Arbeitspapier Nr. 124

Proceedings of the IV Nereus International Workshop
“Definiteness and DP Structure in Romance Languages”

M.T. Espinal, M. Leonetti & L. McNally (eds.)
Proceedings of the IV Nereus International Workshop sponsored by:

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

Agència de Gestió d'Ajuts Universitaris i de Recerca

The publication of these proceedings is being funded by:

Universität Konstanz
Fachbereich Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Konstanz

Arbeitspapier Nr. 124

Proceedings of the IV NEREUS INTERNATIONAL WORKSHOP: DEFINITENESS AND DP STRUCTURE IN ROMANCE LANGUAGES

M. TERESA ESPINAL, MANUEL LEONETTI & LOUISE MCNALLY (eds.)

Fachbereich Sprachwissenschaft
Universität Konstanz
Fach 185
D-78457 Konstanz
Germany

Konstanz
Juni 2009

Schutzgebühr € 3,50

Fachbereich Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Konstanz
Sekretariat des Fachbereichs Sprachwissenschaft, Frau Tania Simeoni,
Fach 185, D–78457 Konstanz, Tel. 07531/88-2465
Table of contents

Preface

Anna Bartra (Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona):
Some remarks about the grammaticalization process of the DP functional domain in Old Romance

M. Teresa Espinal (Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona) / Louise McNally (Universitat Pompeu Fabra):
Characterizing ‘have’-predicates and indefiniteness

Susann Fischer (Universität Stuttgart):
Expletives, definiteness and word-order in Romance: Accounting for the differences between Spanish/Catalan and French

Klaus von Heusinger (Universität Stuttgart) / Sofiana Chiriacescu (Universität Stuttgart):
Definite “bare” nouns and pe-marking in Romanian

Manuel Leonetti (Universidad de Alcalá):
Remarks on focus structure and non-specificity

Natascha Pomino (Universität Zürich) / Elisabeth Stark (Universität Zürich):
Adnominal adjectives in Romance: Where morphology seemingly meets semantics

Xavier Villalba (Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona):
Definite adjective nominalizations in Spanish
Preface

This volume is a collection of papers presented at the IV NEREUS (http://www.ilg.uni-stuttgart.de/Nereus/) international workshop on the topic Definiteness and DP Structure in Romance Languages, held at the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona on October 9th and 10th, 2008.

The main theme of the workshop was the relation between the semantic notion definiteness and the syntactic structure of the Determiner Phrase. Within this theme various specific topics were discussed during the workshop. One group of papers addressed the topic of definiteness and specificity: the notion of indefiniteness characteristic of object bare singular nominals in Spanish and Catalan, the interrelationship between (in)definiteness and word order, the interpretation of definite bare nouns in Romanian, the interrelationship between focus structure and non-specificity in Spanish, definiteness and specificity in denominal verbs, and definiteness in adjective nominalizations in Spanish. Another group of papers dealt with the syntactic DP structure corresponding to different types of nominal projections in Old Romance, and the structure of vectorial bare NPs in Spanish. Finally, one paper was presented on the properties of adnominal adjectives in Romance at the morphology-semantics interface, and one on a semantic approach to the notion of differential object marking.

Although some authors were not able to include their presentation in this volume (J.M. Brucart & Á. Gallego, M. García, and D. Jacob), we would like to thank all the contributors and participants at the workshop for their talks and interesting discussion.

Finally, we would like to thank the institutions that contributed to the success of the workshop:

Departament de Filologia Catalana. UAB
Departament de Filologia Espanyola. UAB
Departament de Lingüística. Universität Konstanz
Departament de Traducció i Ciències del Llenguatge. Universitat Pompeu Fabra
Departamento de Filología. Universidad de Alcalá
Generalitat de Catalunya. AGAUR (2008ARCS100007)
Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia (HUM2007-31131-E)
Vicerectorat d’Economia. UAB

Bellaterra, April 27th 2009

M. Teresa Espinal
Manuel Leonetti
Louise McNally
Some remarks about the grammaticalization process of the DP functional domain in Old Romance
Anna Bartra-Kaufmann
anna.bartra<at>uab.cat

1. Introduction and outline of the paper*

The grammaticalization process, by which definite articles (D) evolved out of Demonstratives (Dem) in most languages of the world, and particularly in Germanic, Romance and Scandinavian languages, has been well known since philological studies carried out in the nineteenth century. Within the more recent theoretical framework of the minimalist program, grammaticalization is understood as a bottom-up reanalysis which creates a new functional head out of a lexical phrase. This view, together with proposals about the functional architecture in the extended nominal projection stemming from Abney (1987), has shed some new light on this process and put upon the table different proposals about the hierarchy of Functional Categories in the extended nominal projection. The first question that must be addressed is whether there exists a universal range of functional categories. Given the clear fact that languages differ in their inventory of functional morphemes—such as, in our present concern, Determiners—an affirmative answer to this question would imply that some Functional categories are inert or empty in languages which do not have lexical material to merge in them. On the other hand, though a negative answer would at first sight be more minimalist or economical, it implies the need for additional machinery to explain how different outputs of the Computation System yield the same meaning at the I-C component. Either way, any proposal about the functional categories of the nominal projection must be well motivated on empirical grounds while preserving minimalist assumptions about the computational system.

Moreover, another problem has to be considered in relation to this subject. Although since Lightfoot (1999) grammatical change has been envisaged as instantaneous, abrupt, and catastrophic—in the sense that grammars are individual states of a mind—from a social and philological point of view, changes appear to occur gradually over time, with different grammars seeming to coexist at any one point in time. So given two grammars $G_1$ and $G_n$ chronologically distant in time, the problem is to explain the intermediate $G_2$, $G_3$, and $G_4$ stages and even the stages in which, for example, $G_3$ and $G_4$ appear to overlap chronologically.

---

*I would like to thank the organizers of the IV NEREUS International Workshop: Definiteness and DP Structure in Romance Languages (Bellaterra, Barcelona, Oct. 9-10, 2009), Maria Teresa Espinal, Manuel Leonetti, and Louise McNally for offering me the possibility to present a previous version of this paper. I also thank the audience for their comments and discussion. This research has been partially supported by grants MEC/FEDER HUM2006_13295_C02_01 and DURSI 2009SGR1079.

---


In this paper I aim to shed some light on the debate about functional categories in the extended nominal projection while focusing on these apparent intermediate stages in the grammaticalization of Latin determiners in Old Romance, mainly in Old Spanish and Old Catalan. Specifically, I will try to argue in favour of a strict correspondence between differences in syntactic construction and differences in meaning. More precisely, I argue that the features in functional categories lower than $D^0$ are capable of licensing the Noun Phrases without a Determiner in Old Romance. In section 2, I present the main lines of the problem to be addressed. In section 3, I review the various proposals regarding the structure of DP. In section 4, I present the data and show that differences in terms of the presence or absence of a full determiner in the same historical period of time correspond to differences in meaning and in the structure of the DP. In section 5, I provide an analysis of the data based first on a recent hypothesis about grammaticalization and then on a more restrictive hypothesis about functional categories in the nominal domain. Section 6 will present my conclusions.

2. Presence or absence of determiners in Old Spanish and Old Catalan: some puzzling data

The process by which Latin Demonstratives became grammaticalized into determiners by semantic bleaching and phonological weakening started very early\(^3\). Indeed, the earliest documents available in Old Spanish and Old Catalan already show determiners:

\begin{enumerate}
\item (a) Old Spanish\(^4\) (Fueros de la villa de Palenzuela, CORDE).
  \begin{verbatim}
  de suso el cerral aiusso en acca
  \end{verbatim}
  from top the.MASC hill down to here
\item (b) Old Spanish (Fueros de la villa de Palenzuela, CORDE).
  \begin{verbatim}
  de Valdecennar el sendero arriba
  \end{verbatim}
  from V. the.MASC path upwards\(^5\)
\item (c) Old Spanish (1076, Anónimo, Fuero de Sepúlveda, CORDE).
  \begin{verbatim}
  Et quando el senior fuerit in la villa,
  \end{verbatim}
  and when the.MASC lord be.3.PAST.IND in the.FEM town
\end{enumerate}

\begin{verbatim}
  el iudex in palacio comedat, et numquam pectet, et dumi fuerit index, so
  escusado non pectet.
\end{verbatim}

---

\(^{3}\)"The weakening of the demonstrative to a definite article and of the numeral uno to an indefinite article was a long process, starting with the Christian writers and continuing over centuries. [...] In the eighth century the indefinite article is likewise fully formed [...] Lui, lei and loro also make their appearance at this time" (Migliorini, 1960: 47). "In terms of real time, Löfstedt on the basis of his analysis of a wide range of authors concludes that only during the 6\(^{th}\) century in certain contexts one finds concrete and true instances of incipient definite articles; a true weakening of the value of ille takes place starting in the 8\(^{th}\) century (1956: 373)" (Bauer, 2007:129).

\(^{4}\)Spanish examples are mainly taken from CORDE database of the Real Academia de la Lengua Española [REAL ACADEMIA ESPAÑOLA: Banco de datos (CORDE) [en línea]. Corpus diacrónico del español. \url{http://www.rae.es}]; Catalan examples are taken from CICA (Corpus Informatitzat del Català Antic, supervised by Joan Torruella, Manuel Pérez Saldanya and Josep Martines) \url{http://seneca.uab.es/sfi/cica}.

\(^{5}\)I gloss only the relevant parts of the text. However, I have reproduced longer extracts in order to illustrate how Romance and Latin were intermingled in written texts in this period. Latin segments are in italics.
In these texts, a very archaic Old Romance coexists with Latin. However, this code-switching does not obscure the fact that in this form of Romance the definite determiner has already become mandatory (under some semantic and syntactic conditions, as we will presently see). It is therefore surprising that in comparatively late texts, we find alternating pairs like the following:

(2) (a) Old Spanish (Cid, 712)
Moros le reciben por la sena ganar
Moors him receive.6.PRS.IND for the.FEM flag win.INF
‘(Some) Moors go to meet him in order to win the flag’
(b) Old Spanish (Cid, 755)
los moros nos van del campo
the Moors no+REFL go.6.PRS.IND from=the field
‘The Moors refuse to abandon the battlefield’

The same alternation is found when the nominal is the complement of a preposition:

(3) (a) OS (Cid, 2925)
a los pies le cayo
to the feet him fall.3.PAST.IND
(b) OS (Cid, 1594)
a pies se le echava
to feet REFL himDAT throw.3.PAST.IND

Modern Spanish and Catalan allow plural indefinites as objects of the verb (whether postverbal or preverbal) but not as external (preverbal) subjects, as in (2a), or as objects of prepositions, as in (3b). In fact, it is not absolutely clear that these examples from Old Spanish imply an indefinite value of the nominal. If they do, they obviously challenge the hypothesis that only definite specific noun phrases can be arguments (Longobardi, 1994). Other problematic examples are those offered in (4):

(4) (a) Old Catalan (Cròniques d’Espanya, p. 270, l. 16)
e perquè pau e concòrdia fos entre los
and so that peace and harmony be.3.PAST.SUBJ between the.MASC.PLUR
navarros e aragonesos
Navarrese and Aragonese
‘and so that peace and harmony might exist between the Navarrese and the Aragonese’
(b) Old Catalan (Primera part de la Història de València, p. 167, line 39).
Aprés, en lo temps que fon donada pau
after, in the.MASC time that be.3.PAST.IND give.PP.FEM peace
‘Afterwards, in the time that peace was made...’
In these examples, a singular bare nominal is in subject position, with examples (b), (c) and (d) featuring passive constructions.

As seen, bare singular and bare plural nominals (hereafter BNPs) appear with clear argument value in a period when full grammaticalized definite articles were already present in the language. Therefore, the questions posed by these examples are:

(5) (a) Are Case and argumenthood inherently linked to reference and definiteness?
(b) How can the referential and argument properties of BNPs be checked?

The questions in (5) are closely related to the more specific questions in (6):

(6) (a) At a stage in Old Romance when former Latin Demonstratives are already grammaticalized definite articles, should BNPs be considered simply as “residues” of the Latin grammar? I.e.: are two competing grammars being used simultaneously?
(b) Do Old Romance BNPs have the same or a different interpretation from full DPs? Therefore, what structure should be attributed to the BNPs?
(c) Are there differences between the semantic and syntactic properties of BNPs in OR and MR? More specifically, are there differences between the functional layer in Old and Modern Romance, and consequently, are there different licensing conditions for DPs/BNPs in Old and Modern Romance?
(d) Can the properties of DPs and BNPs in Old Romance be related to other properties of the sentence?

Briefly, the questions in (6) put forward the question “What does it mean to be a BNP in Old Romance?”. Related to this basic question is the one in (6d), which I will address only incidentally.

Batllori and Roca (2000) offer a positive answer to the second question in (6a). Following Kroch, these authors argue that Old Spanish had two different subsystems of grammar for the descendants of the Latin demonstrative ille, one “innovative” and the other “etymological”. In the innovative grammar they had already been reanalysed as discourse anaphors, and examples such as the ones in (2a) would not be possible. In the etymological grammar, by contrast, these examples would be commonplace while el, la, los and las would continue to serve as demonstratives. This would mean that two sentences, one with a full Det and another one without it—like (2a) and (2b), for instance—would have the same meaning. Nevertheless, I would argue that this is not exactly the case. Certainly, the data show that in this period the determiner did not have the same presence as it does in Modern Spanish or Catalan and that it showed an obviously unstable state. But its presence or absence follows clear semantic and syntactic patterns. My claim is that that each syntactic construction corresponds to a different semantic interpretation.
In the next section I present a hypothesis about the Functional Categories of the nominal domain and the grammaticalization processes that took place in Old Romance in that domain.

3. The extended nominal domain in Old and Modern Romance

The data are neither scanty nor fortuitous, but widespread and regular, at least in Old Spanish and Catalan (we will show also some examples from Old Italian). Therefore, we would propose the following working hypothesis (7)

(7) Working Hypothesis (1)

(a) There are no two competing grammars in Old Catalan and Old Spanish—one in which Latin Demonstratives are fully grammaticalized and another one in which they are not yet definiteness markers. This means that in this period BNPs and full DPs have not the same meaning and the same referential properties.

(b) The distribution of BNPs (relative to that of DPs) follows from the semantic and syntactic properties of nominals.

We follow recent work on grammaticalization processes which argue that grammaticalization favours economy (see Van Gelderen, 2004a/b) by favouring internal merge or lexical insertion into functional heads. This option is much more economical than external merge or movement from phrases into spec positions in order to validate the uninterpretable features of morphologically empty functional heads.

(8) (a) Head Preference (or Spec to Head) Principle

Be a head, rather than a phrase.

(b) Merge over move

(c) Late Merge Principle

Merge as late as possible

(d) The Linguistic Cycle

A very similar view is that expressed in Roberts & Roussou (2003: 201):

---

6 Van Gelderen (2004: 11-12; 2006:6). In the representation in (8d), arrow (1) represents the operation move from a phrase to reach a Spec position to check some feature(s), whereas arrow (2) represents the grammaticalization process, by which a former phrase becomes a head.

7 It should be clarified that arrow (1) represents a case of move, whereas arrow (2) shows the diachronic evolution in the sense that a former phrase ends up as a head.
(9) Simplicity
   (a) A structural representation R for a substring of input text S is simpler than an alternative representation R’ iff R contains fewer formal feature syncretisms than R’.
   (b) \( F^* \text{Move} / \text{Move} > F^* \text{MoveXP} / \text{Merge} > F^* \text{MoveXP} / \text{Merge} > F^* \text{MoveXP} / \text{Merge} > F^* \text{MoveXP} / \text{Merge} > F^* \text{MoveXP} / \text{Merge} > F^* \text{Agree} / \text{Merge} > F^* \text{Agree} / \text{Merge} > F \).

As for the grammaticalization of Dem into D, the process clearly obeys the principles established in (8) and (9).

All developments that can be observed are in accordance with the unidirectionality principle: whereas demonstratives acquired uses as definite markers and numerals as indefinite markers as a result of language contact, there is not a single case suggesting a reversed directionality whereby a definite article developed into a demonstrative or an indefinite into a numeral for ‘one’.

3.1. The grammaticalization of Dem into Det

In a minimalist framework, this process has been given an explanation by Roberts & Roussou (2003). They make the following assumptions:

(10) (a) D position is a definiteness position.
   (b) Demonstratives occur in a position lower than that of definite articles, and can relate to D either by overt raising (to Spec DP) or coindexation (i.e. binding).
   (c) The loss of the [+demonstrative] feature is responsible for the development of a definite article.
   (b) The raising/binding relation (…) is lost.

Roberts & Roussou (2003) rely heavily on previous analyses such that by Giusti (2001), which we represent in (11):

(11) (a) DP (b) DP

```
     DP
    /   \
   DemP D'
   / |   \
  (il)le D ... D ... (il)le
```


---

relates the need for DEM-into-D insertion with the loss of case morphology from Latin to Romance. She assumes that Det is the locus where case is hosted, and the rich morphology of Latin suffices to make the N-to-D chain visible at PF and every level. Once the morphology is lost, in Romance, the only way for the case features to be valued is through lexical insertion into D.

A similar analysis is given for Spanish by Batllori and Roca (2000:253):

(12) \[ DP \ D [\text{DemP} \text{Dem} [\ldots [\text{Poss}] \ldots \text{NP} \ldots]] \]

and for German by Abraham (2007: 244):

(13) “(…) the direct grammaticalizing step from ArtPro [Artice-Pronoun. A.B.K.], SpecDP, to article, D⁰, in German (…).”

There is no general agreement on the exact semantic and syntactic features of Dem and D⁰, but some general ideas are abstracted in (14):

(14) (a) Dem is a lexical or substantive category, whereas D is a Functional Category
(b) Dem is lower in the tree than D¹
(c) Dem is Xₘₐₓ, whereas D is X⁰
(d) Dem and D only share some of their semantic features.

We will not go into the semantic properties of Dem and D in detail, since it has been extensively analysed in the literature¹¹. There seems to be agreement on the notion that both Dem and D are [+definite] and can be [+specific]. By contrast, Dem means [+unique] and can be [+focus], whereas D need not carry values such as unique or specific and has no focalising value; it is rather a topicaliser or thematic element.

As shown by parallel processes in other languages, we would expect the different stages of the introduction of the article (i.e. the grammaticalization of DemP) to shed some light on important grammatical properties of DPs and the syntactic environments they appear in.

The universality of D has been the subject of much debate, together with the exact number and hierarchy of the functional projections present in the extended nominal projection. For instance, are Latin, Finnish or Japanese nominals DPs or NPs? We propose to reconcile the conflicting requirements of descriptive and explanatory appropriateness in this respect—in other words, the requirements of UG and minimalist proposals—by means of the statement in (15)¹²:

(15) Given a universal range of Functional Categories. particular grammars activate only the ones for which the child gets positive morphological evidence.¹³

---

¹ Abraham, interestingly, introduces two discourse linking categories FocDp and ThemaDP into the DP domain, as he considers that the process involves a ‘defocalisation’ and ‘thematising’ path of the DemPro into Article. We leave for forthcoming work the possible application of this hypothesis to the evolution of Romance.


¹³ I would like to assume that the ambiguities or default meanings originated by the absence of a category are resolved by internal or external merge into a higher projection.
As for DP, since Longobardi (1994) it has been accepted that D is the place where reference and argumenthood are checked or verified. But Latin has no overt D. Instead, Latin has a case system. Significantly enough, the impoverishment and subsequent extinction of the Latin case system runs parallel to the development of the Romance D-system and the grammaticalization of D. Giusti considers D the place where case is hosted. Alternatively, it could be argued that in a language without D, reference and argument status is checked against K. One could make the assumption that definiteness, topic and focus properties of the NP are licensed contextually.\textsuperscript{14}

We also assume Number (NumP)\textsuperscript{15} and Gender (GenP or Class) projections over NP. Even if it not crucial for our analysis, we assume, for coherence with the analysis of verbal and prepositional categories\textsuperscript{16}, a small \textsuperscript{n} category, which gives its categorical value of the root.\textsuperscript{17} Therefore a possible structure of nominal projections would be that shown in (16):

\begin{equation}
(16) \text{[KP [DP [NumP [GenP [nP [√]]]]]]}
\end{equation}

Following Abraham (2007), Batllori and Roca (2000), Brugè (2001), Giusti (2000), Roberts and Roussou (2003), and others, we assume that the Demonstrative rose from a lower position in the tree to SpecDP /Spec KP. After grammaticalization, Dem is no longer Dem but D: this means that from that time on, it merged in D\textsuperscript{0}.

The question now is to determine whether all the categories in (16) are syntactically active throughout the period of Old Romance. Even if in some cases there is a need to posit a grammar in which nominals are strictly Bare Noun Phrases, it is essential to clarify exactly what BNP means while at the very least bearing in mind the possibilities offered by (16)\textsuperscript{18}.

Before we sketch out a proposal, let us in the next section review the process by which the definite determiner was introduced into Old Spanish and Catalan, as well as the different grammars of determination.

3.2. Types of nominals and the progressive use of the definite article in OR

As in many other languages in the world, in Old Spanish and Old catalan the presence of (definite) determiners did not imply that they were used in all types of nominals in every syntactic position. The data show that the presence of the Determiner evolved following an order that is presented roughly in (17), which has to be interpreted in the following way: the first nominals that took a D were specific definite non abstract

\textsuperscript{14} We leave aside, as we said, proposals such as those set out in Abraham (2007), Aboh (2003) and others.

\textsuperscript{15} Stark (2006) posits a PIP (Plural Phrase) that does not have exactly the same value as NumP, because both categories coexist in Stark’s analysis. She argues that PIP hosts not the plural morphemes, but rather the [+/- countable] value of the noun, as well as its power to admit a plurality morpheme and to move to NumP.


\textsuperscript{17} As will become clear later on in the text, this functional category becomes relevant in deverbal nouns.

\textsuperscript{18} To review several analyses that have been proposed for standard BNP constructions we refer to Bosque (1996), Dobrovie-Sorin & Laca (2003), Dobrovie-Sorin, Bleam & Espinal (2006), Espinal (2001), Guérön (2006), Laca (1999), Munn & Schmitt (2004), Zamparelli (2005) and references therein.
nouns, followed by discourse-linked specific and / or definite, ones, etc. reflects the order in which the nominals required determiners in Romance

(17) (a) Specific definite (unique) non-abstract
(b) Discourse-linked specific definite
(c) Generic and nonspecific plurals
(d) Indefinite specific concrete
(e) Indefinite nonspecific concrete
(f) Abstract mass N

The examples in (17) show that in very early stages of Old Romance unique specific nominals bear an article:

(18) (a) Old French (Artu ; cit, Dufresne, Dupuis, Tremblay, 33)
quant li rois entent ceste parole,
when the king hear.3.PAST.IND this talk
(b) Old French (Chanson Roland, v. 1678 [in Brunot-Bruneau: 187])
Dur sunt li colp(s)
hard be.6.PRS.IND the blow(s)
(c) Old Catalan (Llull, Mer., VIII, LIV)
Lo rei d’aquelles gents era hom molt bo
the king of=those people be.3.PST.IND man very good
(d) Old Italian (Novellino, 53, rr. 3-9, cit. ITALANT)
Lo imperatore donò una grazia a un suo barone (...) The emperor give.3. PST.IND an honour to one his knight.
Il barone mise alla porta un suo passagere (gabelliere)
The knight pu.3.PST.IND. (...) Il pedaggere li domandò un danaio ...
(e) Old Portuguese, in Martins (2000: 213)
E assi escapou o comde J. F. de nom seer morto
and thus escape.3.PST.IND the=count J. F. from not be.INF.kill.PP.MASC

(18d) illustrates the fact that topics or discourse-linked noun phrases bear a definite article, whereas focuses or noun phrases with a newly introduced value bear the indefinite article.

We believe that (17c), the third group of nominals that needed the D, are exemplified in the examples in (19) below, which are the same ones we saw in (2):

Several caveats have to be made. Firstly, the absence of a determiner does not mean only the absence of a definite determiner. As a reference point we have in mind the grammars of contemporary Modern Spanish and Catalan, but sometimes a BNP of the Old language corresponds to an indefinite determiner in today’s language. Secondly, the hierarchy must be envisaged as a tendency, since discourse conditions make determiners necessary in abstract generic nominals, for instance. Thirdly, I have not carried out an exhaustive quantitative study using a closed database. Nevertheless, the hierarchy in (18) is rather plausible and similar conclusions have been reached by other authors, like Company (1991:95). She sets up the table in (i), based mainly on data from Cantar de Mio Çid:

(i) Referential Near Metaphorical Known Abstract
- Determiner - - + - +
+Determine + + + - -
The examples in (19) have been taken as an argument in support of the hypothesis of competing grammars by Batllori and Roca (2000). We would claim that in the examples in which *moros* does not bear any determiner, the nominal must in fact be interpreted as nonspecific. In (19a) and (19d) the NP receives an existential interpretation, whereas in the other cases the singer speaks about ‘some discourse recoverable group of Moors’.

The difference in meaning can also be seen clearly in the complement of the P in (19b) and (19c), because in (19b) the Moors abandon a previously mentioned “battlefield”, i.e., the battle, whereas in (19c) the “battlefield” refers to a generic nonspecific battle that has not even begun. As for the subjects, as noted, we believe that the cases with a definite determiner (19b,c,e,f) are discourse-linked: the author refers to an already mentioned group of Moors, whereas the cases without a determiner (19a,d) refer to a nonspecific group; in (19d) the interpretation is one of an existential sentence with a fronted internal argument. The same can be argued from the examples in (3) repeated here as (20):

(20) (a) Old Spanish (*Cid*, 2925)
\[a \text{ los pies } le \text{ cayo}\]
to the feet him,DAT fall.3.PST.IND

(b) Old Spanish (*Cid*, 1594)
\[a \text{ pies se } le \text{ echava}\]
to feet REFL=him throw.3.PST.IND

In (20a) the nominal refers to the feet of a specific person. By contrast, in (20b), *a pies* is part of the metaphorical sense “echarse a (los) pies” ‘to throw oneself at
somebody’s feet as an act of submission’. The same contrast can be seen in (21): whereas (21a) refers to a manner of killing, (21b) refers to a specific sword.

(21) (a) Old Spanish (Crónica General, 118/26a).
   *E a su mugier otrosi mataron la a espada*
   and (to) his wife also (they) kill.3.PST.IND=her to sword
   ‘And they killed his wife with a sword’

(b) Old Spanish (Crónica General, 118/7a)
   *et dio muy gran ferida con el espada en el pescuezo*
   and give.3.PST.IND very big wound with the sword at the neck
   ‘And he hurt him with the sword on his neck’

The same results obtain if we compare the two uses of the nominal caça in the following fragment:

(22) Old Spanish (Abraham de Toledo, Moamín. Libro de los animales que cazan. 1250)
   *E non conuiene que, quando los caçadores salieren a caça, que les prenda cobdicia de demandar mucha caça (…) ca por esto se façen más atreuudas e quieren más la caça.*
   (a) *cuando los caçadores salieren a caça*
      when the hunters go-out.6.PST.SUBJ to hunt.N
      ‘when the hunters go hunting’

(b) *quieren más la caça*
      want.6.PRS.IND more the game
      ‘they are more keen to hunt down their game’

There are—as expected—few cases in which a concrete noun denoting a referential specific entity appears without an article. The BNPs in (23) are complements of a verb or a preposition, but would take a determiner in the modern language. One possible explanation is that all three (not just agua in (23a)) are perceived as mass nouns, and therefore licensed as complements. Another possibility is to suppose that in cases like these the determiner would have an expletive value. In fact, we hypothesize that this expletive value is the last of a series to be acquired in the grammaticalization process. Put another way, the expletive value is the last stage to appear in the course of grammaticalization, since of all its features the article only retains the agreement features.

(23) (a) Old Spanish (Cid, 553)
   *Açerca corre Salon, agua nol puedent vedar.*
   near flow.3.PRS.IND Salon, water not=to=him can .6.PRS.IND deny.INF
   ‘Salon flows near, therefore they ca not deny water to him’

(b) Old Spanish (Cid, 2126).
   *Dios que está en cielo*
   God who be.3.PRS.IND in heaven
   ‘God, who is in heaven’

(c) Old Spanish (Hita, 294d).
   *por ello en infierno, desque morio, yacia*
   because of that in hell, since (he) die.3.PST.IND (he) lie.3.PST.IND
   ‘Because of that he lied in hell since his death’
Old Spanish and Old Catalan databases show abundant instances of nonspecific concrete BNPs, mainly in legal documents. Most of them appear in a complement position (i.e. the object of a verb or preposition)

(24) (a) Old Catalan (Usatges de Barcelona, p. 123, line 10)  
[S]i algú 
  fe**mbra verge** per força corrupr**à**  
  hò li dò marit de sa valor.  
  or her DAT give.3.PRS.SUBJ (a) husband according to her value  
  E si **fembra que no sia verge alg[ú] per força aurà**  
  And if (a) woman who not be SUBJ virgin someone by force takes

(b) Old Spanish (Crónica General, 644/37a)  
  et que tomare marido con cuyo acuerdo  
  and that (she) take.3.PST.SUBJ (a) husband with whose agreement

In these examples and other similar ones, it is clear that the lawyer is referring to a generic (i.e. indefinite, nonspecific) female or husband thus exemplifying the third ‘level’ (17c) in the hierarchy. In modern Catalan and Spanish, such nominals are introduced by an indefinite article. Some examples with the same value can be found in an apparently external argument position:

(25) (a) Old Catalan (Cròniques d'Espanya, p. 270, line 16)  
  e perquè pau e concòrdia fos  
  and in order that peace and harmony be.3.PRS.SUBJ

(b) Old Spanish (Arciprete de Hita, Libro de Buen Amor: 473)  
  moltyno andando gana, /  
  mill run-better.3.PRS.IND  
  Huerta major labrada da la major mançana:  
  vegetable garden better work.PP.FEM give.3.PRS.IND the the better apple

(c) Old Catalan (Primera part de la Història de València, p. 167, line 39).  
  en lo temps que fon donada pau a la sglésia,  
  in the time that be.3.PST.IND give.PP.FEM peace to the Church

The most relevant case is (25c), where the BNP is the subject of a passive construction. In (25a), the nominals are subjects, but ser in OC has an existential value; the subject is therefore an internal argument that has been focalised to the left periphery of the sentence. In principle (25b) looks more clearcut, but the parallel structure in the following verse suggests that the syntactic structure may have been forced in some way. The examples in (26) are along the same lines as the ones in (25):

(26) Old Catalan (Llibre de l'orde de cavalleria: p. 203, line 27)  
  Escut és donat a cavayler per significar offici de cavayler,  
  shield is give.PP.MASC to (a) knight to signify.INF (the) office of knight
  cor enaxí con l'escut met lo cavaler entre sí e son enamic,  
  because just-as the shield put.3.PRS.IND the knight between himself and his enemy
  enaxí cavayler és lo mitgà qui és entre rey  
  thus (a) knight be.3.PRS.IND the intermediary who be.3.PRS.IND between (a) king

\(^{20}\) We only gloss the relevant parts of the text.
It is clear that BNPs in (26) are indefinite and nonspecific in meaning (exemplifying 17e) and contrast with the discourse-linked cases that take the article (exemplifying 17b).21

Other concrete indefinite nonspecific nominals can be seen in (27):

(27) (a) Old Catalan (EVM,2).

\[\text{missatge del dit noble és anat a la vostra altea} \]
\[\text{message of the said noble be.3.PRS.IND gone to the your Highness} \]
\[\text{‘A message from said noble has gone to Your Highness’} \]

(b) Old Catalan (Jaume I, Llibre dels feits).

\[\text{e que enuïem carta en Arago} \]
\[\text{and that sen.4.PRS.IND letter in Aragon} \]
\[\text{‘And that we send letter to aragon’} \]

The last level in the list (17 of nominals that need Det is occupied by abstract nouns in the complement position of a V or a P:

(28) (a) Old Spanish (Fuero de Zorita, p. 36).

\[\text{Del que quisiere petició fazer} \]
\[\text{About=the who want.3.COND request make.INF} \]
\[\text{‘About who would make a request’} \]

(b) Old Spanish (Abraham de Toledo, Moamín. Libro de los animales que cazan. 1250).

\[\text{que les prendan cobdicia} \]
\[\text{that them.DAT.PL takes.3.PRES.SUBJ greed} \]
\[\text{‘that greed may take them’} \]

These examples can be analysed as complex predicates with a light verb and a deverbal noun—in fact the ancestors of a typical class of idioms—. These constructions are widespread in many languages and have been interpreted as properties which incorporate semantically into the verb.22

Nevertheless, what is most intriguing is the fact that sometimes the verb phrase is in passive form and therefore the BNP appears as an external subject:

(29) (a) Old Catalan (Llull, Blanq., II, XXXIV).

\[\text{E fo feta concordança e amistat} \]
\[\text{and be.3.PST.IND make.PP.FEM agreement and friendship} \]

---

---

21 It will be apparent that this paper—like many studies on the rise of D0—suffers from a methodological shortcoming, since in fact the development of the definite article cannot be separated from the study of the need for an indefinite article and the differences and similarities between the latter and the numerical meaning ‘one’. From that perspective, some differences between OR and MR would be narrower, since plural indefinites still need no (indefinite) article:

(i) Llegaron turistas de todas partes del mundo
   (there) arrived tourists from all parts of the world

(ii) Veo dificultades para el proyecto
   (I) see difficulties for the project

22 See Dobrovie Sorin, Bleam & Espinal (2006) and references therein.
4.

The licensing of NPs without an overt determiner

Let us start out by recalling the functional architecture that has been proposed for the nominal domain:

(31) \[KP [DP [NumP [GenP [nP [\sqrt{\_\_}\_\_\_\_\_]]]]]\]^{23}

(31) represents only the relative ordering of the different Functional elements inside the DP layer. DEM is not represented in this structure, since we accept the assumption that it is not a FC. The possibility should be envisaged that DEM, like POSS, starts from a complement position. But we leave this question for investigation elsewhere.

In this paper we don’t analyse the point of the lexical category. For our purposes it is not crucial whether it is a noun or a bare root selected by a functional small \(n\).

\(^{23}\) In this paper we don’t analyse the point of the lexical category. For our purposes it is not crucial whether it is a noun or a bare root selected by a functional small \(n\).
Whereas DP, NumP and some version of a Classifier or a GenP are generally assumed to be Functional categories, to our understanding there is no general agreement on the universality and status of KP. Moreover, differing interpretations have been given of that category (cf., for instance, Kayne (2002) vs. Ogawa (2001)).

Remember also our previous working hypothesis, restated as (32):

(32) The data in OR do not indicate an unstable state, in which two competing grammars can be used alternately by speakers, but rather the alternating nominals have distinct semantic and syntactic properties.

Given the systematic properties of the BNPs that coexist in time with full DPs, I will try to explore the properties of the extended nominal domain, in association with the position of the BNPs. I will argue that the determiner was merged into D exclusively in cases where a specific unique countable nominal had a discourse-linked value. The main point to be developed is that other functional categories available in the extended functional domain of the N were able to license a nominal.

4.1. An earlier analysis

In previous work we proposed a view of the functional nominal domain in which the different Functional Categories of the universal repertoire were activated bottom-up as morphological evidence acted as a cue. In this process, the grammaticalization of the most deeply inserted Functional Categories took place parallel to the insertion of new morphological material in the upper part of the DP. Now we intend to go one step further, by relating this development to two factors that were not taken into account in that previous work: the properties of K/D, and the fact that the indefinite article was not fully grammaticalized as marker of indefiniteness, at least in the plural.

We will still maintain some of the ideas of our previous analysis and which followed some insights offered by Boucher (2005), which we will review now. Following Dobrovie-Sorin (2001: 208), Delfitto & Schroten (1991), Schroten (1991; 2001) and others, Boucher argues that in languages without overt determiners, no functional projection D needs to be established in order to derive the argument status of nominals. In these languages, the referential or definite value of the noun can be checked against other existing functional projections. He adopts the principle spelled out in (33):

(33) The restricted Quantification Constraint (RQC):

The existential interpretation of DPs is only available if two ‘logically’ different elements are present, filling distinct syntactic positions and respectively providing the domain of quantification and the ‘quantifying in’ operator. (Boucher, 2005: 97)

Boucher goes on to say that the assertion in (33) should be interpreted as in (34):

(34) Lexical items (N, V, A, P) are first order predicates having scope respectively over objects, situations, attributes. Each lexical head projects a ‘pure’, semantic

25 We must leave for future research the decision about the exact nature of this uppermost projection. We maintain its ambiguous status, either as a D which hosts Case (Giusti, 2002) or as a K which hosts reference (Boucher, 2005).
projection and assigns (one or more) theta roles. All nouns predicate a quality […] of some referent, which we call R (Higginbotham, 1986), and place in Spec,NP.

The structure is represented in (35):

(35) [NP R [N1 N…]]

‘Semantic’ functional heads are operators that must bind an argument in the lexical projection they c-command. Specifically, D binds (R) in the NP projection. In the case of Bare NPs, other extended functional projections may do so in the absence of DP.

Restating Boucher’s claims, we can say that

(36) The universal condition on restricted quantification can be satisfied by NPs if they are dominated at least by NumP, which is included in the set of ‘operator’ heads.

Following (36), the structure in (37) would reflect the properties of a nominal like that seen in the English sentence in (38). The detailed structure is shown in (39):

(37) [NUMP [NUM’ [N1-Num] [NP R [N1 t]]]]

(38) Beavers build dams

(39) [NUMP [NUM’ [beaver-s] [NP R [N1 beaver, ]]]]

These structures are not possible in Modern French, Modern Spanish or Catalan. Boucher claims that the reason is that in these languages the number affix is not strong.

In Boucher’s analysis,

(40) For a BNP to be used in subject position, the noun must adjoin also to K0.

Though based on it, our earlier analysis was a bit more complicated than Boucher’s. Briefly, taking as a crucial argument the fact that most BNPs found in OS and OC were not incorporated into a complex Prepositional or verbal component, our proposal stated:

(41) (a) From the inventory of Functional Categories of UG, particular grammars activate only those for which there is formal and morphological evidence.

(b) Numerical subscripts in a representation like [DP D3 [NUMP Num2 [GENP Gen1 [NP N] ]]] indicate the order of “activation”.

(c) The external subject position requires at the least an active FC NumP.

In that analysis, the following structures were presented:

(42) (a) fazer ayuntamiento

(b) [VP [V’ fazer [NUMP [ayuntamiento-Num0 [GENP ayuntamiento [SN t]]]]]]
4.2. Some shortcomings

This analysis had, however, several shortcomings, which we summarize in (44):

(44) (a) It failed to predict exactly in which cases one or another FC would be activated;
(b) There was no clear relation between the internal structure of the BNP/DP and external licensing in the sentence.
(c) It failed to explain how, for instance, Num could be responsible for licensing a singular BNP in Old Romance in some positions but not in others (contrary to the facts in English, or in Modern Romance, for instance).

5. In search of a slightly finer analysis

In order to overcome these problems, and to make a slightly more fine-grained analysis, I will now deal with the various types of nominals independently.

BNPs in OS and OC can be classified into the groups in (45) (though there may be others):

(45) (a) Abstract mass BNPs in object position.
(b) Abstract mass Ns acting as subjects of passive sentences.
(c) Generic count singular NPS with a property-type interpretation.
(d) Plural indefinite nonspecific BNPs.

5.1. Abstract mass singulars

Here we must make a distinction between two different situations, according to the position of the noun phrase.

5.1.1. Abstract /mass singulars acting as direct objects or objects of prepositions

The unmarked case is exemplified in (46a), with its abstract constituents shown in (46b):

(46) (a) fazer petició
(b) [VP light verb [BNP object –count, +abstract]]

Similar examples from Old Italian can be found in ITALANT database:

(47) Old Italian (Libro de le virtuti de le pietre preziose, p. 314, rr. 15-16 [1310])
Nota che ‘l zaffiro è pietra utile e bella, e di cilestrino [celestino] colore, et ae [ha] proprietade e virtù contra a rompimento di sangue [emorragia]. Et ae virtude contra male d’occhi.
‘…has (some) property and (some) virtue…’

26 We only gloss the relevant nominal.
This structure has been explained as the result of an incorporation process into the VP. They are “real” BNPs, in the sense that they have no [Num] features (or projections) at all. As we see in (48), a ‘pure’ NP (as in (a)) or a GenP (as in (b)) is selected by the V. Since no agreement features are needed, no NumP is necessary. We believe that the GenP projection is clearly justified by the fact that the nominalising suffixes are gender marked.

(48) (a) vP
    v
    VP
    
    V
    nP
    fazer n -cion

    (b) vP
    v
    VP
    
    V
    GenP
    fazer n
    n √petic
    -cion

In Modern Romance these structures are no longer possible, unless they have become lexicalized as idioms. It may be that two processes took place in parallel. The deverbal

---

28 From a more traditional point of view, it could be argued that in fact what we have is an eventive N that becomes “semantically” verbalised by means of the (light) verb.
29 With reference to the lexical category, see fn. 22.
Ns like *petición* became lexicalized, and simultaneously the light verb grammaticalized and was merged into small *v*. The NP then had to move to SPEC *v* to license K and / or referentiality. But in cases where the *nP* was not inserted into a *NumP* and /or *DP*, it had no Kase or reference features. Therefore, only lexicalised complex predicates (with the *nP* frozen “in situ”) survived.

5.1.2. **Abstract mass nouns acting as subject of passive sentences**

The same line of reasoning must be followed to explain the corresponding passive sentences, like (49):

(49) fo feta concordança

Notice in the first place that in Old Romance the subject of these passive sentences is almost always post verbal<sup>30</sup>. We think that the NP could be licensed in a local way, in a VP internal position, as the internal argument of a Participial or Aspectual Phrase, which, in turn, is selected by the copular verb:

(50)

```
  vP
    v
      AspP
        Asp
          VP
            [+Perf] V'
                V
                  NP
                    fo
                    feta
                    concordança
```

Simply because the nominals are not full DPs, they can appear in this environment: they are not an appropriate goal for T, but they satisfy the lexical requirements of the light V. Once countable non-abstract Ns need a D, the DP becomes an appropriate goal for T.

In those cases where the BNP appears in a preverbal position, we must assume that they underwent a topicalization move.

5.1.3. **Abstract/mass singulars acting as subjects of active sentences**

These structures, exemplified in (51), require further attention.


```
    Fill, bonea d’hom està en membrar
    son, goodness of man be.3.PRS.IND (in) remember.INF
```

One possibility could be to give them the same analysis on the basis that the BNP is the subject of a Small Clause selected by a copular verb. But we have also seen cases where there are no copular verbs present:

<sup>30</sup> We didn’t find examples of reflexive or SE passives with preverbal BNPs in the databases.
In fact, abstract mass Nouns denoting qualities, sins, virtues, psychological states, etc., can be found in generic descriptions in all Old Romance languages, as the examples in (53) show:

(53)  
(a) Old Italian (Brunetto Latini, Rettorica, p. 159, rr. 4-6/ ITALANT)  
*Dell’exordio. (…) Exordio è un detto el quale acquista convenevolmente l’animò dell’uditore all’altrè parole che sono a dire…*  
“exordio” is a manner of speaking…”  
(b) Old Italian (Bono Giamboni, Libro, chap. 33, par. 6)  
*Ed ella disse: - Prudenzia è un verace conoscimento del bene e del male, con fuggir lo male ed eleggere [scegliere] il bene.*  
‘prudence is a true knowledge…”  
(c) Old Catalan (Llull, Blanquerna, IV, chap. LXXVIII).  
*Valor ha major sperança en aquells qui són majors e pus honrats del món*  
‘courage has bigger hope…”  
(d) Old Catalan (Llull, Blanq., II, LVIII).  
*Enveja, defalliment de caritat, ergull, avarícia, injúria, són en nostra companyia.*  
‘envy, lack of charity, arrogance, greed, iness, offence are…”  
(e) Old Catalan (Llull, Mer., II).  
*Esdevenc-se que injúria contrastà a la justícia, e ignorància a la saviesa; mas fortitudo ajudà a la justícia, e trempança a la saviesa, per la qual ajuda foren vençudes injúria, ignorància, frevoltat e gola, e fo engendrat caritat, en la qual estigueren justícia, saviesa, fortitudo e trempança.*  
‘It happened that offence opposed justice…”  

Some of these subjects could be analysed as a metaphorical personification. In this case, the nominal could be assimilated to a proper noun that has risen to D. This explanation tells us nothing about the internal structure of the nominal. Moreover, these structures are impossible in Modern Romance.

Let us comment on several points in a rather exploratory fashion. First of all, a large number of the cases we have seen are equational sentences: therefore, the BNP could in fact be the predicate. Even if the sentences with copular verbs in (53) and similar sentences should not be interpreted as existential, following Stowell (1981), and Moro (1997), we interpret that the subject raises from a VP internal position, the position of the subject of a complement small clause.

Summing up, these BNPs can be analysed in the same way as the mass N internal arguments.

---

31 Again, we only gloss relevant parts of the fragment.
32 We leave aside certain archaic constructions in religious language, as in “Prudencia, justicia, fortaleza y templanza son las virtudes teologales.”
33 Following Hale and Keyser (2002), the verb *be* corresponds to the X in the small clause at LS level, as the lexicalisation of a P of Central Coincidence. But this fact does not change our reasoning.
A final question has to be addressed with reference to this group of nominals. In general the sentences in which they appear are deontic assertions to be taken as definitions. In fact, most speakers of contemporary Spanish will accept sentences like those in (55):

\[(55) \]

(a) \textit{Pereza es no tener nunca ganas de trabajar} \hspace{1cm} \textit{‘(True) laziness is never feeling like working’}

(b) \textit{Orgullo es no saludar a los colegas} \hspace{1cm} \textit{‘(True) arrogance is not saying hello to your colleagues’}

(c) \textit{Amor es no aburrirse nunca} \hspace{1cm} \textit{‘(True) love is never getting bored’}

Note that the subject BNPs have to be translated as “pure N”. This means that they have to be interpreted in a contrastive way. The definitions in (55) have an interpretation that differs from the one they would have if the definite determiner were present. For example, (56) has an unmarked interpretation:

\[(56) \]

\textit{La pereza es la falta de ganas de trabajar} \hspace{1cm} \textit{‘Laziness is the lack of a desire to work’}

Given the interpretation of these sentences, I would propose that the BNP in (55) has been moved to the SPEC of FocP.

### 5.2. Plural indefinite BNPs

Now let us re-examine some of our key examples, which are reproduced in (57):

\[(57) \]

(a) Old Spanish \textit{(Cid, 712)}

\textit{Moros le reciben por la seña ganar} \hspace{1cm} \textit{Moors him receive.3.PRS.IND for the.FEM flag win.INF} \hspace{1cm} \textit{‘(Some) Moors go to meet him in order to win the flag’}

(b) Old Spanish \textit{(Cid, 1143)}

\textit{Moros son muchos ya quieren reconbrar} \hspace{1cm} \textit{Moors be.6.PRS.IND many, already want.6.PRS.IND retrieve.INF} \hspace{1cm} \textit{‘There are many Moors, they want to retrieve’}
We argue that in both these examples, moros represents a genuine argument. Roberts & Roussou (2003) follow Foulet (1990) in claiming that nonspecific indefinite nominals in OF had an empty indefinite determiner.

Instead, we adapt some ideas from Boucher (2003) and argue that these nominals are NumP, since a [+pl] feature is present in the N. From this point, two alternative analyses are possible.

One analysis would be that the plural N is an appropriate goal for the unvalued Num feature. Num could count as a quantificational head in Old Romance (like in Modern English), but not in Modern Romance.

According to the alternative analysis, K/D would have an unvalued [+plural] feature and would probe NumP to value it. This latter option receives support, in our view, from the fact that in Latin the Class or Gender declension was related to case features. Furthermore, Class / Gender features were related to the possibility to be selected by NumP, since some Classes (Masculine and Feminine) used to be [+countable], whereas Neuter nouns used to be [-countable].

5.3. Singular indefinite nonspecific BNPs

We take as a paradigmatic case the one shown in (58)

(58) Old Spanish (Fuero de Viguera y Val de Funes, c.1250)

Et si enemigo entrase en el regno e cercare
And if enemy enter.3.PST.SUBJ in the realm and surround. 3.PST.SUBJ

villa o castillo, o si algun castillo del regno se alcare
village or castle, or if some castle of the realm revolt.3.PST.SUBJ

‘If an enemy entered into the realm (…) or if some castle revolted’

This example is very interesting, because it shows that the first N enemigo and villa and castillo are indefinite and nonspecific, whereas ‘algún castillo’ is indefinite but taken from a previously established set, i.e. ‘del regno’. Roberts & Roussou propose that in such cases there is a null article. We are not in a position to argue for or against that view and must leave this question for further investigation. But, before concluding, we would like to point out that most of the sentences in which such items appear are hypothetical sentences. Guéron (2006) establishes a nice correlation between generic sentences and BNPs. The hypothesis of the null indefinite determiner receives support from the fact that these singular countable concrete BNPs appear in hypothetical environments; the null article would be bound by an operator in the left periphery, probably in a Functional category hosting the hypothetical operator. However, the generic nonspecific meaning of the noun with a ‘kind’ flavour could also imply that they are to be interpreted as mass nouns.

All these features contribute to the referential properties of the nominal expressions. In our view these semantic features preserve their bottom-up hierarchy in parallel to the bottom-up development of the Functional categories of the nominal domain.

6. Concluding remarks

We have reviewed the various structures which contain BNPs in OC and OS, and tried to establish the Functional Properties of the extended nominal domain active in each case.
Our previous view, suggesting that GenP and NumP might be able to license these nominals in OR, has been maintained in two cases: abstract mass nouns and indefinite nonspecific plurals.

Abstract mass singulars have been explained by taking the Old Romance determiner not to have expletive value, only a discourse-linked or anaphorical one.

As for indefinite BNPs, it is not clear to us that the absence of a null article can be dispensed with.

In (59) we list the main conclusions we have reached.

(59) (a) The contrasts between BNPs and full DPs in Old Spanish and Old Catalan do not show an unstable grammar or a situation with two alternate competing grammars.

(b) Rather, these differences are due to the licensing conditions of the BNPs, stemming from their lexical properties together with the formal features encoded in the Functional nominal projections.

(c) The distribution of BNPs in OR is not very different from that which exists in MR, which is what one would expect if Determiners were grammaticalized already at that time.

(d) Nevertheless, minor differences between OR and MR do appear in this respect. These are related with other grammaticalization processes, such as the processes that affected the indefinite determiner, complex verb phrases or passive constructions.

(e) In spite of being grammaticalized, the D in Old Romance had only logical content and did not have expletive value.
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1. Introduction

In this paper we discuss the contrasts in the distribution and acceptability of a particular kind of indefinite, namely bare singular nominals (BSNs) with intensional transitive verbs in Catalan and Spanish (e.g., necessitar / necesitar ‘need’, buscar / buscar ‘look for’, voler / querer ‘want’, and desitjar / desear ‘desire’), in contrast to prototypical verbs of having such as tenir / tener ‘have’. These contrasts are illustrated in (1).

(1) CATALAN
(a) Tinc cotxe.
  have.1SG car
  ‘I have a car.’ (= I am a car owner)
(b) ?Necessito cotxe.
  need.1SG car
  ‘I need a car.’ (= I am a car needer)
(c) ?Busco cotxe.
  look-for.1SG for car
  ‘I’m looking for a car.’ (= I am a car searcher)
(d) ?Vull cotxe.
  want.1SG car
  ‘I want a car.’
(e) *Desitjo cotxe.
  wish-for.1SG car
  ‘I wish for a car.’

Espinal & McNally (E&McN) (2007) argue that BSNs are acceptable as objects of verbs that entail a HAVE relation and, together with the verb, form what we call a characterizing ‘have’-predicate. However, this proposal predicts that all of the verbs in (1) are equally able to take BSN objects, because all of these verbs appear to belong to the class of ‘have’-predicates – those that should entail such a HAVE relation – as defined in Borthen (2003).

Our goal here is to argue that, despite the data in (1), our original analysis in fact targets a coherent class of ‘have’-predicates, and that voler / querer ‘want’, and desitjar / desear ‘desire’ are more restricted in this construction because they have lexical semantic properties that distinguish them from the other members of this class and enter into conflict with the lexical rule that ultimately permits BSN complements. Our proposal is that (1a-c) form a well-defined natural class, and that the various judgments we observe (notice the single question marks in front of (1b-c)) are due to pragmatics, not to syntax or semantics. By contrast, the differences between (1a-c) on the one hand, and (1d) and (1e) on the other are...
due to syntactic and related semantic properties of the verbs involved.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we present a brief background on ‘have’-predicates and the main rules of E&McN analysis. In Section 3 we show the properties of the data in (1) in more detail, and the most relevant differences among the verbs that these examples contain. In Section 4 we introduce a review of previous work on these verbs to show the need for a new analysis that accounts for the possible combination of BSNs with intensional verbs. Finally, in Section 5 we present this new analysis of ‘have’ predicates at the syntax-semantics interface, distinguishing between three groups: (i) one that includes tenir ‘have’, necessitar ‘need’ and buscar ‘look for’, (ii) a second one that includes desitjar ‘wish’ and non-modal voler ‘want’, which allow control structures with BSN complements, and (iii) a third one that includes the semi-modal voler ‘want’ in a restructuring context.

2. ‘Have’ predicates and the E&McN analysis

BSNs in Catalan and Spanish are largely restricted to a class of verbs that we call ‘have’-predicates, following Borthen (2003). This class is not limited to verbs of having, strictly speaking, such as tenir / tener ‘have’, or posseir / poseer ‘possess’. Rather, the class also includes both intensional transitive verbs that entail a relation that could be expressed via a verb of having in the relevant possible world, such as necessitar / necesitar ‘need’, buscar / buscar ‘look for’, as well as a small set of extensional transitive verbs that entail a possessive or locative relation, such as posar-se / ponerse ‘put on (as in clothing)’, portar / llevar ‘carry’, fer servir / usar ‘use’, comprar / comprar ‘buy’, vendre / vender ‘sell’, trobar / encontrar ‘find’, obtenir / obtener ‘obtain’, and rebre / recibir ‘receive’. Some Spanish and Catalan examples are given in (2)-(4).

(2) SPANISH
Este proyecto posee licencia municipal.
this project possesses permit municipal
‘This project has a permit from the city.’

(3) (a) Usa bastón.
uses stick
‘(S)he walks with a stick.’

(b) Quien quiera vender piso...
who want sell flat
‘Those who want to sell a flat…’

(c) Ha obtenido permiso de trabajo.
has obtained permit of work
‘(S)he has obtained a work permit.’

1 According to Borthen (2003:190) a ‘profiled have-relation’ - construction in Norwegian is characterized by the following properties:

(i) (a) Any kind of nominal phrase in Norwegian (including bare singulars) can occur as the possessed argument of a have-predicate.

(b) A have-predicate is a word that introduces a have-relation (either explicitly or implicitly).

(c) A have-relation is an asymmetrical coexistence relation between two arguments, called the possessor and the possessed, where the possessor is superior to the possessed rather than the other way round.

(d) An argument can be superior to some other argument in terms of control, part-whole dependency, animacy, or point of view.
In addition to the restriction on the verbs that combine with BSNs, there is a constraint on the interpretation of the resulting predicate: the BSN is licensed only if, in accordance with specific contextual information, the VP could plausibly denote a characterizing property of the entity in subject position. This property is not necessarily a prototypical, stereotypical or institutionalized property, as claimed to be the case in a language such as Hindi (Dayal 2003). In Catalan and Spanish it is not possible to determine on the basis of the larger cultural or cognitive context which exact combinations of V + N can occur in these constructions, as might be expected if the property had to be stereotypical or institutionalized. It also need not be a temporally stable property of the individual in question, as shown by examples such as (5).

(5) CATALAN

Ahir finalment vaig rebre carta.
‘Yesterday I finally received a letter.’

However, it is not clear that we can identify the notion of characterizing property with that of an individual level predicate (as postulated in Bosque 1996). In support of this claim we would like to point out that, unlike individual-level predicates, non-stative verbs that license BSNs can quite naturally appear in the progressive (e.g. Spanish Este profesor está buscando secretaria ‘This professor is looking for a secretary’), whereas individual level predicates like stative ‘have’-predicates cannot (e.g. *Este profesor está teniendo libro lit. this professor is having book).

Informally speaking, what we mean for a property to be characterizing is that it can be used to make a significant distinction in a particular context between individuals that have the property and those that do not. Thus, the claim in (6a) makes a division between a professor that has as a characteristic property that of having a position at the university and those that do not. Similarly, (6b) introduces a division between a lamp that used to have a shade and those that don’t.

(6) CATALAN

(a) Aquest professor té càrrec.
   ‘This professor has responsibility.’
(b) Aquest llum portava pantalla de seda.
   ‘This lamp had a silk shade.’
The requirement that the V + N be characterizing plays an important role in explaining the fact that not all types of nouns sound equally felicitous as BSN complements with all types of ‘have’-predicates. It also points to an important contrast between BSNs and singular indefinite complements, in spite of the indefinite status of BSNs. This fact is illustrated by considering the examples in (7), which differ from those in (1) in having an overt singular indefinite determiner un ‘a’.

(7) **CATALAN**
(a) **Tinc** un cotxe.
    have.1sg a car
    ‘I have a car.’
(b) **Necessito** un cotxe.
    need.1sg a car
    ‘I need a car.’
(c) **Busco** un cotxe.
    look-for.1sg a car
    ‘I’m looking for a car.’
(d) **Vull** un cotxe.
    want.1sg a car
    ‘I want a car.’
(e) **Desitjo** un cotxe.
    wish-for.1sg a car
    ‘I wish for a car.’

The analysis we put forward in E&McN (2007) has two parts: first, a lexical rule applies that intransitivizes the verb, and that provides as an output a description of a potentially characterizing property of an external argument. Second, a semantic compositional rule combines the denotation of the intransitivized verb with that of the object BSN, without postulating that the syntactic argument is also a semantic argument. Specifically, we argue that this composition rule involves a special kind of intersective modification. Let us consider these two rules in turn.

First, the **lexical rule** applies only to those predicates which explicitly or implicitly express a ‘have’-relation. It suppresses the theme argument of the transitive predicate and adds an appropriate entailment concerning its potentially characterizing nature. We define this rule, which we call **Characterizing Property rule** (Char-rule), in (8).

\[
\text{Char}(\lambda y \lambda e [V(e) & \theta(e)=y &}
\exists w[C(w)][\exists e'[Depend(e,e',w) & Have(e') & Havee(e')=y]]]
= \lambda e[V(e) & \text{Potentially-characterizing}(e) &}
\exists w[C(w)][\exists e'[Depend(e,e',w) & Have(e') & Havee(e')=\theta(e)]]
\]

The **composition rule** has the following ingredients: (i) we preserve from Dayal’s (2003) and Dobrovie-Sorin et al.’s (2006) analyses the hypothesis that the BSN is a verb modifier, rather than a ‘true’ argument; (ii) we maintain the maximally simple hypothesis that the BSN denotes a property (modelled here as type <e,t>); (iii) we avoid having the verb semantically se-

\[2\] Notice that our representation of the verb is Parsonsian (cf. Parsons 1990), insofar as it treats the verb as a predicate of events and separates out reference to the verb’s participants, and follows Kratzer (1996) in positioning that the external argument is introduced via a functional voice projection. We also follow Dobrovie-Sorin et al. (2006) in representing the verb’s thematic roles as functions from events to the individuals that bear those roles.
lect for the BSN, and in order to do this, we propose that the verb and the BSN combine not
via function application, but rather via the alternative semantic composition rule in (9), where
T(α) stands for the semantic characterization of α in logical terms.

(9) If $T(V) = \lambda e[V(e)]$ and θ is an implicit role function defined for e,
    and if $T(N) = N$, a property,
    then $T([V N]) = \lambda e[V(e) \& N(\theta(e))]$

This formula says that if the translation of a V(erb) is a predicate of events for which an
implicit θ role function can be defined, and the translation of an N(oun) is a property denoting
expression, then the semantic translation of a V + N sequence will be the description of an
event in which the N describes the value of the implicit role function.

Having outlined the E&McN analysis, in the next section we look at the data in some more
detail.

3. The data in more detail
First, as noted above, not all intensional transitive ‘have’ verbs (cf. Larson et al. 1997 for a
list of intensional transitive verbs) combine equally felicitously with BSNs; we repeat the data
in (1) for convenience.

(1) CATALAN
   (a) Tinc cotxe.
       have.1sg car
       ‘I have a car.’ (= I am a car owner)
   (b) ?Necessito cotxe.
       need.1sg car
       ‘I need a car.’
   (c) ?Busco cotxe.
       look-for.1sg for car
       ‘I’m looking for a car.’
   (d) ??Vull cotxe.
       want.1sg car
       ‘I want a car.’
   (e) *Desitjo cotxe.
       wish-for.1sg car
       ‘I wish for a car.’

Second, not all nominal expressions combine equally felicitously with ‘have’-predicates. Ab-
stract nouns (e.g., pau interior ‘internal peace’, silenci ‘silence’, amistat ‘friendship’, sinceritat
‘sincerity’, qualitat de vida ‘quality of life’) are systematically accepted in object position
without the requirement of an overt article, but this is no doubt due to the fact that they can
have a mass interpretation (cf. the acceptability of bare mass nouns such as informació ‘in-
formation’ in (10)).

(10) (a) Tinc pau interior / informació.
    have.1sg peace internal / information
    ‘I have internal peace / information.’
(b) Necessito silenci / informació.
   need.1SG silence / information
   ‘I need silence / information.’
(c) Busco amistat / informació.
   look-for.1SG friendship / information
   ‘I’m looking for friendship / information.’
(d) Vull sinceritat / informació.
   want.1SG sincerity / information
   ‘I want sincerity / information.’
(e) Desitjo qualitat de vida / informació.
   wish-fo.1SG quality of life / information
   ‘I wish quality of life / information.’

However, other nominal expressions introduce some variation in acceptability. For example, we have observed that intensional transitive ‘have’ verbs can combine only with a very limited set of simple event (count) nominals (Grimshaw 1990), but not with the vast majority of other (count) event nominals, such as abraçada ‘embrace’, compliment ‘compliment’, disculpa ‘apology’ or petò ‘kiss’. Compare (10) and (11).

(11) CATALAN
(a) Tinc partit / reunió / sopar / viatge / visita.
   have.1SG match / meeting / dinner / trip / visit
   ‘I have a(n) match / meeting / dinner / trip / visit.’
(b) Necessito hora.
   need.1SG hour
   ‘I need an appointment.’

(12) (a) *Tinc disculpa.
     have.1SG apology
     ‘I have an apology.’
(b) *Necessito disculpa.
     need.1SG apology
     ‘I need an apology.’
(c) *Busco disculpa.
     look-for.1SG apology
     ‘I’m looking for an apology.’
(d) *Vull disculpa.
     want.1SG apology
     ‘I want an apology.’
(e) *Desitjo disculpa.
     wish.1SG apology
     ‘I wish an apology.’

Although the difference between the singular (count) event nouns in (11) and (12) requires further study, we suspect that the excluded event nominals have argument structures that need to be satisfied but cannot be in this context, while those that are acceptable lack the relevant sort of argument structure.\(^3\)

\(^3\) Note that count event nominals of the sort exemplified in (12) improve when an internal complement is made explicit.

(i) (a) *Tinc disculpa. (=12a)
     have apology
     ‘I have an apology.
(b) ??Tinc disculpa de l’agència de viatges.
     have apology from the agency of travel
     ‘I have an apology from the travel agency.’
(c) Tinc una disculpa de l’agència de viatges.
     have an apology from the agency of travel
     ‘I have an apology from the travel agency.’
Let us now consider some restrictions that apply when combining various intensional transitive ‘have’ verbs with BSNs in object position.

3.1 Tenir / tener ‘have’ vs. desitjar / desear ‘wish, desire’

Only tenir ‘have’ is free to combine with various types of count nominals, among others: capacity nominals (secretària ‘secretary’) and nominals that describe a full range of physical entities (llapis ‘pencil’, entrepà ‘sandwich’, etc.).

(13) CATALAN
   (a) Tinc secretària.
       have.1sg secretary
       ‘I have a secretary.’
   (b) Tinc pis.
       have.1sg apartment
       ‘I have an apartment.’
   (c) Tinc bolígraf.
       have.1sg pen
       ‘I have a pen.’
   (d) Tinc entrepà.
       have.1sg sandwich
       ‘I have a sandwich.’

In sharp contrast to tenir ‘have’, we find the verb desitjar ‘wish (for), desire’, which cannot combine with any type of BSNs.

(14) (a) *Desitjo secretària.
       wish-for.1sg secretary
   (b) *Desitjo pis.
       wish-for.1sg apartment
   (c) *Desitjo llapis.
       wish-for.1sg pencil
   (d) *Desitjo entrepà.
       wish-for.1sg sandwich

Note, however, that desitjar allows BSNs in object position of a subordinate infinitive clause. See the contrast between (14) and (15).

(15) (a) Desitjo tenir secretària.
       wish.1sg have secretary
       ‘I wish to have a secretary.’
   (b) Desitjo trobar apartament.
       wish.1sg find apartment
       ‘I wish to find an apartment.’

---

4 Posseir ‘possess’ behaves semantically like tenir ‘have’ but is more restricted in the BSNs it combines with because in general it imposes stricter selectional restrictions on its object arguments than does tenir.

5 Desitjar does seem acceptable with BSNs in examples like Desitjo habitació amb bany ‘I would like a room with a bathroom’. We thank Daniel Jacob for pointing similar examples in Spanish to us. We do not have an explanation for this case at this time, but we observe that what distinguishes acceptable examples of desitjar with BSNs from the examples in (14) is the fact that the former appear to always involve a speech act of requesting, while the latter do not.
Characterizing ‘have’ predicates and indefiniteness

3.2 Necessitar / necesitar ‘need’ and buscar / buscar ‘look for’

In between the two verbs we have just mentioned, we find *necessitar / necesitar* ‘need’, *buscar / buscar* ‘look for’ on the one hand, and *volver / querer* ‘want’ on the other.

*Necessitar* and *buscar* form a single class in that they can freely combine with capacity nominals, but they can combine with nouns that describe ordinary individuals/physical objects (hereafter, *sortal* nouns) only depending on the contextual information that is available: the question marks below indicate that only in certain contexts are the VPs in (16) and (17) likely to denote characterizing properties of the subject.

(16) CATALAN

(a) Necessito secretària / company de pis.
   need.1sg secretary partner of apartment
   ‘I need a secretary / partner for the apartment.’
(b) Necessito apartament / cotxe.
   need.1sg apartment car
   ‘I need a(n) apartment / car.’
(c) ?Necessito llapis.
   need.1sg pencil
   ‘I need a pencil.’
(d) ???Necessito entrepà.
   need.1sg sandwich
   ‘I need a sandwich.’

(17) (a) Busco secretària / company de pis.
   look-for.1sg secretary partner of apartment
   ‘I’m looking for a secretary / partner for the apartment.’
(b) Busco apartament / cotxe.
   look-for.1sg apartment car
   ‘I’m looking for a(n) apartment / car.’
(c) ??Busco llapis.
   look-for.1sg pencil
   ‘I’m looking for a pencil.’
(d) ???Busco entrepà.
   look-for.1sg sandwich
   ‘I’m looking for a sandwich.’

One factor that improves the possibility of interpreting the VP as a characterizing property is the uniqueness of the referent of the bare nominal with respect to the external argument of the VP, in the particular context. This appears to be a pragmatic phenomenon, though its explanation will have to await further research.

(18) (a) Tinc família / marit.
   have.1sg family husband
   ‘I have a family / husband.’
(b) Necessitem director de departament / plaça de pàrquing.

‘We need a head of the department / parking slot.’

(c) Busco pis / parella.

‘I’m looking for an apartment / partner.’

Given that in the right context the examples in (16) and (17) become felicitous, we conclude that, from a semantic point of view, necessitar ‘need’ / buscar ‘look for’ form a single class with tenir ‘have’.

3.3 Voler / querer ‘want’

In contrast to the verbs discussed so far, intensional transitive voler is puzzling because it cannot freely combine with either sortal or capacity nominals, even though, when followed by a nominal, it is often analyzed as entailing that the subject has an entity describable by the nominal in his or her preferred bouletic alternatives to the actual world. It thus might be expected to behave like tenir ‘have’, but it does not.

(19) CATALAN

(a) ??Vull secretària.

‘I want a secretary.’

(b) ??Vull apartament.

‘I want an apartment.’

(c) ??Vull llapis.

‘I want a pencil.’

(d) *Vull entrepà.

‘I want a sandwich.’

However, for Catalan we observe that when the sentence introduces what we will refer to as a situational argument for which the BSN can form part of a characterizing ‘have’ predicate, then the sequences are completely well-formed. See the contrast between (20) and (21). It should be noticed that the clitic hi in (21) is theta-related neither to voler nor to the overt infinitival complement.

(20) ??Vull piscina / taula / aperitiu.

‘I want a(n) swimming-pool / table / appetizer.’

(21) (a) No em fa res anar de càmping, però hi vull piscina.

‘I don’t mind going camping, but I want there to be a swimming pool.’

(b) Al despatx, hi vull taula de reunions.

‘In my office I want there to be a meeting table.’

6 We thank Anna Bartra and Mar Massanell for their judgments on these and similar examples.
(c) Ja m’està bé que fem un sopar després del casament, però johi
already me is fine that do.1PL a dinner after of+the wedding but I there
want appetizer
‘It’s fine with me to have dinner after the wedding, but I want there to be an
appetizer.’

We postulate that the contrasts in (20) and (21) parallel those illustrated in (22) and (23),
which show that a BSN can occur in object position of the existential ‘have’-predicate haver-
hi / haber ‘there be’ only if the BSN is anchored by the oblique clitic (cf. Espinal and
McNally 2007:exs. (33) and (34)).

(22) CATALAN
(a) *Ha garatge
    has garage
(b) Hi ha garatge.
    there has garage
    ‘There is a garage.’

(23) SPANISH
(a) *Ha garaje.
    has garage
(b) Hay garaje
    has-there garage
    ‘There is a garage.’

Additional evidence for the similarity between the clitic hi ‘there’ required with voler ‘want’
in (21) and the situational argument required with existential haver-hi ‘there be’ comes from
the parallel in the contrast between (24a-b), on the one hand, and between (25a-b), on the oth-
er. Like haver-hi, voler ‘want’ does not allow for locative modifiers or secondary predicates
of the BSN unless they are left dislocated and coindexed with the locative clitic because, as
argued in E&McN, the BSN does not introduce a (temporary or permanent) discourse referent
to anchor the predication and to be the holder of an argument denotation.

(24) (a) */??Hi vull taula de reunions al despatx.
        there want table of meetings at+the office
        ‘I want a meeting table at the office.’
(b) Al despatx, hi vull taula de reunions.
    at+the office there want.1SG table of meetings
    ‘In my office I want there to be a meeting table.’

(25) (a) */??Hi ha garatge a l’ edifici. (E&McN 2007: ex. (43a))
    there has garage at the building
(b) A l’ edifici, hi ha garatge. (E&McN 2007: ex. (42a))
    at the building there has garage
    ‘There is a garage in the building.’

---

7 Spanish existential haber differs from Catalan haver-hi with regard to the fact that the oblique clitic y is only
spelled out in the third person singular of the indicative present tense. See Freeze (1992) for a description of
the relation between existential and locative sentences.
Finally, observe that the *hi* that cooccurs with *voler* ‘want’ does not have the same status as the one that could possibly appear with other intensional transitive verbs such as *necisitar* ‘need’. In both (26a-b) *necessito jaqueta* serves to characterize the first person subject. Clitic *hi* is not obligatory here; if made explicit, it is not the external (or situational) argument of the characterizing complex predicate, but is bound to the left-dislocated ‘comitative’ adjunct introduced by the preposition *amb* ‘with’.

(26) (a) *Necessito* jaqueta.
   need.1SG jacket
   ‘I need a jacket.’

(b) *Amb aquest vestit, (hi) necessito jaqueta de conjunt.*
   With this dress there need.1SG jacket of set
   ‘With this dress, I need a matching jacket.’

3.4. *Desitjar / desear* ‘wish, desire’

The verb *desitjar / desear* ‘desire’ contrasts with *voler / querer* ‘want’ in several respects. First, *desitjar* cannot appear in contexts analogous to (21). The data in (27) are ungrammatical, but the sequences in (28) with clitic *hi* do not improve.

(27) *Desitjo piscina / taula / aperitiu.*
   wish.1SG swimming-pool table appetizer
   ‘I wish a(n) swimming-pool / table / appetizer.’

(28) (a) *No em fa res anar de càmping, però hi desitjo piscina.*
   not me makes anything go of camping but there wish.1SG swimming-pool

(b) *Al despatx, hi desitjo taula de reunions.*
   at+the office there wish-for.1SG table of meetings

(c) *Ja m’ està bé que fem un sopar després del casament, però jo hi desitjo aperitiu.*
   already me is fine that do.1PL a dinner after of+the wedding but I there wish appetizer

Second, according to most speakers, *desitjar*, in contrast to *voler*, does not allow clitic climbing (Picallo 1990). Compare (29a) with (29b).

(29) (a) *Aquesta pel·lícula, la vull veure.*
   this film it want.1SG see
   ‘This film, I want to see it.’

(b) *Aquesta pel·lícula, la desitjo veure.*
   this film it desire.1SG see

Third, while *voler* allows cliticization of the partitive clitic *en* in certain cases depending on the properties of the infinitival complement (e.g., when this infinitive is an unaccusative verb), *desitjar* never does. Picallo (1990) argues on the basis of these facts that a control analysis is necessary for *desitjar*, but is not appropriate for *voler* in cases like (30a).
(30) (a) Volen venir quatre estudiants. → En volen venir quatre.
    want come four students one-PART want come four
    ‘Four students want to come.’
(b) Desitgen venir quatre estudiants. → *En desitgen venir quatre.
    wish come four students one-PART wish come four
    ‘Four students wish to come.’

Finally, although desitjar is a hyponym of one reading of voler, voler also has a semi-modal
use (see Picallo 1990 for detailed discussion). This use is evident in the potential semantic
lightness of voler, which appears to facilitate its combination with meteorological verbs, a
property shared with other modal verbs but not with desitjar.

(31) (a) Vol ploure.
    wants rain
    ‘It looks like it will rain.’
(b) Pot / ha de ploure.
    can / has to rain
    ‘It may / must rain.’
(c) *Desitja ploure.
    wishes rain

This difference suggests an important lexical semantic difference that accompanies the syn-
tactic differences mentioned above. We will present our analysis of the contrast between vol-
er / querer ‘want’ and desitjar / desear ‘wish, desire’ in Section 5.

4. Previous analyses of intensional transitive verbs

Though there are a number of previous analyses of syntactic and semantic differences within
the class of intensional transitive verbs, none of these analyses has addressed the data
presented above, and perhaps for that reason, none of them accounts for these data (though
this is not to question their potential interest for accounting for other data).

The first such analysis we will discuss appears in Larson et al. (1997). The goal of this
work is to argue that all intensional transitive verbs take clausal (specifically, CP)
complements, even when the superficial object is a simple noun phrase. For some verbs (e.g.
want, desire, need), Larson et al. propose that this CP complement contains an abstract HAVE
as the main predicate; for others (e.g. seek), the complement contains an abstract FIND. Thus,
while the analysis posits two subclasses of intentional transitive verbs, the classification does
not differentiate necessitar from voler and desitjar, nor does it group together necessitar
and buscar, as is necessary to explain the distribution of BSN objects. Although Larson et al. do
observe a few differences between want and need – notably involving adverbial scope –, these
are given a pragmatic analysis which is not strong enough to account for the differences
between Catalan voler and necessitar involving the clitic hi, nor does it say anything about the
difference between desitjar and the remaining verbs.\(^8\)

Similarly unhelpful is the distinction made in Schwarz (2006), between intensional verbs
that take propositional complements, among which he lists need, and those that have property
complements, which he takes to include look for. But just as Larson et al.’s similar distinction
failed to capture the similarities between necessitar and buscar, on the one hand, and the
differences between these verbs and voler and desitjar, on the other, Schwarz’s analysis has
the same problem for exactly the same reason.

The analysis that comes closest to making the distinction we need between voler and
necessitar is provided in Harves (2007). Harves attributes certain contrasts between want and

\(^8\) Furthermore, we question the need for a CP analysis for V+N sequences.
need in English to the fact that the former is a control verb, while the latter is a raising verb that “involves a Kaynian (1993)-style HAVE as [BE + preposition]-incorporation approach” (2007, p. 2). Harves suggest that this analysis can be extended to Spanish; thus, the analysis of Spanish (and by extension Catalan) examples in which the verb is followed by a DP (e.g. (32)) would be as in (33a) and (33b), respectively.

(32) CATALAN
   (a) La Maria vol un cangur.  
      the Maria wants a baby-sitter  
      ‘Maria wants a baby-sitter.’
   (b) La Maria necessita un cangur.  
      the Maria needs a baby-sitter  
      ‘Maria needs a baby-sitter.’

(33) (a) [VP La Maria, [VP vol [CP ...PRO ...un cangur]]]
    (b) [TP La Maria, T [VP necessita + P HAVE [PP-HAVE t, tP un cangur]]]

While we do want to make a distinction between these two verbs, the distinction we need cannot be characterized strictly in terms of control vs. raising. There are two reasons why this is so. First, being a raising verb is not a necessary condition for allowing a BSN in object position: we find verbs that combine with BSNs that are not raising predicates, such as posar / portar ‘to put on/wear’. In fact, these verbs do not combine with overt infinitives, gerunds or clauses of any kind at all.

(34) (a) La Maria es va posar faldilla.  
      the Maria REFLEX PAST put skirt  
      ‘Maria put on a skirt.’
   (b) La Susanna porta motxilla.  
      the Susanna carries backpack  
      ‘Susanna carries a backpack.’

Second, being a control verb is not a sufficient condition for not allowing a BSN in object position. In (35a) we find a BSN object with demanar, which, if it is either raising or control at all in (35a), would have to be a control verb, given that demanar imposes specific entailments on its subject argument, unlike the typical raising verb.

(35) (a) La nova professora ha demanat secretària.  
      the new teacher has asked secretary  
      ‘The new teacher has asked for a secretary.’
   (b) La nova professora ha demanat tenir secretària.  
      the new teacher has asked have secretary  
      ‘The new teacher has asked for a secretary.’

Thus, if BSNs are acceptable with necessitar / buscar and unacceptable with voler / desitjar, the explanation cannot lie in the raising vs. control nature of the respective verbs.

To summarize this section, there is no obvious account of the distribution of BSNs with these verbs in previous analyses. We therefore need a different approach.

---

9 We do not provide more details of Harves’ analysis of want here because she argues that the internal structure of the embedded CP varies according to whether or not the language is what she calls a ‘HAVE-language.’ What is important for our purposes is that in all cases a control relation exists between the subject of want and a PRO within in the CP.
5. Analysis

We now turn to our analysis of the facts. As mentioned above, we opt for a mixed approach. *Necesitar* and *buscar* will be given the same basic syntactic and semantic analysis as *tener*, and the differences between them discussed in section 3 will be considered pragmatic in nature. In contrast, the difference between the above verbs on the one hand, and *voler* and *desitjar*, on the other, will be both syntactic and semantic.

We begin with *necesitar* / *buscar*. Combinations of these verbs with BSNs are accounted for directly by the analysis in E&McN. We propose, following Van Geenhoven & McNally (2005) that the basic relation described by these verbs is one that holds between individuals – the one who needs or seeks, and the one which is needed / sought. Given that these predicates lexically entail that in a world in which the subject’s needs are met or his/her search is successful, s/he stands in a HAVE relation to the object, *necesitar* and *buscar* can undergo the lexical rule in (8) and can appear in the syntactic configuration in (36); the compositional rule in (9) can then apply.10

(36) [ν *necesitar* / *buscar* N]

In contrast, we claim that neither *desitjar* nor non-modal *voler* denotes such a relation between individuals, and therefore they will not be able to undergo the lexical rule that licenses BSNs. Rather, like Larson et al. (1997) we take these verbs to denote relations between individuals and propositions or states of affairs. As was shown in (15), they may select a CP in a control structure with an explicit subordinate V, which of course can under the right conditions select for a BSN complement, as in (37).

(37) [desitjar / voler [CP [IP PRO [V V N]]]]

This configuration does not appear to license an abstract HAVE in the lower V position. The explanation for this will have to await future research.

The semantics for the structure in (37) is provided in (38). Recall that we follow Kratzer (1996) in leaving the external argument out of the core verbal argument structure; it is brought in subsequently by a higher functional head (not shown here). The want relation in (38) will hold of the eventual external argument if and only if in all of the preferred bouletic alternatives associated with the bearer of the wanter role, p is true.

(38) λpλe[desitjar / voler(e,p)]

But with the semantics in (38), *desitjar* and non-modal *voler* cannot undergo the Char rule themselves: the propositional complement cannot be a Havee, which is what the Char rule requires in order to apply.

We offer essentially the same account for the cases in which these verbs take a DP complement. An informal corpus study shows that the DP complements of *desitjar* normally denote situations.11 Like a proposition, a situation is also not the sort of entity that can be a Havee. If one desires a situation, one wants it to happen or hold, one does not want to have it. Some illustrative examples appear in (39).

10 In E&McN we argue that a subtype of (i) is also allowed with existential *haver-hi / haber*, on which V+N attributes a characterizing property to a situational argument introduced by the oblique clitic *hi*:

[ν, híhíν [V HAVE N]].

11 We set aside examples where *desitjar* combines with a DP that refers to a person, because this use of *desitjar* refers exclusively to a sexual desire and thus diverges semantically from the examples of interest in the text. But notice that the fact that the understood relation between the subject and object arguments of *desitjar* is so specific in this case (and is not a simple ‘have’ relation) in fact reinforces the point we make in the text.
(39)  (a) desitjar unes bones vacances  
    desire some good vacations  
    ‘desire a good vacation’  
(b) desitjar la publicació dels documents  
    desire the publication of the documents  
    ‘desire the publication of the documents’  
(c) desitjar un aclariment  
    desire a clarification  
    ‘desire a clarification’

Observe also that in those cases where desitjar appears with a DP that does not denote a situation, the resulting sentences differ from those with BSN complements in that the DP’s referent has a definite metonymic relation to a situation which is rather more specific than a basic ‘have’-relation: see the examples in (40).

(40)  (a) desitjar la revista  
    desire the magazine  
    ‘want the magazine’ = wish to be subscribed to  
(b) desitjar aquesta informació  
    desire that information  
    ‘desire that information’ = wish to be informed  
(c) Els prèsssecs que desitja el consumidor europeu …  
    the peaches that desire the consumer European  
    ‘The peaches that the European consumer desires’ = wishes to consume  
(d) desitjar un Audi  
    desire an Audi  
    ‘want an Audi’ = wish to own

Although non-modal voler is perhaps less selective than desitjar in this respect, it nonetheless allows its DP’s referent to be in a similarly large variety of metonymically related situations, as with desitjar, the situation in question will depend on the DP involved. In this respect, non-modal voler contrasts with the ‘have’ verbs which generally fix one such relation for all DP complements (e.g. portar un vestit always entails a ‘have’ relation between the subject and object referents which is grounded in a wearing relation). This multiplicity of relations suggests that, even in cases such as (40), the complement to the verb is really interpreted as a situation rather than as simply an individual, much as the nominal complement to the verb enjoy in an example like enjoy the book is arguably coerced to denote a situation (see e.g. Asher 2007, among others, for a particularly clear discussion of this phenomenon). Again, under the assumption that a situation cannot be a Havee, the Char rule will not apply in these cases, either.

Finally, for semi-modal voler we adopt a monoclausal restructuring analysis. A sentence with a restructuring infinitive is a single clause throughout the derivation, and a restructuring infinitive never constitutes an independent clausal domain (see Strozer 1976, Picallo 1990, Moore 1991, Alsina 1993, Wurmbrand 2001, Cinque 2004 for arguments for such an approach). Nothing will prevent voler from hosting an abstract HAVE in its complement, so nothing will prevent a situational argument marked by the clitic hi analogous to that found with existential haver-hi (see footnote 11), as illustrated in (41).

---

12 This is no doubt correlated with the fact that the other ‘have’-predicates lack the option of a VP/CP complement, with the exception of necessitar, which is different from the rest in also being a raising predicate.
Because of restructuring, the situational argument can clitic climb out of the complement and be adjoined to the restructuring verb. Clitic climbing seems to be necessary to allow the situational argument to serve information structurally as a link in the sense of Vallduví (1992), which in turn seems to be necessary for the construction to be understood pragmatically as characterizing that argument. *Voler* here clearly has the function of modalizing the characterizing predicate, though it still requires its own external argument to identify the individual whose bouletic alternatives are relevant for the interpretation of the sentence.

The semantics for the specific structure in (41) appears in (42). As was the case with (39), the relation in question will hold if and only if the proposition obtained by combining the nominal property with HAVE via the compositional rule in (9) is true in all of the preferred bouletic alternatives for the external argument of *voler*. Observe that the situational argument, which is the value of the Haver role function, is represented in (42) with the variable $i$, where the subscript $i$ indicates that the variable gets its value from the context.

\[
\lambda e[\text{voler}(e, \lambda w \exists e'[\text{HAVE}_w(e') \land \text{Potentially-characterizing}(e') \land \\
\text{Haver}(e') = l_i \land \text{N} (\text{Havee}(e'))])]
\]

6. Conclusion

The conclusion that can be drawn from this discussion is that being a ‘have’-predicate is only a necessary, but not a sufficient, condition for allowing a BSN in object position. We have shown that non-modal *voler* ‘want’ and *desitjar* ‘desire’ fail to undergo the Char rule (and thus to allow BSN objects) because their object argument, even when manifested as a DP, does not correspond to a Havee, but rather denotes a situation. However, *voler* also has a semi-modal use which allows it to appear in a structure that legitimates an abstract HAVE predicate. When a BSN is the object complement in this context, the resulting characterizing property is anchored to a situational argument that does not coincide with the external argument of *voler*.
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In this paper, I will argue that expletive drop in non-pro-drop languages is connected to the availability of SpecTP. The availability of SpecTP (cf. Bobaljik & Jonas 1996) and how the EPP is checked (Move/Merge XP or Move/Merge X°, cf. Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 1998, 2004) with respect to SpecTP accounts for the definiteness restrictions in some medieval and some modern Romance languages. Furthermore, it will be suggested that the change in word-order, i.e. the result of the loss of SpecTP and how the EPP is checked, explains the semantic interpretation of preverbal subjects in Romance and seems to nicely explicate why definite articles in Romance turned up first in preverbal position.

1. Introduction

It is a well known fact that certain positions or contexts within sentences or utterances require a noun phrase occurring there to have a particular value [+/- Def] (or to be interpreted as having such a value). Restrictions of this kind are termed “(in)definiteness effects” and suggest that definiteness plays a role in guiding the hearer/reader through the organization of information in discourse (cf. Lyons 1999). English and French show such a restriction in unaccusative structures whereas e.g. Spanish and Catalan do not.

(1) (a) There arrived a man          ModE
    (b) *There arrived the man

(2) (a) Il est arrivé une fille       ModF
    it is arrived a girl
    ‘There arrived a girl’
    (b) *Il est arrivé la fille
    it is arrived the girl

I would like to thank the audience at the IV NEREUS International workshop “Definiteness and DP Structure in Romance Languages” for inspiring comments and critical questions. Special thanks go to Artemis Alexiadou, Thomas McFadden, Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarsson for helpful comments on an earlier draft of this paper. Of course, all remaining mistakes are my own.

In order to show which examples stem from which language I will use the following abbreviations: ModE = Modern English, OCat = Old Catalan, ModCat = Modern Catalan, OF = Old French, ModF = Modern French, OSp = Old Spanish, ModSp = Modern Spanish.
Unaccusativity, definiteness and word-order

(3) (a) Juan llegó
  Juan arrived
  ‘Juan arrived’
(b) Llegó Juan
  arrived Juan

(4) (a) La carta va arribar
  the letter past arrive
  ‘The letter arrived’
(b) Va arribar la carta
  past arrive the letter

For some time now, the definiteness effect in Modern English and Modern French has been explained with Diesing’s (1992) Mapping Hypothesis, i.e. syntactic positions are directly mapped to semantic interpretation and the observed definiteness restrictions in (1) and (2) are due to the low VP-internal position of the subjects. These low subjects are mapped to nuclear scope and therefore get a weak existential reading. Others have argued that the indefiniteness effect in unaccusative constructions in Modern English and Modern French is dependent on the expletive. If an expletive is introduced into the derivation, the definiteness restriction applies, if no expletive is introduced no definiteness restriction applies (cf. Silva-Villar 1998, Sheehan 2007).

The SV/VS alternation without any indefiniteness effect, neither in unaccusative nor in ergative or transitive constructions, that we perceive in Modern Spanish and Modern Catalan has often been termed “free inversion” and is taken to be a characteristic of null-subject languages.

In this paper I will argue that the difference with respect to the definiteness restriction (DR) between some old (Old Spanish, Old Catalan, Old French) and some modern Romance languages (Modern Spanish, Modern Catalan, and Modern French) can be derived by applying Bobaljik & Jonas’s (1996) arguments concerning the availability of SpecTP and Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou’s (1998) model of parametrizing the way in which the Extended Projection Principle (EPP) [D] is checked. In contrast to A & A’s approach, however, I do not assume that all preverbal subjects are base-generated in a clitic left dislocated position. Instead I assume that these subjects are arguments generated inside VP and that the movement to some preverbal position is triggered by syntactic features of semantic import, i.e. external motivation in terms of distinct kinds of semantic interpretation and perhaps processing (Chomsky 2001: 3). Thus, I suggest like others before me that the available preverbal position(s) in Old Romance are/is constrained by discourse (e.g. von Humboldt 1822, Lehmann 1976, Calboli 1978, Rinke & Meisel 2009, among many others). More precisely I will suggest that the preverbal subject position is a topic position, therefore [+definite/+specific].

Furthermore, I will present data that allows the assumption that expletive drop in non-pro-drop languages is connected to the availability of SpecTP and that the availability of SpecTP together with how the EPP is checked (Move/Merge XP or Move/Merge X°) accounts for the appearance of DR effects in Romance. It will be argued that the change in word-order, due to the loss of SpecTP and due to the change in how EPP is checked, explains the difference in interpreting preverbal subjects. It will be argued that as long as the verb checks the EPP in AgrSP, preverbal subjects are interpreted as topics [+definite, +specific].

Section two seeks to account for the difference in Romance between non-null-subject languages and null-subject-languages. In section three it will be shown how the availability of SpecTP explains the change concerning word-order in the Romance languages under discussion here, furthermore it will be suggested that expletive drop in a language is allowed
as long as SpecTP is available\(^2\). Section four will provide an overview of how to interpret preverbal subjects in Old Romance suggesting that the change in how the EPP is checked (via XP or X\(^0\)) affected the interpretation of subjects in Romance. In section 5 I will briefly summarize the findings.

### 2. Null-subject languages vs. non-null-subject languages

The label “free inversion” implies that the subject in (3) and (4) can move optionally to a preverbal position, or remain in-situ. This however, is not possible under the general concept of minimalism where movement needs to be triggered and is a “last resort” option, in order to check off uninterpretable features. One of the famous and notorious movement-triggering uninterpretable features is the EPP which Chomsky has claimed to be a universal property of natural languages: the requirement that every sentence needs a subject (Chomsky 1982: 10).

In formal terms this is conceived as an uninterpretable \([D]\) feature on AgrS which requires a \(D\) / a nominal element to merge in its specifier. Under the analysis put forward in Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1998) (see also Barbosa 1995 for a similar approach) the difference between null-subject languages and non-null-subject languages is derived by proposing that the EPP feature is checked in null-subject languages by verb-movement, i.e. verbal morphology in null-subject languages includes – among other features – a nominal element \([+D, +interpretable\ phi-features, potentially +Case]\).

The proposal has two implications: (i) EPP is universally strong, it is a formal property of sentences that relates to the PF interface, and needs to be checked, either by Move/Merge XP or Move/Merge X\(^0\); (ii) the strong \([D]\) feature of AGRSP (EPP) triggers V-raising in null-subject-languages. Building on the intuition that null-subject languages have (pro)nominal agreement (Rizzi 1986 among others) it is proposed that verbal agreement morphology in pro-drop languages include a nominal element \([+D]\). This means that the verbal agreement affixes in e.g. Modern Spanish (5c) and Modern Catalan (5d) have exactly the same status as the pronouns in the English (5a) or French paradigm (5b).

\[(5)\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) I write</th>
<th>(b) j’écrit</th>
<th>(c) escribo</th>
<th>(d) escrie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>you write</td>
<td>tu écrites</td>
<td>escribes</td>
<td>escrius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he writes</td>
<td>il écrit</td>
<td>escribe</td>
<td>escriu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we write</td>
<td>nous écrivons</td>
<td>escribimos</td>
<td>escrivim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you write</td>
<td>vous écrivez</td>
<td>escribéis</td>
<td>escriviu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they write</td>
<td>ils écrivent</td>
<td>escriben</td>
<td>escriuuen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1998) propose and provide convincing evidence that verbal agreement has the categorial status of a pronoun in pro-drop languages. Thus, V-raising checks in these languages the EPP-feature in the same way as XP-raising does in non-pro-drop languages. Under this assumption, preverbal subjects in pro-drop languages are non EPP related, i.e. they do not move in order to check off the strong \([D]\) feature, since this has already been checked by the verb, i.e. these preverbal subjects in pro-drop languages move for independent reasons. It is assumed here that they move into a preverbal position for semantic reasons.

\(^2\) This paper is mainly concerned with the Romance languages Spanish, Catalan and French, however, in order to show how the parameters interact and what variation can be derived by applying the two parameters, examples of other languages (outside the group of Romance) need to be discussed as well, namely English, Icelandic and Irish.
There is a long-standing intuition that there is a relationship between rich agreement morphology and the licensing of null-arguments (cf. Rizzi 1986, Rohrbacher 1994 among others) however, there are also a number of counter-examples found and discussed in the literature (Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 1998, Fischer 2002, 2006, Bobaljik 2003, among many others). For instance languages like Chinese and Japanese which lack person and number agreement and still allow null-subjects and languages that show person and number agreement and still don’t allow pro-drop (cf. Jaeggli and Safir 1989). The exact morphological property correlating with the availability of pro-drop has never been identified. Therefore, the hypothesis is put forward that there is no correlation between richness of morphology and the availability of strong agreement in the sense of pro-drop. Whether agreement qualifies as [+D] needs to be decided on the basis of syntactic evidence: availability of pro-drop, availability of VSO orders, and the lack of DR effects (cf. Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 1998). Thus, the richness of morphology is just an additional piece of evidence pointing to the same deduction. Furthermore, it needs to be clarified that the relation between pro-drop and V-raising is unidirectional: a pro-drop language is V-raising, however, not every V-raising language is necessarily a pro-drop language.

2.1 The modern languages

The languages that are discussed in this paper can be divided into two main groups as concerns a cluster of properties: the availability of referential pro-drop, the possibility of SV/VS orders without the introduction of an expletive, the existence of verb-raising independently of V2, the DR effects in unaccusative contructions, and some other effects concerning word-order.

Modern Spanish (6) and Modern Catalan (7) allow pro-drop, VS orders and lack DR-effects, whereas Modern French (8) does not allow pro drop, shows Expletive/VS orders and displays DR-effects in unaccusative constructions.

(6) (a) María sabe la lección
Mary knows the lesson
‘Mary knows the lesson’
(b) Sabe la lección María
knows the lesson Mary

(7) (a) La carta va arribar
the letter perf. arrive
‘The letter arrived’
(b) Va arribar la carta
perf. arrive the letter

(8) (a) Une fille est arrivée
a girl is arrived
‘A girl arrived.’
(b) Il est arrivé une fille
it is arrived a girl

It is generally assumed that in Modern French (and also in Modern English) the inverted subjects remain in a VP-internal position (9/10).
Il arrive souvent [vp une fille]  

it arrive often a girl  

There were suddenly [vp three trolls in my garden]  

The same has been shown for Modern Spanish and Modern Catalan (cf. Vallduví 2002, Ordoñez 1998, Zubizarreta 1992), since also in these languages the VS orders may be interrupted by adverbials.

(a) Ayer cerró probablemente [María la puerta….]  

yesterday closed probably Maria the door  

‘Mary probably closed the door yesterday’  

(b) Me pregunto si canta siempre [algún pájaro]  

me ask if sings always some bird  

‘I wonder if there is always a bird singing’  

(c) Me pregunto si canta siempre [María ….]  

me ask if sings always Maria  

‘I wonder if Maria always sings ...’

(Ayer cerró probablemente [María la puerta….]  

yesterday closed probably Maria the door  

‘Mary probably closed the door yesterday’  

Me pregunto si canta siempre [algún pájaro]  

me ask if sings always some bird  

‘I wonder if there is always a bird singing’  

Me pregunto si canta siempre [María ….]  

me ask if sings always Maria  

‘I wonder if Maria always sings ...’

There are also languages where the postverbal subject is not in a VP internal position. Modern Icelandic (13) represents a non-null-subject language and Modern Irish (14) a null-subject language that both allow postverbal subjects outside VP. The subjects in these two languages may precede the adverb, which is taken as a convincing evidence for the availability of SpecTP and the placement of the postverbal subject in SpecTP (Bobaljik & Jonas 1996).

(a) Einhverjir stúdentar lasu bókina  

some students read book  

‘Some students read the book’

(b) það lasu einhverjir stúdentar bókina  

there read some students book  

‘Someone has completely finished the assignment’

(c) það hefur einhver alveg [vp lokið verkefninu]  

there has someone completely finished assignment  

‘Someone has completely finished the assignment’.

There are also languages where the postverbal subject is not in a VP internal position. Modern Icelandic (13) represents a non-null-subject language and Modern Irish (14) a null-subject language that both allow postverbal subjects outside VP. The subjects in these two languages may precede the adverb, which is taken as a convincing evidence for the availability of SpecTP and the placement of the postverbal subject in SpecTP (Bobaljik & Jonas 1996).

(deireann siad i gcónaí o paidir roimh am lui  

say they always a prayer before time lie  

‘They always say a prayer before bed-time’  

(cf. Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 1998: 497)

Thus, the two parameters derive the following distribution among modern languages: pro-
drop-languages with an available SpecTP, e.g. Modern Irish, pro-drop-languages without SpecTP, e.g. Modern Spanish and Modern Catalan\(^3\); non-pro-drop-languages with an available SpecTP, e.g. Modern Icelandic and non-pro-drop-languages without SpecTP, e.g. Modern English and Modern French (see 15).

\[(15)\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
(+D) (XP) & \text{Spec,TP} & \\
(a) & + & - & \text{Modern English, Modern French} \\
(b) & + & + & \text{Modern Icelandic} \\
(c) & - & - & \text{Modern Spanish, Modern Catalan} \\
(d) & - & + & \text{Modern Irish}
\end{array}
\]

2.2 The old languages

Looking at the old languages, we see that these show a variant behaviour concerning the two parameters discussed here again we see two groups. Old Spanish\(^4\) and Old Catalan\(^5\) allow referential pro-drop, VS orders and lack DR-effects, Old French\(^6\) and Old English\(^7\) undoubtedly allow expletive-drop and VS orders, but nevertheless display DR-effects in unaccusative constructions.

2.2.1 The availability of SpecTP

All the old languages examined show a greater variety concerning word-order than the modern languages and some of this variety seems to be connected to the availability of SpecTP. Bobaljik & Jonas (1996) convincingly argued that the availability of SpecTP goes hand in hand with object shift, subject inverted orders for transitive predicates, and with adverbs and PPs following the postverbal subject. Biberauer and Roberts (2003) provide data (16) showing that Old English allows object shift. Zaring (1998) and Sitaridou (2005) argued for object shift and VS orders in Old French (17)\(^8\).

---

\(^3\) There is some debate going on whether Modern Catalan represents an SVO or a VOS language (Vallduví 1993, 2002) under the assumption that Modern Catalan is VOS an outer SpecVP/vP needs of course be present in order to host the object.

\(^4\) All examples of Old Spanish – if not indicated otherwise – are taken from Mark Davies’s corpus that is accessible under http://www.corpusdelespanol.org or from the corpus CORDE of the Real Academia Española http://corpus.rae.es.

\(^5\) The examples of Old Catalan – if not indicated otherwise – are taken from the Old Catalan corpus of Fischer (2002) or from the corpus CICA (Corpus informatizat del català antic). More detailed information on this corpus is available at http://lexicon.uab.cat/cica/.


\(^7\) All examples of Old and Middle English are taken – if not indicated otherwise – from the York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose (YCOE), a morpho-syntactically annotated corpus of more than 1.5 million words of prose text that was created by Ann Taylor, Anthony Warner, Susan Pintzuk and Frank Beths and from the Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English, 2nd ed. (PPCME2) that was edited by Anthony Kroch and Ann Taylor. More detailed information on the YCOE and PPCME2 are available at http://www-users.york.ac.uk/~lang22/YCOE/.

\(^8\) Please notice that these structures could also be analysed with an underlying I-medial, V-final structure (cf. Pintzuk 1996) and not as representing object shift, i.e. a moved object. Even though I do agree with Biberauer & Roberts (2003) concerning Old English and with Zaring concerning Old French clause structure against a variable base, and in accordance with Kayne’s approach (1994), in order to be absolutely sure that this is
(16) (a) þei shuld no meyhier haue  
OE  
they should no mayor have  
‘They were not allowed to have a major’  
(Chronicles 62,23)  
(b) þæt he mehte his feorh generian  
that he want his live save  
‘That he wanted to save his life’  
(cited according to Biberauer & Roberts 2003)

(17) (a) por coi avés vos ce fait  
OF  
why have you this made  
‘Why did you do it?’  
(Ar148-53)  
(b) les gens qui ont accoustumé a ce faire,  
the people who are accustomed to this make  
‘The people who are accustomed to do this,’  
(cited according to Zaring 1998: 321)

As concerns Old Spanish and Old Catalan, we find a similar variation in word-order. It has been argued by Parodi (1995) that Old Spanish displays object shift (18a) and the relevant data – a finite verb followed by an object preceding an adverb – is also attested in Old Catalan (19d).

In addition, for both old languages seems to hold that the canonical postverbal subject position is the one immediately following the finite verb (cf. Fischer 2009). Even, in Old Catalan, the subject edge is rarely attested at the leftmost edge (19), which however is according to Vallduví (2002) the canonical postverbal subject position in Modern Catalan.

(18) (a) Dixol cuemo avia su obra acabada.  
OSp  
told.him how had his work finished  
‘He told him that he had finished his work.’  
(cited according to Parodi 1995: 276)  
(b) (...) que mas fuerte es el que vene  
that most strong is the who comes  
‘(...) that the stronger is the one who comes,’  
(Libro del consejo, Maestro Pedro 12s)  
(19) (a) (...) aquesta vegada no calgra lo rey trebalar  
OCat  
that time not seem the king work  
‘(...) this time the king does not seem to work’  
(Desclot 82/16)

really object shift and that the object has moved out of the VP one would need an adverb to the right of the object. Unfortunately, I could not find data of this kind in the available data-bases of Old French and Old Spanish which is assumedly due to the effect that these corpora are not morpho-syntactically annotated.
(b) E acompanyaven-lo dos hòmens de gran estatura, and accompanied-him two men of great height
   “And two men of great height accompanied him.” (Metge 18/2)
(c) Ara han feyta tots los barons del chomdat de Barcelona now have made all the barons of the county of Barcelona
   lur respostar their answer
   ‘All the barons of the county of Barcelona have given their answer now.’ (Declot 82/4)
(d) (...) el marit amava aquella dona sa muller molt, the husband loved that woman his wife much
   ‘(...) the husband strongly loved that woman his wife,’ (Llull, 56)
(e) Ab aytal temptació e opinió anà tot lo jorn Fèlix (...) with such temptation and opinion go all the day F.
   ‘With temptation and opinion Felix walked all day (...)’ (Llull, 28/25)

In (19a-c) the subject is immediately following the finite verb, in (19d) the subject precedes the finite verb, and in (19e) the postverbal subject is separated from the verb by an adverbial. Examples of the type (19e) are rarely found in the Catalan corpora (Fischer, 2009).

2.2.1 The Null-Subject Parameter

As for Modern Spanish and Modern Catalan, there has never been any doubt that also the medieval languages are referential pro-drop languages in main and embedded sentences, and that no definiteness restriction applies.

(20) (a) (...) donaren la paraula al compte de Pallàs, OCat
   gave the word to the count of P.
   ‘they gave the count of P their word.’ (B_02, Desclot, 12)
(b) que a Barcelona no hi plou, that to Barcelona no loc rain
   ‘that there in Barcelona it does not rain,’ (I-02 Sereneta, 1376, 20 març)
(c) Tantost e sens triga vengueren Jacob e Curial soon & without hurry arrive J. & C.
   ‘Soon and without any hesitation Jacob and Curial arrived’ (Curial 73/2)

(21)ª (a) pero que lo non fallamos en toda la estoria (...) OSp
   but that it not find in all the story
   ‘but we do not find it through the whole story (...)’ (Alfonso X, Estoria de Espana II, 11)
(b) e fizo-lo traer preso (...) & made-him bring prisoner
   ‘and he ordered him to bring prisoners (...)’ (Alfonso el Sabio-I.126r)

As concerns Old English and Old French the evidence is more complicated. It has been agreed upon that Old English did not allow referential pro-drop and only limited expletive pro-drop (Fischer et. al 2000: 39). As concerns Old French, the traditional view has been that Old French, like the other Old Romance languages, is a null-subject language that allows all

ª The examples (21) are cited according to Fontana (1993).
different subjects (referential and expletive subjects) to be dropped (Boucher 2003). By others, however, it has been argued that Old French did not exhibit the stereotypical syntactic behaviour of a null-subject language since it is not found in embedded sentences, and only found in matrix sentences if the verb is located in C°, i.e. in verb-second contexts (cf. Roberts 1995, Sitaridou 2005). On the basis of thoroughly investigated French texts, Sitaridou (2005) convincingly argues that Old French and Middle French, exactly like Old English, do not allow for referential pro drop.

However, investigating the existing data, it becomes obvious that expletive drop is available in all different medieval English and French texts (22a/b and 23b/c). For English it has additionally been shown that the expletive *þere* appears only from the 15th century onwards (22b) before that time *þere* is only used as a locative (cf. Ingham 2001).

(22) (a) & come a culur se briht as þah ha bearnde of heouene OE
   and come a dove so bright as though it burnt of heaven
   ‘And there came a dove from heaven so bright as though it burnt.’
   (Margarete 89.564)
   
   (b) þere ben 5 provinces (...) there are 5 provinces
   ‘Five provinces are there (...)
   (Mandeville 29.28)

(23) (a) quant il durent ariver une turmente (...) OF
   when it must arrive a storm
   ‘when a storm will arrive (...)
   (Elid, 1165, 869)
   
   (b) en toteneis est arrivez plusurs reis (...) in now is arrive some kings
   ‘and now some kings have arrived (...)
   (Elid, 1165, 27)
   
   (c) en walcres arriva rois antiaumes in w. arrive kings antiaumes
   ‘in Walcres arrive the antiaume Kings (...)
   (Mous, 1243,1201)

Silva-Villar (1998) (see also Shehaan 2004, 2007) has suggested that the definiteness restriction only applies if the expletive is introduced (23a). If no expletive is introduced no definiteness restriction would apply. However, see the sentences in (22a/b) and (23b/c), it can be noticed that irrespective of whether an expletive turns up or not, the definiteness restriction seems to hold. Therefore it seems to be the correct assumption that the definiteness restriction is independent of the appearance of an expletive in a sentence.

Comparing the cluster of features that go together in order to explain the definiteness effect, it becomes obvious that Old French and Old English allow expletive drop and that SpecTP is available in both languages. The same holds for Modern Icelandic: expletive drop is allowed and SpecTP is available (see also Hrafnbjargarsson 2004). And as concerns other languages, e.g. Old Swedish, we see the same pattern: expletive drop is allowed and SpecTP is available (Falk 1993, Platzack 1988).

Next to Silva-Villar and Sheehaan’s explanation for the DR effect and for expletive drop, we also find Falk’s (1993) suggestion that has often been repeated in the literature (cf. Holmberg & Platzack 1995, Rohrbacher 1994). She argues that the availability of referential pro-drop depended on the verb showing number and person agreement and that expletive drop is available as long as the verb still displays number agreement. As soon as the verb had lost both person and number agreement, expletive drop was no longer allowed. This seems to be a good explanation as concerns the change in Swedish. However, it has been shown extensively that morphology does not drive syntax and that rich verb inflection does not explain the
availability or absence of pro-drop or expletive drop in a language (Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 1998, Fischer 2002, 2006, Bobaljik 2003 among many others). Especially as concerns English and also Icelandic, the loss of referential pro drop and also expletive drop cannot be explained by the loss of rich verbal morphology, because medieval English showed the full paradigm of verbal inflection but no referential pro drop and the same holds for Modern Icelandic (cf. Fischer et.al. 2000, Hrafnbjargarsson 2004, Fischer 2008). Therefore it might be the correct assumption to hypothesise that the availability of expletive drop is connected to the availability of SpecTP along the following lines:

In non-null-subject languages subjects check [+D] of AgrSP either when moved to Spec AgrSP or when moved to SpecTP. As long as postverbal subjects can be placed in SpecTP no expletive needs to be introduced in SpecAgrS. Only when SpecTP is no longer available, and postverbal subjects remain inside VP the [+D] needs to be checked either by movement of the subject into SpecAgrS or by introducing an expletive.

However, DR effects with postverbal subjects appear when a language is no longer a referential pro-drop language. In other words, as soon as the verb no longer checks the [+D] feature of AgrSP (22-23), DR effects are present, irrespective of whether an expletive is introduced or not.

(24)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPP (XP)</th>
<th>Spec,TP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) +</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) +</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) −</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) −</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two parameters explain a whole cluster of characteristics in the languages under investigation in this paper (s. table 1), including whether a language allows expletive drop or not, which so far has posed major problems in explaining.¹⁰

Table 1: Typology of different properties

| (a) + EPP(XP) / −SpecTP | non-null-subject, non-null-expletive, Expletive/VS orders, DR effect, no object shift. |
| (b) +EPP(XP) / +SpecTP  | non-null-subject, null-expletive, (Expletive)/VS orders, DR effects, object shift |
| (c) −EPP(XP) / −SpecTP  | null-subject, null-expletive, VS orders, no DR effects, no object shift¹¹ |
| (d) −EPP(XP) / +SpecTP  | null-subject, null-expletive, VS orders, no DR effects, object shift |

¹⁰ In many languages the fronting of a participle or infinitive as in Stylistic Fronting (SF) was alternating with an expletive. Therefore, it has been argued that these fronted elements check off the EPP feature (Holmberg 2000). Theoretically, this was very problematic, since it suggested that even infinitives could check the EPP (see Fischer 2008 for arguments and data that clearly show that SF is independent of checking the EPP feature).

¹¹ See Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1998) for convincing arguments that [-EPP/-SpecTP] languages like Greek and Spanish do not display object shift.
The table clearly shows that whenever SpecTP is available the languages also allow null-expletives even in non-null-subject languages like Old English (22a), Old French (23b,c) and Modern Icelandic (recall 15).

3. The interpretation of preverbal subjects

Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou’s analysis predicts that elements which typically cannot be left dislocated should not appear preverbally and take the unambiguous semantics of SV orders as proof for their claim that preverbal subjects are always the result of clitic-left-dislocation (CLLD) in null-subject languages: wide scope reading, the behaviour of indefinites, adverb placement etc. However, there are many reasons to believe that preverbal subjects in Modern Spanish and Modern Catalan are not always the result of CLLD (cf. Suñer 2002, Sheehan 2004, Zubizarreta 1998, see especially Sheehan 2007 for many arguments against a CLLD analysis).

I do not want to go into the details of the different suggestions for the preverbal subject position of Modern Spanish and Modern Catalan, but only briefly summarize them. CLLD subjects in Spanish allow optional “ad sensum” agreement (25). The sentence in (25) seems to reflect semantic number rather than syntactic number. The grammatical number of the subject is clearly singular however, the semantic number is plural and the verb shows plural agreement. Therefore it can be assumed that subject and verb are not in a spec-head relation. However, in (26) the subject has to agree with the verb otherwise the sentence is ungrammatical.

(25) El jurado, María nos aseguró que estaban presionados
the jury.m.sg, Mary us assures that were.pl pressured.m.pl
‘The jury, Maria assured us that they felt pressured.’
(Sheehaan 2004)

(26) El jurado *estaban presionados / estaba presionado
the.jury.m.sg *were pressured / was pressured
‘The jury felt pressured’

This leads Sheehan (2004), following Suñer (2002), to conclude that preverbal subjects cannot always be the result of CLLD.

Furthermore, in contexts where an element in a higher topic position is present together with a preverbal subject, the subject behaves distinctly from other fronted elements (cf. Zubizarreta 1998, Sheehan 2007). In Spanish, the order topic > subject > VP (27a) is more natural and requires fewer pauses than orders in which the subject precedes the topic (27b).

(27) (a) Ayer, María presentó su renuncia
yesterday, M. presented her notice
‘Yesterday Maria handed in her notice.’

(b) ?? María, ayer, presentó su renuncia
 M. yesterday presented her notice

These and other reasons (e.g. also the behaviour of non-nominative subjects in Spanish and Catalan) have led quite a number of linguists to assume that Spanish SpecAgrS has both A and A’ properties (Masullo 1993, Zubizarreta 1998, Gallego 2006). There is still a great deal of disagreement among the different linguists of whether we should assume more than one subject position for the null-subject Romance languages (cf. Poletto 2000, Cardinaletti 2004, among others). But then, one could also interpret the dual character of this position as an
Unaccusativity, definiteness and word-order

argument in favour of Li and Thompson’s (1976) notion of subjects as being grammaticalised topics. Maybe, it would be the correct assumption to see Modern Spanish and Modern Catalan as being on their way to behave like Modern French, where the preverbal subject clearly is a grammatical subject without full topic value.

3.2 Old Romance SV

Old Spanish and Old Catalan still have a more fine-grained architecture of preverbal (and postverbal) positions (cf. Fischer 2008).

Table (2): Preliminary subject cartography of Old Catalan and Old Spanish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>XP</th>
<th>Subj</th>
<th>V</th>
<th></th>
<th>XP</th>
<th>Subj</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(28)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subj</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subj</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>XP</td>
<td>Subj V</td>
<td></td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Subj</td>
<td>XP V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Subj</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subj XP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>V Subj</td>
<td></td>
<td>CP</td>
<td></td>
<td>V Subj</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consider the following examples that show the possible distribution of subjects in medieval texts. The examples here are from Old Catalan; however, the same distribution can be found for Old Spanish as well (cf. Fontana 1993, Company 1991, Fischer 2009, Bartra-Kaufman 2009).

(28) (a) d’aquí avant lo rey féu-li donar tot (...) OCat

‘from’here before the king made-him gave all
‘from now on the king forced him to give everything (…)’ (B_01, Desclot/9,26)

(b) Aprés estes peraules lo ermità dix aquesti eximpli:

‘After these words the ermit gave that example:’ (Llull 66/17)

(c) L’hom sovent planta arbres, dels quals no espera

‘Men often plant trees of which they do not hope to get any fruit.’ (Metge 39/23)

(d) e ella tantost se posà en la finestra (...),

‘and she immediately placed herself on the windowsill (…)’ (Eiximenis 61/14)
(29) (a) Dementre que Fèlix en aço cogitava OCat
while that F. in that thought
‘While Felix thought about that’ (Llull 28/29)
(b) com Dèus en est món ha tan pochs amadors e servidors
how god in this world has so little lovers and servants
‘how God has such few lovers and servants in this world.’ (Llull 25/17)

(30) (a) En tristícia e en languiment stava un home en stranya terra ( )
in sadness & in patience was a man in strange country
‘In a foreign country was a sad but patient man’ (Lull 21/12)
(b) Assò li atorgaren los barons de la terra.
this him conceded the barons of this country
‘The barons of the country conceded him this.’ (Desclot 14/20)
(c) E accompanyaven-lo dos hòmens de gran estatura,
& accompanied-him two men of great height
‘And two men of great height accompanied him,’ (Metge 18/2)
(d) Ab aytal temptació e opinió anà tot lo jorn Fèlix (…)
with such temptation & opinion went all the day F.
‘With temptation and opinion Felix went all day (…)’ (Llull 28/25)

(31) (a) que no u vol nostre senyor Déus. OCat
that not it want our lord God
‘that our Lord did not want it.’ (C_03, Sant Vicent, 53)
(b) que no ha hòmens ni dones e·l món
that not have men nor women in the world
‘that neither man nor women are in this world.’ (C_03, Sant Vicent, 67)

In addition to this we find Stylistic Fronting of the Icelandic type together with preverbal subjects in both languages (see Fischer 2004, 2008 for more data). It has been argued that the fronting of participles or infinitives applies in order to guarantee a verb-second structure (Cardinaletti & Roberts 2002) or in order to check of the EPP (Holmberg 2000 among others). Looking at the data below (32 and 33), one immediately notices that these languages are null-subject languages, therefore they do not need a subject in preverbal position, furthermore stylistic fronting applies even together with a subject, therefore it is also independent of any verb-second constraint.
The distribution of the subject exemplified from (27) to (31) together with the stylistic fronting data in (32) and (33) clearly shows that the preverbal subjects and the stylistically fronted elements move for independent reasons. Checking of the EPP cannot be the trigger. I have argued elsewhere that SF applies for semantic reasons (Fischer 2004). Here I want to extend this view and assume that preverbal subjects, together with SF, and also independent of SF move for discourse reasons, i.e. word-order in Old Romance is constraint by discourse. The preverbal subjects in Old Spanish and Old Catalan are generated in an argument position assuming that Case is valued and deleted via agree.

Subjects move into a position, where they are interpreted as information already referred to in the discourse or as a subpart of a referent already mentioned before, anchored in discourse therefore they are [+definite/+specific].

This is not a new proposition – in fact – I repeat a view that has already been suggested by many linguists before (von Humboldt 1822, Lehmann 1976, Calboli 1978 among many others). What is new however, is the way in which the presented analysis accounts for the whole cluster of characteristics.

Furthermore, it seems that this analysis is on the right track, since it is corroborated by the data and the arguments presented by Vincent (1997) and Company (1991) – Company even provides statistics. Vincent (1997) and Company (1991) both argue and show that definiteness marking in full noun phrases was initially largely limited to subjects in preverbal position. In Old Spanish, Old Catalan (also in many other languages cf. Lyons 1999) objects like complements of prepositions often appear without an article even though identifiable (cf. Company 1991). This is easily explained under the assumption that the preverbal position was a topic position and therefore definite: “If a language has the category of definiteness, it must be represented in this position but may be optional elsewhere” (Lyons 1999: 335).
5. Summary and Conclusion

It was argued that the availability of SpecTP goes hand in hand with the availability of expletive drop in a language. As long as SpecTP is available in a non-null-subject language and subjects can be placed in SpecTP no expletive needs to be introduced in SpecAgrSP, since subjects in non-null-subject languages can check [D] either when moved to SpecAgrSP or when moved to SpecTP. Only when Spec TP is no longer available, and postverbal subjects remain inside VP, [D] needs to be checked either by movement of the subject into SpecAgrSP or by introducing an expletive. Under this assumption it is possible to account for the change from Old French to Modern French (and for many other languages outside Romance as well, e.g. Modern Icelandic, Old English, Old Swedish etc.) without referring to morphology and without the need to claim that Old French was a pro-drop language.

As concerns Spanish and Catalan, it has been shown that Old Spanish and Old Catalan exhibit a further postverbal position namely SpecTP into which subjects are allowed to move into (even in Old Catalan). In both, the medieval and the modern languages it is the verb that checks the EPP by verb-raising. This allows the assumption that preverbal subjects move for independent reasons. It has been suggested that preverbal subjects in Old Spanish and Old Catalan move for discourse reasons independent of any Verb-Second constraint and independent of the need to check of the EPP. In Modern Spanish and Modern Catalan it has been argued by Masullo (1993) and Suñer (2002) that the subject position SpecAgrSP has a dual character allowing A and A’ elements to turn up there. This dual character might be interpreted as a sign of grammaticalisation according to Li and Thompson (1976), i.e. preverbal subjects in Modern Spanish and Modern Catalan are already grammaticalised topics and on their way to become grammatical subjects like in Modern French. In Old Spanish and Old Catalan however, these preverbal subjects clearly have to be interpreted as topics, they are [+definite/+specific] which seems to nicely explicate why definite articles turned up first in preverbal position in Romance (Company 1991).
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1. Introduction

Romanian is a language which exhibits differential object marking (DOM) using the particle pe (Niculescu 1965, Panâ-Dindelegan 1997, von Heusinger & Onea 2008, Stark & Sora 2008). Direct object case marking is obligatory for some referential types of direct objects, optional for others and ungrammatical for a third type. The semantic-pragmatic parameters for DOM in Romanian (animacy, definiteness and specificity) are responsible for the distribution of pe in most cases but they cannot account for the presence or absence of the DOM-marker in a particular set of constructions. The interesting cases are post-verbal indefinite direct objects and unmodified definite NPs or “bare nouns”, which differ considerably from modified definite NPs. It is these non-elucidated cases that represent the focus of our interest in the present paper.

In the case of post-verbal, indefinite human specific direct objects, pe-marking is optional. Based on a diachronic and synchronic study we previously showed (Chiriacescu & von Heusinger 2009) that besides specificity, discourse prominence also influences the case-marking of indefinite direct objects. Case marked indefinite direct objects show the property of “referential persistence”, i.e. the number of occurrences of co-referential expressions in the subsequent utterances is higher than in the case of unmarked indefinite direct objects. Referential persistence is a weaker constraint than topicality, which obligatorily triggers pe-marking.

Post-verbal definite NPs generally get DOM, if they are further modified. However, definite NPs which are not modified are subject to an independent constraint of the Romanian grammar: Most prepositions block the definite article of an unmodified NP. Thus, pe-marking - formally similar to a preposition - blocks the attachment of the definite article to an unmodified definite direct object. Speakers have two alternatives: they either use a construction in which the direct object is suffixed with the enclitic definite article (-a/-(u)l) and where pe is omitted, or mark the direct object with pe, omitting instead the definite article. In this paper we show that this variation is not aleatory, but that the discourse prominence influences the pe-marking of the definite unmodified object along the same constraint that holds for indefinite NPs, rather than for definite modified NPs.

The examples in (1), (2) and (3) below intend to exemplify the possible alternations with definite NPs, starting from the common context sentence (A), which licenses the definiteness of the direct object in the subsequent sentences. The modified direct object un
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Definite “bare” nouns and pe-marking in Romanian

A relatively productive phenomenon, which correlates with the pe-marking of the direct object is the doubling of the direct object with a clitic, like in (1a). According to Gierling (1997) and Gramatica Academiei Române (2005), the presence of the clitic pronoun is not only restricted to the class of human referents. The obligatory occurrence of an accusative clitic, limited in Spanish to contexts in which the direct object is realized as a strong pronoun, extends in Romanian to strong NPs like proper names, pronouns, definite descriptions and NPs with strong quantifiers, all of which must be clitic doubled. As pointed out by Gierling (1997), the addition of modifiers favors the strong (specific) reading of the object, diminishing the acceptability of non-doubled constructions in contexts in which these would be otherwise optional. Moreover, clitic doubling is claimed to be compatible with weakly quantified NPs only if there is no material which would force a non-specific interpretation. A construction in which the direct object is doubled by a clitic is interpreted as being specific, whereas the reverse does not necessarily hold. The driving factor behind clitic doubling is therefore not specificity but its dependency on the doubled object.

While in the case of other prepositions this rule strictly blocks the sole apparition of the
definite article, like in (2b), in the case of DOM-marked nouns it allows two alternatives. The ungrammatical sequence (2a) can be reformulated in two different ways: as in (3a) where *pe* is omitted and the definite article is kept, or as in (3b) where *pe* is retained but the definite article is omitted:

(3) A: Un băiat merge la doctor. (A boy goes to the doctor.)
   (a) Doctorul examinează băiatul
      Doctor.DEF examines boy.DEF
      ‘The doctor examines the boy.’
   (b) Doctorul îl examinează pe băiat
      Doctor.DEF CL examines PE boy
      ‘The doctor examines the boy.’

Up to this point, the literature (Cornilescu 2001, von Heusinger & Onea 2008) mainly concentrates on the conditions and development of *pe*-marking in Romanian. After accounting for the more problematic cases involving unmodified indefinite NPs (Chiriacescu & von Heusinger 2009), we will bring into focus the factors licensing the *pe*-marking of unmodified definite NPs. Our main claim is that the crucial condition is the same as for indefinite NPs, namely “referential persistence”. Referential persistence (Givon 1981, Ariel 1988) designates a discourse pragmatic property that is weaker than topicality and reconstructs the informal description of “importance for the subsequent discourse”. This property indicates that the NP will be more frequently taken up in the following discourse and we can offer a quantitative measure of this property. If our hypothesis is correct, we would add to the local parameters determining DOM in Romanian and other languages a discourse-based parameter, integrating discourse information into the Grammar of DOM.

In Section 2 we will briefly look at the local factors animacy, definiteness and specificity, which are responsible for the distribution of *pe*-marking in Romanian in most cases. The contexts in which personal pronouns, proper names, indefinite and definite NPs may appear are enumerated. For indefinite unmodified DOs which cannot be accounted for by means of the general acknowledged criteria, we propose the adoption of a discourse-based feature, namely “referential persistence”. In Section 3 we concentrate on definite unmodified NPs or “definite bare NPs”. Using several tests, we also try to differentiate between differentially marked definite NPs and bare NPs. Furthermore, we will discuss some syntactic restrictions that are responsible for the blocking of the appearance of *pe*. In a next subsection, we try to find out by analyzing newspaper excerpts, whether *pe* behaves as a topic maker or if it displays the same contrast as in its relation to indefinite NPs. Section 4 comprises the summary, the concluding remarks and some open remained questions of the present paper.

2. PE Marking in Romanian

Animacy, definiteness and specificity are the three main local factors that determine whether a direct object will be *pe*-marked or not. In the following, we will briefly sketch the distribution of *pe* as a case marker along these scales, paying special attention to entities realized as definite unmodified direct objects in post-verbal position. Space limits do not permit us to go into a detailed discussion of this distribution (however, see Farkas (1978), Gramatica Academiei Române (2005), Chiriacescu (2007), von Heusinger & Onea (2008), Stark & Sora (2008), for a detailed picture of this distribution).

Furthermore, because *pe*-marking targets mainly those direct objects which are specified for the semantic feature [+human], we will not analyze direct objects that constitute exceptions with respect to this animacy feature.
2.1 Definite expressions

Full personal pronouns (4) referring to animate entities are always marked with *pe* and doubled by a clitic in the Romanian language of the 21st century:

\[(4) \text{ Maria îl ascultă pe el} \]

Mary CL listens PE he

‘Mary listens to him.’

It is worth mentioning at this point that full personal pronouns are most commonly used in order to refer to human entities that are very often emphasized in this position. Direct objects realized as reflexive pronouns, the interrogative and relative pronouns *cāre* and *cine* (‘that / who’) referring to animates as well as inanimates also receive *pe*-marking. The negative pronoun *nimeni* (‘nobody’) and the indefinite pronouns are also differentially marked with *pe* when they replace a noun referring to an individual (see Pană-Dindelegan 1997, Gramatica Academiei Române 2005, Chiriacescu 2007, von Heusinger & Onea 2008, Stark & Sora 2008 for further discussions concerning different types of pronouns).

Proper names referring to humans, or to strongly individuated, personified animals, as in (5), are always case marked with *pe* when they appear in direct object position. Exceptions from this rule are toponyms. Not even in cases in which these proper names referring to names of countries or cities are used metonymically, denoting the inhabitants of a city is the occurrence of *pe* preferred.

\[(5) \text{ L-am văzut pe Ion / Donald Duck} \]

CL Aux. seen PE John / Donald Duck

‘I have seen John / Donald Duck.’

There are further additional conditions triggering the *pe*-marking of proper names, including metonymical shifts, metaphorical transfers, etc. (cf. Gramatica Academiei Române 2005, Chiriacescu 2007) but we do not discuss them in our present analysis.

As already noted in the introductory part, definite NPs are usually (but not always) differentially marked with *pe* whenever the noun is further modified. We tested this generalization on 650 examples found on Google and in a corpus containing Romanian newspaper articles. Even though Google is not necessarily a representative corpus, it has several advantages as the storage of an enormous amount of data which can be processed electronically, facilitating their rapid analysis.

We opted for three transitive verbs: *a omori* (‘to kill’), *a critica* (‘to criticize’), *a impresiona* (‘to impress’) and tested the frequency of *pe*-marked and unmarked definite modified NPs in relation to each verb. To avoid any false results, we did not take into consideration phraseologies and repetitions. The type of construction we tested is given in (6) below:

\[(6) \begin{align*}
(a) & \quad \text{Am impresionat -o pe femeia…} \\
& \quad \text{Aux. impressed CL PE woman.DEF…} \\
& \quad \text{‘I have impressed the… woman.’} \\
(b) & \quad \text{Am impresionat femeia…} \\
& \quad \text{Aux. impressed woman.DEF…} \\
& \quad \text{‘I have impressed the … woman.’}
\end{align*} \]

The examples in (6) are similar, except that in (6a) the definite modified direct object is preceded by *pe* and doubled by a clitic, while in (6b) the direct object is neither marked with
pe nor doubled by a clitic. As it would have been complicated and difficult to test, we did not specify the modifier of the definite NP. Our findings are summarized in table (7) below:

(7) Definite modified NPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pe-marked (with def.art)</th>
<th>Unmarked (with def.art)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Syntactic</td>
<td>Semantic restriction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To kill</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To criticize</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To impress</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When in combination with the three verbs listed above, animate definite modified direct objects are generally preceded by pe as predicted by the high position on the Referentiality Scale. There are, however, a considerable number of unmarked occurrences of animate definite direct objects. The majority of these cases can be accounted for either in terms of a syntactic or in terms of a semantic restriction. Firstly, the occurrence of the possessive dative in preverbal or postverbal position rules out the pe-marking. This syntactic restriction will be discussed more amply in example (22) in the next section. The semantic restriction which renders the pe-marked construction infelicitous is found in relation to definite noun phrases which bear a collective reading or to definite nominal phrases which represent a metonymical shift (e.g. El a impresionat presa straină, ‘He impressed the foreign press’), which marks the noun phrase as inanimate and therefore blocks pe-marking. However, the last column of the table in (7) underlines the existence of marginal cases of variation (8 out of 254) in which the particle pe optionally precedes a direct object.

In Section 3 we will look at contexts which block the appearance of the differential object marker with definite unmodified direct objects. The first type of these contexts deals with the inhibiting effect of the possessive dative on the apparition of the pe-marker which gives rise to an alternative construction. The second context which blocks the DOM-marking is the incompatibility of the direct object with pe in the absence of other modifiers than the enclitic definite article. The focus of our interest will represent those constructions in which the pe-marked construction can co-occur with the unmarked construction.

2.2 Indefinite NPs and the local parameters

For indefinite human direct objects, pe-marking is optional; however, the parameters that might influence the DOM-marking are not quite clear, this being a typical instance of “fluid” constraints (see Malchukov& de Hoop 2007, de Swart 2007). In what follows, we test the following (additional) parameters: scopal specificity with extensional and intensional operators, epistemic specificity in “transparent” contexts and topicality.

Scopal specificity with extensional and intensional operators triggers pe-marking. While the sentence (8a) is ambiguous between a specific (or wide scope) reading and a non-specific (or narrow scope) reading, the non-specific reading in (8b) is ruled out due to the presence of pe (Dobrovie-Sorin 1994). The same variation between wide and narrow scope is maintained for constructions with intensional operators, like in (9):
(8) **Extensional operators (universal quantifiers)**

(a) Toţi bărbaţii iubesc o femeie
   All men love a woman
   ‘All men love a woman.’ (specific/ non-specific)

(b) Toţi bărbaţii o iubesc pe o femeie
   All men CL love PE a woman
   ‘All men love a/ this woman.’ (only specific)

(9) **Intensional operators**

(a) Ion caută o secretară
   John looks for a secretary
   ‘John looks for a secretary.’ (specific/ non-specific)

(b) Ion o caută pe o secretară
   John CL looks for PE a secretary
   ‘John looks for a secretary.’ (only specific)

The indefinite NP *o secretară* (‘a secretary’) in (9a) could refer to a specific as well as a non-specific woman, while the sentence (9b) only allows a specific interpretation of the woman introduced in the sentence.

The contrast between (10a) and (10b) could be explained by epistemic specificity. In the first sentence, the referent of the indefinite *un prieten* (‘a friend’) is not particularly important in the present context. In contrast to that, the speaker of a sentence like (10b) gives the impression that the referent of the direct object is important for the present discourse, maybe intending to communicate more information about him. If we take into consideration example (10c), we soon realize that the picture becomes more complex, since the direct object is preceded by *pe* but not doubled by a clitic. (See Gierling 1997 for an explanation of this problem in terms of focus-projection).

(10) **Transparent context**

(a) Petru a vizitat un prieten
   Petru Aux. visited a friend
   ‘Petru visited a friend.’

(b) Petru l-a vizitat pe un prieten
   Petru CL Aux. visited PE a friend
   ‘Petru visited a friend.’

(c) Petru a vizitat pe un prieten
   Petru Aux. visited PE a friend
   ‘Petru visited a friend.’

In cases like (10), epistemic specificity alone cannot offer a satisfying justification of the variation found within the class of indefinites in transparent contexts.

Besides the local factors tested above, the global factor topicality also plays an important role for DOM. The distribution of *pe*-marking for indefinites is significantly different if the direct object is in a preverbal position, in the sense that a sentence like (11a), where the topicalized direct object is *pe*-marked is strongly preferred in comparison to (11b), where the direct objects is not preceded by *pe*. 

### Notes

- **Extensional operators**: Universal quantifiers like “all” or “some”.
- **Intensional operators**: Operators that refer to the properties or characteristics of the referent. For example, “the only” or “a specific”.
- **Transparent context**: A context where the direct object is not under a focus, allowing for specific or non-specific interpretations.
- **Topicality**: The importance or relevance of the direct object in the discourse.
(11) **Topicality**

(a) Pe un băiat îl strigau părinții
   `PE a boy CL called parents`
   ‘A boy was called by the parents.’

(b) Un băiat strigau părinții
    `A boy called parents`
    ‘A boy was called by the parents.’

Even if topicality explains the preference of (11a) over (10b), this factor is not general enough to account for the more subtle examples presented in (10).

2.3 Indefinite NPs and the discourse parameters

Because the variation with indefinite unmodified direct objects can be accounted for neither in terms of the local factors animacy, definiteness and specificity nor in terms of the global factor topicality, we proposed the addition of a discourse-based factor on the list of the pe-triggering features. This parameter called “discourse prominence” is the most general factor and exhibits the property of “referential persistence” of a referent introduced by a pe-marked indefinite unmodified object. In a previous study we showed (Chiriacescu & von Heusinger 2009) that a referent introduced in the discourse by means of an indefinite pe-marked direct object tends to be more often taken up in the subsequent discourse than an unmarked one.

Two newspaper articles were chosen to illustrate the special status within the discourse occupied by the direct object preceded by pe. The first article in (12) contains a direct object introduced by means of pe in the discourse, whereas in the second article (13), the same indefinite direct object occurs without pe. It is worth noting at this point, that the two article extracts relate the same shooting event in the same way, the only difference being the realization phrase of the two objects.

(12) **pe-marking**

[1] Neculai Florea, de 40 de ani, viceprimarul satului Horodniceni, și-a pus poliția pe cap după ce l-a împuşcat cu un pistol cu gloanțe de cauciuc pe un tânăr din localitate.

[2] Incidentul s-a petrecut în noaptea de 10 spre 11 februarie, la discotecca ce aparține soției viceprimarului Florea și a fost reclamat la poliție în cursul după amiezii, la ora 15:40.

[3] La ora respectivă, Vasile M., de 24 de ani, din comuna Horodniceni, pro s-a adresat postului de poliție reclamând că pro a fost împuşcat în picior de viceprimarul Neculai Florea.

[4] La Horodniceni s-a deplasat în aceeași zi o echipă operativă a Serviciului arme, explozivi, substanțe toxice din IPJ Suceava, pentru a elucida cazul.

[5] Din primele verificări efectuate s-a stabilit că în cursul nopții, la discotecca viceprimarului, pe fondul consumului de alcool, a avut loc o alterație, iar Neculai Florea a folosit pistolul cu gloanțe de cauciuc împotriva lui Vasile M., pe care l-a împuşcat în picior, rânindu-l.


[1] The 40-year-old Nicolae Florea, the vice mayor of the Horodniceni village, angered the police after he shot a young man from the same village with a gun with plastic bullets.

[2] The incident took place on the night of February 10th in the discotheque, whose owner is Florea’s wife, while the police were notified at 15:40 in the afternoon.

[3] At that time, the 24-year-old Vasile M., from the Horodniceni village complained to the police that he was shot in the leg by the vice-mayor Neculai Florea.

[4] A team of the IPJ Suceava went to Horodniceni to investigate the case.

[5] In keeping with initial findings, it was established that during the night an altercation took place at the vice mayor’s discotheque due to alcohol consumption. Neculai Florea used his gun with plastic bullets against Vasile M., whom he shot in the leg, hurting him.

[6] The vice-mayor Neculai Florea maintains that he had to make use of his gun, as he was shoved by the mentioned young man.
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[7] A spus că în cursul nopţii de 10 spre 11 februarie, în discotecă administrată de soţia lui a izbucnit un scandal între două grupuri rivale de tineri. [8] "Soţia mea m-a chemat şi am intervenit ca să linistesc apele. [9] Am încercat să stau de vorbă, să-i calmez, dar băiatul acela m-a lovit în piept şi era cât pe ce să...

He said that on the night of February 10th, a scuffel broke out between two rival groups of young men in the discotheque administered by his wife. [8]. My wife called me and I came to calm down the situation. [9] I tried to talk to them, to calm them down, however, that boy hit me in the chest and he almost…

Before taking a closer look at the discourse prominence of the direct objects, it is also important to underline the fact that in (12), it is the other man, Neculai Florea, who is the topic and not the *pe*-marked DO. A striking observation with respect to DOM is the fact that the *pe*-marked introduced direct object in (12) displays a higher discourse prominence than the direct object which was not introduced by *pe* in the discourse. So, discourse prominence is reflected by the fact that it shows the potential to generate further expressions. This feature of DOM marked indefinite direct objects is underlined on the one hand by the fact that the referent of this object is taken up in the next eleven sentences nine times. On the other hand, the referent of the unmarked direct object in (13) was mentioned again in the next eleven sentences only three times. The discourse prominence of the *pe*-marked direct object is also evidenced by the first anaphoric item. In article (12), the newly introduced referent un tânăr (*‘a young man’) is taken up in the following discourse by a proper name. However, a proper name can be chosen only in cases in which the presupposition licensed by the proper name can be accommodated within the context. This does not hold for the second article (13), in which the referent of the not *pe*-marked direct object is mentioned again by means of the definite NP tânărul împuşcat (*‘the young man that was shot’*). In his seminal work, Givon (1983) introduced the concept of “topic continuity” (the situation in which the same topic extends over more clauses) for the behavior of discourse referents across more than one sentence. He showed that the referential form of the referent mirrors its importance in the discourse. Accordingly, zero anaphors are most continuous (anaphorically and cataphorically) and accessible, while indefinite nominal phrases are rather discontinuous and less accessible. So, following Givon (1983) and as a result of our analysis with respect to the referential persistence of indefinite direct objects, we propose the following discourse prominence scale:

----


[1] The vice mayor Neculai Florea from the village Horodniceni, is verified by the police after he shot a 24-year-old young man in the leg in the night from Saturday to Sunday in a discotheque. [2] The vice mayor, who is a PNG member, took his gun out in order to intervene in a quarrel which started in his family’s discotheque between some young men. [3] He is the owner and his wife the administrator. [4] The police found out that the young man, Vasile Mihaie, was shot due to alcohol consumption, and that (he) was involved in a scuffel, and that the vice mayor intervened in order to stop him. (no further co-referential expressions)

[7] He said that on the night of February 10th, a scuffel broke out between two rival groups of young men in the discotheque administered by his wife. [8]. My wife called me and I came to calm down the situation. [9] I tried to talk to them, to calm them down, however, that boy hit me in the chest and he almost…

----

(14) Discourse Prominence Scale

Topic> Referential Persistence> No prominence

Unmarked indefinite unmodified direct objects are usually less referential persistent in comparison to pe-marked direct objects which usually occupy the middle position on the scale. Our claim is that referential persistence is the general feature according to which we can differentiate between different indefinites.

2.4 Bare NPs

Moving along the referentiality scale to the right, after analyzing specific and non-specific indefinite NPs, we come to another category of indefinites which are characterized by their feature [-argumental] (see Leonetti 2003, von Heusinger 2008 for Spanish) and by their morphological “emptiness”, in the sense that they are realized as a “bare NP”. Bare NPs can express different functions, including generic readings, non-argumental direct objects or - as we will discuss in section 3.3. - a certain kind of definite NPs. Bare nouns are generally divided into two classes, depending on whether their head is a plural or a mass noun. Romanian, a language which allows bare countable nouns (both plural and singular), rules out bare singulars\(^3\) in subject position\(^4\). The constructions we are interested in are those in which the bare singular nominal (BSN) takes the position as a DO, the referent of which displays the feature [+human], for example: (15a) non-specific NPs and (15b) kind-denoting NPs:

(15) (a) Caut elev pentru [...]  
Looking for student for [...]  
‘I am looking for a student for [...].’
(b) Caut secretară  
Looking for secretary  
‘I am looking for (a) secretary.’

In section 3.3. we will pay special attention to bare NPs like the ones in (15a) and (15b) and compare these with definite pe-marked constructions which seem to resemble true bare NPs. One of the characteristics of BSNs is the fact that a certain combination between a verb and a noun or preposition must be given so that bare singulars can appear (Carlson et al. 2006) and this distinguishes bare singulars from other kinds of NPs, which are not restricted to that kind of contexts. A second characteristic of bare singulars is that the lexical identity of the noun itself determines in many cases whether it can participate in the construction or not. In terms of their interpretations, bare NPs invoke “semantic enrichment”. Moreover, BSNs have a number neutral interpretation, which means that they are compatible with atomicity as well as non-atomicity entailments (Farkas and de Swart 2003). Another feature of this type of NPs is that they can combine neither with affective expressions nor with demonstratives or restrictive modifiers. In the next chapter we will test the behavior of definite unmodified pe-marked NPs with respect to these features.

\(^3\) The term bare singular means in the present paper a determinerless non-plural count noun.

\(^4\) Bare singular NPs in subject position are found in rather marginal constructions, which express psychological, physiological or natural phenomena (Mi se face foame/ ‘I’m getting hungry’, bate vânt/ ‘the wind is blowing’) and in frozen, idiomatic, negative contexts. Another type of bare nouns realized as external arguments when accompanied by a verb of existence are bare mass terms. However, such constructions do not represent our main interest at this point, so we will leave them out.
2.5 Summary
The following table (16) comprises the referential contexts in which direct objects are *pe*-marked. Besides the type of phrase through which the objects are realized, the table also makes a clear distinction in the domain of indefinite nominal phrases with respect to specificity. So, indefinite non-specific NPs are not differentially marked. Against other accounts, we subsume the contrast between specific and non-specific under referential persistence to account for all cases of post-verbal direct objects.

(16) Referentiality Scale for *pe*-marking in Romanian for human direct objects depending on the Referential Scale and Discourse Prominence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref Scale Disc Prom</th>
<th>pers. pron.</th>
<th>&gt; PN</th>
<th>&gt; def. NP</th>
<th>&gt; indef NP</th>
<th>&gt; non-arg NP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>topic</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ref persistence</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-prominence</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Besides the cases in which the *pe*-marking is obligatory or excluded we showed that there are cases in which the *pe*-marked and the unmarked form coexist. Unmodified indefinites in the direct object position are optionally marked with *pe* and this variance could not be accounted for only in terms of specificity. The non-elucidated cases, in which the difference between a *pe*-marked and a *pe*-unmarked indefinite direct object is minimal, were accounted for in terms of discourse pragmatic prominence. This feature was also integrated in the summary-table above. Indefinite specific objects which are important for the upcoming discourse are characterized through high persistence and will therefore be marked by *pe*. Indefinite specific objects which are not relevant for the discourse will (usually) not be mentioned again in the subsequent discourse. The lack of prominence of such objects is formally expressed by the absence of *pe*.

In what follows we analyze definite unmodified NPs in the same terms as indefinite NPs. We will divide specific definites according to their prominence: those objects which are important for the discourse in question will be *pe*-marked while non-prominent objects will be unmarked.

3. Definite “bare nouns”
3.1 Definite unmodified direct objects
As we have already shown, whenever a definite nominal phrase has no further modifiers except the enclitic definite article, the direct object cannot be preceded by *pe*. The blocking of the definite article in the absence of further modifiers applies to almost all nouns preceded by most prepositions in Romanian irrespective of the position of the occurrence of the prepositional phrase (17a)\(^5\). In order to explain this phenomenon, we repeat the examples presented in (1) as (17) below. Modified definite human definite NPs in the object position are generally *pe*-marked, as illustrated in (17a). The form without *pe* is rather marginal:

---

\(^5\) Further evidence for this observation is found in the Gramatica Academinei Române (2005), where several constructions in which a preposition combines with a certain type of PP are listed.
(17) A: Un băiat merge la doctor. (A boy goes to the doctor.)
   (a) Doctorul îl examinează pe băiatul bolnav
       Doctor.DEF CL examines PE boy.DEF sick
       ‘The doctor examines the sick boy.’
   (b) Doctorul examinează băiatul bolnav
       Doctor.DEF examines boy.DEF sick
       ‘The doctor examines the sick boy.’

Romanian shows a general blocking effect of prepositions upon unmodified noun phrases, which also holds for the DOM-marker pe. Pe blocks the enclitic definite article -ul in (18a) in the same way as the preposition la (‘at’) blocks the article in (18b). Note, however, that the blocking effect disappears for modified NPs, as in (18c) or (17a):

(18) A: Un băiat merge la doctor. (A boy goes to the doctor.)
   (a) Doctorul îl examinează pe băiat(*-ul)
       Doctor.DEF CL examines PE boy
       ‘The doctor examines the boy.’
   (b) Doctorul se uită la băiat(*-ul)
       Doctor.DEF REFL look at boy
       ‘The doctor looks at the boy.’
   (c) Doctorul se uită la băiatul bolnav
       Doctor.DEF REFL looks at boy.DEF sick
       ‘The doctor looks at the sick boy.’

While “real” prepositions (like in (18c)) always block the attachment of the enclitic definite article on unmodified nouns, in the case of pe-marking in its function of DOM, the above mentioned constraint gives rise to an alternation. Speakers of Romanian can either drop the marker pe, as in (19a), or drop the definite article, as in (19b):

(19) A: Un băiat merge la doctor. (A boy goes to the doctor.)
   (a) Doctorul examinează băiatul
       Doctor.DEF examines boy.DEF
       ‘The doctor examines the boy.’
   (b) Doctorul îl examinează pe băiat
       Doctor.DEF CL examines PE boy
       ‘The doctor examines the boy.’

Both sentences (19a) and (19b) represent different possibilities of expressing very similar referential categories. As it could be noticed so far, Romanian shows a variation between modified definite objects and unmodified definite objects. Nevertheless, the alternation is different: for modified definite objects the alternation concerns the marker pe, but not the definite article; for unmodified definite objects the alternation affects both: the marker pe and the definite article. Furthermore, the semantic-pragmatic conditions are probably quite different: For modified definite objects, the form without the marker pe is marginal, while for unmodified definite objects, both forms are acceptable. Depending on the context and language register Romanian speakers tend to prefer one construction over the other; however, both sentences are grammatical and have the same propositional content. Interferences of this type, where speakers are free to choose between a pe-marked construction and a pe-free construction, provide evidence for the fact that the generally acknowledged local and global criteria (animacy, definiteness, specificity and topicality) cannot thoroughly delimitate between instances with and without pe.
The questions that arise at this point are: What kind of reading do *pe*-marked definite NPs in contrast to unmarked definites in direct object position have? What are the decisive criteria that impinge speakers to choose one construction over the other?

3.2 Further blocking effects
Before we further investigate the alternation between the *pe*-form and the article-form of differentially marked direct objects, we have to account for additional blocking effects that trigger one or the other form. In what follows, we offer two examples for such blocking effects: (i.) the lexical semantics of the NP and (ii.) a particular construction (the possessive dative). We will only mention metonymical shifts as a major blocker of the *pe*-marked construction but we will not discuss such examples at this point. (See Chiriacescu 2007, von Heusinger & Onea 2008 for a detailed picture on this aspect).

3.2.1 Lexical type of the noun
Archaic usages of certain terms in direct object position found in written texts at the beginning of the 20th century (Chiriacescu 2007) constitute an exception in the sense that such expressions can be simultaneously suffixed by the definite article and *pe*-marked, even in the absence of further modifiers. However, a direct object like in (20), in which the functional expression șeful (‘the boss’) is suffixed by the definite article and simultaneously *pe*-marked, is not a recommended one in synchronic Romanian:

(20) L-am văzut pe șeful
   CL Aux see PE boss.DEF
   ‘I have seen the boss.’

Another marginal exception is found in the case of expressions of kinship relations (the father/ the aunt). The referents of these NPs are characterized by means of their most salient feature, representing uniquely identifiable entities in the context of utterance; signalizing a high degree of individualization:

(21) (a) Îl văd pe tată
       CL see PE father.DEF
       ‘I see the father.’
(b) Merg la mama
       go to mother
       ‘I go to mother.’

Again, this exception is not only found in combination with differentially marked direct objects, but also in combination with other prepositions, as it becomes obvious in (21b).

3.2.2 The possessive dative
At sentence level, *pe*-marking is ruled out whenever the definite article is modified by a possessive preverbal (22a) or postverbal dative (22b), even in cases where the NP is further modified by an adjective:

(22) (a) Maria își înțelege (*pe) buna prietenă
       Maria DAT understands PE good.DEF friend
       ‘Maria understands her good friend.’
(b) Întelegându-şi (*pe) frumoasa soţie a făcut
Understanding- DAT PE beautiful.DEF wife Aux. made
‘Understanding his beautiful wife, he made […].’

The noun involved in such a possessive relation is strongly individuated and combines with the definite article. These are the constructions representing the unmarked modality to convey possession. Nevertheless, besides the examples in (22) there “coexist” other constructions to express possession in which the noun is *pe*-marked and appears with a possessive pronoun in Genitive:

(23) Maria o înţelege pe prietena ei [dar nu pe a mea]
Maria CL understands PE friend.DEF her [but not mine]
‘Maria understands her friend [but not mine].’

Only sentence (23) emphasizes the fact that the direct object prietena (‘the friend’) is Maria’s friend, however, not mine/ yours/ etc. So, the DOM marker adds a discursive contrast to the object it precedes.

3.2.4 Corpus data
In a corpus containing Romanian newspaper articles and in a Google survey, we tried to analyze the distributional contexts in which definite and indefinite DOM-marked direct objects appear, paying special attention to definite unmodified objects preceded by *pe*. In order to compare these findings with the ones involving direct objects realized as definite modified NPs, we opted for the same transitive verbs as in 2.1. above, namely: a omori (‘to kill’), a critica (‘to criticize’), a impresiona (‘to impress’) and tested the frequency of *pe*-marked and unmarked definite modified NPs in relation to each verb.

With respect to the frequency of apparition of definite unmodified NPs, our findings were not surprising: the majority of direct objects are not preceded by *pe*. Furthermore, as the table in (24) shows, the three verbs display a different affinity with respect to the marking of their definite unmodified NPs, underlining the impact of the global parameter verb semantics on the distribution of DOM in Romanian (See von Heusinger for Spanish 2008).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pe-marked (without def.art)</th>
<th>Unmarked (plus definite article)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Syntactic restriction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To kill</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To criticize</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To impress</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most cases in which the direct objects are realized as definite unmodified NPs can be explained by means of the above mentioned *pe*-blocking or *pe*-favoring factors. So, the possessive dative is syntactically blocking the presence of *pe* before the direct object. The semantic blocking of the appearance of the *pe*-marker is found in cases in which the noun represents a metonymical shift or when it bears a collective reading (e.g. Un tânăr impresionează juriul- ‘A young man impresses the jury’). More importantly, besides the regular distributional contexts, we also encountered instances in which the presence or absence of *pe* could not be accounted for only in terms of the semantic or syntactic
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restriction, as the example in (25) shows:

(25) (a) [...] a impresionat trecătorul
(s/he)Aux. impressed passer-by.DEF
‘S/he impressed the passer-by.’
(b) [...] l -a impressionat pe trecător
(s/he)CL Aux. impressed PE passer-by
‘S/he impressed the passer-by.’

In contrast to the variation found within the class of direct objects realized as definite modified NPs, these cases do not constitute marginal examples, for 9 out of 51 examples could be marked by pe. Moreover, no factor that was already mentioned can explain the absence of the DOM marker pe in (25a) or its presence in (25b). Variations of this type, which constitute ca. 20% of the cases, impinged us to look for further criteria that can account for the distribution of pe.

Differentially marked direct objects seem to have the same surface structure as that of bare singulars when they are not further modified by the definite article. For this reason, we will concentrate on this apparent similarity in what follows.

3.3 Definite “bare nouns” are not “real” bare nouns

“Bare nouns”, i.e. nouns without determiner (or modifier) can express different referential types: (i) non-argumental indefinites, or what some people may say: narrow scope non-specific indefinites; (ii) kinds and (iii) definite NPs. However, we have clear tests to distinguish between these types in order to identify definite NPs. Furthermore, there are also cases in which the DOM marking is semantically relevant for individualization. In such cases, pe is incompatible with a generic reading as exemplified by (26):

(26) (a) Mihai adoră femeia
Mihai adors woman.DEF
‘Mihai adors the woman/women.’
(b) Mihai o adoră pe femeie
Mihai CL adors PE woman
‘Mihai adors the/that woman.’

In what follows, we will concentrate on the more interesting cases in which bare singulars appear as internal arguments. The two constructions 27 (a) and (c) below have the same morphological structure except for the presence of the DOM marker in the second sentence:

(27) (a) Caut secretară
Looking for secretary
‘I am looking for a secretary.’
(b) Caut o secretară
Looking for a secretary
‘I am looking for a secretary.’
(c) O caut pe secretară
CL looking for PE secretary
‘Looking for a secretary.’ (a certain one)

The sentence 27(b), where the indefinite NP is modified by the indefinite article, is an intermediate step between sentence 27 (a) and (c). Here, the indefinite is understood in a non-
specific way. One question arising at this point is whether the differentially marked direct object in 27 (c) should be analyzed as a true bare NP or not.

To keep the two kinds of phrases apart, we will test in the following the behavior of “true” bare NPs and “definite bare NPs” with respect to the substitution of synonyms, semantic enrichment, and the possibility to combine with restrictive modifiers and referential identity.

One of the salient characteristics of bare singulars is that the lexical identity of the noun itself determines in many cases whether it can participate in the construction or not. Substitution of synonyms does not automatically render a grammatical sentence, as (28a) shows:

(28) Substitution of synonyms
   (a) Caut brutar/*băiat
       Looking for baker/*boy
       ‘I am looking for a baker/boy.’
   (b) Il caut pe brutar/ băiat
       CL looking for PE baker/ boy
       ‘I am looking for the baker/ boy.’

In the case of pe-marked bare NPs (28b), the lexical identity of the noun itself does not play such an important role, so the nominals can be switched, yielding a grammatical sentence.

In terms of their interpretations, one of the more salient characteristics of bare singulars is that they invoke “semantic enrichment”. That means that they seem to induce more than a straightforward composition of parts, as the example (29a) shows:

(29) Semantic enrichment
   (a) Caut secretară
       Looking for secretary
       ‘I am looking for a secretary.’
   (b) O caut pe secretară
       CL look for PE secretary
       ‘I am looking for the secretary.’

Looking for a secretary does not simply imply in (29) that the speaker is looking for a secretary but also means that s/he tries to find someone that is qualified as a secretary in order to employ her/him. For this reason, such semantically enriched readings are occasionally referred to in the literature as “activity readings” (see Carlson et al. 2006, Dobrovie-Sorin et al. 2006). In contrast to the example above, constructions involving marked bare nouns as in (29b) do not have this enriched reading. So, we cannot imply in this case that the speaker is looking for any secretary in order to hire her, but rather that s/he is looking for a certain secretary.

Another criterion differentiating between true bare NPs and marked bare NPs is the fact that true bare NPs do not combine with restrictive modifiers like “all” or demonstratives, as in (30a). Contrastively, marked bare NPs can combine with a restrictive modifier as the example (30b) shows:

6 Such constructions also tend to be sometimes called “idioms”, or characterized as having idiomatic readings.
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(30) **Combination with restrictive modifiers**
    (a) *Chem această secretară
        Call this secretary
        ‘I call *this secretary.’
    (b) O chem pe această secretară
        CL call PE this secretary
        ‘I call this secretary.’

Another property of bare nominals is that they do not include referential identity:

(31) **Referential identity**
    (a) Bob caută secretară şi John la fel
        Bob looks for secretary and John also
        ‘Bob is looking for a secretary and John does too.’
    (b) Bob o caută pe secretară şi John la fel
        Bob CL looks for PE secretary and John also
        ‘Bob is looking for the secretary and John does too.’

In (31a), Bob and John are not necessarily looking for the same secretary, but rather after different ones. In contrast to that, marked bare NPs do signalize identity of referents, as we can see in (31b).

After applying many of the tests that distinguish bare NPs from other nominal phrases, we cannot assume that the examples in which the unmodified direct object is preceded by the accusative marker *pe* are true cases of bare singular nominals.

### 3.4 Fine grained referential properties / Local factors

The alternation between a *pe*-marked direct object and one in which the definite article is suffixed on it may also depend on the referential properties of the definite noun. In this case we can distinguish along four dimensions. The first dimension is the (i) type of definiteness, including uniqueness (*the moon*), familiar definites (*a man/ the man*), kind-readings and weak definites (Carlson et al. 2006). In a first survey we could not find any significant difference between the alternate forms. It is worth noting here that this observation also holds for modified definite direct objects. Another dimension is the distinction between (ii) transparent vs. opaque readings (cf. Keenan & Ebert 1973), as in a sentence like: *We will interview the winner*, where the winner can be understood as: a) the actual winner or b) the one, who will win. The third dimension is (iii) referential vs. attributive reading (Donnellan 1966: *the murderer of Smith*) etc. Again, in both cases we could not find any significant difference between the forms. The only differences we found were (iv) for scopal behavior:

(32) (a) Toţi chiriaşii salută proprietarul bogat
        All renters salute owner.DEF rich
        ‘All renters salute the rich owner.’
    (b) Toţi chiriaşii îl salută pe proprietar / pe proprietarul bogat
        All renters CL salute PE owner / PE owner.DEF rich
        ‘All renters salute the owner/ the rich owner.’

In 32(a), the sentence *proprietarul* (‘the owner’) could be interpreted as “Each renter salutes his/her owner”, even if the NP is further modified by the adjective *bogat* (‘rich’). However, the *pe*-marked DO in 32(b) clearly underlines the fact that the mentioned owner is the same for each renter. In this case also, we consider that this might be a secondary effect of an un-
derlying feature. We assume that this feature has to do with the discourse prominence of the definite NP.

3.5 Discourse prominence

Topicalization is also not a reliable feature which can be used to distinguish between a marked and an unmarked NP, because it clearly triggers the pe-marking. Starting from the common question (A), speakers of Romanian have at least two possibilities to answer it, as (33a) and (33b) show:

(33) A: Iar băiatul? (What about the boy?)
   (a) Pe băiat îl strigă parinţii
       PE boy CL call parents
       ‘The boy is called by the parents.’
   (b) Băiatul îl strigă parinţii
       Boy.DEF CL call parents
       ‘The boy is called by the parents.’(not preferred)

The correct answer for sentence A is 33 (a), with the direct object in topical position marked by pe. Because topicalization cannot differentiate between certain alternations with and without pe, and because in transparent contexts the generally acknowledged parameters triggering DOM seem not to be able to help us either, we need another feature to account for such instances. We assume that the function of pe-marking is the same for indefinite as well as for definite direct objects. Therefore, we will try to look at the persistence of definite direct objects as well, analyzing only such sentences in which DOM is optional.

Consider following examples taken from two newspaper articles:

(34) pe-marking?

```
[1] Lăcrămioara Călin de 40 de ani din localitatea Pîrjol, este o altă mamă care-și va petrece revelionul în spital alături de copilul ei rănit la ochi [...].
[7] “(Eu) Nu mi-am dat seama ce se va întâmpla dacă mă joc cu petard, dar dupa ce (pro) am pus in bidon praf de carbhid şi (pro) am aprins, nu luase foc, de aceea (pro) am rămas în spital pentru ca (pro) să explodeze.
[8] Curios fiind (pro) de ceea ce se întâmplă de nu poenest, (pro) mi-am apropiat ochii de gura bidonului să văd (pro) cauze dar, […] în dreptul ochiului meu.
[9] “[1] 40-year-old Lăcrămioara Călin from the Pîrjol locality is another mother who will spend her New Year’s Eve in the hospital near her child, who has been wounded in the eye […].
[2] We were preparing for Christmas, when I saw the child, bleeding and (pro) being brought by a classmate.
[3] I got scared and brought (pro) immediately to the Moinesti Hospital.
[4] From there, they transferred (pro) to the Bacau Emergency Hospital and hospitalized (pro) here.
[5] This is how I realized that the boy was seriously injured in his eye.
[6] I have no other choice but to spend the holiday in the hospital’s church, praying for my child’s health.
[7] I regret not having taught my child about the danger caused by […]”
[8] I didn’t realize what would happen if I played with petards, but after I […] and I lighted it but it didn’t burn, I threw a lighted petard which exploded after a delay.
[9] Being curious about what was happening why it did not explode, I came closer to the mouth of the tank to look for the cause but […] in front of my eyes.
```

7 http://www.cronicaromana.ro/sarbatori-explozive.html
The same observations we made with respect to the discourse prominence of indefinite NPs introduced with and without *pe* into the discourse are also valid for definite NPs. The newspaper articles in (34) and (35) above underline the special status of the referent that was introduced by *pe* in the discourse. This referent is taken up in the subsequent discourse more often than its unmarked counterpart in (35), as can be seen in the two structures below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antecedent</th>
<th>(34) def. NP, [+pe]</th>
<th>(35) def. NP [-pe]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occurrence</td>
<td>pe+def.NP, pro</td>
<td>def.NP, pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence 1</td>
<td>cl</td>
<td>pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence 2</td>
<td>cl, cl</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence 3</td>
<td>def. NP</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence 4</td>
<td>def. NP</td>
<td>Pro, pron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence 5</td>
<td>cl. NP</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence 6</td>
<td>pron, pron, pro, pro, pro</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence 7</td>
<td>pro, pro, pro, pron</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence 8</td>
<td>pro</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence 9</td>
<td>pro</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Summary

In this paper we provided an explanation in terms of discourse pragmatic prominence that accounts for the interesting, however not yet elucidated, cases in which unmodified definite NPs in direct object position are sometimes used with the suffixed definite article and other times with the DOM-marker *pe* to express the same idea.

Based on a previous study concerning the distribution of indefinites in DO position (Chiriacescu & von Heusinger 2009), we showed that the generally acknowledged local conditions licensing DOM for definite unmodified NPs are insufficient in order to account

---

for their alternation. After eliminating those contexts in which other blocking effects were responsible for the usage of one form over the other (kinship expressions, archaic usages, possessive dative) and after differentiating between the so called “definite bare nouns” and “true” bare NPs, we proposed that the global factor of discourse prominence also influences the case-marking of definite direct objects. Case marked definite direct objects also show the property of referential persistence. We chose two newspaper articles to measure the discourse prominence of the pe-marked and pe-unmarked direct object referents, by counting their subsequent co-referential expressions. We showed that pe-marked definite unmodified NPs are more referential persistent than their not pe-marked counterpart and that referential persistence is the general feature according to which we can differentiate definite unmodified NPs. However, there are several open questions that remain open at the end of this paper; especially with respect to the tests measuring discourse prominence, which should also be further developed.
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‘¿Por qué te fuiste, mamá? Poca ropa me lavabas. ¿Por qué te fuiste, mamita? Raras veces te pegaba.’

Les Luthiers, *Pieza en forma de tango*

1. Verum Focus Fronting*

It is usually assumed, at least for most European languages, that two different fronting constructions should be distinguished, besides *wh*- constructions: (Clitic) Left Dislocation and Contrastive Focalisation (Focus Movement), as in the examples in (1) and (2):

(1) *El libro, ya lo he terminado.*
   *The book, already have_.PR.SG finished*
   ‘The book, I have already finished (it).’

(2) *EL LIBRO he terminado (no el artículo).*
   *The book have_.PR.SG finished not the paper*
   ‘It is the book that I have finished, not the paper.’

Some authors have pointed out that a third kind of fronting operation is available under certain conditions in Romance languages (see Cinque 1986, 1990:74-76, Vallduví 1993, Zubizarreta 1998:102-103, Ambar 1999, Barbosa 2001, 2009 for the basic data). The properties of such a construction have not received much attention, except in Quer (2002) and, under the label of *mild focalization*, in Gallego (2007), although it provides us a valuable testing ground for the study of definiteness / specificity constraints. More recently, an account of this construction in terms of information structure has been

*The investigation presented in this paper is included in the research project “Semántica procedimental y contenido explícito” (SPYCE), funded by the Spanish Ministerio de Educación and FEDER (HUM2006-06630). A previous version was presented at the IV NEREUS International Workshop *Definiteness and DP Structure in Romance Languages* (Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 9-10 October 2008). I am grateful to the audience for stimulating discussion, in particular to María Teresa Espinal, Louise McNally, José María Brucart, Marco García, Nuria Martí and Lisa Brunetti. Special thanks to Aoife Ahern and Louise McNally for checking the English text and for their help with the idiomatic translations of the examples. Finally, I am particularly grateful to Vicky Escandell-Vidal, as usual, for her advice, patience and support.
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proposed in Leonetti and Escandell-Vidal (2008, 2009), with Quer (2002) as the main source of inspiration. The list of examples gathered in (3) represents the prototypical instances of this construction in Spanish:

(3) (a) *Nada tengo que añadir.*
    Nothing havePRS.1SG to add
    ‘I have nothing to add.’
(b) *Algo debe saber.*
    Something mustPRS.3SG know
    ‘(S)he must know something.’
(c) *Poco más te puedo decir.*
    Little more youOBL canPRS.1SG say
    ‘Little more can I say to you.’
(d) *Bastante trabajo tengo ya.*
    Enough work havePRS.1sg already
    ‘Enough work I have already.’
(e) *A alguien encontrarás que te pueda ayudar.*
    Tosomeone findFUT.2SG that youOBL canPRS.3SG help
    ‘You’ll find someone that can help you.’
(f) *Mucho dinero debe tener.*
    Much money mustPRS.3SG own
    ‘(S)he must have a lot of money.’
(g) *Demasiada concesiones hemos hecho ya.*
    Too many concessions havePRS.1PL done already
    ‘We have already made too many concessions.’
(h) *Menos estudiantes teníamos el año pasado.*
    Fewer students havePST.1PL the year past
    ‘We had fewer students last year.’
(i) *Tantas quejas hubo que tuvieron que suspenderlo.*
    So many complaints there-bePST.3SG that havePST.3PL to suspend-it
    ‘There were so many complaints that they had to suspend it.’

The construction, called *Quantificational QP-Fronting* in Quer (2002), shows the following cluster of grammatical properties:

• there is no emphatic stress on the fronted constituent, which can neither be interpreted as a contrastive focus nor as a narrow informative focus;
• there is no resumptive clitic, except in cases where it is independently licensed (this is the most salient difference with respect to Clitic Left Dislocation);
• the subject is postverbal, by virtue of an adjacency requirement between the finite verb and the fronted constituent, as in Spanish *wh*-interrogatives and contrastive focalization;
• the fronted constituent has been extracted from the clause and moved to some position in the left periphery:¹ thus, the construction displays the typical behaviour of operator-variable structures (sensitivity to island constraints, weak cross-over effects);

¹ I do not intend to discuss the nature of the position hosting the fronted constituent. I have a preference for taking it as an unspecified / all-purpose position, basically the same one where interrogatives and contrastive foci move, instead of a specific designated position in an articulated functional structure. See Barbosa (2009) for a recent proposal along these lines.
almost any category can be fronted\(^2\) (cf. Leonetti and Escandell-Vidal 2009); fronting does not affect truth conditions, but has some notable effects: the resulting interpretation is usually emphatic, affective, argumentatively oriented, i.e., in some sense marked with respect to the alternative version with canonical order.

Given this set of properties, the main question raised by the analysis of this kind of QP Fronting or fronting without resumption is this: what is the crucial distinctive factor that defines it among the remaining types of fronting? The answer presented in Leonetti and Escandell-Vidal (2009) is based on information structure, and goes along the following lines. Since the fronted constituent cannot be interpreted as a topic (see §2.1), nor as a contrastive focus, fronting forces an interpretation of the sentence with no informational partition, and focus is thus limited to sentence polarity, i.e. what is usually known as Verum Focus. The construction can thus be named Verum Focus Fronting (from now on VFF). It represents an instance of ‘altruistic movement’, in Erteschik-Shir’s (2007) terms, given that in this case syntactic movement does not obey any feature matching requirements between heads and phrases, but simply blocks the possibility of getting a Topic / Comment split, or a Focus / Background split, and thus induces a Verum Focus reading as a last resort interpretive mechanism —the only way to assign any information structure to the sentence.\(^3\) Fronting acts as the syntactic trigger for the Verum Focus reading. Focus falls on sentence polarity only and the rest of the explicit constituents form the background. The emphatic value, the explicit indication that the content is true, and the argumentative orientation that characterize VFF constructions should all be treated as effects of Verum Focus: focus overtly marks the assertion of the propositional content while rejecting any other alternative proposition.

In what follows I will assume this approach to the syntax and semantics of the constructions in (3) in order to concentrate on one particular aspect of their grammar, namely the constraints they impose on definiteness and specificity in the fronted DPs/NPs. Notice that the fronted DPs in (3) are all indefinite. VFF with definite DPs and strong quantifiers gives anomalous results, as shown in (4), unless used under very specific contextual conditions (see §3.1).\(^4\)

\(^2\) In spite of this, I will concentrate on fronted DPs, in particular direct objects.

\(^3\) I believe there are interesting similarities between our proposal and the way Culicover and Winkler (2008) deal with English Focus Inversion constructions. In their analysis of so-called Stylistic Inversion the requirement that the subject be in focus triggers a suspension of EPP and forces the post-verbal position of the subject. What the two analyses share is the role of Focus structure as a factor that determines the shape of grammatical constructions, and the idea that the interpretive properties of the constructions under analysis do not follow in any obvious sense from general grammatical principles and could hardly be captured in a derivational approach, by encoding of idiosyncratic features in functional heads.

\(^4\) I will not discuss the interesting problem raised by constructions such as (i) and (ii), treated as cases of Resumptive Preposing in Cinque (1990) and Cardinaletti (in press), for Italian, and as a particular instance of VFF in Leonetti and Escandell-Vidal (2009):

(i) \textit{Lo mismo} digo (yo).
The same \textit{say.prs.1sg} (I)
‘I say the same.’
(ii) \textit{Eso creia} ella.
This believe,\textit{pst.3sg} she
‘That’s what she thought.’

The issue raised by such constructions is whether they correspond to the same pattern in (3) or not.
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There are two main reasons for paying attention to this aspect of VFF: one is purely descriptive and simply boils down to the need to obtain an adequate picture of the kinds of nominal expressions that are compatible with VFF, at least in Spanish; the other one is theoretical, and has to do with the possibility of explaining the constraints by resorting to general and well established principles governing DP interpretation, especially the distribution of specific and non-specific readings. As the approach to VFF I just sketched is built on basic notions of information structure and is not tied to any particular hypothesis about the syntax of the left periphery, my main interest will be in the connection between definiteness / specificity and information structure, which I rely on as one of the fundamental notions for understanding the interpretation of DPs in a grammatical context.\footnote{For a discussion of the link between definiteness / specificity and information structure, with special attention to the interpretive effects of topicality, see Reinhart (1982), Gundel (1988), Gundel and Fretheim (2004), Erteschik-Shir (1997), Lyons (1999), Meinunger (2000), Portner and Yabushita (2001), Cohen and Erteschik-Shir (2002), Ebert and Endriss (2004).}

The present paper has three main sections. Section 2 presents and discusses two previous views of specificity / definiteness constraints in fronting constructions: the first one is Cinque’s (1986, 1990), based on Italian data quite similar to the Spanish examples in (3), and the second one is Quer’s (2002), based on data from different Romance languages, where the main issues related to definiteness / specificity constraints were addressed for the first time. Section 3 is devoted to the nature of such constraints and includes a discussion of different facts in Spanish. Finally, section 4 aims at formulating a reasonable explanation for such facts that situates them in the context of the interactions between definiteness / specificity and information structure. I hope to provide a suitable basis for integrating Spanish VFF facts into a more general view of such interactions. The discussion will be predominantly data-oriented. A number of interesting issues will inevitably be left for future research: among them, the place of VFF within a general picture of crosslinguistic variation in information structure, the ways in which the constraints on VFF can be treated in a formal model, and the reason why restrictions on definiteness / specificity disappear when PPs or adjuncts are fronted.

2. Two views of the restrictions

2.1. Cinque (1990): Bare quantifiers as operators

Cinque (1990: 74) states that Italian bare quantifiers like *qualcosa* (‘something’) and *qualcuno* (‘someone’) in left-dislocated positions qualify as proper operators that are able to bind an empty category as a variable in argument position (the object position in most of the examples I will mention). As a consequence, bare quantifiers do not require that a clitic be inserted to identify the empty category (recall that the absence of a resumptive clitic is one of the salient properties of the constructions in (3)). In contrast,
according to Cinque, quantified DPs fail to qualify as operators when they appear in left-dislocated positions, and thus require resumptive clitics, as shown in (5)-(6):

(5) Italian (Cinque 1990)
(a) *Qualcosa, di sicuro, (*lo) farò.
   Something of sure it do,FUT.1.SG
   ‘Something I will do, for sure.’
(b) *Tutto, non dovrà vender(*lo).
   Everything not must,FUT.3.SG sell it
   ‘(S)he will not have to sell everything.’
(c) {Molto / Troppo / Poco}, non (*lo) ha fatto, per noi.
   {Much / Too much / Little} not it have,PRS.3.SG done for us
   ‘(S)he has not done {much / too much / little} for us.’

(6) (a) *Qualche sbaglio, ogni tanto, (*lo) fa anche Gianni.
   Some mistake every such it make,PRS.3.SG also Gianni
   ‘A mistake now and then, even Gianni makes one.’
(b) *Tutti i tuoi libri, prima o poi, dovrai venderli.
   All the your books sooner or later must,FUT.2.SG sell-them
   ‘All your books, sooner or later, you will have to sell them.’
(c) *Molte lettere, *(le) ho ricevute in ufficio.
   Many letters them have,PRS.1.SG received in office
   ‘Many (of the) letters I have received in my office.’

Therefore, the distinction between bare quantifiers and quantified DPs correlates with the distinction between fronting without resumption and clitic dislocation: when the clitic is inserted, the fronted phrase is a topic, as usually assumed, but without it the information structure must be a different one, since the fronted phrase cannot be interpreted as a topic. Moreover, the fronted phrase has a non-specific interpretation in (5). I assume that, when there is no resumption, Cinque’s examples correspond essentially to what I have called Verum Focus Fronting. VFF seems thus to be allowed with bare quantifiers only. Now the question is why VFF should be limited to bare quantifiers, if indeed the Italian examples require exactly the same analysis as the Spanish ones (see below).

A number of remarks are in order here to clarify the scope of the basic generalization and to obtain a complete picture of the situation. First of all, Cinque is not clear about which bare quantifiers behave like operators in ‘fronting without resumption’ constructions; not all quantifiers should be considered as inherent operators, given that the following examples, where the quantifiers ciascuno ‘each one’ and parecchio ‘a lot’ have been fronted, are ill-formed in Italian:

(7) (a) *A ciascuno l’avrai sicuramente detto.
   To each one it have,FUT.2.SG surely told
   ‘You will have surely told it to each one.’
(b) *Parecchio ha già guadagnato.
   A lot have,PRS.3.SG already earned
   ‘(S)he has already earned a lot.’

Notice that several bare quantifiers are compatible with clitic resumption, which means that the correlation between ‘fronting without resumption’ and the bare status of

---

See Cinque (1986) and Benincà (1988: 142-143) for additional remarks.
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quantifiers does not hold: this is the case of numerals, as shown in (8), with two instances of Clitic Left Dislocation where the quantifiers have topical status.

(8) (a) Tre, li avevo già ascoltati.
    Three them have.PST.1.SG already listened to
    ‘Three of them, I had already listened to.’
(b) Dieci, cerco di spedirli oggi.
    Ten try.PRS.1.SG of send-them today
    ‘Ten of them, I try to send today.’

Second, Cinque is not explicit either with respect to the interpretation of the fronted constituents: Are they topics, or foci? He does not really address this issue, but he seems to maintain that bare quantifiers occupy the same position as left-dislocated topics — a claim that is incompatible with the analysis advocated in Leonetti and Escandell-Vidal (2009). In any case, it seems clear that fronted constituents are not interpreted as topics in (3): there is a clear interpretive difference between (3) and (8).

Third, as rightly pointed out by Quer (2002), quantified DPs (which according to Cinque are not operators) can however appear in a fronted position without requiring a resumptive clitic, at least in Spanish and Catalan:

(9) (a) Bastante trabajo tengo ya.
    Enough work have.PRS.1.SG already
    ‘Enough work I have already.’
(b) Pocs col·legues hi ha convidat.
    Few colleagues there have.PRS.3.SG invited
    ‘(S)he invited few colleagues.’

The same happens in Italian with the indefinite qualche ‘some’ and with negative quantifiers ((10b) is adapted from Benincà 1988: 143):

(10) (a) [Qualche libro] avrai pur letto.
    Some book have.FUT.2.SG also read
    ‘You must have read some book.’
(b) [Nessun caso simile] possiamo trovare invece nel nostro paese.
    No case similar can.PRS.1.PL find however in our country
    ‘But no similar case can be found in our country.’

This suggests that the contrast between bare quantifiers and quantified, complex DPs is not an adequate basis for understanding the constraints on ‘fronting without resumption’: on the one hand, bare quantifiers can occur both with and without resumption; on the other hand, quantified DPs are acceptable in the two constructions as well. However, Cinque’s remarks concerning the acceptability of the examples in (5) and (6) are, in any case, accurate.

In addition, we should, first of all, be cautious in considering all of Cinque’s examples as instances of VFF, i.e. equivalent to the Spanish ones in (3). There are at least two reasons to think that constructions with tutti, molto, troppo or poco such as those in (5b) and (5c) are not equivalent to core cases of VFF: the intonational contour is similar to the one associated to contrastive focalization (although the interpretation is not really contrastive), with a break between the quantifier and the rest of the sentence, and negation is present, which is impossible in Spanish VFF, as pointed out in Leonetti
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and Escandell-Vidal (2009: §5.3) (cf. *Nada no tengo que añadir, *Algo no debe saber, *Poco más no te puedo decir, *Bastante trabajo no tengo ya). Examples such as (5b) and (5c) should thus be carefully set aside in a discussion of VFF. They suggest that Italian differs from Spanish in allowing for VFF only to a very limited extent and apparently only with certain quantifiers (the indefinites qualche, qualcuno, qualcosa and negative quantifiers like niente and nessuno). Here I do not intend to deal with the issue of cross-linguistic variation in VFF, but I take it to be partially dependent on certain aspects of the mapping from syntax to information structure (see Leonetti and Escandell-Vidal 2008 for some speculations concerning Romance languages).

Leaving aside this caveat, one should try to offer an account for the acceptability of fronted quantified expressions in Italian that explains why being a bare quantifier or a complex quantified DP is a relevant factor, even though the bare / complex distinction is not only unable to cover the facts in a precise way, but also raises new questions (e.g. Why should a fronting operation be sensitive to such a distinction?). My idea is that being bare or phrasal is not the crucial factor: the correlation that holds between bare quantifiers and the absence of resumption is simply an effect of some more basic property of the construction. Looking for such a basic property is the only way to grasp what the explanation is behind the alleged operator status of bare quantifiers, i.e. why bare quantifiers should behave as operators in Cinque’s sense. The key notions are the incompatibility of certain quantified expressions with a topic interpretation and the possibility of assigning them a non-specific / non-referential interpretation: on the one hand, the set of expressions that undergo fronting in (3) in a productive way seems to be equivalent to the set of quantifiers that cannot be topics; and, on the other hand, such expressions are usually interpreted as non-specific. I assume that these ideas are crucial for an account of definiteness constraints in VFF (cf. Barbosa 2009: 12-16). Thus, they need a brief comment before going back to Cinque’s original observation.

The ban against certain quantifiers as topics is certainly a well known grammatical phenomenon (see Benincà 1988, Rizzi 1997, Ebert and Endriss 2004, Endriss and Hinterwimmer in press, Barbosa 2009). Benincà (1988: 143, 158) explicitly points out that in Italian quantifiers like niente, nessuno, pochi and qualcosa cannot be left-dislocated as topics, but can be fronted without resumption (with the exception of poco, pochi). The facts are essentially the same in other Romance languages, like Spanish, Catalan and Portuguese. It seems natural to look for a single feature that underlies both facts, and such a feature must be related to the kind of interpretations the quantifiers can have. Non-specificity is a good candidate: if the quantifiers are typically or by default non-specific, they will be unable to give rise to a nominal expression with independent reference, thus becoming incompatible with syntactic positions where a requirement of independent reference is in force, such as in topics. Their incompatibility with topichood is, at the same time, what makes them perfect candidates for VFF, because this kind of fronting is felicitous only under the condition that there is no informational partition in the sentence, i.e. there is no topic (I refer the reader to Leonetti and Escandell-Vidal 2009 for discussion). It is just this property that acts as one of the triggers of the Verum Focus reading. In this sense non-specificity is strongly connected at least to the core cases of VFF.

To be more precise, my basic assumptions are that (i) being a topic strongly favours specific / referential readings in indefinites and quantified expressions (although this does not imply that specific indefinites are always topical), and (ii) a construction with no Topic-Comment split blocks the possibility that a quantified DP inside it receives a specific reading: such a reading, in particular in fronted DPs, would typically trigger an informational partition, as the fronted specific / referential DP would be processed as a
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processed as a topic. Non-specific and purely cardinal expressions, on the other hand, fit in non-partitioned constructions in a natural way. In addition, I am assuming that some underlying property is common to quantifiers that are unable to occur as topics and quantifiers that are typically non-specific—an issue I do not intend to address here (see Ebert and Endriss 2004 for a formal attempt at defining the basic property of this set of quantifiers). Each of these assumptions deserves a detailed discussion, but I will take them for granted in what follows. This gives us a rationale for the way non-specificity is connected to the core cases of VFF.

Does such a connection shed some light on the ‘bare vs complex’ condition as stated in Cinque (1990)? Intuitively, the main reason why bare quantifiers (or at least certain of them) fare better than complex quantified expressions is, again, that bare indefinites like qualcuno or niente are non-specific: their lexical meaning favours non-specific readings, and there are no linguistic cues that could guide the hearer toward a specific or strong interpretation.

Another factor that conspires to make bare quantifiers particularly adequate in VFF constructions is the fact that they are obviously ‘lighter’ than complex expressions, in the phonological sense. Given that VFF is characterized by the absence of an informational partition in the sentence, it is dependent on the possibility of compressing a certain amount of information—i.e. of linguistic constituents—inside a construction without forcing any Topic-Comment, or Focus-Background, partition. Languages differ in the limits they impose on the configuration of informational partitions, and I believe that cross-linguistic variation in VFF is essentially an effect of those different limits, both at the phonological and at the syntactic level (cf. Leonetti and Escandell-Vidal 2008 for comparative data). If this perspective is correct, then one should expect that short, or light, expressions fit better when fronted. ‘Heavy’ expressions would tend to trigger some kind of informational partition: on one hand, because they increase the formal complexity of the whole construction, and on the other hand, because they could make good candidates for sentence topics. Italian is a language that seems to be quite restrictive with respect to the amount of structure it allows inside a ‘non-partitioned’ construction, so that all the conditions mentioned in Benincà (1988) and Cinque (1990) could be derived from this restrictive nature: thus, bare quantifiers—actually only some of them—are acceptable in VFF, while complex DPs tend to be excluded. In any case, as we saw in (9) and (10), it is also possible to have fronting of whole DPs in VFF.

To sum up, though the ‘bare vs complex’ distinction seems to be a useful descriptive tool in the case of Italian, it does not represent a core syntactic property of fronting: it is simply an effect of the link between non-specificity and the ‘non-topic’ requirement on the fronted constituent.

2.2. Quer (2002): QP Fronting and focus-affected readings

Quer (2002: 259) points out that strong quantifiers like all or both are incompatible with this kind of fronting, and that “QP-Fronting seems to create a Definiteness-Effect context”. His Catalan examples are reproduced here, in (10), and the equivalent Spanish examples appear in (11):

---

A correlation that is worth exploring is the one between the set of quantified expressions that cannot be topics (i.e. cannot be clitic-dislocated) and the set of quantified expressions that cannot license intersentential pronominal anaphora. The two sets are strikingly similar.
(10) (a) {*Cada libro / *tots els llibres / *ambdós llibres} deu haver comprat.  
    each book / all the books / both books mustPRS3SG have bought  
    ‘(S)he must have bought {each book / all the books / both books}.’

(b) *La mayoría de llibres compraran.  
    The majority of books mustPRS3SG buy  
    ‘(S)he will buy most books.’

(11) (a) {*Cada libro / *todos los libros / *ambos libros} debe haber comprado.  
    each book / all the books / both books mustPRS3SG have bought  
    ‘(S)he must have bought {each book / all the books / both books}.’

(b) *La mayoría de los libros comprarán.  
    The majority of the books mustPRS3SG buy  
    ‘(S)he will buy most (of the) books.’

Definite determiners seem to be excluded from the construction as well:

(12) (a) *Los libros habrán comprado ya.  
    The books mustPRS3SG bought already  
    ‘They will have already bought the books.’

(b) *Esos libros habrán comprado ya.  
    Those books mustPRS3PL bought already  
    ‘They will have already bought those books.’

(c) *Mi libro habrán comprado ya.  
    My book mustPRS3PL bought already  
    ‘They will have already bought my book.’

Quer (2002) makes accurate remarks regarding further constraints on the distribution of determiners: bare plurals and indefinite DPs introduced by the indefinite article un are also excluded from the construction. Quer’s example in Catalan is (13a), and (13b) is the Spanish equivalent.

(13) (a) {*Libres / *Un llibre} deu haver comprat.  
    Books / A book mustPRS3SG have bought  
    ‘(S)he must have bought {books / a book}.’

(b) {*Libros / *Un libro} debe haber comprado.  
    Books / A book mustPRS3SG have bought  
    ‘(S)he must have bought {books / a book}.’

Moreover, certain syntactic combinations inside DPs are impossible in the canonical object position, but acceptable when fronted, which is unexpected, and shows that the

8 According to Quer (2002: 259), unmodified mass nouns are unable to enter a QP-Fronting structure, but this observation seems to be too restrictive, in the light of examples like (15)-(16) and the following ones (cf. Leonetti and Escandell-Vidal 2009):

(i) Miedo me da pensararlo.  
(ii) Vergüenza debería darte.  
(iii) Tiempo tendrás de salir.  
(iv) Razón tienes, si señor.

The acceptability of singular mass nouns may depend as well on the degree of conventionalization of certain expressions. I will leave this issue aside here.
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conditions governing the use of quantifiers and indefinites in fronting and non-fronting constructions are in fact different. Quer (2002) mentions the following contrast in Spanish:

(14) (a) Poco libro publican, últimamente.
    Little book publishPRS.3.PL lately
    ‘Few books have been published lately.’

(b) ??Publican poco libro, últimamente.
    PublishPRS.3.PL little book lately

Some parallel contrasts are found in ironic utterances like (15) and (16). This confirms that fronting constrains the interpretation of DPs / NPs in particular ways that have to be investigated:

(15) (a) Bonita faena me has hecho.
    Beautiful job meOBL havePRS.2.SG done
    ‘Nice job you’ve done on me.’

(b) ??Me has hecho bonita faena.

(16) (a) Menudo coche te has comprado.
    Small car youOBL havePRS.2.SG bought
    ‘What a car you’ve bought.’

(b) ??Te has comprado menudo coche.

Quer (2002: 260) states that QP-fronting is “the syntactic encoding of a certain kind of reading weak DPs can yield when affected by (semantic) focus” and tries to show how it favours weak / cardinal readings of indefinites, at the same time excluding strong / partitive readings. According to Quer, fronted indefinites in Catalan and Spanish are assigned a focus-affected reading, in Herburger’s (2000) terms. In (17), the focus-affected reading corresponds to ‘Few of the people that Mireia has invited to the party are colleagues’.

(17) Pocs col·legues hi ha convidat, a la festa, la Mireia.
    few colleagues there havePRS.3.SG invited to the party the Mireia
    ‘Mireia has invited few colleagues.’

This is a reading that cannot be equated with typical weak or cardinal readings of indefinites, because it includes a proportional aspect: “the speaker states that the proportion of colleagues vis-à-vis the invited crowd is relatively small” (Quer 2002: 263). It arises when a focused predicate inside the DP –in this case, the predicate col·legues– serves as the matrix or nuclear scope for the determiner and the non-focused part serves as the restriction. Thus, focus-affected readings are created when focus induces a particular quantificational structure in the sentence; they are impossible with strong determiners and in contexts that impose strong interpretations. Quer suggests that the notion of focus-affected reading as a specific property of QP-fronting is the key to understanding the distributional restrictions on quantifiers and determiners: only weak determiners that can yield proportional / partitive readings can enter QP-fronting, as such a condition is essential for getting a focus-affected reading. This excludes, for instance, bare plurals (cf. (13)).

To sum up, Quer (2002) makes the following proposals for Romance fronting
constructions (later on I will address some additional points he mentions):

- The only determiners allowed are weak ones which can receive a focus-affected reading.
- QP-Fronting is the syntactic reflection of focus-affected readings (at least in Spanish and Catalan).

These ideas deserve careful examination and detailed comments. In section 3, I review Quer’s descriptive generalizations and present a different perspective on the alleged Definiteness Effect (from now on, DE) in the construction. As for his analysis, I should point out that in my opinion fronting does not trigger focus-affected readings. The basic reading of (17) does not seem to be adequately rendered by focusing on the proportion of colleagues with respect to the invited people, as the sentence could be used as well in a situation where the only guests were a few colleagues, with no proportion involved. I do not deny that a proportional reading like the one just mentioned is possible in (17), but it would simply be one of the available pragmatic values that the indefinite DP can get, and it is not necessarily connected with focus on the common noun. Moreover, there are at least two reasons, one descriptive and the other theoretical, for discarding focus-affected readings as the main feature of VFF constructions.

First, most indefinite determiners that occur in the construction do not exhibit proportional or focus-affected readings when fronted. A quick look at the examples in (3), repeated here, shows that there is no proportional interpretation in indefinite expressions like nada, algo, poco más, bastante trabajo, alguien, mucho dinero, demasiadas concesiones, menos estudiantes or tantas quejas. In certain cases, for instance with nada and demasiado, proportional readings seem quite difficult to obtain (this holds for all cases where a bare quantifier is fronted).

(3)  
(a) Nada tengo que añadir.  
(b) Algo debe saber.  
(c) Poco más te puedo decir.  
(d) Bastante trabajo tengo ya.  
(e) A alguien encontrarás que te pueda ayudar.  
(f) Mucho dinero debe tener.  
(g) Demasiadas concesiones hemos hecho ya.  
(h) Menos estudiantes teníamos el año pasado.  
(i) Tantas quejas hubo que tuvieron que suspenderlo.

The reading that fronted indefinites yield in (3) is a purely cardinal one: they signal a point on a quantitative scale, and other possible referential readings that may involve the individuation of particular referents are excluded.

Second, the idea of focus-affected readings is incompatible with the account of VFF put forward in Leonetti and Escandell-Vidal (2009). If VFF is based on the absence of informational partition in the sentence, there should be no focus-affected readings of the fronted DP, as the DP should never represent the narrow focus –except when it is a contrastive focus, but in that case we have an instance of Focus Movement, a different construction. Of course, this is not a compelling argument against Quer’s proposal, but it is worth considering it as long as we do not have a global alternative account of VFF. The fact that our proposal accounts for the discourse properties of VFF constructions and their emphatic nature gives us some support in contrast to Quer’s.

A puzzling point in Quer’s analysis is the absence of a motivation for linking the fronting operation and the focus-affected reading. There would be such a motivation if
the target of the movement were a designated position such as the specifier of Focus Phrase, for obvious reasons. The problem is that, even remaining neutral with respect to the nature of the target position, we should bear in mind that it is not connected to a Narrow Focus reading. One of the driving forces underlying VFF is precisely avoiding such a reading on a DP which most probably would be interpreted that way if left in situ. In a few words, assuming that VFF is an instance of movement to a Focus Phrase does not explain why VFF is a different construction from Contrastive Focalization. As for Quer’s proposal, the crucial question still is: why should QP-Fronting be associated with focus-affected readings of indefinites? There is no clear answer, as far as I can see. This suggests it would be appropriate to look for alternative approaches to the problem: in particular, approaches that do not include the notion of focus-affected reading.

2.3. Some questions

Groundbreaking studies such as Cinque (1990) and Quer (2002) have brought to light some notable properties of VFF constructions. Although their proposals are not free from problems, as I have tried to show in the previous section, they have contributed to a better understanding of the construction by showing that VFF is associated with certain constraints on definiteness / specificity of the fronted DP, which give rise to a sort of DE. Now the problem is how to obtain a more precise characterization of such constraints, which do not seem to be reducible to either the ‘bare’ vs. ‘complex’ distinction, or the notion of ‘focus-affected reading’. I believe that a clarification of the issue must include two phases: the first one is mainly descriptive, and aims at an adequate description of the distributional constraints holding in VFF; the second one corresponds to finding a motivated account of the constraints that is compatible with what we know about VFF. Pursuing these goals means trying to give an answer to a number of questions that represent the main lines of the inquiry into VFF:

• To what extent is VFF a DE context? Is there a systematic constraint against strong determiners or strong readings of DPs in VFF constructions?
• What kind of connection is there between the syntax and information structure of VFF and the referential properties of the fronted DP? Is it grammatical or pragmatic?
• If Contrastive Focalization does not impose any restriction on the type of determiner heading the fronted phrase, why does VFF show restrictions on definiteness / specificity?

I will try to give at least a sketchy answer to these questions in the following sections.

3. Determiners in Verum Focus Fronting

The primary goal of this section is descriptive. It aims at presenting enough data from Spanish to ascertain whether there actually is some kind of DE in VFF constructions. Assuming that most indefinite determiners – in particular negative and monotone decreasing quantifiers – are perfectly acceptable when fronted, I will concentrate on the behaviour of strong determiners, possessives, bare plurals, and determiners like *un* and *algún*.
3.1 Strong determiners

There is no systematic restriction against strong determiners in Spanish VFF, despite the fact that the examples in (10) and (11) are ungrammatical. A detailed review of several particular cases is in order here so as to establish what the nature of the constraints on VFF may be. The data will show that there is no DE stricto sensu in Spanish VFF.

First of all, it must be emphasised that all constraints on determiners are neutralized and suspended under certain conditions, i.e. when the propositional content has been made accessible in the immediate context and, in particular, when it has been already mentioned as a non-factual and non-asserted situation (as a possibility, a desire, an intention, a belief or a duty). The effect of VFF in these cases, illustrated in (18), (19) and (20), is to confirm and reinforce the truth of the previously mentioned proposition and emphatically assert it as the only true proposition, thus excluding the corresponding negative alternative (Leonetti and Escandell-Vidal 2009).

(18) Dije que terminaría el libro, y el libro he terminado.
Say.PST.1SG that finish.COND.1SG the book, and the book have.PRS.1SG finished
‘I said that I would finish the book, and finish the book I did.’

(19) Dijo que terminaría el libro. Pues el libro ha terminado.
Say.PST.3SG that finish.COND.3SG the book. Well the book have.PRS.3SG finished
‘(S)he said that (s)he would finish the book. Well, (s)he did finish the book.’

(20) A: - ¿Conociste por fin al presidente?
Know.PST.2SG at last to.the president
B: - Al presidente he conocido.
To.the president have.PRS.1SG known
‘A: - Did you finally meet the president? B: - I did meet the president.’

Sentences like (11), (12) and (13), here first presented as ungrammatical, are in fact really odd when uttered out of the blue, with no connection to any previous relevant information. However, given that they can be fully acceptable in appropriate contexts like the ones in (21), they should best be treated as grammatical strings, although acceptable only under very strict contextual conditions. This leads us to reconsider the nature of the constraints on determiners originally pointed out in Quer (2002).

(21) (a) Dijo que compraría cada libro que yo recomendase,
say.PST.3SG that buy.COND.3SG each book that I recommend.SUBJ.1SG
y cada libro que he recomendado se ha comprado.
and each book that have.PRS.1SG recommended CI have.PRS.3SG bought
‘(S)he said (s)he’d buy each book I recommended, and each book I recommended she bought.’

9 In building the examples in (21), I have slightly adapted them in order to avoid other difficulties that happen to be in any case independent from the constraints that I am discussing in this section.
(b) A: - ¿Has leído de verdad ambos libros?
   Have.PRS.2.SG read really both books
   B: - Ambos libros he leído, se lo aserno.
       Both books have.PRS.1.SG read you.OBL it assure
       ‘- Have you really read both books?
       - Both books I have read, I assure you.’

(c) Tenía que leer {(todos) los libros / esos libros}. Pues {(todos) los libros / esos libros} he leído.
   have.PST.1.SG that read all the books those books well all the books / those books have.
   ‘I had to read {(all) the /those} books. Well, {(all) the /those} books I have read.’

(d) No sabíamos si sería capaz de escribir {libros / un libro}. Pues {libros / un libro} ha escrito.
    not know.PST.1.PL whether be.COND.3.SG able of write books a book.
    book well books a book have.PRS.3.SG written
    ‘We did not know whether (s)he would be able to write {books / a book}. Well, write {books / a book} (s)he did.’

In (21), once a context of previous mention of the proposition has been provided that justifies the relevance of an explicit and emphatic assertion of such proposition, fronted lexical definite DPs, bare nouns and indefinite DPs with un are acceptable; the result is always a marked, strongly emphatic utterance. On the one hand, this confirms that some kind of constraint must hold against these kinds of DPs, given that they obey such a strict condition for fronting (i.e. they give rise to anomalous strings in any other discourse context), but, on the other hand, this means that there is no purely syntactic restriction concerning formal classes of determiners, and that examples like (11), (12) and (13) are not strictly ungrammatical, but just difficult to contextualize.

The obvious question is why VFF allows for the insertion of certain types of DP only when a previous mention of the proposition expressed is immediately accessible, while hosting most weak quantifiers in a natural way. A generalization that is worth bearing in mind is that VFF cases of the kind exemplified in (21) can only have a so-called ‘exhaustive’ reading, but not a ‘contrastive’ or ‘refutative’ one (cf. Leonetti and Escandell-Vidal 2009:§4). This means that VFF with definites, based on a previous mention of the proposition, cannot be used to reject or correct another proposition taken from the set of alternatives defined by Focus. It can be used exclusively to choose the affirmative proposition as the only one that is true. VFF with indefinites, on the other hand, may have a contrastive discourse function as well.

It seems to me a reasonable idea to try to find a common account for both problems: the contextual restriction on certain determiners, and the corresponding contextual restriction on the way VFF fits into the organization of discourse. Before addressing this issue in §4.4, I have to complete the picture of the distribution of determiners with some more data, now completely independent of the set of contexts that I have just presented.

Let’s look first at the behaviour of todo ‘all’. Some acceptable instances of VFF with preposed todo\textsuperscript{10} are in (22):

\textsuperscript{10} Notice that todo is usually associated with the insertion of a clitic pronoun like lo, as can be observed in several examples. The clitic is due to the particular conditions that license clitic doubling with todo in all dialects of Spanish, and should not be confused with real resumptive pronouns. This means that the presence of lo is not an obstacle for the analysis of the examples in (22) as proper cases of VFF.
As a further confirmation of the partial adequacy of Cinque’s original remarks on bare quantifiers, all the examples contain the bare forms *todo* and *todos*. Fronting becomes harder to accept when *todo* precedes a full DP, as in (23), but it is not totally excluded (cf. (24)):

(23) (a) *Todo* el apartamento registraron, y no encontraron nada.
    ‘They searched the whole apartment and found nothing.’

(b) *A todos los testigos (los) habrán interrogado.
    ‘They will have questioned all the witnesses.’

(24) *Todo el mundo he recorrido, y nunca he visto
    ‘I have travelled all over the world, and I have never seen anything like this.’

The relevant facts with *todo* are the following ones: 1) VFF is not strongly incompatible with universal quantifiers like *todo*; 2) the bare form *todo* is predominantly non-specific (its distribution closely resembles that of a Free Choice Item), while the complex expression *todo* + DP often has specific readings: it is no surprise that bare *todo* is much more natural in VFF contexts; 3) bare *todo* cannot appear in topic positions, which makes it a good candidate for this kind of fronting.

In a nutshell, it seems to be non-specificity – and the absence of an articulated restrictor– that precludes the use of *todo* as a (dislocated) topic, and thus turns it into an adequate host for the initial position in VFF. The ‘weak / strong’ distinction does not seem to play a prominent role, so we do not have a real DE here.

Next, we should check whether a distributive element like *cada* ‘each’ may be

11 Examples like (i) and (ii), with *todo* as a topic, are ungrammatical:

(i) *Todo, te lo perdonó.
(ii) *Todo, ella es quien lo sabe.

The acceptability rate may increase if *todo* is used as a contrastive topic.
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Cada cannot appear without a nominal restrictor, except in the complex expression cada uno. It is hardly acceptable in VFF, as shown in (25).

(25) (a) ?A cada uno atendía una enfermera. Each one look after a nurse

To each one of them was looked after by a nurse.’

(b) ?Cada cosa archivaba con sumo cuidado. Each thing filed with extreme care

‘(S)he filed everything with extreme care.’

However, it is significant that when cada is interpreted as an indefinite determiner, roughly equivalent to ‘such a kind of X / so Y an X’, as in (26), it fits much better the VFF context: the examples in (27) are much closer to the typical intonational and interpretive features of VFF than the ones in (25).

(26) (a) Tiene cada reacción... (= ‘Tiene unas reacciones...’) have each reaction

‘(S)he has such reactions...’

(b) Dice cada cosa (que)... (= ‘Dice unas cosas (que)...’) say each thing that...

‘(S)he says such things...’

(27) (a) Cada reacción tiene... (que nunca sabes cómo tratarlo). Each reaction that never know how treat

‘He has such reactions... that you never know how to treat him.’

(b) Cada cosa dice... (que valdría más que se callara). Each thing that be better that Cl be quiet

‘(S)he says such things... that it would be better for {him/her} to be quiet.’

Again, an indefinite reading is much more acceptable in the construction than a strong one. The possibility of inserting cada in a VFF context is quite restricted, possibly due to several intervening factors. As in the case of todo, however, it is not totally excluded as a fronted quantifier: this confirms that the constraint operating on VFF does not work as a ban on the members of a certain formal category (for instance, definite DPs), but rather as a condition on interpretations.

The case of cualquier(a) ‘any’ is a bit more complicated, as it is not entirely clear whether it should be classified as a universal quantifier or as an indefinite. Cualquier(a) is a Free Choice Item and its distribution is constrained by a number of semantic factors (genericity, non-factuality). When cualquier(a) appears as a (part of a) direct / indirect object, fronting is sometimes acceptable, as in (28), but sometimes it is not, as in (29):

12 If a resumptive clitic appears, it is due to the generalized phenomenon of clitic doubling with indirect objects. The examples are not to be analyzed as instances of Clitic Left Dislocation, but as real cases of VFF.
(28) (a) *A cualquier cosa llaman 'paella'.* 'They call anything ‘paella’.'
(b) *A cualquiera que lo necesitara le prestaba ayuda.* 'She gave help to anyone that was in need.'
(c) *A cualquiera convencerían esas condiciones.* 'Anyone would be convinced by those conditions.'
(d) *A cualquiera aprueba, este tío.* 'This guy passes anyone.'

(29) (a) ??*Cualquier tarta puedes probar.* (Cf. *Puedes probar cualquier tarta*)
Any cake can.taste
‘You can taste any cake.’
(b) ??*Cualquier tarjeta aceptamos aquí.* (Cf. *Aquí aceptamos cualquier tarjeta*)
Any card accept here
‘We accept any (credit) card here.’

At first sight, the distinction between universal and existential readings of the quantifier seems to be relevant for the acceptability of the fronting operation, as the interpretation of *cualquier(a)* in (28) is always universal and close to the value of *everything* or *everyone*. However, this cannot be the key notion: in the canonical version of (29a) *cualquier* is existential or universal, and in the canonical version of (29b) it is universal, and still fronting gives odd results in both examples. Other semantic factors should be considered in order to capture the contrast between (28) and (29). I cannot offer a detailed account here of the possibility of fronting with *cualquier(a)*, which is in any case rather limited, but the data allow me to conclude at least the following: VFF is possible in some cases with fronted free choice items, and this must be related to their non-specific interpretation.

### 3.2 Possessives

Possessives behave in many respects as definite determiners. They introduce DPs that can make perfect topics, which leads us to predict that fronted definite DPs with possessives give bad results in VFF contexts (except in contexts where a proposition that has just been mentioned without asserting it is emphatically asserted by means of VFF: the case of (21)). In a few words, we expect that possessive DPs follow the same pattern as any other definite DP. This prediction is in fact confirmed (both examples would be fully acceptable in the usual context in (21)):

(30) (a) ??*Vuestros libros he leído.*
Your PL books have read
‘I have read your books.’
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(b) Tus camisas hay que planchar.
   Your shirts have that iron
   ‘Your shirts must be ironed.’

However, there is an interesting phenomenon concerning the interpretation of possessives that should be mentioned here. VFF with possessives is acceptable in examples like the following ones:

(31) (a) Sus problemas tendrá; déjalo.
   His problems have leave.
   ‘He must have his problems; leave him alone.’
(b) Sus cuadros venderá, no creas...
   his paintings sell not believe
   ‘He must sell a number of paintings, do not doubt it.’
(c) Tus historias podrías contar.
   Your stories can tell
   ‘You could tell a number of stories.’

What is remarkable about (31) is that here possessives exhibit a sort of indefinite reading: the whole DP is not referential, it may follow a verb like tener ‘have’ (i.e. a trigger of definiteness constraints, at least in certain uses), and it can be paraphrased as ‘a remarkable or significant amount of...’. It falls outside the limits of this paper to explain how and why such a reading arises in possessives, but it is interesting to realize that it is particularly prominent in VFF: while it is just one of the two possible readings in the sentences without fronting in (32)-(33) —the other one is the default, referential, one—, it is the most natural reading in (31).

(32) Venderá sus cuadros.
   Sell.fut.3.sg his/her paintings
   ‘(S)he will sell {his / her} paintings.’

(33) Podrías contar tus historias.
   CanCOND.2.sg tell your stories
   ‘You could tell your stories.’

In a few words, again we have a case of a preference for indefinite or weak readings in fronted DPs in VFF. And again we have a confirmation that the constraint on VFF does not put a ban on a certain lexical class of determiners, but rather on a certain class of interpretations. This is a feature it shares with the classical DE in existential sentences (cf. Lyons 1999: chapter 6). It is also an indication that the constraint is of a semantic nature, and not a purely syntactic one.

Notice that I have avoided a mention of the canonical equivalent of (31a), Tendrá sus problemas. In fact, the indefinite reading is still the most acceptable one here, and maybe the only one. Thus, there is no contrast between VFF and the canonical order in this case. However, this is probably due to the presence of the possession verb tener ‘have’ together with the possessive inside its internal argument. This is completely independent from VFF.
3.3 Bare Plurals

Bare plurals are supposedly incompatible with VFF, according to Quer (2002) (cf. (13)). Nevertheless, as in the previous cases, it is possible to find acceptable sentences – though marked and emphatic – that contradict this generalization:

(34) (a) Cosas veredes, amigo Sancho, que harán temblar las paredes.
    Things see.fut.2.sg friend Sancho that make.fut.3.pl shake the walls
    ‘You will see such things, my friend Sancho, that will make the walls shake.’

    (b) Motivos hay para desconfiar.
        Reasons have.prs.3.sg for mistrust
        ‘There are reasons to mistrust.’

    (c) Ocasiones tuvo para llenar el saco.
        Occasions have.pst.3.sg for fill the sack
        ‘(S)he had occasions to fill the sack.’

    (d) Amigos tendrás que puedan ayudarte.
        Friends have.fut.2.sg that can.subj.3.pl help.you
        ‘You must surely have friends that can help you.’

A striking property of the VFF examples in (34) is the presence of an extraposed modifier after the verb, usually a relative clause. Suppressing it can produce an ill-formed, probably uninformative, construction (cf. ??Cosas veredes); the same happens when the modifier is not extraposed but follows the noun (not only when bare plurals are fronted, but in some other instances of VFF, like Negative Fronting; cf. Nada te he dicho que pueda ofenderte vs ?Nada que pueda ofenderte te he dicho). The possibility of extraposition of a modifier is one of the outstanding features of VFF. As already observed by Bosque (1980: 40) and Quer (2002: 265), extraposition is severely constrained in Spanish, and fronting, together with wh-interrogatives, is one of the few contexts that allow for it (Leonetti and Escandell 2008). At first sight, extraposition is motivated by the necessity to optimize processing by pushing heavy constituents towards the end of the string, thus separating them from the noun they modify and keeping the internal complexity of the fronted constituent to a minimum. This is probably an effect of the absence of informational partition in VFF; as complexity increases inside the first constituent, it tends to force a partition, which would give rise to a Topic-Comment structure. In fact, if there were no extraposition, the fronted constituents in (34) would typically receive a contrastive topic interpretation, as in (35).

(35) (a) Cosas que harán temblar las paredes veredes.
    (b) Motivos para desconfiar hay.
    (c) Ocasiones para llenar el saco tuvo.
    (d) Amigos que puedan ayudarte tendrás.

Thus, under certain conditions related to the defining properties of VFF, fronting with bare plurals is possible in Spanish. The resulting interpretation of the nominal is implicitly quantified and resembles that of fronted indefinites: Motivos hay is equivalent to Suficientes motivos hay ‘There are enough reasons’, Ocasiones tuvo is equivalent to Bastantes ocasiones tuvo ‘(S)he had plenty of occasions’, and Amigos tendrás corresponds to Algún amigo tendrás ‘You must have some friend’. Bare plurals behave like indefinite / non-specific nominals in this context.

As already pointed out with respect to different cases of fronting with strong and
weak determiners, VFF is constrained by a number of semantic and pragmatic factors. When bare plurals are fronted, one of those factors can be a special informativeness requirement that holds in VFF but not in sentences with canonical word order. Consider the following contrast:

(36) (a) *Películas mejores he visto.* (cf. ??*Películas he visto*)
Films better have.PRS.1.SG seen
‘I have seen better films.’

(b) *Cosas peores había vivido.* (cf. ??*Cosas había vivido*)
things worse have.PST.3.SG lived
‘(S)he had experienced worse things.’

(37) (a) ??*Películas de Fellini he visto.*
Films of Fellini have.PRS.1.SG seen
‘I have seen films by Fellini.’

(b) ??*Crisis bursátiles hemos pasado.*
Crisis exchange have.PRS.1.PL passed
‘We have suffered stock market crisis.’

The contrast suggests that the acceptability of fronted bare plurals partly depends on the nature of the nominal modifier. Comparative adjectives like *mejor* ‘better’ and *peor* ‘worse’ give perfect results, while restrictive and classifying modifiers like *de Fellini* ‘by Fellini’ or *bursátil* ‘relative to the stock market’ give rise to anomalous sentences. Intuitively, this could be due to the fact that comparative adjectives indicate that a certain value has been reached on a scale that licenses some scalar implications: this equals the effects obtained with adnominal quantifiers, usually associated with scales. On the other hand, classifying adjuncts such as the ones in (37) do not allow defining a value on a scale; they do not trigger scalar implications, and maybe this precludes an adequate inferential connection with the context. Emphatically asserting that I have seen better films implicates that there are better films than the one under consideration and that alternative propositions have to be rejected (‘I have not seen any better film’, ‘This is the best film I have seen’, ‘This is a very good film’): this is the general interpretive mechanism of VFF. When saying *Alguna película habrá visto* ‘(S)he must have seen some film’, the speaker communicates that all the propositions obtained by substituting the indefinite quantifier with other quantifiers representing lower values on a scale should be discarded (for instance, ‘(S)he has seen no films’), thus triggering other contextual implications that justify resorting to a marked construction like VFF. The idea is that certain nominal modifiers play a role that is similar to the quantifiers’ in allowing scalar implications, which seems to be relevant for the contextual adequacy of fronting. These are purely speculative remarks, in any case, and should be confirmed in a more detailed study.

3.4 *Un / Algún*

The indefinite *algún* ‘some’ (together with its pronominal [+ animate] variant *alguien* ‘someone’ and [- animate] variant *algo* ‘something’) is one of the elements that best fits VFF contexts. The indefinite article *un*, on the contrary, often gives bad results in the same contexts where *algún* is perfectly natural: some contrasts are presented in (38)-(40) –recall that the examples with *un* would be acceptable if inserted in a context that provides a close linguistic antecedent for the proposition expressed and justifies its
emphatic assertion.

(38) (a) Alguna razón debe haber para esto.

Some reason must have for this
(b) ?Una razón debe haber para esto.

There must be {some / a} reason for this.

(39) (a) Alguna película habrá que te haya gustado.

Some film that you have pleased
(b) ?Una película habrás que te haya gustado.

‘{Some / One} film must have pleased you.’

(40) (a) Pues sí, algún ordenador me he cargado.

Well yes some computer Cl have broken
(b) ?Pues sí, un ordenador me he cargado.

‘Well, yes, I have broken {some / one} computer.’

This is just one of the puzzling types of contrast between un and algún that can be signalled. I believe that a promising approach to the facts in (38)-(40) could be based on the fact that ‘un + N’ is frequently used as a topic DP, mostly with specific and generic interpretations, while ‘algún + N’ seldom appears as topic (though this is not excluded, especially if the DP is interpreted as a contrastive topic). The relevant generalization is that ‘un + N’, as a potential topic, easily deviates the processing task towards an informational partition with Topic and Comment, thus being, in principle, incompatible with the interpretive process associated with VFF constructions. Algún represents just the opposite behaviour: it is not easily taken as a topic and, consequently, it enters VFF contexts smoothly. An accurate semantic analysis of the two elements should be able to throw some light on this particular aspect of their linguistic behaviour. The characterization of algún as an ‘epistemic indefinite’, following Alonso-Ovalle and Menéndez-Benito’s (2003) terminology, is surely relevant: algún signals that the speaker is unable to provide any further information about who or what satisfies the existential claim (s)he is making, and, moreover, that any individual in the relevant domain may be the one satisfying the existential claim (Alonso-Ovalle and Menéndez-Benito 2003 rightly claim that algún is characterized by a ‘free choice epistemic effect’). This makes difficult to assign a referential reading to a DP headed by algún (and the same holds for algo and alguien). The preference for algún in VFF can thus be explained as the result of its being in competition with the indefinite article un in a context favouring non-referential readings. Of course, as in the previous cases, it is not at all impossible that an indefinite DP with un appears fronted, if the context facilitates an adequate processing: in (41), for instance, fronting with un is acceptable because the presence of a disjunction (un libro u otro) makes clear that the domain of quantification is not reduced to a singleton, thus producing a free choice reading of the fronted DP that is comparable to the typical readings of algún (I am grateful to N. Martí and M. T. Espinal for pointing out this fact to me).

14 Some of them have been recently discussed in Gutiérrez Rexach 2003.
Another fact that is worth mentioning here (first pointed out to me by J. M. Brucart) is that the singular form algún is often preferred to its plural algunos in VFF. This is confirmed by the examples in (42), counterparts of some of the previous examples with algún.

(42) (a) Algunos libros habrá leído.
(b) Algunas películas habrá que te hayan gustado.
(c) A algunos encontrarás que te puedan ayudar.

The contrast between algún and algunos is quite subtle and not really systematic. As the plural form algunos is devoid of the ‘epistemic’ flavour of the singular form, and is perfectly acceptable in indefinite topics (cf. Algunas de estas películas, ya las había visto ‘Some of these films, I had already seen’), the slightly anomalous status of (42) is predicted on the same basis that accounts for the contrast between un and algún.

3.5 Results

Summing up, the following points have been established in this study on the distribution of determiners in VFF:

- The preference for bare quantifiers in VFF, pointed out in Cinque (1986, 1990), seems to be a combined effect of the informational requirements of the construction —i.e. avoidance of expressions whose internal complexity could trigger an informational partition— and of the non-specific interpretation of bare quantifiers. Both things make them ideal candidates for VFF.
- Weak quantifiers represent the typical determiners that occur in fronted nominals, and their interpretation is systematically non-specific or cardinal.
- Strong quantifiers and determiners are always acceptable when the context provides a previous occurrence of the proposition and a suitable occasion for asserting it. This kind of grammatical environment allows for any type of determiner inside the fronted DP, and has to be given a special, marked, status. The obvious question is why such a context suspends the constraints that are usually in force.
- Some strong determiners (todo, cada, possessives) can be fronted even out of the particular context just mentioned. Interestingly, this happens because they are clearly non-specific or because they can receive non-specific, indefinite-like, readings. In such cases the DP cannot be interpreted as a topic.
- The contrast between the indefinites un and algún is again accounted for by resorting to their different potential for heading topical DPs. Being interpretable as a topic or not thus becomes the key factor in the licensing of fronted DPs in VFF.
- As for bare plurals, they can appear in VFF if certain conditions are met. On the one hand, there seems to be an informativeness requirement on the propositional content that is stronger than in canonical word order and imposes some limits on the acceptability of fronting in these cases; there is often extrapolation of nominal modifiers, sometimes even obligatorily. On the other hand, fronted bare
plurals can make good topics: in fact, it is sometimes difficult to distinguish a case of VFF with a bare plural from a case of dislocation with a bare plural as an initial topic. There are no resumptive clitics in either of the two constructions, and only the intonational contour and subject-verb order can help the hearer. The potential ambiguity with respect to dislocation structures acts as a severe limitation on the acceptability of fronting with bare plurals. One of the reasons extraposition may play a prominent role is just the possibility it provides for separating VFF cases from dislocation cases, since extraposition is not allowed from topic positions.

- Contrasts in acceptability seem to be due to semantic incompatibility or to contextualization or processing difficulties, but not to the violation of syntactic constraints. Furthermore, there is a particular context that suspends all constraints on the kind of nominal expression that can be fronted: this means that such constraints are not strictly grammatical, but at the same time confirms that something must be said on their nature and motivation, given that they hold in most contexts for VFF.

4. The Nature of the Constraint

Now it’s time to look for some way to unify these observations. I will try to do this, as far as possible, by building a model of a procedure for interpreting VFF constructions.

Let’s assume that the presence of a fronted constituent, placed in a non-canonical position, is the starting point. Three different possibilities open up for interpreting such a constituent: 1. it is a topic; 2. it is a narrow focus (contrastive focus); 3. it is neither. Possibilities 1 and 2 give rise to Dislocation and Contrastive Focalization respectively. Each of the constructions is unambiguously characterized by a cluster of formal properties (resumption, intonation, word order).

If 1 and 2 are not available, then possibility 3 is the only one remaining. It forces the hearer to process the sentence with no informational partition, and ultimately restricting focus to sentence polarity (Verum Focus Fronting). The resulting interpretation is an emphatic assertion of the proposition expressed.

The obvious condition for VFF is avoidance of a Topic or Narrow Focus reading for the fronted phrase. Processing will operate smoothly if a) the phrase is unable to receive a Topic reading (typically, being a member of a certain class of quantifiers), or b) it is assigned a non-referential reading in that particular context, and c) it does not exceed a certain amount of internal structure (it is not a complex, ‘heavy’, phrase, or alternatively some extraposition process has made the initial element ‘lighter’ by separating it from its modifier). In these cases a Topic reading will be easily discarded (the same for the Narrow Focus reading, when the intonational contour is not the appropriate one).

The Non-Topic condition should impose a non-referential reading, i.e. a reading that does not involve the individuation of a particular referent, but rather presents a quantitative estimation on a scale (based on the properties of fronted quantifiers), and forces the hearer to infer the corresponding argumentative orientation for the utterance. The hearer has to recover an interpretation that justifies the use of a marked word order and the emphatic assertion of a propositional content that is presented as a part of the background.

In case the fronted phrase is a possible Topic (for instance, it is a definite DP), there are two ways to treat it: a) as a Topic, in a Dislocation structure, thus discarding a Verum Focus interpretation; or b) as a part of a VFF structure, only if it reproduces a
previous mention in the preceding sentence, and the literal repetition ensures that there will be no ambiguities concerning its grammatical role and that it cannot be taken as a Topic (cf. (21)). In such a context, processing will not deviate from VFF and the resulting reading will be an emphatic assertion. This is a last-resort mechanism able to rescue the interpretation of the string.

In the following sections I will give an answer to the three questions raised in 2.3.

4.1 To what extent is VFF a Definiteness Effect context?
The question requires a comparison of VFF with the classical DE context, i.e. existential constructions. Such a comparison shows that there are deep similarities, but differences too –some of them have already been pointed out. Let’s begin with shared properties.

First of all, both existentials and VFF allow for several violations of the DE: this is a well known fact (see Leonetti 2008 and McNally in press for a revision) that leads us to conclude that the DE is a semantic or pragmatic constraint that rules out certain interpretations, but not necessarily the insertion of strong or definite determiners. It is also possible to claim, along the same lines, that the DE does not operate on formal definiteness, but on semantic definiteness and even on related notions such as specificity. In fact, both existential sentences and VFF impose restrictions on the use of specific DPs. Definiteness and specificity usually go together in their interaction with syntax. In this sense, it is reasonable to say that VFF creates a DE context.

The second major similarity lies in the way the constraints on definiteness / specificity are related to information structure. In VFF the constraints are related to information structure because of the Non-Topic condition on the fronted constituent and the ban against informational partition on the whole construction. At first sight, this is an exclusive feature of VFF. However, as I tried to show in Leonetti 2008 based on evidence from Romance languages, the DE in existential sentences is connected to information structure in just the same way. The internal DP position that excludes definite expressions is typically a non-topic position and requires the insertion of new information. Moreover, the DE manifests itself when the postverbal definite DP does not receive a narrow focus interpretation, in particular in constructions where the unmarked interpretation is one of broad focus (all-focus) or where another constituent following the DP is assigned narrow focus. Thus, the DE shows up in contexts that block the topic interpretation of the DP and at the same time prevent it from being narrow focus: the only option remaining is being a part of broad focus, and this is the key factor for the constraint against definite expressions (of course, it is not the only one that is to be considered). The following examples in Italian illustrate the problem.

(43) (a)  *In Piazza della Signoria c’è la statua di Michelangelo.*
   ‘In Piazza della Signoria there is the statue of Michelangelo’

(b)  ??*C’è la statua di Michelangelo in Piazza della Signoria.*
(c)  *C’è la statua di Michelangelo, (in Piazza della Signoria).*
(d)  *C’è una statua di Michelangelo in Piazza della Signoria.*

In (43a) the definite DP *la statua di Michelangelo* is in postverbal and final position, and in this case Italian allows for definites in existentials. The locative *in Piazza della Signoria* occupies the preverbal position, presumably as a topic. In (43b) the relative
order of the constituents in the existential construction is inverted, and the two options for assigning an information structure are a) broad focus, or b) narrow focus on the last phrase, the locative; in any case the definite DP is odd. The contrast with (43d), where the DP is indefinite, shows that it is the combination of definiteness and focus structure that gives rise to unacceptability. Finally, (43c) is perfect, because the locative is right-dislocated, as a topic, or otherwise elliptical. Thus, definite DPs seem to resist their incorporation into broad focus in thetic constructions like existentials. They cannot be ‘pressed’ into non-partitioned domains that prevent their interpretation like topics or narrow foci.

VFF is not a thetic construction, but its similarity with existentials is quite clear: a DE appears when a definite DP is inserted in a string with no informational partition (in particular, with no Topic-Comment partition). This is the basic property that VFF shares with existential sentences. Again we have some reason to think that the constraint on VFF is after all another instance of the classical DE (provided we take the DE as a semantic / pragmatic restriction).

Let’s turn now to the differences. Some of them are quite clear, though not particularly illuminating for a better understanding of the distribution of definiteness marking. First of all, certain lexical triggers are involved in the DE in existential contexts: the combination of the verb ‘be’ / ‘have’ and some kind of locative in Italian, Catalan, English or French, the lexical competition between *haber* and *estar* in Spanish, the presence of *geben* in German. There is nothing comparable in VFF, as it reduces to an instance of syntactic (A-bar) movement to a preverbal position, independent of the insertion of any particular lexical items. Second, VFF shows interpretive effects (emphasis and argumentative orientation) that are completely absent from existential contexts.

What looks as an important difference is that the constraints on definite DPs in VFF derive from the fact that the fronted position excludes referential expressions that can be interpreted as topics. In a few words, the DE in VFF is entirely based on the Non-Topic condition. The set of determiners typically found in instances of VFF is the set of the determiners that are incompatible with topic status (in particular, with Clitic Left / Right Dislocation in Romance languages). This set crosscuts the classical weak / strong distinction, as shown in table (1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table (1): Determiners in VFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Todo, cada</em>, possessives, <em>(cualquier)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Algún, poco, bastante, mucho, demasiado, mucho, más, menos, tanto, nada, ningún...</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If both strong and weak determiners are possible in VFF -strong ones only under very strict conditions-, the constraint cannot be exactly the same as in existential sentences. It is certainly true that existential contexts admit strong determiners in a number of cases, but the conditions are not equivalent. The difference lies in the basic requirement that the two constructions impose on the DP: existentials require it to represent new information, VFF requires it to be incompatible with topic status. Therefore, the answer to the initial question (*To what extent is VFF a DE context?*) has to include some qualification: VFF creates a DE context, but not exactly of the same kind as the classical one.
4.2 How are the referential properties of the DP connected to information structure?

The view I want to defend is that the constraints on the referential properties of the fronted DP are not encoded as a part of the grammar, but arise as an effect of the way the syntactic configuration is processed (I have tried to draw a sketch of the process at the beginning of this section). If this is correct, the connection between the syntax and information structure of VFF, on the one hand, and the referential properties of the fronted DP, on the other hand, is mostly pragmatic. The flexible nature of the constraint and the existence of a discourse context that allows for any kind of determiner in VFF (see §4.4) support a pragmatic account. In addition, this view is in accordance with what we know about other constructions imposing conditions on definiteness or specificity: those involving a Topic position (scrambling and object shift, object agreement and clitic doubling, preverbal subjects in several languages) favour definite / specific DPs, while those involving non-Topic positions in non-partitioned domains favour indefinite / non-specific expressions (existentials, VFF). The alternative view should resort to encoding referential conditions in different positions in functional structure, in certain syntactic rules or in the specification of particular constructions. This seems to me an uninteresting and poorly motivated strategy.

4.3 Why do Contrastive Focalization and VFF impose different restrictions?

Information structure constrains the availability of specific and non-specific readings for DPs, but only indirectly: topic positions favour specific readings (without necessarily imposing them –this depends on the language and the particular construction), but focus positions do not force any kind of readings. This is why Contrastive Focalization is free from definiteness or specificity constraints. If the non-specific reading is the default one in VFF, it is because nothing is there to force a specific reading for the fronted constituent, and the Non-Topic condition has to be maintained and obeyed. In my view, non-specificity is an effect of the non-partitioned status of the construction. Contrastive Focalization is obviously a clear case of informational partition, and the stressed constituent is not expected to obey any condition on referentiality. Notice that this asymmetry would be unexpected if we had chosen to analyze VFF as one more instance of movement to the specifier of a Focus Phrase (a solution I would reject mainly on interpretive grounds).

4.4 One remaining puzzle

The main problem for treating VFF as a DE context was presented in §3.1. When a propositional content is introduced in the discourse and it is mentioned or evoked, but not asserted, resorting to a VFF construction is an adequate way to select the positive proposition expressed and emphatically asserting it. Two discourse environments that satisfy the condition of evoking the propositional content are polar interrogatives and non-factual contexts where the content is presented as a possibility, an intention, or a belief. A nice example of VFF in this last environment is in (18), repeated here:

(18) Dije que terminaría el libro, y el libro he terminado.
Say,PST.1SG that finish,COND.1SG the book, and the book have,PRS.1SG finished
‘I said that I would finish the book, and finish the book I did.’
Fronting of the definite DP *el libro* ‘the book’ is perfectly acceptable, in spite of the fact that such an expression could make a good topic. The problem, as already noticed in §3.1, is why fronting with definite DPs is possible in cases like (18), as a restricted option, and why it can only have an exhaustive function, i.e. that of selecting the affirmative proposition as the only one that is true (in the example, ‘I have finished the book’) and discarding the competing negative proposition. The two aspects of the problem must be related.

One of the major implications of the analysis of VFF is that Verum Focus entails a requirement that the propositional content be in the background. VFF constructions fit in a context that provides the set of alternative possibilities as already given content: in (18), the first sentence introduces the alternative set, and the second sentence (VFF) communicates the speaker’s commitment about the truth of the proposition. The exhaustive interpretation of VFF requires an almost literal repetition of the propositional content. This is crucial for explaining the possibility of fronting with definite DPs –with any kind of DP, actually. In fact, the first mention of the propositional content clearly determines grammatical relations, thematic roles and all kinds of syntactic dependencies. Once this is established as the background, emphatic affirmation simply repeats it, with some minor modifications in temporal deixis. Fronting a constituent can hardly hamper the processing of sentential content in such a context, as the fundamental aspects of interpretation have already been set. This frees the construction from the constraints usually associated with it and cancels the Non-Topic condition. In a few words, it is literal repetition that makes it possible that any kind of phrase be fronted in this context. It is worth recalling that VP Preposing in English has exactly the same properties (see Ward 1990 and Leonetti and Escandell-Vidal 2009: §5.2): in examples like (44) the second sentence emphatically affirms the speaker’s commitment about the truth of the proposition expressed in the first subordinate sentence, and the discourse function of the construction is exhaustive.

(44) *We went there to learn, and learn we did.*

The parallelism with VFF is that this is the only possibility to have fronting of a constituent like VP in English. The previous introduction of the propositional content that has to be affirmed opens the door to a syntactic operation that is forbidden in other contexts. Both VFF and VP Preposing are ways of expressing Verum Focus, with an exhaustive discourse function, and both of them allow for fronting possibilities that are otherwise ruled out. I suggest that it is the discourse environment that licenses such a kind of fronting, thus cancelling the general constraint against definiteness / specificity in VFF.

5. Conclusions

The particular kind of fronting construction I have analyzed, VFF, had not been studied in detail before. It deserves a deeper investigation because it can provide us with valuable insights concerning the left sentential periphery, the mapping of syntax onto information structure, and the interface between syntax and intonation, among other issues. Here I have concentrated on the class of determiners that appear in the initial constituent. My aim has been to offer an account of the constraints on definiteness / specificity that characterize VFF in light of our current knowledge of definiteness restrictions. After a brief discussion of two previous studies of the construction (Cinque
1990, Quer 2002), I have reviewed a series of examples of VFF in Spanish. The data show that VFF is in fact a construction that typically rejects definite DPs in initial position while favouring indefinite / non-specific expressions. However, there is a discourse context that makes definite DPs fully acceptable. This has led me to think that the constraint on definiteness is not encoded in the syntax but is rather a result of the interaction of the semantics of the fronted phrase with the informational requirements of the whole construction. The crucial condition is the ban against potential topics in the initial position. This excludes, in most discourse contexts, the presence of fronted definite DPs. At the same time, the Non-Topic condition explains several additional facts, such as the possibility to use strong quantifiers like todo, the preference for an epistemic indefinite like algún instead of the indefinite article un, or the acceptability of non-referential and monotone decreasing quantifiers. Once the nature of the constraint has been ascertained and its theoretical consequences briefly commented on, the problem of the particular context where the constraint is cancelled has been addressed: I have sketched an informal proposal based on how the presence of an explicit mention of the propositional content in the discourse context paves the way for the use of the fronting construction and suspends the Non-Topic condition. Here, as in the previous issues I have dealt with, the explanation is essentially pragmatic and follows a very simple schema: syntax and information structure impose certain constraints on interpretation, and pragmatic inference plays a central role in deriving a relevant interpretation according to such constraints.
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1. Introduction*

Most Romance varieties exhibit two possible positions for adnominal adjectives with respect to the noun, pre- and postnominal. These two positions are usually associated with different ‘semantic effects’ on the interpretation of the AN- or NA-complex or the readings of the pre- or postnominal adjectives (cf. Delbecque 1990 for an explicit comparison of French and Spanish, Bouchard 1998, 2002, Radatz 2001, Knittel 2005). Apart from displaying different interpretations and different syntactic restrictions (e.g. no adjectival complements together with their head possible in prenominal position), adnominal adjectives in pre- vs. postnominal position in Romance languages and varieties like (spoken) French, Occitan (Provençal Maritime), substandard (spoken) Brazilian Portuguese and Ladin (Fassano) show different agreement patterns with respect to number and/or gender marking (cf. Durand 1932:28f., Bayle 1967:32f., Blanchet 1999:88f., Scherre 1988, 2001a,b, Rasom 2003, 2006, 2008 and Mensching & Stark 2007). A fact described in some grammars, but almost completely neglected in the theoretical discussion up to now.

The aim of this paper is to present an explanation for the apparently ‘variable’ position of adnominal adjectives in Romance taking as a starting point morphological observations about incomplete or “lazy” gender and number agreement inside the noun-adjective complex.

In section 2.1 we present data from Fassano, a Ladin variety, which shows the most complex agreement pattern of the considered languages. We proceed, in 2.2, with Occitan and Brazilian Portuguese data, which (even though the varieties in question are very distant from each other with respect to the genetic classification) behave very similarly as far as the agreement patterns at issue are concerned. And finally, in 2.3, the presented data from spoken French show that this language can be grouped together with Occitan and Brazilian Portuguese. As shown in the overview in 2.4, all these languages or varieties show “lazy” or defective agreement patterns. In section 3 we present our proposal for the different agreement patterns presented in section 2. We start by giving an overview over what we want to argue for and against (cf. 3.1). In our analysis, which is illustrated in detail in sections 3.2 to 3.3, we assume, giving semantic motivations, two different underlying head-orderings for the two main interpretation types (direct vs. indirect modification). Yet, in contrast to existing analyses, which also assume two different constructions for adnominal adjectives, our analysis starts from base-generated N-A in order to derive A-N, with semantically motivated movement, and vice versa from A-N, in order to derive N-A, assuming semantically motivated N-movement. In order to explain the different agreement patterns we depart from two probing operations. We show that the analyzed languages differ mainly with respect to whether “little n°” is defective or not. This defectivity receives again a semantic motivation.

* This paper is based partially on work elaborated together with Guido Mensching Freie Universität Berlin, and Daniel Hole, University of Potsdam/University of Stuttgart, which we would like to thank very much for their support, patience and helpful critical remarks. Some preliminary versions have been presented in November 2006 at the “Institut für Deutsche Sprache”, Mannheim, at the international workshop “Syntax der Nominalphrase”, and in September 2007 in Vienna, at the workshop “Fokus und Hintergrund in den romanischen Sprachen”, at the XXXth meeting of German romanists.
Adnominal Adjectives in Romance.

The different morphological patterns result in all these cases from different syntactic structures and operations, which are, in turn, partially semantically motivated. Finally, section 4 summarizes the central points of our analysis.

2. The data
2.1 The Ladin variety of Campitello di Fassa

As in other Romance languages, in the Ladin variety Fassano adnominal adjectives can appear in pre- and postnominal position. Yet, this variety shows the peculiarity that, in the feminine plural, we find different agreement patterns depending on the position the adjective takes and seemingly on its semantic interpretation (Rasom 2005:21, 2008:19):

(1) (a) La\(^1\) picola cèses de Fascia [prenominal: Det-a A-a N-es]
        the.F.SG small.F.SG house.F.PL of Fascia
        ‘the small houses of Fascia’

(b) *La piclees cèses de Fascia [prenominal: *Det-a A-es N-es]
        the.F.SG small.F.PL house.F.PL of Fascia
        ‘the small houses of Fascia’

(c) La cèsa piclees de Fascia [postnominal: Det-a N-a A-es]
        the.F.SG house.F.SG small.F.PL of Fascia
        ‘the small houses of Fascia’

(d) La cèses piclees de Fascia [postnominal: Det-a N-es A-es]
        the.F.SG house.F.PL small.F.PL of Fascia
        ‘the small houses of Fascia’

In prenominal position (cf. (1a)), the adjective appears without number inflection, while the noun has a plural form. Number inflection on the prenominal adjective, like in (1b), which corresponds for example to the Spanish agreement pattern, is clearly ungrammatical in Fassano. In postnominal position (cf. (1c) and (1d)), the adjective shows number and “gender” inflection. The difference between these two examples lies in the behaviour of the modified noun: in (1c), there is no number inflection on the noun; in (1d), instead, the noun is fully inflected. That is, for Fassano we have to distinguish three different cases: Lazy Agreement on the adjective (cf. (1a)), Lazy Agreement on the noun (cf. (1c)), and no Lazy Agreement between the noun and the adjective (cf. (1d)).\(^2\)

In order to find the systematics which hides behind these patterns, Rasom (2006, 2008) assumes, in line with Cinque (2003, 2005) (cf. also Demonte 1999, 2005), that the respective syntactic structural position of the adnominal adjective goes hand in hand with different semantic interpretations. Like Cinque (2003:7, 2005) she distinguishes between direct and indirect modification (following Sproat & Shih 1988, 1991), the latter one having the same readings as predicative adjectives in relative clauses, and links different semantic interpretations to these two modification types. Based on Cinque (2005) and others, she assumes that in prenominal position the adjective receives only one interpretation, whereas in

---

\(^1\) As far as Rasom (2006:22ff.) reports, this Ladin variety uses the feminine plural form of the determiner les only in some specific morphosyntactic contexts, e.g. with numerals: les trei ‘the\(_3\) three’, les catere ‘the\(_4\) four’ etc. Yet, if the numeral allows gender and number inflection, as e.g. doi ‘two’, the determiner appears uninflected for number: la does ‘the\(_{sg}\) two\(_{pl}\)’ vs. *les does ‘the\(_{pl}\) two\(_{pl}\)’

\(^2\) As there is only one case in which both, the adjective and the noun, are fully inflected for gender and number, Haiman & Benincà (1992:219ff.) term this phenomenon Ladin Lazy Agreement Rule. Rasom (2008) prefers, instead, the term Lazy Concord, for reasons we can not discuss here in the interest of space. For the moment, we use agreement to denote overt morphological correspondences in shared features between constituents of noun phrases.
postnominal position, it can have two interpretations, i.e., postnominal adjectives are (or can be) ambiguous, cf. Rasom (2008:27 based on Cinque 2003:7, 2005):

Table (1): Modification types and semantic interpretation³

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prenominal</th>
<th>postnominal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct modification</td>
<td>indirect modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individual level</td>
<td>stage level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-restrictive⁴</td>
<td>restrictive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>absolute</td>
<td>relative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc.</td>
<td>etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The semantic interpretations stage level, restrictive and relative (to a comparison class, cf. Cinque 2003:4) which are linked to the indirect modification result, according to Rasom (2008), from a reduced relative clause. This kind of modification is thus restricted to the postnominal position of the adjective (cf. Larson 1998, Cinque 2003, 2005, Marchis & Alexiadou 2008). The direct modification with its corresponding semantic interpretations has, if we follow Cinque (2003, 2005), no such positional restriction in Romance for adnominal adjectives, i.e., we find it with pre- as well as with postnominal adjectives.

The two possible interpretations of postnominal adjectives are not disambiguated morphologically in Romance languages like e.g. Italian, Spanish etc. In Fassano however, and this is one part of Rasom’s main assumption and indirect support for the ‘ambiguity hypothesis’ for postnominal adjectives, Lazy Agreement (or Concord as she terms it) disambiguates the two possible interpretations of postnominal adjectives:

(2) Lazy Concord Hypothesis (LCH) (incomplete) (Rasom 2008:30):

“In Ladin the morphology of lazy concord on the noun disambiguates the potentially ambiguous interpretation of postnominal adjectives present in the Romance languages”.

Rasom’s hypothesis becomes clear if we compare the agreement patterns of postnominal adjectives in the following examples: In (3), where the adjective has a ‘direct modification reading’, both the adjective and the noun are inflected and morphologically marked by -es. In the case of the indirect modification in (4), only the adjective shows the ending -es, whereas the noun lacks number marking, i.e. we find Lazy Agreement on the noun.

(3) Direct modification N-A: No Lazy Agreement (Rasom 2008:31ff.):

(a) La steiles invisiboles de Andromeda les è n muie dalènc.

the.F.SG star.F.PL invisible.F.PL of Andromeda CL are very distant

= individual level; ‘Andromeda’s stars are all invisible and very far’

(b) La ores stufouses de Ferrari l se les recorda duc.

the.F.SG hour.F.PL boring.F.PL of Ferrari they themselves them remember all

= non-restrictive; ‘Ferrari’s lessons were all boring and all remember them’

³ Other semantic properties associated with prenominal adjectives in Romance, and thus with direct modification, are non-intersectivity, and ‘central property modification’; whereas indirect modification would additionally cluster with intersectivity and ‘referent modification’ (cf. Katz 2008:3f.).

⁴ This corresponds exactly to the main observation about adnominal adjectives and their semantics since the seminal work of Bolinger (1967): “The systematic but often subtle difference between pronominal and postnominal adjectives first noted by Bolinger (1967) in many respects remain poorly understood. […] This paper focuses on one difference of this sort that occurs in both these murky domains: for both adjectives and adverbs, nonrestrictive interpretations are possible without resort to parenthetical intonation only in pre-head positions” (Morzycki 2008:1).
(c) I volea demò rampeèr su per la crepes autes e they wanted only climb up along the.F.SG mountain.F.PL tall.F.PL and ertes de l’India.
steep.F.PL of the India
= absolute; ‘the mountains in India are all tall and steep and they wanted to climb them all’

(4) Indirect modification N-A: Lazy Agreement on the noun (Rasom 2008:31ff.):
(a) La steila invisiboles de Andromeda les é n muie dalènc.
the.F.SG star.F.SG invisible-.F.PL of Andromeda CL are very distant
= stage level; ‘there are some stars of Andromeda’s which are (now) invisible and these are very far’
(b) La ora stufouses de Ferrari I se les recorda duc.
the.F.SG hour.F.SG boring.F.PL of Ferrari they themselves them remember all
= restrictive; ‘all remember those lessons of Ferrari’s which were boring (but not all were so)’
(c) I volea demò rampeèr su per la crepa autes e they wanted only climb up along the.F.SG mountain.F.SG tall.F.PL and ertes de l’India.
Steep.F.PL of the India
= relative; ‘they wanted to climb only those mountains of India which are tall and steep’

In contrast, Lazy Agreement on the adjective, as for example in (5), has nothing to do with the disambiguation of different semantic interpretations; it is a purely syntactic phenomenon which, according to Rasom (2008), depends on the position of the adjective:

(5) Direct modification A-N: Lazy Agreement on the adjective (Rasom 2008:31ff.):
(a) La invisibola steiles de Andromeda les é n muie dalènc.
the.F.SG invisible.F.SG star.F.PL of Andromeda CL are very distant
= individual level; ‘Andromeda’s star are all invisible and very far’
(b) La stufousa ores de Ferrari I se les recorda duc.
the.F.SG boring.F.SG hour.F.PL of Ferrari they themselves them remember all
= non-restrictive; ‘all classes of Ferrari were boring and they remember all of them’
(c) I volea demò rampeèr su per la auta e erta they wanted only climb up along the.F.SG tall.F.SG and steep.F.SG crepes de l’India.
mountain.F.PL of the India
= absolute; ‘the mountains in India are all tall and steep and they wanted to climb them all’

Based on these data and in line with Elwert (1943:113) and Haiman & Benincà (1992:219ff.), Rasom (2008:39) assumes for Fassano that elements which are not in the last

---

5 Cf.: “There are a number of northern Italian dialects […] in which plurality is marked only once within noun phrases whose heads are feminine plural. This situation seems to be characteristic of almost all Ladin dialects, with the exception of Badiot. (Friulian seems to have this feature also, but, as we shall argue, does not.) Nevertheless, it is not an exclusively Ladin feature. (Rohlfs 1949: II, 47 indicates Bagnone, Villafranca, Isolaccia, Livigno, Val Colla, Mesolcina, and Bergell outside the Ladin area of Rhaeto-Romance with this same feature of ‘lazy agreement’.) In Fassa, Elwert claimed that only the last word within the noun phrase marks number (Elwert 1943: 113), whether this word is the head noun […] or the adjective […]” (Haiman & Benincà 1992:219; their emphasis).
head of the DP do not receive number marking. Thus, as in (5) the adjectives are prenominal, they are not “DP-final” and therefore they are not marked for number. In contrast to this, the adjectives in (3) and (4) are “DP-final” and show number marking. This hypothesis is expressed by the second part of the LCH:

(6) **Lazy Concord Hypothesis (LCH)** (Rasom 2008:39):

(a) “In Ladin the morphology of lazy concord on the noun disambiguates the potentially ambiguous interpretation of postnominal adjectives present in the Romance languages;

(b) lazy concord on adjectives instead exclusively depends on their syntactic position.”

Fassano shows three different agreement patterns for adnominal adjectives, i.e. there is one specific agreement pattern for each attested ‘modification-word order type’. In the case of the postnominal adjectives, we can say that it is morphology which disambiguates the two possible readings, as syntax fails in doing it. According to Rasom (2006, 2008), if the N-A-complex shows the -es/-es pattern, the interpretation of the postnominal adjective must be individual level, non-restrictive or absolute, whereas if it inflects according to the pattern -a/-es, the postnominal adjective can only be stage level, restrictive or relative. In this case, semantics seemingly meets morphology in the sense that it is morphology (not syntax) which disambiguates the respective readings.

The two different word order and agreement patterns we find with direct modification readings cannot be explained along this line, because for them, according to Rasom (2006, 2008), the semantic interpretation is the same. That is, morphology does not disambiguate anything in this case. Thus, there must be a syntactic reason which yields to the different adjective inflection and to different word order. This interpretation of the Fassanian data is summarized in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantics</th>
<th>Individual level, non-restrictive, absolute, etc.</th>
<th>Stage level, restrictive, relative, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct modification</td>
<td>N-A</td>
<td>N-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect modification</td>
<td><strong>Lazy Agreement</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lazy Agreement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Morphology</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lazy Agreement</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lazy Agreement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lazy Agreement</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lazy Agreement</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lazy Agreement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on the adjective</td>
<td>on the noun</td>
<td>on the noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>syntactic reason</td>
<td>semantic reason</td>
<td>semantic reason</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantics</th>
<th>Individual level, non-restrictive, absolute, etc.</th>
<th>Stage level, restrictive, relative, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct modification</td>
<td>N-A</td>
<td>N-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect modification</td>
<td><strong>Lazy Agreement</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lazy Agreement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Morphology</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lazy Agreement</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lazy Agreement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lazy Agreement</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lazy Agreement</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lazy Agreement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on the adjective</td>
<td>on the noun</td>
<td>on the noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>syntactic reason</td>
<td>semantic reason</td>
<td>semantic reason</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Occitan (**Provençal Maritime**) and Brazilian Portuguese: Surprising parallels

Incomplete agreement inside complex nominals with adnominal adjectives is a well-known fact in other languages as well, e.g. in German (cf. rotes Röslein ‘red (small) rose’ vs. *rot Röslein, but Röslein rot vs. *Röslein rotes). Yet, also some varieties of Occitan (cf. Durand 1932:28-29; Bayle 1967:32-33; Blanchet 1999:88-89) and of substandard spoken Brazilian Portuguese (**Português Popular**, cf. Scherre 1998, 2001a, b) have incomplete or Lazy Agreement. In these varieties, the noun never inflects for number, number marking occurring

---

6 We will not enter into the discussion whether -a is a gender or a class marker. Neither will we discuss the possible inner structure of the marker -es.

7 Cf. the following quote from Blanchet for the Occitan variety **Provençal Maritime**: “[…] l’adjectif placé juste avant le nom qu’il qualiﬁe s’accorde en nombre avec celui-ci et prend une marque du pluriel […] ; dans toutes les autres positions, l’adjectif est, comme le nom, invariable en nombre (mais il est toujours accordé en
regularly on the determiner. Adnominal adjectives, which are always marked for gender, are marked for plural only in prenominal, but not in postnominal position:

(7) **Provençal Maritime** pre- and postnominal adjectives (cf. Blanchet 1999:89):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A-N</th>
<th>N-A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) lou sourne pantai</td>
<td>(b) lou pantai sourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘the dark dream’</td>
<td>‘the dark dream’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) lei sournei pantai</td>
<td>(d) lei pantai sourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘the dark dreams’</td>
<td>‘the dark dreams’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) la bello fiho</td>
<td>(f) la fiho bello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the.F.SG beautiful.F.SG girl.F.SG</td>
<td>the.F.SG girl.F.SG beautiful.F.SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘the beautiful girl’</td>
<td>‘the beautiful girl’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) lei béllei fiho</td>
<td>(h) lei fiho bello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the.PL beautiful.PL girl.F.SG</td>
<td>the.PL girl.F.SG beautiful.F.SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘the beautiful girls’</td>
<td>‘the beautiful girls’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(8) **Português Popular** pre- and postnominal adjectives (cf. Scherre 1988, 2001a, b):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A-N</th>
<th>N-A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) o novo aluno</td>
<td>(b) o aluno novo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘the new (male) pupil’</td>
<td>‘the new (male) pupil’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) os novos aluno</td>
<td>(d) os aluno novo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘the new (male) pupil’</td>
<td>‘the new (male) pupil’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) a nova aluna</td>
<td>(f) a aluna nova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the.F.SG new.F.SG pupil.F.SG</td>
<td>the.F.SG pupil.F.SG new.F.SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘the new (female) pupil’</td>
<td>‘the new (female) pupil’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) as novas aluna</td>
<td>(h) as aluna nova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the.F.PL new.F.PL pupil.F.SG</td>
<td>the.F.PL pupil.F.SG new.F.SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘the new (female) pupil’</td>
<td>‘the new (female) pupil’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Provençal Maritime we can deduce that the only morphological marking we find in the singular is the “gender” marker -o for feminine adjectives. In the plural forms, the morphological ending of the adjective is -ei in prenominal position. This ending is to be associated exclusively with number, as we do not find any overt gender distinction (cf. (7c) with (7g)). In postnominal position, the plural forms show, however, the same patterns as the corresponding singular forms, i.e. no marking for masculine adjectives and -o-marking for the feminine ones. Thus, we find Lazy Agreement on the adjective in postnominal position and Lazy or Zero Agreement on the noun in both positions, as nouns are invariable in this variety. Nearly the same pattern is observable in Português Popular: Gender is always marked on the adjective and on the noun (at least in these cases), whereas plural is only marked on the prenominal adjective. That is, like in Provençal Maritime, we find Lazy Agreement on the adjective in postnominal position and Lazy or Zero Agreement on the noun in both positions. The difference between our Occitan variety and this variety of Brazilian Portuguese has to do with “gender” marking (cf. table (3)): in Brazilian Portuguese, there is a strict gender distinction, which is not found in the plural forms of the Occitan variety in question.

---

Blanchet 1999:89; ‘the adjective, when placed just before the noun it modifies, agrees in number with the noun and takes a plural marker […]; in all other positions, the adjective, like the noun, is invariable with respect to number (but it always agrees in gender […]).’
Table (3): Agreement patterns Provençal Maritime and Portuguese Popular

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Provençal Maritime</th>
<th>Portuguese Popular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prenominal</td>
<td>postnominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Postnominal</td>
<td>prenominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.sg.</td>
<td>Adjective: Ø</td>
<td>Adjective: -o-Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noun: Ø</td>
<td>Noun: -o-Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fem.sg.</td>
<td>Adjective: -oGEN</td>
<td>Adjective: -a-Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noun: Ø</td>
<td>Noun: -a-Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.pl.</td>
<td>Adjective: -eiNUM</td>
<td>Adjective: -o-s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noun: Ø</td>
<td>Noun: -o-Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Adjective: Ø</td>
<td>Adjective: -a-s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noun: Ø</td>
<td>Noun: -a-Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fem.pl.</td>
<td>Noun: Ø</td>
<td>*Adjective: -a-s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Noun: Ø</td>
<td>Noun: -a-Ø</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even if the Occitan and Brazilian data differ to a considerable extent from the data presented in section 2.1., they are similar to Fassano in showing also different agreement patterns with pre- and postnominal adjectives. But, departing from the semantic description proposed by Rasom (2008) for postnominal adjectives, in contrast to Fassano, in Provençal Maritime and in Portuguese Popular, morphology does not disambiguate anything: both varieties show the same agreement pattern for postnominal adjectives, independently of the corresponding reading. We find different agreement patterns, but only in correlation with different adjective positions. Thus, the first part of Rasom’s Hypothesis in (6) is not applicable to our Provençal Maritime and Portuguese Popular data, in that there is no morphological means of disambiguation between direct and indirect modification readings for postnominal adjectives, while the second part, Lazy Agreement of adnominal adjectives being due to syntactic reasons, could hold for our data as well, with maybe different syntactic triggers.

2.3 French

Overt nominal morphology in French is extremely reduced when compared with other Romance languages, at least in the phonetic code. Plural marking is not overt in adjectives and nouns, with the exception of a small group exhibiting the alternation [-al]SING – [-o]PLUR, e.g. cheval ‘horse’ ~ chevaux ‘horses’. In the overwhelming majority of French DPs, only the determiner carries overt number marking, and (as in the varieties of Occitan and Brazilian Portuguese, but in contrast to Fassano) the last element of the DP is never marked for number. This becomes evident when one takes into account the “liaison facts”. This phenomenon is described as being obligatory for A-N, but only optional and even extremely rare in spoken French for N-A (cf. (9)). Furthermore, there is never liaison between the last element of a noun phrase, e.g. a postnominal adjective, and the following constituent (VP or else), cf. (10).

(9) Liaison in contemporary spoken French: AN and NA (cf. Abeillé & Godard 1999:11):

```
les savantsA anglaisN           le savantsN anglaisA
‘Englishmen who are wise’      ‘wise men from England’
```

(a) [lesavãzãglɛ]                  ? [lesavãzãglɛ]
(b) * [lesavãzãglɛ]                [lesavãzãglɛ]

8 The common point of the varieties presented so far is that the morphological marking with the prenominal adjective seems (only) to be syntactically triggered, yet, with exactly the inverted number marking patterns: Plural marker of prenominal adjectives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Provençal Maritime</th>
<th>Portuguese Popular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fassano: * A-(e)s N-Ø vs. A-Ø N-(e)s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provençal Maritime: A-ei N-Ø vs. * A-Ø N-ei</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portuguese Popular: A-s N-Ø vs. * A-Ø N-s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 Liaison means the overt realisation of a word-final consonant which is not pronounced before a following word-initial consonant, but is realized in front of a following word-initial vowel.

10 This example is cited and discussed in Klein (1982:162), but it probably goes back to Sten (1956:66).
Impossible Liaison between postnominal adjectives and subsequent constituents:

(a) *les amis* | *anglais* | *enormes*
[lez ami | āgle | enɔrm ]
‘the fat English friends’

(b) *les amis* | *anglais* | *ont demandé*
[lez ami | āgle | ɔ̃ dəmādə ]
the.M.PL friend.M.SG English.M.SG have.3PL asked.PTCP
‘the English friends asked’

(c) *les eaux* | *amères* | *anglaises*
[lez o | amer | āglɛz ]
the.F.PL water.F.SG bitter.F.SG English.F.SG
‘the bitter English waters’

In order to describe the underlying syntactic regularities of liaison in French, Lamarche (1991) proposes the following generalizations: *Liaison* is possible between a lexical head and its complement, it is possible and even obligatory between a functional element and the lexical material following it, but it is impossible between a specifier and its head, cf. (11).


(a) possible  (b) obligatory  (c) impossible

This assumption will become important for our proposal on the internal structure of modified noun phrases in Romance (cf. section 3). As stated before, in an A-N-construction, *liaison* is obligatory or at least possible. Therefore we cannot assume a structure like (11c), where the adjective is in [Spec,XP], because it would erroneously predict that the in fact almost obligatory *liaison* between the prenominal adjective and the noun was impossible. In other words, we argue against the assumption that adjectives are in a specifier position, like Cinque (1994), Gallmann (1996), Alexiadou (2001), Rasom (2006, 2008), and many others do.

To sum up, postnominal adjectives in French lack full agreement with the head noun, being not overtly marked for number and, thus, showing no *liaison* with a following constituent (cf. (10)); the same holds for the noun in A-N structures in general (cf. (9) and (10)). Prenominal adjectives, however (cf. (9a)), are fully inflected for gender and number. This can be described as Lazy Agreement with postnominal adjectives in French NPs, due to the morphological defectivity of French nouns, never being overtly marked for number (cf. as well Delfitto/Schroten 1991, Lamarche 1991, Bouchard 2002, against Knittel 2005:219, who erroneously assumes that “any adjective, regardless of its position, must agree with N”).

11 Please note that seemingly overt plural marking, as e.g. *cheval* ‘horse’~ *cheveaux* ‘horses’, is neither productive nor regularly true for all nouns ending in -al, cf. *le festival* ‘the festival’ ~ *les festivals*/*les festivaux* ‘the festivals’.
The morphological pattern we can observe here when it comes to adjectival and nominal number marking is the exact reverse of the Ladinian facts described in section 2.1, but patterns perfectly with the above described varieties of Occitan and Brazilian. First, only the determiner is always marked for number, while it is never marked in Ladinian (except with numerals above ‘2’). Second, prenominal adjectives are overtly marked for number and gender by *liaison*, while they are only marked for gender in Ladinian. Third, postnominal adjectives are not marked for number in French, but are always marked for it in Ladinian.

2.4 Summary of the data

From a morphological point of view, which in previous analyses has not been taken very much systematically into account, we find cross-linguistically different agreement patterns inside nominals with one adnominal adjective, cf. table (4).

Table (4): Overview of the data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantics</th>
<th>Individual level, non-restrictive, absolute, etc.</th>
<th>Stage level, restrictive, relative, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Syntax</td>
<td>Direct modification</td>
<td>Indirect modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphology (Fassano)</td>
<td>m./f.sg</td>
<td>adj.: Noun: -a-es Lazy Agreement on the adjective syntactic reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasom’s Hypothesis</td>
<td>m.pl. f.pl.</td>
<td>noun: Noun: -es Lazy Agreement on the noun semantic reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphology (Provençal Maritime)</td>
<td>m./f.sg. m.pl. f.pl.</td>
<td>-eiNUM/-Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphology (Brazilian Portuguese)</td>
<td>m./f.sg. m.pl. f.pl.</td>
<td>-a-o/-o-Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphology (French)</td>
<td>m.sg. f.sg. m.pl. f.pl.</td>
<td>[z]/Ø cons.+[z]/Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis (Provençal Maritime, Brazilian Portuguese and French)</td>
<td>m.sg. f.sg. m.pl. f.pl.</td>
<td>-o/-o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 *Liaison* after a nominal constituent is impossible in any syntactic context: it is excluded between a lexical subject NP and the following verb: *les amis anglais* _entre* dans la salle* ‘the English friends enter the room’, also between an object complement and other following complements or adjuncts: *J’ai vu les amis anglais* _à Paris* ‘I have seen the English friends in Paris’.
The widespread Spanish pattern, with full gender and number agreement on the determiner, the adnominal adjective and the noun (cf. the bottom of table 4), which we have not mentioned explicitly in the presentation of the data, does not show any different morphological marking for the three possible cases. The “opposite” case to Spanish is Fassano (cf. the top of table 4), where the three possible constructions show three different morphological agreement patterns. Following Rasom (2008), postnominal adjectives in direct or indirect modification are disambiguated morphologically, and prenominal adjectives show a different agreement pattern due to syntactic reasons. Spoken French and some varieties of Occitan and Brazilian Portuguese are somewhere in between Spanish and Fassano: Prenominal adjectives, which can only serve for direct modification, have full gender and number agreement with the determiner, while the noun is defective (no number agreement), which thus results in a special agreement pattern for plural noun phrases, whereas in all other cases we find another pattern, i.e., overt number marking only on the determiner. As there are no different morphological patterns for the two possible readings for postnominal adjectives in these varieties (direct and indirect modification following Cinque 2003, 2005), it seems as if the attested agreement patterns were not due to semantics, i.e. as if morphology did not disambiguate anything.

3. Our analysis

3.1 What we want to argue for and against

Many studies assume a prenominal base generation of the adnominal adjective and derive its postnominal position via N-movement (or even NP-movement)13 to a higher position (e.g. the specifier of a functional projection above N, cf. Cinque 1994, Gallmann 1996, Bernstein 2001, Shlonsky 2004, Radford 2004, chap. 9:367-372, Laenzlinger 2005, Rasom 2008, etc.). These analyses have all one severe shortcoming: there is no clear trigger for this assumed N- or NP-movement; it remains totally unclear why in some structures the N should move and in others it would not. Especially if the raising analysis is motivated by morphological reasons (cf. Bernstein 1991, 1993 who assumes a strong number feature for French N’s which thus have to move to a higher functional projection NumP), the cases of A-N remain unexplained, given that all French nouns are assumed to have a strong number feature to check (cf. Knittel 2005:197, Boucher 2006:44). Cinque’s proposal seems to have a strong descriptive, yet rather idiosyncratic power, as he proposes that N-raising is motivated by certain semantic features on the respective N (e.g. [size]), which attracts N in some cases and in some languages and in others not (cf. in French vs. Germanic; for a detailed discussion see also Boucher 2006:47f.).

The complex morphological facts presented above constitute another severe problem for existing proposals concerning adnominal adjectives. Agreement can be conceived of as a ‘probing’ process between a functional head and a c-commanded lexical constituent in recent versions of minimalism. Now, let us assume for the moment that a functional head F₁ contains the adnominal adjective and is located above N. This functional head has a so-called probe, i.e. a complex of unvalued gender and number features. N has valued gender and number features and can be found by the probe in F via strict c-command. The features in the F₁-probe get valued and N becomes mobile, leading to optional N-movement, so that we can obtain both attested orders, A+N (e.g. Sp. grandes casas) or N+A (e.g. Sp. casas grandes) after AGREE. Yet, this analysis has at least one problem: it is not able to explain the morphological differences in our French, Occitan or substandard Brazilian Portuguese varieties, where postnominal adjectives show only partial or even complete lack of agreement.

---

with the noun. If all adjectives were generated prenominally and if there were a probe in F₁ looking for the features of N, it would always find it, always get valued, so that we could not account for the lack of agreement only in postnominal adjectives.

In order to look for a possible syntactic implementation or an explanation of the semantic correlates of the discussed adjective ordering phenomena in Romance, especially in French, Bouchard (1998, 2002) proposes the following principle: At least for Romance, it looks like if prenominal adjectives form a kind of ‘incorporation’ structure or a complex head AN, whereas prototypical postnominal adjectives are complete APs, base-generated in postnominal position. Whatever problematic this proposal may be in some detail (cf. Knittel 2005:203), it correctly excludes a parallel or even identical syntactic analysis for the two possible orders A-N and N-A (cf. Lamarche 1991:224ff.), because for these as well as for other cases of adnominal adjectives (cf. Knittel 2005:206-213), it can be observed that “meaning change and syntactic change are two sides of the same phenomenon” (Knittel 2005:213). Thus, one central question in the discussion of adnominal adjectives in Romance languages is if there are one or two or even more basic positions for pre- and postnominal adnominal adjectives. If we take into account the considerable semantic differences between pre- and postnominal adjectives together with the fact that prenominal adjectives cannot be complete phrases, i.e. heads with their complements, in Romance, the assumption of at least two basically different adjective positions seems more than plausible and has often been, in fact, proposed in the literature (‘prenominal adjectival heads vs. postnominal full projections of AP’, cf. for further details Lamarche 1991, Bouchard 1998, 2002, Demonte 2005, Boucher 2006).

In what follows, we will therefore show that A-N with ‘direct modification’ and N-A with ‘indirect modification’ reading of A are actually two different constructions with two different underlying constituent orders. Only N-A with a ‘direct modification’ reading has to be derived from the same underlying order as A-N, including some (optional) movement operations. We will furthermore motivate the different orders by semantic factors leading to different ‘dependency relations’ between N and its modifying A as to their interpretation, explaining the observable differences between ‘non-restrictivity’ and ‘restrictivity’ of A.

### 3.2 Direct modification: Prenominal and postnominal adjectives (‘all Ns are A’)

For the adjective projection and the nominal one, we propose in general a shell analysis, i.e. we divide them into a lexical NP and AP and a functional nP and aP or ModifierPhrase (ModifP). The ordering of the respective heads differs with respect to whether a structure with a direct or an indirect modification is derived. For direct modification, we depart from the structure in (12a).

---

14 Both Demonte (2005) and Katz (2008) argue convincingly against the existence of the ‘ambiguity’ for postnominal As, reducing the ‘direct modification’ reading of some postnominal As to pragmatic factors which can easily be cancelled. Speakers of Italian and Spanish prefer by large prenominal position for adjectives without a restrictive reading (cf. Katz 2008:21f.). This would be then an argument against the existence of N-A-order with a ‘direct modification’ reading for A and against the rather unmotivated optionality of movement in our analysis, cf. section 2.3, and in favour of the ‘corresponding hypothesis’ of word-order and adjective interpretation (cf. Bouchard 1998, 2002, Demonte 2005, Katz 2008). We cannot go deeper into this problematic point in the interest of space, but consider it a subject worth an intense discussion.

15 We follow in this first Larson (1988) for vP-shells, where “little v°”, which takes the lexical VP as its complement, can be considered the place where a simple predicate turns into a situation or an event, including a time variable. Lexical verbs can only become the predicate of a sentence if they get incorporated into “little v°” (cf. the idea of calling it “predication phrase” following Bowers 1993 in Remberger 2006:62-75). Second, we follow Radford (2004:368) in assuming also nP-shells. We will not go here into the details of theta role assignment inside nominals, but we will assume the existence of “little n°” with a parallel semantic function to “little v°”: “little n°” determines the ‘ontological class’ of the intended exponent of a simple lexical property denoted by N (mass or count, animate or inanimate etc.).
We assume that $A^o$, which has only lexical features, is selected by $\text{Modif}^o$ (= $a^o$) and incorporates there via head-to-head-movement in order to function as a modifier (cf. step ①). $\text{Modif}^o$ has grammatical as well as semantic features. The grammatical ones are the unvalued gender and number features for agreement with the noun it modifies, which must be valued during the syntactic derivation. The semantic feature which can be paraphrased by ‘denote a predicate with regard to $X$’ can be understood as a context operator binding the open variable in $A^o$ for the (contextually) correct interpretation of the property denoted by the adjective. A property like CUTE, for example, can be interpreted as ‘likeable’ or ‘good looking’.

What is important as to the variable of prenominal adjectives is that its value is never an independent part “of the descriptive content of the sentence”, and it is never independent of the variable in $N^o$ (cf. Katz 2008:4, Morzycki 2008:15). As nouns with adjectives in direct modification behave like contextually given plural NPs with a contextually fixed variable, we assume that their variable is valued by a kind of semantic agree between $N^o$ and $\text{Modif}^o$: $N^o$ is purely lexical (e.g. ‘daugtherish’) and (just like $A^o$) it ‘denotes a predicate with regard to $X$’. Thus, we assume that it has a “semantic probe” looking for a context operator in order to get its variable fixed (e.g. ‘daughterish with respect to physical aspect’). One of our main assumptions is that due to this reason, $N^o$ c-selects $\text{Modif}^o$ in cases of direct modification (cf. (12a)). Both, $N^o$ and $A^o$ via $\text{Modif}^o$ have to share the same ‘respect’ according to which $A$ and $N$ have to be interpreted. Therefore the “semantic probe” in $N^o$ searches and finds the context operator in $\text{Modif}^o$ (cf. step ② in (12a)), whose value is copied onto the probe, binding the variable in $N^o$ (cf. step ③ in (12b)). For successful agree, the open gender feature in $\text{Modif}^o$ gets instantiated by the probe carrying category (cf. step ④ in (12b)).

After agreement, the goal is free for movement, but this movement is optional (cf. also llegaron dos hombres vs. dos hombres llegaron, Mensching & Remberger 2006). In the case of prenominal adjectives, the complex head $\text{Modif}^o$ incorporates into $N^o$. For postnominal adjectives with a direct modification reading, we assume that $\text{Modif}^o$ stays in situ.

---

16 Cf.: “In particular, they presuppose that all of the individuals that instantiate the property denoted by the noun-phrase uniformly also instantiate the property denoted by the adjective” (Katz 2008:22f.).

17 “I suggest an understanding of this in which a nonrestrictive modifier is predicated of something like a contextually-restricted definite description” (Morzycki 2008:22).
3.2.1 Prenominal adjectives

As already mentioned, after Agree between N° and Modif°, Modif° is “mobile” and incorporates in N° in the case of prenominal adjectives. After this step, “little n°” enters the syntactic derivation and selects NP as its complement. Its principled function is the determination of the ‘ontological class’ of the intended referent of a simple lexical property denoted by N (e.g. mass or count, animate or inanimate etc.). NP is the place where essential semantic operations like classification take place, and it has accordingly received a number of different names in the literature (e.g. “classifier phrase” in Picallo 2002, 2005, associated with gender agreement in Romance languages, cf. also Pomino/Stark 2007, or “plural phrase” in Heycock & Zamparelli 2003 related to countability, cf. Link 1983 and Stark 2008). Every lexical N° has to incorporate there in order to get its right ‘classification’.

In the varieties of Occitan and Brazilian Portuguese as well as in French, n° lacks an unvalued number features, it is “defective” (cf. (13)). This is due to the fact that in these languages or varieties, the nouns are never marked for plural number. In Fassano, where the noun is sometimes marked for plural, and in Spanish, where it is always marked for plural, little n° has an unvalued number feature (cf. (15)). The “defective little n°” in the Occitan, Brazilian Portuguese and French varieties in question here compared to the non-defective little n° in Fassano and Spanish yields to a different morphological realisation of the plural marker. This becomes clear if we consider the next step in the derivation, where “little nP” is selected by Num°, a functional head responsible for number agreement outside the nominal, thus always carrying a number feature, and hosting cardinals, weak quantifiers, indefinite articles etc. (cf. Heycock & Zamparelli 2003:11ff.).

(13) Provençal Maritime, Português Popular and French

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Num°} & \quad \text{[pl]} \quad \text{[fem]} \\
\text{nP} & \quad \cdots \quad n' \quad \text{defective} \\
\text{n°} & \quad \cdots \quad \text{NP} \\
\text{N°k} & \quad \text{n°} \quad \cdots \quad \text{N'} \\
\text{Modif°}_j & \quad \text{<physical>}_C \quad \text{[fem]} \\
\text{A°}_{i,p} & \quad \text{[pl]} \quad \text{[fem]} \\
\end{align*}
\]

In (13), the gender probe on Num°, i.e. the unvalued gender feature on a functional head, searches a valued gender feature and finds N° first as a possible goal (cf. step ①), i.e. a c-
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commanded constituent with a matching set of features. The probe, once it has its unvalued feature instantiated by its goal (cf. step 2), “gives away” its number feature. The complex head n° will thus receive the value [plural] (cf. step 3) which is instantiated in Modif°, as it is the only head in this domain with an open number slot (cf. step 4). For the Occitan, Brazilian Portuguese and French varieties, the relevant derivation is finished at this point and we get the expected results (cf. (14)), i.e. the number (and gender) features on Modif° will be realized by a suffix which is bound by the sister head A°. Thus, the prenominal adjective shows full inflection, whereas with the modified noun, we find Lazy or Zero Agreement in this configuration, because “little” n° has no number feature.

(14) Provençal Maritime, Português Popular and French

(a) lebelA°-el°Modif° fihO°-O°n°
(b) as novA°-as°Modif° alunaN°-O°n°
(c) [le belA°-z°Modif° amiN°-O°n°] (vs. *lebelzamis, sg. [labelami])

For Spanish and Fassano, the probing mechanism of Num° is exactly the same (cf. step 1 and 2): N°, which is part of the complex head “little n°”, is found as first potential goal, and complex n° receives the value [plural] (cf. step 3).

(15) Spanish and Fassano

For Spanish and Fassano, the probing mechanism of Num° is exactly the same (cf. step 1 and 2): N°, which is part of the complex head “little n°”, is found as first potential goal, and complex n° receives the value [plural] (cf. step 3).

Yet, in contrast to (13), there are two heads in (15) with open number slots, non-defective n° and Modif°. For Spanish, we assume that the number feature of complex n° “percolates” to both number slots (cf. step 4). Yet, in Fassano, only n° receives the value [pl] (cf. step 5),

---

18 For the general process of AGREE in recent versions of minimalism cf. Chomsky (1998ff.).
19 We assume that in fact the complex head n° receives [plural] and that this feature percolates to all possible slots inside this complex head, i.e. n° and Modif° or only Modif° if n° is defective.
because the “feature percolation” onto Modif° is avoided (cf. step ⑨) due to the language specific morphological constraint in (16). Therefore, the number feature on Modif° is instantiated by the default value singular (cf. step ⑩).20

(16) Morphological constraint on adjectives in Fassano:
Adjectives demand a plural exponent only in phrasefinal position (NP or AP complements can follow), if in the scope of a plural feature (cf. Haiman & Benincà 1992:219ff. and fn. 5).

Thus, in Fassano and Spanish (cf. (17)), the noun is fully inflected, i.e. the feature of n° is realized by a suffix, which will be bound by the sister head N°. But, only in Spanish, also the plural feature in Modif° is realized morphologically.

(17) (a) Spanish
las pequeñ A°-asModif° casN°-as_n°
the.F.PL small-F.PL house-F.PL
‘the small houses’
(b) Fassano
la picolA°-aModif° cèSN°-es_n°
the.F.SG small-F.SG house-F.PL
‘the small houses’

3.2.2 Postnominal adjectives
The main difference between prenominal adjectives and postnominal adjectives in direct modification is the fact that Modif° does not incorporate into N°. Yet, the lack of incorporation (together with the (non-)defectivity of n°) has an effect on agreement, because in this case, Modif° is out of the reach of the probe in Num°. For the Occitan, Brazilian Portuguese and French varieties we assume the derivation in (18).

(18) Provençal Maritime, Português Popular and French

---

20 It is also possible that percolation does take place. Yet, assuming a postsyntactic morphological module, the condition in (16) would delete the feature.
As before, the gender probe on Num° finds as a first possible goal N°, and the value [fem] is copied onto the probe (cf. steps ① and ②). Yet, this Agree-relation does not lead to the instantiation of a number feature, because in the probing domain n°, no such a feature is present. Modif° has an unvalued number feature, but, assuming a strictly local probing domain (cf. López Carretero 2007:50ff. for the assumptions on strict local agreement), it is outside of Num°’s reach. In this case, the default value is instantiated (cf. step ③). As a result, neither the postnominal adjective nor the noun are morphologically marked for number.

Let us now turn to Fassano and Spanish, where postnominal adjectives in direct modification show full inflection. The main difference to the above derivation is the presence of the unvalued number feature in n°, cf. (19).

(19) Spanish and Fassano

The goal of the gender probe on Num° is again N°, which is part of “little n°” (cf. steps ① and ②). As in this case “little n°” has an unvalued number feature, it will be filled with the value [plural] (cf. step ③). This leads to full inflection on the noun. At this stage of the derivation, Modif° has still an unvalued number feature. In contrast to Occitan, Brazilian Portuguese and French, this feature can not be filled by the default value, because this would lead to a “misagreement” between the complex n° (which has the value [plural]) and the complex Modif° (which would have the value [singular]). Notice that both complex heads are bound by an agree relation. Due to this, the number feature of n° percolates downwards to Modif°, where plural is instantiated (cf. step ④). Percolation is here also possible in Fassano, because Modif° is in final position and thus does not contradict the morphological requirement in (16). Yet, this process is not possible in the case of Occitan, Brazilian Portuguese and French, because n° lacks number information.
3.3 Indirect modification: Postnominal adjectives (‘those Ns that are A’)

The main difference between adjectives in direct modification and adjectives in indirect modification is that in the latter case, ModifP is not selected by N°, but NP by Modif°. The reason herefore is that NP denotes a property that has to be compatible with the one denoted by A°/Modif°, but A°/Modif° and N° have to remain independent from each other as to their ‘context operators’. As the descriptive content of postnominal adjectives is part of the descriptive content of the entire sentence, so that the two properties can be interpreted conjunctively, one of the current assumptions for restrictive nominal modifiers (cf. Katz 2008:10), both predicates, N° and A°, have to remain separate, with variables bound by two different context operators. This leads not only to a different syntactic structure (cf. (20)), but also to a different semantic interpretation: In a situation where we want to talk about the daughters of Maria, interpreting the property ‘daugtherish’ under the respect “parental relationship”, in an NP like las hijas hermosas de Maria ‘the cute daughthers of Mary’, CUTE could still be interpreted with regard to the physical aspect of the respective referent, creating thereby a subsection of the referents denoted by the expression the daughters of Maria. CUTE and DAUGHTER are thus two properties which are interpreted in a contextually independent way, from which results a restrictive reading of the (postnominal) adjective.

As in the case of indirect modification Modif° is a selecting head – in direct modification Modif° is a head which is selected – its unvalued gender feature functions as a probe. This probe finds N° as a goal, and the respective value is copied onto the probe (cf. (20)b).

(20) Indirect modification (incomplete)

(a) Before AGREE

(b) After AGREE

Modif°

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{A°}_{i_x} \quad \text{Modif°} \\
<\boldsymbol{X}>_{C} \quad \text{...} \quad \text{A'} \\
[\text{gen}] \quad \text{t}_i \quad \text{NP} \\
[\text{num}] \quad \text{... N_y} \quad <\boldsymbol{Y}>_{C} \\
\end{array}
\]

head-to-head movement

Modif°

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{A°}_{i_x} \quad \text{Modif°} \\
<\boldsymbol{X}>_{C} \quad \text{...} \quad \text{A'} \\
[\text{fem}] \quad \text{t}_i \quad \text{NP} \\
[\text{num}] \quad \text{... N_y} \quad <\boldsymbol{Y}>_{C} \\
\end{array}
\]

ModifP is then selected by n°, and nP by Num°. As we find several differences cross-linguistically in these steps of the derivation, we treat the languages at issue separately. We start with the Occitan, Brazilian Portuguese and French varieties, where the postnominal adjective does never inflect for number.
Again, the gender probe on Num° finds N° as a possible goal, and the value [fem] is copied onto the probe (cf. step ②). The probe would like to distribute its number value, but as there is no open slot for it in its local domain, nothing happens. The unvalued number feature on Modif° does not get valued by the Num° probe, as it is structurally too distant for the probe to be found, and, like before, it will therefore instantiate the default value, i.e. singular (cf. step ③). Thus, as expected, plural number is only marked on indefinite articles, weak quantifiers etc., i.e. all possible elements being merged in Num°, and, via agree, also on definite determiners, which are merged somewhere higher in the structure.21

In the corresponding derivation for Spanish (cf. (22)), the gender probe of Num° finds N° as a goal, too (cf. step ②). Yet, as in this case n° is non-defective, [plural] gets instantiated (cf. step ③). Then the plural feature of n° will again “percolate” down to the open number feature of Modif° (cf. step ④), because this feature can not be filled by the default value, as this would lead to a “misagreement” between the complex n° (which has the value [plural]) and the complex Modif° (which would have the value [singular]). Notice that both complex heads are bound again by an agree relation and, thus, percolation is possible. As expected, the noun as well as the adjective are marked for number and “gender”.

21 Note that feature percolation, in contrast to the probing mechanism, is not directionally restricted. That is, features can percolate up- and downwards (cf. Rasom 2008:82).
Let us now turn to Fassano where the nouns are not generally defective. But, in case of postnominal adjectives with an indirect modification reading, i.e. a restrictive reading which only conjunctively together with the reading of N° creates the property denotation of the complex nominal, they appear without overt number marking. They also appear without overt number marking in nominals with a collective reading and with a partitive reading:

In (23b), where the noun has no number marking, we get a collective reading. And in (23d), the partitive de is redundant or impossible, because partitive reading is already obtained by Lazy Agreement on the noun. Thus, it seems as if the “little” Fassano n° with incorporated N°s in these cases is defective in that it does not classify Ns as countable units. This phenomenon is parallel to singular NPs e.g. in Brazilian Portuguese (cf. Munn & Schmitt 2005) with a collective reading. We thus assume that n° in all these cases lacks an unvalued number feature which leads to the following derivation:

---

22 In (23c) partitive de is impossible for other reasons which we can not expose here (cf. Rasom 2008 chapt. III, section 2.2 for a detailed discussion).
The probe on Num° cannot instantiate [plural] in its probing domain, because n° does not have such a slot, like in the Occitan, Brazilian Portuguese and French varieties (cf. (21)). Yet, the number feature of Modif° has to be valued somehow. In contrast to the mentioned varieties, we cannot decide about a potential default number instantiation in Modif°, because the morphological rule in (16) always demands a plural exponent in phrasefinal adjectives if they are in the scope of a plural feature. That is, in the case of Fassano, [plural] is instantiated in Modif° (cf. step 3).23 As a result, the noun appears without and the adjective with number marking.

4. Conclusion

We have presented in this paper a syntactic analysis based on the “probe-and-phase model” (Chomsky 1998ff.) of adnominal adjectives in different Romance languages and varieties, which not only show different word-order types corresponding partially or completely to different semantic interpretation types of the respective adjectives (roughly prenominal = direct modification; postnominal = indirect modification), but also different agreement patterns. The most complex agreement pattern is found in Fassano in feminine nominals: in prenominal position, the adjective lacks number marking, whereas the noun is fully inflected. In postnominal position, the adjective is always fully inflected, but only in case of direct modification the noun is fully inflected, too. Otherwise (i.e. in indirect modification), the noun lacks number marking. In the Occitan variety Provençal Maritime, in substandard spoken Brazilian Portuguese as well as in spoken French, the adjective inflects for number only in prenominal position, while the noun is invariable. The last and also the most redundant pattern we have considered is the well-known Spanish one, where the adjective and the noun show full inflection in all cases, at least in Standard Spanish.

Our analysis assumes two different underlying head-orderings for the two main interpretation types: N° selecting a functional projection over A°, “little a” or Modif°, in the

23 It is also possible that, in syntax, [singular] gets instantiated in Modif°. Yet, assuming postsyntactic morphological processes, the morphological rule in (16) would overwrite this feature with the value [plural].
case of a shared contextually bound variable of $N^\circ$ and $A^\circ$, leading to non-restrictivity of $A^\circ$, or $\text{Modif}^\circ$ selecting $\text{NP}$, which has its own context operator binding its variable, independently from $\text{Modif}^\circ$ and $A^\circ$, which leads to a possible conjunctive interpretation of $\text{NA}$, yielding a restrictive interpretation. Two agreement operations between $\text{Modif}^\circ$ and $N^\circ$ (with semantically motivated subsequent N-movement + incorporation) and $\text{Num}^\circ$ and the complex expression located in “little $n^\circ$” (where $N^\circ$ always has to incorporate) and interlinguistic variation in the feature structure of $N^\circ$ and $n^\circ$ respectively (both being defective in certain varieties of Occitan, Brazilian Portuguese and French vs. non-defectivity in Spanish and Fassano) explained the different agreement patterns observable in Romance. Different word orders (A-N vs. N-A) are the result of semantically motivated different basic head-orderings, and only one – though disputable – type, N-A with a “direct modification” reading of A, is the result of a non-realized optional movement of N. Please note that in sharp contrast to existing analyses, our analysis starts from base-generated N-A in order to derive A-N, with semantically motivated A$^\circ$- or Modif$^\circ$-movement, and vice versa from A-N, in order to derive N-A, assuming semantically motivated N-movement. The different morphological patterns result in all these cases from different syntactic structures and operations, which are, in turn, partially semantically motivated.

Table (5) gives a final overview over the differences between and the common features of the analyzed languages. As one can see, the main difference lies in the defectivity of “little $n^\circ$”. If this functional category is non-defective, e.g. in Spanish, [pl] gets instantiated and percolates to all the heads with open number slots $n^\circ$ dominates (via complex head or c-command). In Fassano, due to the morphological requirement that adjectives cannot be marked with -$es$ if not in final position, this percolation is avoided in case of prenominal adjectives. As soon as the functional category $n^\circ$ is defective, [pl] is normally not instantiated, and Modif$^\circ$ receives the default value. Again, Fassano is an exception, because in the special case of postnominal adjectives in indirect modification, the adjective is in final position and inside the scope of Num$^\circ$ with a plural feature. Thus, it is forced to carry the plural marker.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Occ., BP, Fr. varieties</th>
<th>Fassano</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct: A-N</td>
<td>$n^\circ$ defective</td>
<td>[pl]-instantiation in $\text{Modif}^\circ$</td>
<td>non-defective $n^\circ$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[pl]-“percolation” from $n^\circ$ to $\text{Modif}^\circ$</td>
<td>[pl]-“percolation” from $n^\circ$ to Modif$^\circ$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not possible, because Modif$^\circ$ not final</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct: N-A</td>
<td>$n^\circ$ defective</td>
<td>No [pl]-instantiation; (final) Modif$^\circ$ receives default value</td>
<td>non-defective $n^\circ$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[pl]-“percolation” from $n^\circ$ to (final) Modif$^\circ$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect: N-A</td>
<td></td>
<td>No [pl]-instantiation; (final) Modif$^\circ$ receives default value</td>
<td>non-defective $n^\circ$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Modif$^\circ$ receives [pl], because inside scope of Num$^\circ$-[pl]</td>
<td>[pl]-“percolation” from $n^\circ$ to Modif$^\circ$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1 Introduction

The exact denotation of nominalizations based on property-denoting adjectives has been a matter of much concern in formal semantics, where a number of proposals have been suggested in terms of type-shift operations —e.g. the iota operator and its modifications as in Partee (1986)— or equivalent devices —e.g. Chierchia’s (1982) nominalization operator. Yet this interest has been mainly aimed at lexical A-to-N rules, without taking into account the rich gamut of nominal constructions involved. One recent attempt to fill this gap is Friederike Moltmann’s work (Moltmann 2004a, b), which resorts to tropes, a concept borrowed from descriptive metaphysics. For her, the nominalization John’s honesty denotes a trope, defined as a concrete instantiation of a property (that of being honest) in an individual (John). In contrast, the universal honesty would be the abstract representation of all concrete instantiations of the property of being honest (i.e. a kind of trope).

The main goal of this article will be to consider the viability of extending Moltmann’s proposal to Spanish, which, besides the standard deadjectival lexical nominalization (1b), counts with a specialized syntactic nominalizer unique in Romance, the neuter article lo (1c):

(1) (a) Juan es honesto.
   Juan is honest
   ‘Juan is honest.’
(b) la honestidad (de Juan)
   the.F honesty of Juan
   ‘Juan’s honesty’
(c) lo honesto (de Juan)
   LO honest of Juan
   ‘Juan’s honesty’

Since prima facie both standard and lo-nominalizations seem suitable candidates for a trope analysis along the lines suggested by Moltmann for English, we will explore in depth to which extent both constructions denote the very same semantic object. Particularly, building on corpus evidence, I will take as crucial the possibility of deriving tropes from two different sources of property-denoting elements. On the one hand, I will follow standard practice in considering adjectives (honest) to denote properties. On the other hand, I will follow Levinson (1976, 1980) in arguing that bare singular nominalizations (honesty) denote qualities, a more abstract type of attribute. As I will argue, this enrichment of our ontology will allow us to explain not only the disparate behavior of each nominalization construction as regards genericity, but the special mixed behavior of bare abstract nouns in Spanish as

---

* I would like to thank M. Teresa Espinal for her kind invitation to participate in the IV Nereus International Workshop, and for her patience during the manuscript preparation. Moreover, I am indebted to her for pointing out to me the relevance of Friederike Moltmann’s work on tropes to the research on lo-nominalizations that Anna Bartra-Kaufmann and myself have been conducting in the later years. Obviously, as a consequence of this long-term collaboration, Anna’s profound linguistic knowledge and sagacity permeate many parts of this paper, even though all inadequacies can only be attributed to me. I am also indebted with Louise McNally for her intelligent remarks, which have contributed to improve the paper. This research has been supported by grants HUM2006-13295-C02-01/FILO (MEC/FEDER), and 2009SGR1079 (DURSI).
halfway between properties and individuals, as well.

The structure of the article is the following. In section 2, we will introduce Moltmann’s theory of tropes as applied to English deadjectival nominalizations. Then, in section 3, I will consider in some detail the empirical challenges that Spanish poses to Moltmann’s treatment of nominalizations. Section 4 will then be devoted to presenting my alternative proposal, which combines the trope analysis with the property-quality distinction originally developed by Jerrold Levinson. Finally, section 5 will provide the main conclusions of the article.

2 Tropes

Let us begin with the very concept of trope:

A trope is an instance or bit (not an exemplification) of a property or a relation; e.g. Clinton’s eloquence, Sydney’s beauty, or Pierre’s love of Heloïse. Clinton’s eloquence is understood here not as Clinton’s participating in the universal eloquence, nor as the peculiar quality of Clinton’s eloquence, but simply as Clinton’s bit of eloquence, the eloquence that he and he alone has. Similarly, Pierre’s love is not his participation in love as such, nor the special way he loves, but the loving peculiar to Pierre as directed toward Heloïse. 

While the concept of trope has a long tradition in the metaphysical literature (including Plato, Aristotle, Avicenna, Averroës, Thomas, Scotus, Buridan, Suárez, Leibniz, Husserl, and Russell) as denoting a particular instantiation of a universal property in an individual, its development corresponds to the second half of the twentieth century through the work of P. F. Strawson, D. C. Williams (to whom the name *trope* is due), and N. Wolterstorff, among others (Strawson 1953-4, Williams 1953, Wolterstorff 1970). Yet, the linguistic interest in tropes, and particularly its application to the semantics of nominalizations is due to Friederike Moltmann (Moltmann 2004a,b). Her basic idea is that tropes (e.g. John’s honesty) are more concrete entities than the (universal) properties they particularize (that of being honest) in several respects: in particular tropes are entities situated in space and time, just as individuals are. In order to show this, she builds up a series of linguistic tests, which I cannot reproduce in full. Just to help the reader to see her point, I am focusing on three features: spatiotemporal location, causation, and perception.

First, since tropes are particular instantiations of abstract properties, they can be placed on temporal and spatial axes:

(2) John’s happiness lasted only one year.

In contrast, a property cannot get such an interpretation. Therefore, a sentence like

(3) Happiness lasted only one year.

can only be understood as referring to a particular instance of happiness salient enough in the context, not as involving a predication about the abstract property of being happy; as, for example, in the following context:

(4) We married ten years ago. Happiness lasted only one year.
Second, since they are spatiotemporal entities, tropes can participate in causal relations.

(5) The redness of the apple made Mary buy it.

In contrast, properties cannot under any natural reading.

(6) #Redness made Mary buy the apple.

Again, in order to rescue this utterance, we should provide it with a particularized reading salient enough in the context, as in the following case:

(7) Those apples were juicy, and crispy, but it was (their) redness that made Mary buy them.

Finally, tropes and properties contrast with respect to perception: the former can be perceived; the latter cannot. So then one can naturally realize or observe or note the redness of an apple, but one cannot realize or observe or note redness aside from an individual instantiating it. That’s why to make the following sentences coherent, we systematically attribute the nominal a particularized reading through a contextually salient referent.

(8) John realized/observed/noted redness (#in that apple).

To sum up, the picture stemming from Moltmann (2004a,b) introduces a new ontological category, tropes, which are typically realized by means of deadjectival nominalizations with a complement introducing the individual which the property applies to. Moreover, just like individuals, tropes may construct a corresponding kind, which we represent by means of bare nominalizations: honesty. Schematically:

| Table (1): Range of entities in Moltmann’s analysis |
| trope | individual | quantity |
| kind | honesty | tigers | water |
| particular | John’s honesty | this tiger | this water |

Interesting as it is, Moltmann’s treatment of nominalizations heavily relies on the behavior of nominalizations in English. In the following section, I will show that when we move to Spanish, a major refinement is needed, involving a distinction between properties and qualities.

3 The Spanish Case

3.1 Spanish nominalization structures

Moltmann’s analysis runs into trouble when we move from English to Spanish, for in the latter language, the range of nominalizing possibilities increases dramatically.\(^1\) I will

---

\(^1\) Another problem with Moltmann’s analysis lies in her treatment of bare nominalizations as kind of tropes, for it is grounded on the fact that bare mass nouns in English can denote kinds. Obviously, this is a major shortcoming when we move to Romance, where bare nouns in general, and bare nominalizations in particular cannot have a kind reading:

(i) (a) En este país, abunda *(la) banalidad.
    ‘In this country, banality abounds.’

(b) En este país, hace años que se extinguió *(la) puntualidad.
    ‘In this country, punctuality became extinct many years ago.’
concentrate on adjective *lo*-nominalizations, which have been described as involving two different interpretations (see Bosque & Moreno 1990 and Leonetti 1999).\textsuperscript{2} The first one is partitive/referential —*individuative lo* for Bosque & Moreno (1990):

(9) Lo interesante del libro es el primer capítulo.

`The interesting part of the book is the first chapter.'

The second interpretation is quantificational —*qualitative lo* for Bosque & Moreno (1990)— (see Bartra-Kaufmann & Villalba (2006a,b) and Villalba and Bartra-Kaufmann in press):

(10) Me asusta lo peligroso de la empresa.

`It frightens me how risky the enterprise is.'

As the translations make clear, whereas the former refers to a part of the subject which can be characterized by the property denoted by the adjective, the latter involves degree quantification over the scale denoted by the adjective predicated of the subject.

Therefore, the range of dejectival nominalizations in Spanish doubles that of English:

(11) (a) la honestidad (de Juan)

`Juan’s honesty'

(b) lo honesto (de Juan)

`Juan’s honesty'

My next move will be to determine which nominalization mechanism corresponds best to Moltmann’s tropes.

### 3.2 Tropes and Spanish nominalizations

When we consider the linguistic tests devised for tropes by Moltmann (2004a,b) under the light of Spanish nominalizations, the conclusion is that both definite nominalizations, and *lo*-nominalizations should be analyzed as tropes.

Consider first the spatiotemporal locability of both kinds of nominalizations in the following examples from the *Corpus de Referencia del Español Actual* (CREA), available online at [http://corpus.rae.es/creanet.html]:

\textsuperscript{2} The neuter article *lo* works as a wide-range nominalizer in Spanish:

(i) (a) lo justo [property]

`fairness’

(b) lo sucedido ayer [event]

`what happened yesterday’

(c) lo que has comprado [individual]

`what you bought’

(d) lo más alto del rascacielos [location]

`the highest part of the skyscraper’
(12) (a) Todos comentaban lo imposible de aquella imagen afuera…
   ‘Everybody was talking about the impossibility (of having) that image out there…’
   (b) De ahí lo necesario de corregir esta situación.
      ‘Hence the need to correct this situation.’

(13) (a) la sequedad de nuestra país en los meses de diciembre…
   ‘our country’s dryness every December…’
   (b) Me negué en principio, por la inutilidad de aquel viaje.
      ‘First, I refused, because of the uselessness of that travel.’

Consider now the causation test (again, the examples are from the CREA corpus):

(14) (a) La estrechez del camino dificulta el rescate de un vecino.
   ‘The narrowness of the path makes a neighbor’s rescue difficult.’
   (b) habiendo sido rechazadas […] a causa de la limitación de espacio.
      ‘since they were rejected […] due to space limitation.’

(15) (a) debido a lo estrecho de sus calles y andenes
   ‘due to the narrowness of their streets and platforms’
   (b) están obligados a subsistir debido a lo limitado de sus ingresos
      ‘they are condemned to subsistence, due to their meager income’

Here, both nominalization structures pass the test, suggesting they should both be analyzed as involving tropes.

The very same conclusion follows with respect to the perception test (examples from the CREA corpus)

(16) (a) también es capaz de apreciar la belleza de su obra.
   ‘(s)he can also appreciate the beauty of his work.’
   (b) aprendió ver la belleza de las cosas cotidianas.
      ‘(s)he learned to see the beauty of everyday things’

(17) (a) Al ver lo imposible de su amor…
   ‘When (s)he saw the impossibility of his/her love…’
   (b) Como estudiante veo lo necesario de respetar nuestras costumbres.
      ‘As a student, I see that we must respect our traditions.’

Again, no difference exists between definite and lo-nominalizations, which suggests that both denote tropes, in Moltmann’s sense.
3.3 Spanish nominalizations and genericity

We have just seen that both kinds of nominalizations pass Moltmann’s trope tests. However, a closer examination shows us that they don’t occur in the same contexts. One such context is generic sentences. Consider the following contrasts with typical characterizing predicates yielding generic statements:

(18) (a) En este país, la banalidad de la política suele salpicarlo todo.
in this country the.FEM banality of the.FEM politics uses.to spill.it all
‘In this country, the banality of politics spreads everywhere.’
(b) En este país, la credibilidad de los políticos ya se extinguió.
in this country the.FEM credibility of the.PL politicians already get.extinct
‘In this country, politicians’ credibility get extinct.’

(19) (a) *En este país lo banal de la política suele salpicarlo todo.
in this country LO banal of the.FEM politics uses.to spill.it all
(b) *En este país lo creíble de los políticos ya se extinguió.
in this country LO credibility of the.PL politicians already get.extinct

Whereas definite nominalizations are perfect, *lo*-nominalizations are impossible.\(^3\)

A similar result obtains when we move to individual-level predicates, which as is well-known, typically allow their subjects to obtain a kind reading:

(20) (a) Firemen are altruistic.
    (b) Lions are fierce.

In contrast subjects of stage-level predicates cannot obtain the kind reading, just the specific one:

(21) (a) Firemen are available.
    (b) Lions are hungry.

In Spanish, this contrast correlates with the use of a particular copulative verb: *ser* ‘to be’ for individual and *estar* ‘to be’ for stage-level predicates.\(^4\) Consider the Spanish version of the above examples:

(22) (a) Los bomberos son generosos.
    the.PL firemen are altruistic.PL
(b) Los leones son fieros.
    the.PL lions are fierce.PL

(23) (a) Los bomberos están disponibles.
    the.PL firemen are available.PL
(b) Los leones están hambrientos.
    the.PL lions are hungry.PL

\(^3\) Crucially, we are considering nominalizations with a PP complement, which denote tropes. If we suppress the PP, the nominalizations denote kinds of tropes, and consequently may appear in generic environments. See section 4.2 below.

\(^4\) Even though a fairly reliable test, it should be noted that the *ser/estar* alternation doesn’t perfectly match the individual/stage level distinction. See Fernández Leborans (1999: 37.5) and Bosque & Gutiérrez-Rexach (2008: 5.7.1).
As a consequence, if it is the case that only standard nominalizations are amenable to a generic reading, we expect that, under normal conditions, *lo*-nominalizations cannot be the subject of individual-level predicates. This prediction is borne out:

(24) (a) En este país, la banalidad de la política es muy común.
    in this country the.FEM banality of the.FEM politics is very common
    ‘In this country, the banality of politics is very common.’
(b) En este país, la desvergüenza de los políticos es destacable.
    in this country the.FEM shamelessness of the.PL politicians is remarkable
    ‘In this country, the shamelessness of politicians is remarkable.’

(25) (a) *En este país lo banal de la política es muy común.
    in this country LO banal of the.FEM politics is very common
(b) *En este país, lo desvergonzado de los políticos es destacable.
    in this country LO shamelessness of the.PL politicians is remarkable

To reinforce the point, let us consider nominalizations with an intrinsic generic value, like the following:

(26) (a) la pequeñez del hombre/ser humano
    the.FEM smallness of-the man/being human
    ‘the smallness of man/the human being’
(b) la crueldad del hombre/ser humano
    the.FEM cruelty of-the man/being human
    ‘the cruelty of man/the human being’
(c) la inmortalidad del alma
    the.FEM immortality of-the soul
    ‘the immortality of the soul’
(d) la solubilidad del gas
    the.FEM solubility of-the gas
    ‘the solubility of gas’

(27) (a) lo pequeño del hombre/ser humano
    LO small of-the man/being human
    ‘the smallness of man/the human being’
(b) lo cruel del hombre/ser humano
    LO cruel of-the man/being human
    ‘the cruelty of man/the human being’
(c) lo inmortal del alma
    LO immortal of-the soul
    ‘the immortality of the soul’
(d) lo soluble del gas
    the.FEM soluble of-the gas
    ‘the solubility of gas’

All these nominalizations typically favor a generic interpretation; therefore they offer us a good test for determining the degree of abstractness of the semantic objects they denote. Hence, a Google search was carried on March, 12th 2009, which gave the following results (where *standard* refers to standard nominalizations and *lo* to *lo*-nominalizations):
The figures speak for themselves: given the 1/46 ratio favoring standard nominalizations, we cannot conclude that they denote the very same semantic object that lo-nominalizations.

In order to understand these facts, we will argue that both nominalization constructions denote tropes, but of a slightly different character, for they are based on two different property-denoting elements: properties and qualities. This enrichment of our ontology of semantic objects will allow us to cope with the empirical challenge posed by Spanish nominalizations while maintaining the basic insights of Moltmann’s trope analysis.

4 A new analysis: Properties and qualities

The gist of my solution to the empirical challenge posed by Spanish nominalizations is resort to a finer-grained ontology of property-denoting elements, like the one developed by Levinson (1978, 1980) for attributes. Levinson distinguishes three basic levels of attributes. First we have ‘ways of being’, which are typically represented by adjectives (or adverbs, if one include as a subclass ‘ways of acting’). So, if we consider politicians honest, we can say that ‘honest’ is a way of being of politicians:

(28) (a) How are politicians?
    (b) Honest/*Being honest.

Even though this is what one could commonly call a property, Levinson argues that properties are constructed in a different way, namely conceiving the attribute as a condition or a state that an object is in. For instance, one could ask about the honesty of politicians in the following terms:

(29) (a) Which condition/property should politicians satisfy/have?
    (b) (That of) being honest/*(That of) honest.

Obviously, these two objects are tightly related, since the condition is constructed over the former attribute; e.g. one is in the condition of being honest if one is of a certain way, namely honest. Yet, the crucial point is the different way we conceptualize the very same relation: as a way of being (honest) or as a condition that an object is in (being honest), which, as pointed out to me by Louise McNally (p.c.), seems to amount to building properties over states.

Yet the picture becomes more complicated when we consider another kind of attribute that
has commonly being analyzed as a property: deadjectival nominalizations like *honesty*. Levinson argues that these nominals, which he names *qualities*, denote an *abstract substance*, similarly to concrete mass nouns.\(^5\) Hence, he notes (Levinson 1978: 10):

One difference between being blue, being patient, being charitable, etc., which Wolstertorff recognizes but unaccountably dismisses as insignificant, is that the latter seem to admit of quantization, whereas the former do not. We can speak of an *abundance* of charity in a community, of displaying *much* patience, of one’s tie having *more* redness than another—but not of an abundance of being charitable, of displaying much being patient, of having more being red. A person can possess *some* tenacity but not *some* being tenacious. Qualities thus show themselves as differing from properties in being somewhat substance-like, in that varied amounts of them can be doled or parcelled out in a particular instance.

Hence, if we incorporate qualities into the picture, we obtain the following typology:\(^6\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>attribute</th>
<th>denotation</th>
<th>example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adjective</td>
<td>‘way of being’</td>
<td><em>honest</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>property</td>
<td>‘condition/state of being in a certain way’</td>
<td><em>being</em> <em>honest</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quality</td>
<td>‘abstract substance’</td>
<td><em>honesty</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once we have introduced Levinson’s typology of attributes, we have the bricks to build an answer to the puzzle posed by the existence of *lo*-nominalizations. The gist of my proposal is to take advantage of the distinction between properties and qualities, as the source of two different kinds of tropes: *property-tropes*, which are realized by means of *lo*-nominalizations, and *quality-tropes*, which are realized by means of standard nominalizations. I will sustain my claim on the following kind of evidence. First, I will show that *lo*-nominalizations cannot receive a ‘substance-like’ reading, in accordance with their property-status, while standard nominalizations can. Then I will show that the quality-property distinction helps us to reinterpret the contrast in the generic reading of nominalizations described in 3.3. Finally, I will show that this finer-grained typology of attributes paves the way for an account of the mixed behavior of bare nominalizations, which seem to share features of both properties and individuals.

### 4.1 Conditions and substances

If we apply Levinson’s distinction between properties and qualities to the Spanish catalog of nominalizations, one can easily expect *lo*-nominalizations to correspond to *property-tropes* and standard nominalizations to *quality-tropes*. If this move is correct, we only expect the latter to admit quantization, which is the case:

---

\(^5\) It should be noted that Levinson, in recent work (Levinson 2006), has changed his mind on the issue and denies the very existence of qualities (and tropes).

\(^6\) As noted by Louise McNally (p.c.), it would be interesting to place into this picture the distinction that Chierchia (1982) makes between properties and their entity correlates. I leave this issue for future research.

\(^7\) Levinson doesn’t use a specific label for this kind of attribute, probably for he is interested in the property-quality distinction.
(30) (a) *Lo honesto de los políticos aumenta día a día.
   LO honest of the.PL politicians increases day to day
(b) La honestidad de los políticos aumenta día a día.
   the.FEM honesty of the.PL politicians increases day to day
   ‘The honesty of politicians is increasing everyday.’

(31) (a) *Lo honesto de los políticos es mayor que lo honesto del gobierno.
   LO honest of the.PL politicians is bigger that LO honest of the government
(b) La honestidad de los políticos es mayor que la honestidad del gobierno.
   the.FEM honesty of the.PL politicians is bigger that LO honesty of the government
   ‘The honesty of politicians is bigger than the honesty of the government.’

(32) (a) *Lo honesto de los políticos supera lo honesto del gobierno.
   LO honest of the.PL politicians exceeds LO honest of the government
(b) La honestidad de los políticos supera la honestidad del gobierno.
   the.FEM honesty of the.PL politicians exceeds LO honesty of the government
   ‘The honesty of politicians exceeds the honesty of the government.’

It should be taken into account that the impossibility of conceptualizing property-tropes as quantities of an abstract substance doesn’t entail that the adjective representing them cannot be modified by a few degree words:

(33) Lo poco/*muy/*bastante honesto de los políticos
   LO little/very/quite honest of the.PL politicians

Yet this fact doesn’t seem to improve the sentences above (I disregard the reading where the quantity increased, compared or exceed corresponds to that of the degree word poco ‘little’):

(34) (a) *Lo poco honesto de los políticos aumenta día a día.
   LO little honest of the.PL politicians increases day to day
(b) *Lo poco honesto de los políticos es mayor que lo poco honesto del gobierno.
   LO little honest of the.PL politicians is bigger that LO little honest of the government
(c) *Lo poco honesto de los políticos supera lo poco honesto del gobierno.
   LO little honest of the.PL politicians exceeds LO little honest of the government

Clearly, this behavior suggests that lo-nominalizations don’t denote an abstract substance, in contrast with standard nominalizations.

4.2 Genericity
As discussed at length in 3.3, lo-nominalizations are far less common in generic environments than their corresponding standard counterparts. Yet we didn’t offer an explanation of this disparate behavior. Now we have the formal tools to offer a possible line of solution: the trope analysis plus the property-quality distinction. The idea that I will suggest resorts to the basic
distinction between properties conceived of as conditions objects are in, and qualities, conceived of as universal abstract substances.

As Levinson (1980) argues from a metaphysical point of view, properties and their particular instantiation involve imposing a condition on the way an object is, and hence we create a new state of affairs: e.g. regarding an apple, that of being red. In contrast, qualities in objects involve the possession of particular bits of an abstract substance, which can only be identified with respect to their possessors: e.g. John’s honesty. Even though admittedly speculative, I would like to suggest that the fact that trope properties involve a situated state of affair renders them less suitable to enter into generic statements; for particular states of affairs must be inherently or at least highly contextualized on spatiotemporal basis. In the case of abstract substances we are just dealing with possession, which doesn’t require such a contextualization. That’s why we are prone to consider qualities, for instance, in persons, as atemporal features one possesses.

Even though tentative, this line of reasoning fits in with what the corpus survey told us in 3.3 (see Table 2). We are not saying that property-tropes (realized by means of lo-nominalizations) cannot appear in generic statements, but rather that we expect them to be far less suitable for this task than quality tropes.

Finally, to reinforce our point, just note that once we eliminate the PP complement of the nominalizations, we obtain a kind of trope (be it a property trope or a quality trope), so that the inclusion in generic statements becomes possible for lo-nominalizations. Consider the following example from the novel Tu rostro mañana. 1 Fiebre y lanza by Javier Marías:

(35) Hoy se aborrece lo definitivo y seguro y en consecuencia lo ya fijado en el tiempo
    ‘Today people hate definitive and sure things and, as a consequence, what is already fixed on time.’

Here, the kind reading of the lo-nominalizations perfectly fits in with the generic nature of the sentence, which shows two prototypical features of generic statements: present tense, and impersonality. This impression gets easily confirmed when one considers typical Spanish sayings:

(36) (a) Lo cortés no quita lo valiente
    ‘Being polite is compatible with being brave.’
(b) Lo bueno si breve, dos veces bueno
    ‘Good things, when short, are twice as good.’

8 The substance-bit-like conception of qualities leads Levinson (1980) to consider that qualities must be infinite and independent of the objects that possess it, hence Platonic entities.
Henceforth, the proposed typology of Spanish nominalizations and their denotations is the following:

**Table (4): Typology of Spanish nominalizations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nominalization</th>
<th>denotation</th>
<th>example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>standard quality trope</td>
<td>la honestidad de Juan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kind of quality trope</td>
<td>la honestidad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lo</td>
<td>property trope</td>
<td>lo honesto de Juan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kind of property trope</td>
<td>lo honesto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.3 Bare singular nominalizations between properties and individuals

There is a fast-growing literature arguing for the view that bare nouns (may) denote properties, not kinds (Dobrovie-Sorin et al. 2006, Farkas & de Swart 2003, Espinal & McNally 2007, among others). One major piece of evidence favoring this property-denoting analysis concerns scope, namely mass nouns and count bare singulars lack scope:

(37) (a) No té aigua.  
not has water  
‘(S)he has no water.’/‘(S)he doesn’t have any water.’
(b) Tots tenen aigua.  
all.PL have water  
‘Everybody has (a different quantity of) water.’

(38) (a) No té cotxe.  
not has car  
‘(S)he has no car.’
(b) Tots tenen cotxe.  
all.PL have car  
‘Everybody has a (different) car.’

Standard deadjectival bare nominalizations are scopelessness as well:

(39) (a) No demostró sensatez.  
not showed sense  
‘(S)he showed no sense.’
(b) Todos demostraron sensatez.  
all.PL showed sense  
‘Everybody showed (a different degree of) sense.’

A second argument for the property analysis of bare nominalizations follows from the possibility of obtaining a subkind or type reading:

(i) Jamás había leído unos libros así como esos.  
never had read a.PL books so/like those
(40) (a) Jamás encontré (una) resistencia así/como esa. never encountered a resistance so/like that ‘I never found such a resistance.’
(b) Jamás había bebido (una) agua así/como esa. never had drinken a water so/like that ‘I’d never drunk such a water.’

Bare singulars can barely obtain a subkind/type reading, as expected if they denote properties. This is confirmed by corpus queries. For instance, a search carried on the CREA corpus showed no occurrence of any of the following combinations typically related to subkind/type readings:

(41) (a) resistencia así/parecida/semejante resistance so/similar/similar ‘such a resistance’
(b) amabilidad así/parecida/semejante kindness so/similar/similar ‘such a kindness’
(c) sinceridad así/parecida/semejante sincerity so/similar/similar ‘such a sincerity’
(d) generosidad así/parecida/semejante generosity so/similar/similar ‘such a generosity’

In contrast with the evidence just reviewed for the property-denoting analysis, bare singular nominalizations behave as individuals in several aspects. First, they can be antecedents of pronominal anaphora or of relative clauses:

(42) (a) No pretendía ofrecer resistencia, pero la opuso. not pretended offer resistance but her opposed ‘(S)he didn’t mean to offer resistance, but (s)he did offered it.’
(b) No esperaba amabilidad, pero la recibió a manos llenas. not expected kindness but her received to hands full.PL ‘(S)he didn’t expected any kindness, but (s)he received plenty of it.’

(43) No quiso ofrecer resistencia que se pudiera malinterpretar. not wanted offer resistance that SEcould.be misunderstand ‘(S)he didn’t want to offer resistance that could be misunderstood.’

Second, regardless of the previous evidence for scopelessness, Spanish bare nominalizations do seem to scope out of conditionals, just like indefinites and bare count singulars do:¹⁰

¹⁰ Here, Spanish shows a sharp contrast with a language like Hungarian, which is cited by Farkas & de Swart (2003) as a clear case of the impossibility of bare singulars to scope out of a conditional:

(i) Ha János olvasna ujságot tudná a hireket. if Janos read.COND newspaper.ACC know.COND the news.PL.ACC ‘If Janos read the newspaper he would know the news.’
(44) (a) Si un líquido encuentra (alguna) resistencia, siempre la acabavenciendo.
\[
\text{If a liquid meets (any) resistance, it always ends up overcoming it.}
\]
(b) Si un líquido encuentra una barrera, siempre la acaba venciendo.
\[
\text{If a liquid meets a barrier, it always ends up overcoming it.}
\]
(c) Si buscas piso, siempre lo acabas encontrando.
\[
\text{If you are seeking for a flat, you end up finding it.}
\]

Obviously, since we are dealing here with a variant of donkey anaphora, we should be cautious concerning scope matters. However, the above examples show us that there is some common feature shared by typically quality-denoting (bare singular) nominals and individual denoting ones (indefinites). Crucially, this feature is not special about Spanish nominals, for it is reproduced in kindred languages, like Catalan:

(45) Si un líquido troba (alguna) resistència, sempre l’acaba vencent.
\[
\text{If a liquid meets (any) resistance, it always ends up overcoming it.}
\]

Moreover, it is not a special feature about Spanish pronouns either, for Catalan, which counts with a specialized partitive clitic pronoun which typically pronominalizes bare nominals, must resort to the definite clitic as well, as in the example above. Particularly, Catalan can easily reintroduce the referent of the anaphoric pronoun by means of a right-dislocate, and its form is typically that of an individual-denoting nominal:

(46) Si un líquido troba resistència, sempre l’acaba vencent, aquesta resistència.
\[
\text{If a liquid meets resistance, it always ends up overcoming it, this resistance.}
\]

Now it’s time to fit this mixed behavior of bare singular nominalizations within our enriched typology of attributes, particularly regarding the fact that standard nominalizations denote qualities and quality tropes (a distinction that helped us to explain the genericity facts in 4.2). The key feature is the fact pointed out by Levinson (1980: 110) that, unlike properties, “[q]uality-bits are identified by reference to their bearers, as are pains and sneezes.” In other words, besides its size, John’s honesty can only be distinguished from Mary’s honesty in terms of their attachment to John and Mary, to the extent that one could hardly talk about the very existence of John’s or Mary’s honesty once John or Mary disappear (unlike what happens with material substances like water). Given this tight identity connection between the quality and the individual bearing it, it makes perfect sense to take qualities as semantic objects suited to individualization tasks, possibly as an instance of a general metonymic cognitive process of taking the content by the container. This would give us a cue for their shared behavior with individuals e.g. concerning reference matters. Moreover, while qualities retain those basic features one could standardly associate with property-denoting objects, one can expect them to behave as properties e.g. regarding scope facts.

Even though speculative at best at this very point, if this line of reasoning proved correct, the quality-trope analysis of standard nominalizations in Spanish defended in this article might open a new line of research for a better understanding of the mixed behavior facts reported above.
5. Conclusions

In this article I have considered extending Moltmann’s (2004a,b) trope analysis of English deadjectival nominalizations to Spanish, which has a specialized nominalizer unique in Romance: the neuter \textit{lo} article. I have shown that while \textit{lo}-nominalizations (\textit{lo honesto (de Juan)} ‘(John’s) honesty’) seem to correspond to Moltmann’s tropes and kinds of tropes, the coexistence of standard nominalizations (\textit{la honestidad (de Juan)} ‘(John’s) honesty’) poses an empirical challenge which calls for an enrichment of the ontology of property-denoting items. My solution has followed Jerrold Levinson’s distinction between properties and qualities, the former being represented by \textit{lo}-nominalizations and the later by standard nominalizations. I have shown that this enrichment of our ontology allows us to explain the disparate behavior of each construction in generic statements, while offering a possible explanation for the reported special behavior of bare abstract nouns in Romance, halfway between properties (more accurately, qualities) and individuals.
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