):

(2) est enim [homo iste] populo Romano deditus. (Cicero, Republican Era 56 B.C.)
   COP indeed man this people Roman given
   ‘For this man is indeed dedicated to the Roman people’

Much the same pattern is used in later texts (5th AD): homo is introduced and then referred to via homo iste. Prenominal order was however prevailing and postnominal order is emphatic.

6.2 Non-specialized demonstratives

Starting from the earliest existing texts, demonstratives are used both prenominally and postnominally, with a very strong preference for the prenominal position. This probably shows that the postnominal construction was a more recent creation, which is also the case for other Romance languages (cf. 2007). The less frequent occurrence of the postnominal construction may also reflect the absence of spoken language data from Old Romanian, on the hypothesis that specialization according to the spoken/written languages had occurred earlier than the first written texts.

As observed in the literature (ILRL 1997: 330, Cornilsecu & Nicolae 2009, Giurgea 2012, Nicolae 2014) in Old Romanian, demonstratives are not specialized regarding the prenominal vs. postnominal position. Free interchangeability in prenominal position indicates that in Old Romanian as well demonstratives occupied the same high position, the position of the high demonstrative in demonstrative doubling languages:

(3) Ureche
   a. de i-au împăcat într-acesta chip (p. 51)
      and CL.DAT.3PL=AUX.PERF.3SG conciliate.PPLE in-this way
      ‘and he conciliated them this way’
   b. acest cuvânt (p. 43)
      this word
   c. de pre acel război ce au avut Moldovenii
      after that war which AUX.PERF.3PL have.PPLE Moldavians.DEF.NOM
      cu împaratul Turcilor (p. 41)
      with emperor.DEF.ACC Turks.DEF.GEN
      ‘after the war between the Moldavians and the emperor of Turks’
   d. acela răspuns le-au dat (p. 48)
      that answer CL.DAT.3PL=AUX.PERF.3PL give.PPLE
      ‘and they gave them that answer’
The interchangeability of the two forms in OR shows that at that stage too demonstratives occupied the same position. Also, there is evidence that this position is the high, not the low demonstrative position, also as in MRom. Convincing evidence is again supplied by the fact that cardinals and ordinals follow the demonstrative even in postnominal position in OR:

(4) Costin

a. Au pătruns tuturora inimile acestu sfatu (p. 67)
   ‘this advice touched everyone’s hearts’
   
   b. Fost-au acesta război în anul 7014 (p. 50)
   ‘this war took place in 7014’

(5) Cantemir

a. pre această slujbă l-au trimis (p.7)
   ‘they have sent him for this job’
   
   b. căci mai pe urmă și aceasta taină vii înțelege
   ‘because then you will understand this secret’(p. 12)

   While the prenominal position accommodates both the weak and the -a augmented forms freely, the postnominal position prefers the augmented form, so that a weak demonstrative in postnominal position is rare; the same is true for the pronominal use, where an augmented form is expected. The examples below are due to Giurgea (2012); in the texts we have examined, the strong form is consistently used as a pronoun and as a postnominal demonstrative. As shown above, the use of the strong form both as a pronoun and as an article reinforcer is not a coincidence, but shows the common property of the two constructions (the postnominal and the pronominal) in that both co-occur with a definite NP at some level of structure.

(6) a. nu socotiiu de neamul acel (CP 185r)
   ‘I did not considered that people’
   
   b. pierdu ucișatorii acei și cetățile lor arsă (CT 47r)
   ‘he killed those killers and their cities burned’
   
   c. de grija veacului acestui (CT 27r)
   ‘for the care of this century’

(7) a. acei văzură lucrul domnului (CP 213 r 15)
   ‘those have seen God’s work’
   
   b. și vine și robul mieu să facă această și face
   ‘and my slave comes to do this and he does do it’(CP 213r 15)
   
   c. de această vă dam în știre
   ‘we let you know about this’(DIR LXXXVIII : 1593, Moldova)

   The interchangeability of the two forms in OR shows that at that stage too demonstratives occupied the same position. Also, there is evidence that this position is the high, not the low demonstrative position, also as in MRom. Convincing evidence is again supplied by the fact that cardinals and ordinals follow the demonstrative even in postnominal position in OR:

(8) a. pre aceștii doi mare pizmă și mânie avea (Cantemir, p. 14)
towards these two great envy and fury have. IMPERF.3SG
‘(s)he had great envy and fury towards these two’

b. Aceşti doi purta toată împărăţia… (Costin, p. 100)
these two direct. IMPERF.3PL all kingdom
‘these two took care of the entire kingdom’

c. Însă boierii aceşti doi tot cu fereală îmbla
but boyards. DEF. NOM these two also with care walk. IMPERF.3PL
‘but these two boyards travelled discretely’

Similarly, the demonstrative may occupy a higher position than the definite quantifier toţi, generally analysed as a pre-determiner.

(10) După acestea toate, în acea vară… (Greceanu, p. 107)
after these all. F.PL in that summer
‘and after all these, in that summer’
Că acestea toate pentru noi au făcut… (Varlaam, p. 118)
because these all. F.PL for us AUX.PERF.3SG done. PPLE
‘because they did all these for us’

6.3 The two demonstratives have the same discourse role
The suggestion that the weak and the strong form occupy the same position is further strengthened by the fact that both forms have the same discourse roles. Following a recent discussion of Spanish demonstratives, we will refer to the following information structure categories, identifiable in the written language\(^4\): the anaphoric function, the mutual knowledge function, the cataphoric function, the affective function, the discourse topic role, of which we illustrate only a few.

Anaphoric deixis:
(11) În timpul domniei lui Vasile Lupu (…) despre
in time. DEF reign. DEF. GEN GEN Vasile Lupu about
faptele acestui domn află de la boieri (Costin, p. LV)
actions. DEF this. GEN king find-out. PS. 3SG from boyards
‘during Vasile Lupu's reign (…) about the actions of this king he found out from the boyards’

Cataphoric use:
(12) Toţi oamenii […] au din fire aceasta de
all people. DEF. NOM have. PREP. 3PL from nature this so that
se feresce de moarte (Varlaam, p. 105)
CL. REF. 3PL save. PREP. 3PL of death
‘It's in human nature to keep away from death’

Indexical use
(13) audzi cântări si djocuri şi chemă unul din slugi de întrebă:

\(^4\) To the extent that there are bits of dialogue in these early texts, the indexical function can be identified as well.
hear.PS.3SG songs and dances and call.PS.3SG one of slaves and ask.PS.3SG « Oare acestea ce sânăt ? »

indeed those what are
‘He heard sings and dances and called one of the servants and asked: «What are these?»’

6.4 Doubling of the postnominal form by the definite article is exceptionless

While regarding the choice of the demonstratives in prenominal/postnominal position there is variation in Old Romanian, there is one exceptionless generalization for both Old and Modern Romanian, namely postnominal demonstratives are always preceded by a definite constituent, a head or a phrase exhibiting the suffixal article (see the examples above). In other words, structure (14b) is not attested in Romanian. What has indeed changed from Old to Modern Romanian is the structure of this definite constituent, which – being phrasal – was quite varied in Old Romanian, while in Modern Romanian it has been reduced to a definite noun head.

(14) a. cu răspunsul acesta (Greceanu, p. 109)
   with answer.DEF this
   ‘with this answer’
   b. *cu răspuns acesta
      with answer this

One may wonder about the significance and interpretation of this regularity, which should be interpreted in connection with other facts. First, since it involves the definite article which represents the descendent of the Latin ille, the postnominal demonstrative construction is a form which has developed in Romanian, and cannot as such have been inherited from Latin; Latin did have postnominal demonstratives (see details in Giusti 2013), but a Latin postnominal demonstrative couldn’t have been followed by a definite noun since there is no definite article in Latin. Just as in Spanish and Catalan, the postnominal demonstrative is a more recent creation. Alexander (2007: 140) investigates the history of the Spanish postnominal demonstrative on the basis of a corpus analysis and claims that “Spanish postnominal este/ese first surfaces in the 14th-15th century in Biblical translations and notarial documents”. As already seen, even if postnominal demonstratives are available throughout OR, they are less frequent in earlier 16th century texts and increasingly occur in later texts. It is also significant that it is the augmented form which has been retained for the postnominal demonstratives, irrespective of whether augmentation is achieved by word-internal morphemic alternation (aceea/aceea) or by the incorporation of a deictic locative adverb (Lat. illac> -a, acest/acesta). Selection of the augmented form for the postnominal position is in agreement with the fact that the postnominal demonstratives is prosodically stressed, being a “right periphery” focus, in Bernstein’s (1993) analysis. The incorporation of a locative particle (-a), prosodic stress and the high LF position all concur in accounting for the fact that it is this form which is associated with the indexical, “high deictic” function in Romanian and it is this form which has been selected in spoken Romanian, almost to the exclusion of the prenominal one. The postnominal demonstrative can thus be interpreted as a reinforcer of the indexical value of the definite article. At the same time, through its [locative] feature, it is suitable for expressing involvement in the space of discourse (i.e. anchoring in the speech act context, the osmosis of the text world with the speech act world).

The constant presence of the definite article DPs containing postnominal demonstrative also had an effect on the feature composition of the augmented demonstrative, allowing it to eventually lose its definiteness feature. The augmented demonstrative is thus treated as a postnominal adjective, and postnominal adjectives are indefinite in Romanian.

7. The syntactic structure of demonstrative DPs in old Romanian

7.0. The prenominal demonstrative
In this section we examine the range of DP patterns containing demonstratives in Old Romanian, focusing on more complex constructions. Demonstrative DPs where the demonstrative is the first constituent of the DP are no different from the Modern Romanian ones, except for the interchangeability of the strong/weak form already discussed above.

However, there has been a change in the properties of the prenominal demonstrative. Quite significant changes have affected DPs where the demonstrative is not the first constituent of the nominal phrase. In the first place, while in MRom demonstratives are only preceded by a definite nominal head, in Old Romanian they may be preceded by both APs and NPs, sometimes showing a complex internal structure. Secondly, in MRom a constituent preceding the demonstrative must be definite; this generalization is largely true for Old Romanian too, with very limited exceptions (see the previous section).

The evolution of the structure of demonstrative DP may be understood if one recalls the changes affecting the locality conditions on Agree and on Move. Old Romanian evinces Long Distance Agree (valuation of a feature across an intervening constituent) and Long Distance Move (Movement of a constituent across more than one specifier) (Cornilescu and Nicolae 2011). Neither Long Distance Agree, nor Long Distance Move are possible in Modern Romanian, at least as afar as definiteness checking is involved. Nominal structures dependent on Long Distance Agree and Long Distance Move gradually fell into disuse.

7.1 Demonstratives preceded by (in)definite adjectives
Consider the following examples:

(15) sosiră asupra noastră cumpăste aceste vremi de-acmu (Costin, p. 42)
arrive.PS.3PL upon us terrible these times of-now
‘these terrible times of now arrived upon us’

(16) a. la ce stăpân ticaloasa această țară
at what master wicked.F.SG.DEF this country.NOM
au ajunsu (Greceanu, p. 102)
AUX.PERF.3SG arrive.PPLE
‘the hands of what master has this wicked hand arrived’

b. De multă scârbă și de multă jale ce avea sventele acelea muieri
for much pity and for much grief which have.IMPERF.3PL saints.F.DEF those
tenre invățătorul său (Varlaam)
for master.DEF.ACC their
‘because of much pity and grief which those saint women had for their teacher’

The examples above exhibit two possible demonstrative adjective + demonstrative structures; neither of which is still available in Modern Romanian. The example in (15) is highly infrequent because the demonstrative is preceded by an indefinite adjective. On the assumption that demonstrative DPs are definite, since both the adjective and the noun are articleless, it follows that definiteness is valued by the demonstrative, by Long Distance Agree, and, equally important for the evolution of the demonstrative, a demonstrative which occupies the second position is treated as definite. Structures of this kind indicate that in Old Romanian, both of the demonstratives are [+definite], which is expected since they share the prenominal position, as amply shown above. Second position demonstratives arise when the demonstratives is [+definite]. Examples of type (16) are remarkably similar to present day Greek examples exhibiting the order D> A> Dem> N, except that the demonstrative occupies the high Foc position. It is likely that since the two (strong/weak) demonstratives occupy the same positions in OR, they merge in the same projection, namely ArtP; the weak form is a head, the strong form is the specifier of ArtP. Examples of type (16) exhibit the structure of double definite constructions, with the lower D being
valued by the demonstrative and the higher D being valued by the definite adjectival phrase which occupies a topic position. Here are the possible steps of the derivation of example (16a):

In (18) the adjective has merged in a prenominal position. It agrees with the noun for definiteness and phi-features. It is also endowed with a periphery topic feature.

(17) **ticăloasa**  această țară
    wicked.F.SG.DEF  this  country.NOM

(18)

When the Art-head merges, the AP values its definiteness feature, marking for deletion the $u$-features of the N and the A. The AP moves to the Spec of ArtP, since the Art head is strong. Next the DemP merges, with the demonstrative in specifier position (19).

(19)

Given its use in prenominal position, the strong demonstrative must be $[u+\text{def}]$, since prenominal demonstrative DPs are always interpreted as definite. In the ensuing configuration, the demonstrative is closer to $D_{\text{inner}}$ than ArtP, *so it is the demonstrative which Agrees with $D_{\text{inner}}*, valuing the definiteness feature in D, as in (20). On the assumption that $D_{\text{inner}}$ is always strong the demonstrative moves to Spec, DP and then moves further up driven by its focus periphery feature.

(20)
The next step is that of the adjective moving to the periphery, to delete its uninterpretable topic feature. But as shown in (21), this is possible only if the AP moves across two specifier positions. This is therefore an (unavoidable) instance of Long Distance Agree, followed by Long Distance Move. When it is in Spec, TopP, the definite AP may value the definiteness feature of $D_{outer}$ and then raise to Spec, $DP_{outer}$. Alternatively and preferably to avoid antilocal movement, the higher $D$ carries both definiteness and topicality.

(21) \[\text{această ticăloasa țară}\]

(22) \[\text{această ticăloasa țară}\]
As the derivation shows, topicalized definite adjective demonstrative DP are genuine double definite structures, i.e. structures which show two definite constituents, assumed to value the definiteness of two different determiners.

Two features of the derivation must be retained. First, the non-initial DP demonstrative is definite. As long as the demonstrative is [u+def] and as long as it merges above the definite adjective (which has agreed for definiteness with the noun), the demonstrative is the higher [u+def] constituent and it is in a configuration of Agree with the lower determiner. b. There is movement across two specifier positions of the AP, which raises to get rid of its [u-topic] feature. The higher D is valued by the topicalized constituent.

7.2 Demonstratives preceded by noun-headed phrases

Demonstratives were also preceded by noun phrases in contrast with M Rom, where the demonstrative is preceded by the nominal head. Here are examples which, in different ways, unambiguously show that the N has not moved as a head, but as a phrase.

(23) a. să să pomenească direpții și svenții
  SĂSUB CL.PASS mention.SUBL3SG right.DEF and saint.DEF
  oameni aceia carii... (Varlaam, p. 101)
  people those who
  ‘those right and saint people who… should be mentioned’
  b. care pă ticalosul pamântu acesta (Greceanu, p. 99)
  which on wicked.DEF land this
  ‘which on this wicked land’
  c. prin întunecoasă ceața aceia orbecăind (Cantemir, p. 19)
  through dark.F.SG mist.DEF that grope.GER
  ‘groping trough that dark mist’

(24) a. Și până la domniia lui aceasta (Costin, p. 76)
  ‘and until reign.DEF his this
  and until this reign of his’
  b. Trimis-au în urma Șerban-vodă pre nepotu-său acesta
  send.PPLE=AUX.PERF.3SG in trace Șerban voivode DOM nephew=his this
  ce s-au zis mai sus (Greceanu, p. 100)
  which CL.PASS=AUX.PERF.3SG said.PPLE more above
  ‘then Șerban-voivode sent this nephew of his who was mentioned before’

(25) a. Deci să știi că fările pe atuncé acestea nu erau
  SO SĂSUB know.SUBL2SG that countries.DEF then these not were
  așa supuse (Costin, p. 103)
  so obedient.F.PL
  ‘you should know that these countries were not then so obedient’
  b. Și într-aceia dar vreme… (Greceanu, p. 99)
  in=that but time
  ‘but in that time’

In (23) the NP consists of the nominal head accompanied by prenominal adjectival modifiers, while the demonstrative is in final position. In (23a) and (23b) definiteness is regularly marked on the adjective (the highest [+N] constituent), example (23c) offers an example of low article NP preceding the demonstrative.
Examples in (24) contain the head N with a genitive/possessive argument; notice that the Noun is definite. As far as their analysis is concerned, these examples raise no problem. They differ from the pre-demonstrative adjective construction in the nature of the constituent which raises to SpecArt. For instance (23) unlike the adjectival construction (24), it is the whole AgrP (AP+NP) which raises to Spec ArtP, since the definite AP piedpipes the head NP.

Examples (25) further confirm the phrasal status of the demonstratives in OR. OR allowed the adjunction to nominal constituents of scrambled adverbials or conjunctions, presumably with the further sentential topicalization of the highest constituent of the nominal phrase. On the well-known assumption that there is no phrasal adjunction to heads, the PP pe atuncé is adjoined to the phrasal demonstrative acestea (26).

(26) cǎ ţările acestea nu erau aşa supuse pe atuncé
countries.DEF these not were so obedient.F.PL then
[CP țările [DP ţările [FocP pe atuncé [FocP acestea ]DP] nu erau aşa supuse]].

7.3. Accounting for the changes

The derivation of non-initial demonstratives presented above shows several problematic aspects: anti-local movement (the movement of DemP, from Spec, DP to Spec, FocP), and long distance movement of the topicalized constituent, which should not be problematic, since it is an instance of A’-Movement. One should also recall that the locality of Agree/Move in Modern Romanian has been demonstrated for definiteness valuation (Cornilescu and Nicolae 2011) and this does not entail the exclusion of long distance Agree/Move in other situations, especially when the valuation of periphery features is involved.

7.3.1. The account we propose relies on the suffixal nature of the definite article. When an N enters the derivation as [u+def] it forces the projection of the ArtP in order to delete its definiteness feature. Furthermore, the Spec, ArtP is occupied by the NP, since the Art head is strong. As a result the demonstrative can no longer merge in Spec, ArtP (by virtue of its determiner/article nature), but forces the projection of the DemP, right above ArtP. The Dem head should guarantee merge of a determiner, and determiners must be specified for definiteness. So the Dem head is at least [+D, +idef:___, +dem]. All these features are automatically satisfied by the DemP in Spec, DemP (reverse Agree). However, since the Dem head merges first, the following configuration emerges:

(27)

\[
\text{DemP} \quad \text{ArtP} \\
\text{+D} \quad \text{+idef:___} \\
\text{+dem} \quad \text{NP} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{Art} \quad \text{[u+def:val]} \\
\text{[i+def:val]}
\]

It is immediately obvious that definiteness is valued by the nominal complement, before the demonstrative phrase merges. As a result, to satisfy the features of the Dem head, the demonstrative itself need not be endowed with a definiteness feature, since the definite complement is sufficient to value definiteness.

There are thus two means of valuing the definiteness of the Dem head: insertion of the weak demonstrative, which is a definite head, and selection of a definite nominal complement, i.e. selection of an ArtP, as shown above.
Gradually, the strong form lost its definiteness feature, and replaced it by a requirement for the selection of a definite nominal complement (the definite ArtP). Once DemP is not definite, it is a constituent of the ArtP which moves to the D domain to check definiteness, and the derivation continues as shown above in ((19)-(22)). The DemP reaches Spec, FocP, but cannot check the definiteness of the outer D, forcing the movement of the nominal head across the demonstrative in its Focus position.

The augmented form, which possibly incorporates a reinforcing locative adverbial is a phrasal constituent, and as shown above, there are restrictions on the range structures which are compatible with post-nominal demonstratives.

The prenominal demonstratives Since all (definite) DP configurations should be able be headed by demonstratives, and since adjectives and nouns move as phrase, the non-augmented demonstrative was re-analyzed as a head. This allows it to move to high periphery without interfering with constituents in specifier position.

7.3 A low demonstrative in Old Romanian?

As shown in section 6.2 above, distributional factors – e.g. the fact that postnominal demonstratives consistently precede cardinal and ordinal quantifiers – indicate that the postnominal position of the demonstrative in Romanian is the high not the low demonstrative position (see Guardiano 2012 for discussion).

There is, however, indirect evidence that in the passage from Latin to (Old) Romanian, the low demonstrative position had also been available, being actually the position in which the demonstrative ILLE grammaticalized as a suffixal definite article.

Direct evidence for the grammaticalization of the suffixal definite article out of a postnominal demonstrative (also the position of Romanian traditional scholars, see Coteanu 1956, Graur 1967, Brâncuș 2004) is provided by the "low definite article" construction of Old Romanian, studied in detail by Cornilescu and Nicolae (2011). Essentially, in this construction, an item which might potentially count as a defective intervener in definiteness valuation separates a definite phrase / noun from the [i-def] bearing D head.

(29) a. cu [dp cinstită cartea mării tale] with honoured letter.DEF highness.DEF GEN your 'with your highness' honoured letter' (Dl. 1596: CVI)

b. tu tinde cu milă cătră noi [dp svântă mâna ta] you extend with mercy towards us holy hand.DEF your 'extend your holy hand towards us with mercy' (FT.1570-1575: 3')

c. că văzuiu [dp luminată fața ta] that see.PS.1SG bright face.DEF your 'that I saw your bright face' (A.1620: 58')

d. s-au oploșit în [dp vicleană făgăduința lui] REFL=has sheltered in sly promise.DEF his 'he took shelter in his sly promise' (CLM.1700-1750: 186')

e. iară [dp ascunsă giudêtu lui Dumnedzeu] and hidden judgement.DEF GEN God
toate gândurile omenești le strămută
all thoughts.DEF human CL.ACC.3PL moves
‘and God’s hidden judgement troubles all human thoughts’ (CLM.1700-1750:242’)

să potoale Vasilie vodă [sunate zarvele]
SUBJ mitigate Vasilie prince renowned quarrels.DEF
(CL.M.1700-50: 234’)

(30) a. au aflat cap și începătura moșilor [...] ca să nu (they)have found head and beginning ancestors.DEF.DEF so SUBJ not se înéce [DP a toate tările anii trecuți] REFL drown AL all countries.DEF years.DEF passed
‘They found the origin and the beginning of their ancestors so that the passed years of all countries may not be drowned into oblivion’ (ULM.~1725: A-1 f.2)

b. Umblăm după [DP a lumii înșelătoare fata] (CVL.1672: 34’)
(we)go after AL world.DEF.DEF deceitful face.DEF
‘We are after the world’s deceitful face’

Note that, in Modern Romanian, a definite constituent (a definite noun or adjective) obligatorily occupies the DP-initial position, hence valuing definiteness via Local Agree; by contrast, in old Romanian, indefinite constituents may precede the definite constituent, hence definiteness valuation may also proceed via Long Distance Agree (the constructions in (29) have been eliminated). Similar reasoning applies to the prenominal genitive in (30).

Direct evidence for the fact that the definite article originates from a low demonstrative is provided by the appearance of the low definite article after quantifiers:

(31) a. deade Dumnezeu [DP zeace cuvintele sale] gave God ten words.DEF his
‘God gave his ten commandments’ (CCat.1560: 4’)

b. arătarea [a dooa venireei lui] showing.DEF the-second coming.DEF.DEF GEN his
‘the showing of his second coming’ (CC².1581: 536/16)

c. însă [câte trei morți] nu sunt închipuirì but each three deceased.DEF not are illusions
‘but the three deceased each are not illusions’(AD.1722-1725:131’)

Thus, it is highly likely that a pre-attested stage of Romanian also possessed a low demonstrative, situated below cardinals. This is the position in which the demonstrative ILLE grammaticalized as a suffixal definite article in Romanian.

8. Conclusions