# On the distribution of adjectives in Romanian: the *cel* construction[1]

**Mihaela Marchis & Artemis Alexiadou**
**Universität Stuttgart**

*Abstract*
*This paper deals with the variable position of adjectives in the Romanian DP. As all other Romance languages, Romanian allows for adjectives to appear in both prenominal and post-nominal position. In addition, however, Romanian has a third pattern: the so-called cel construction, in which the adjective in the post-nominal position is preceded by a determiner-like element, cel. This pattern is superficially similar to Determiner Spreading in Greek. In this paper we contrast the cel construction to Greek DS and discuss the similarities and differences between the two. We then present an analysis of cel as involving an appositive specification clause, building on de Vries (2002). We argue that the same structure is also involved in the context of nominal ellipsis, the second environment in which cel is found.*

## 1. Introduction: adjectival modification and cel

As is well known, a general characteristic of Romance languages is that in cases of ambiguous adjectives, pre-nominal placement of adjectives correlates with strictly unambiguous interpretation, while post-nominal placement correlates with ambiguity (Cinque 2005). This is illustrated below with a Romanian example with respect to the ambiguity between the restrictive vs. non-restrictive interpretation of adjectives. In (1a) the post-nominal adjective is ambiguous between a restrictive and a non-restrictive interpretation, while in (1b) the pre-nominal adjective is unambiguously interpreted as non-restrictive.

    (1)    a.    *Legile **importante** n-au fost votate*    (Romanian)
                    laws-the important were not passed
                    "The laws which were important were not passed."

b. ***Importantele*** *legi n-au fost votate*
Important-the laws not have been passed
"Important laws were not passed."
1. all of them were important
2. #The laws which were important were not passed

As Cinque argues in detail, in this respect English and Romance are mirror images of one another, since in English it is the pre-nominal position which is ambiguous between the two interpretations, while the post-nominal one is interpreted as strictly restrictive.

(2)  a. *All of his **unsuitable** acts were condemned*
     b. All of his acts were condemned; they were unsuitable
     c. All of his acts that were unsuitable were condemned
(3)  a. *Every word **unsuitable** was deleted*
     b. #Every word was deleted; they were unsuitable
     c.  Every word that was unsuitable was deleted

In addition to (1), Romanian has a third pattern, illustrated in (4), where the demonstrative article *cel* follows the definite noun and precedes the adjective in post-nominal position (see also Coene 1994, Cornilescu 1992, Cinque 2004). The word order in (4) is strict, i.e. no re-arrangement of the elements (i.e. the DP and the *cel*+Adjective sequence) is permitted:

(4)  *Legile **(cele)** importante n-au fost votate.*
     Laws-the cel important have not been voted.

As (4) contains multiple determiners, it seems superficially similar to Greek Definiteness Spreading (DS) (see (5b) Androutsopoulou 1995, Alexiadou & Wilder 1998 and many others). The behaviour of the adjectives in Greek is similar to that of the English ones in (2)-(3) above. In (5a) the adjective is ambiguous between a restrictive and a non-restrictive interpretation. In (5b), where the post-nominal adjective is obligatorily preceded by a determiner. it is unambiguously interpreted as restrictive.

(5)  a.  *i simandiki nomi*
         "the important laws"
     b.  *i nomi   (afti)  i simandiki*
         "the laws that the important"

Unlike (1a), however, the adjective in (4) is not ambiguous: it is interpreted as restrictive, although it is found in post-nominal position. In this respect

(4) is again similar to DS in Greek. As just mentioned, DS also only involves a restrictive interpretation of the adjective (and see Alexiadou 2001, Kolliakou 2004 and others for further discussion).

We believe that the *cel* construction in Romanian represents the key element for understanding the syntax-semantics interface of post-nominal adjectives in Romance languages. Therefore, in this paper we focus on the nature and distribution of *cel* by comparing this pattern with both Greek DS and post-nominal adjectives in Romance languages.

After introducing the distribution of *cel*, we compare the *cel* construction to Greek DS. We show that in spite of certain similarities between the two constructions, several differences exist, the main one being that *cel* has the status of a maximal projection. We then analyse *cel* strings as an appositive relative clauses with a specification function, building on de Vries (2002), (cf. Cinque 2004). The proposed analysis, departing from Kayne's analysis of adjectives as involving reduced relative clauses, explains the differences between the *cel* construction and DS and argues that the same structure is also involved in the context of nominal ellipsis, the second environment in which *cel* is found.

## *2. Descriptive facts about "cel" in Romanian*
## *2.1 Historical development*

Historically, *cel* is derived from the Latin distal demonstrative *ille* preceded by the demonstrative adverb *ecce*. A number of phonological changes led to the present-day form:

> (6) a. *Cl.Lat. ecce-ĭllum>Late Lat. eccíllum > eccéllum >16th cent. čelu >Mod. Rom. Cel (masc., sg.)*

In Modern Romanian all forms contain an invariant *ce* and an *-l* morpheme which shows inflexion for gender, number and case and which is similar to the definite suffixal article *–l* (Coene, 1994). This is shown in the two tables below:

**Table 1: the *cel* paradigm:**

| Number | Case | masculine | Feminine | neuter |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| singular | N/A | ce**l** | ce**a** | ce**l** |
|  | G/D | ce**lui** | ce**i** | ce**lui** |
| plural | N/A | ce**i** | ce**le** | ce**le** |
|  | G/D | ce**lor** | ce**lor** | ce**lor** |

**Table 2: The definite article**

| Number | Case | masculine | Feminine | neuter |
|--------|------|-----------|----------|--------|
| singular | N/A | Băiat-**ul** | Fat-**a** | Tablo-**ul** |
| | G/D | Băiatu-**lui** | Fete-**i** | Tablou-**lui** |
| plural | N/A | Băieți-**i** | Fete-**le** | Tablouri-**le** |
| | G/D | Băieți-**lor** | Fete-**lor** | Tablouri-**lor** |

## 2.2 The distribution of "cel" in Romanian

There are two main environments in which *cel* is found in Romanian: following a lexically expressed noun and in the absence of a lexically expressed noun. In both cases, it can precede adjectives, cardinals PPs, and superlatives. The former environment is restricted by two conditions. First, *cel* is an optional element. Second, the noun obligatorily takes a suffixal definite article when it precedes the *cel*. This means that *cel* cannot occur in indefinite NPs (7b), in NPs with preposed demonstratives (7c), in front of the noun without an article (7d), but it is fine in NPs with post-posed possessives (preceded by N + suffixal definite article, (7e)):

(7) a. *băiatul (cel) frumos*
     boy-the cel beautiful
     "the boy cel nice"

  b. *\*un om cel rău*
     a man cel bad

  c. *\*acest om cel rău*
      this man cel bad

  d. *\*cel rău om*
     cel bad man

  e. *fiul    meu cel mic*
     "son-the my  cel younger"

The latter environment, all elements preceded by *cel* agree in phi-features (gender, number, case) with it, an has been described as a case of nominal ellipsis:[2][3]

---

[2] Both our anonymous reviewers point out that *cel* can precede cardinals as well, suggesting that it has a head status. see (ib). Note that (ib) differs in interpretation from (ia):

  (i)    a.    *Am vazut trei băieti.*
              (I) have seen tree boys.
              "I  randomly saw three boy, I don't know who they are. "

      b.    *I-am vazut pe cei trei băieti.*
               Clitic-have seen PE cel three boys
              "I saw those three boys, you know whom I am talking about. "

(8)   a.   *cel frumos*          (adjectives)
           Cel beautiful
           "The beautiful one"
      b.   *cei mai frumoşi*     (superlatives)
           cei most beautiful

Does the *cel* construction involve DS? If so, *cel* should be analysed as a kind of determiner. In principle, such an analysis does not contradict the historical development of *cel*, described in section 2.1. The development of definite articles out of demonstratives is a common path of grammaticalization (see Coene 1994, Giusti 2002).

In the next sections we turn to a comparison of the two constructions.

## 3. Similarities between the cel construction and Greek DS

To begin with, the *cel* pattern, like Greek DS, does not give rise to adjectival ambiguity. We saw in (4) that no ambiguity is present in the *cel* construction. In (9) we provide the further examples for Greek DS. As Kolliakou (2004) discusses in detail, (9a) is ambiguous between two

---

First, (ib) has a restrictive interpretation and triggers the presupposition that the hearer knows about whom the speakers talks. Second, the presence of *cel* in (ib) is associated with the presence of transitive marker *pe* and clitic-doubling which reinforce the specific interpretation of the construction. The problem, however, is why *cel* can precede the cardinal in the presence of the noun, but not an adjective. Vulchanova & Giusti (1998: 338) note that this is also the pattern we find with the demonstrative in Romanian:

    (ii)   *aceste două femei frumoase*

         these   two  women beautiful

Marchis (2007) argued that *cel* is inserted in Spec,DP in such cases to check definiteness, as the numeral itself cannot check this feature. We leave a full description and explanation of the distribution of numerals and demonstratives in Romanian for further research.

[3] As an anonymous reviewer correctly points out, the distribution of *cel* in the context of ellipsis is considerably more extended. The arguments of a head are excluded in the post-nominal construction, but are ok in ellipsis:

    (i)   a.   *dependenţa de părinţi si apoi, cea de droguri.*

         ependence-the of partents, and then cel of drugs

      b.   * *dependenţa cea de  părinţi*

         dependence-the cel of parents

If we are right in analysing cel as part of a reduced relative clause, we can account for the ungrammaticality of (ib) as a reduced relative clause cannot intervene between the head and its complement. The grammaticality of (ia) is also covered by our analysis, as here *cel* behaves similarly to the demonstrative pronoun:

      c.   *copiii fară părinţi si cei/aceia cu unul sigur*

         children without parents and cel/those with a sole one

readings: on reading 1, only the efficient researchers will be fired; on reading 2, the efficient researchers happen to be part of the larger group that will be fired. Crucially, (9b) is not ambiguous, it only has reading 1:[4]

(9)   a.   *o diefthindis ipe oti  i kali erevnites     tha*
            the director said that the efficient researchers will
            *apolithun*
            be fired

      b.   *o diefthindis ipe oti **i** kali **i** erevnites       tha*
            the director said that the efficient the researchers will
            *apolithun*
            be fired

Consider next the *stage level vs. individual level* ambiguity. As discussed in Cinque (2005), in Romance the prenominal adjective has an exclusive individual interpretation, while the post-nominal adjective is ambiguous between an individual and stage reading (10a-b). In English, on the contrary, it is the post-nominal position in which the adjective is unambiguously interpreted as stage level. Importantly, in the *cel* construction the adjective has only the stage level reading, much like the post-nominal adjective in Greek DS (10b)-(11b). In the prenominal position the adjective is ambiguous in Greek, similar to its English counterpart (see Campos & Stavrou 2004, Alexiadou 2006):[5]

---

[4] Our claim was that in Romanian (4) is not ambiguous. As Coene (1994) discusses in detail, adjectives that are exclusively non-restrictive can never be combined with *cel*. However, as correctly pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, there are occurrences of *cel* with proper names and adjectives expressing characterizing properties, which are not restrictive:

   (i)    *Radu cel Frumos*
          Radu cel handsome
   (ii)   *Admiram iarba cea verde*
          I admired grass cel green

Followind Radatz (2001), we take (i) and (ii) to involve lexicalizations of a synthetic construction, hence they constitute a case which does not affect our main argument. Note that patterns like the one in (i) can also be found in language like English e.g. *Alexander the Great*. We leave a full investigation of these constructions for further research.

[5] As an anonymous reviewer points out, a different pattern is found in the case of participles. Here it is the participle with the habitual interpretation that is favored, and not the one with the episodic interpretation:

   (i)    a. ??cartea cea citită aseara
             book.the cel read last night
          b. cartea cea mult citită
             book.the cel much read

(10)   a.    *Luminoasele stele sunt foarte îndepărtate.*
            The stars, which are generally bright, are very far away.

        b.    *Stelele*   **cele**  *vizibile sunt foarte  îndepărtate.*
            The stars which are now visible are far away

(11)   a.    *ta **orata** asteria ine poli makria*
            the visible stars are far away

        1.    stars which are generally visible, are very far

        2.    stars, which happen to be visible now, are very far

        b.    *ta asteria   **ta orata**  ine poli makria*
            the visible the stars are very far

        1.    #stars, which are generally visible, are very far

        2.    stars, which happen to be visible now, are very far

Second, both constructions are similar in that they imply a contrast and are organized around the presupposition/focus distinction; the article-noun sequence constitutes the context or presupposition and the articled adjective constitutes the focus. This is shown in (12a-b) for Greek, see Kolliakou (2004), Campos & Stravou (2004) and in (12c-d) for Romanian. Note that in both languages the Det+N sequence can be omitted (a case of noun ellipsis); in Romanian when the noun is overt, *pe* is impossible:

(12)   a.    *pia pena- ti hrisi i tin asimenia?*       (Greek)
            which pen- the golden or the silver

        b.    *nomizo **tin** asimenia (**tin** pena)*
            I think    the silver the pen

        c.    *Pe care stilou l-ai cumparat,*       (Romanian)
            On which pe Clitic-have you bought,
            *pe cel argintiu sau pe cel auriu?*
            the silver one or the golden one?

        d.    *Cred  ca  pe     **cel** argintiu.*
            I think that pe   cel silver.

Thirdly, both constructions are illicit with non-intersective adjectives such as *former* (as known, these occur strictly pre-nominally in Romance):

(13)   a.    **preşedinte-le cel fost*       (Romanian)
            President-the cel last

---

The data point to the fact that more needs to be said about the type of participle involved (±eventive) and the reasons why *cel* can never combine with an eventive participle. The discussion will lead us too far afield, so we leave it for further research.

b.  *O  monos tu  o  erotas ine i  dulja tu. (Greek)
The only  his the love  is  the work his
"His only love is his work. "

All of the above suggests that the two constructions should be analysed on a par. Though several analyses of the DS pattern exist in the literature, we briefly focus here on the one put forth in Alexiadou & Wilder (1998), building on Kayne (1994). On this analysis, adjectives are generated as predicates within a reduced relative clause, and various movement operations guarantee the surface orders that are available in Greek (14):

(14)  a.  $[_{DP} D [_{CP} [_{IP} DP \ AP]]]^6$
the  the book red
b.  $[_{DP} D [_{CP} AP \ [_{IP} DP \ t ]]] \, '$
the  red  the book
c.  $[_{DP} $ the book $ D [_{CP} AP \ [_{IP} t\,t ]]]$
the  red

According to Alexiadou & Wilder (1998), DS is a sub-case of indirect modification (Sproat & Shih 1988) and hence involves a relative clause analysis, see also recent work by Cinque (2005).[7] But can this analysis be used for Romanian *cel*? (see Cinque 2004 for a proposal along these lines, where he claims that *cel* is a realization of indirect modification). While most researchers (Cornilescu 2005, Campos 2005) agree that the *cel* pattern marks predicative adjectives in Romanian, it is not clear that *cel* has the same status as the definite determiner in Greek.

For instance, Cornilescu (2005: 9) analyses *cel* as a Pred head which

---

[6] As the extra determiner in DS does not introduce new reference, Alexiadou (2006) argues that extra determiners in DS are familiarity markers, much like the cases of object clitic doubling, which involves familiar definite NPs only, see Anagnostopoulou (1994):

(i)  DP1(familiarity/presupposition)[CP....[IPDP2/DefP(definite)]]]

[7] Actually, Alexiadou & Wilder (1998) note that DS cuts across indirect and direct modification. Like the former it involves predicative adjectives, but like the latter it is subject to ordering restrictions.

On syntactic analyses such as Alexiadou & Wilder's and Cinque's, a relative clause is involved only in indirect modification. For cases of direct modification, e.g. *the former president*, a different structure is needed, one in which the adjective is closer to the head noun, see the discussion in the aforementioned papers.

On double source analyses of adjectives, the ambiguity found in (1a) is because in the post-nominal position, the adjective can have both structural base generated positions, i.e. both a reduced relative clause source and a direct modifier source. Movements of certain parts of the structure ensure the surface word order.

selects a non-verbal phrase XP and marks it as a predicate. On this view, *cel* is a functional element which spells out a (+def) feature just like the definite article in Romanian. On this analysis, *cel* selects a non-verbal head and marks it as a predicate.[8]

Obviously, if *cel* is a head in the spirit of Cornilescu (2005), Campos (2005) and Campos and Stavrou (2004), then the constructions with optional post-nominal *cel* represent instances of DS. However, a number of properties suggest that the *cel* construction is not a case of DS, as it involves an XP.

## 4. Differences between DS and the cel construction

Firstly, unlike Greek DS, the presence of *cel* is not obligatory, when the adjective occurs in post-nominal position. When it is present, however, a semantic effect arises, described in section 1.

(15)  a.  *fluture-le  (cel) frumos*
          butterfly-the cel beautiful
      b.  *to vivlio *(to) megalo*
          the book the big

This is unexpected, as the definite article is not an optional element. Furthermore, the fact that the *cel* construction has different semantics from the post-nominal position of adjectives in Romanian casts doubts on a possible analysis of the two patterns as involving similar structures. In this respect, *cel* resembles the optional demonstrative pronoun in DS in Greek which, like *cel*, has a different form from the demonstrative deictic pronoun.

(16)  a.  *i  pena  (**afti**)  i   asimenia*      (Greek)
          the  pen    this  the  silver
      b.  ***afto** to vivlio*
          this the book
      c.  *fluturele **cel** frumos*               (Romanian)
          Butterfly-the cel nice
      d.  *fluturele **acela***
          butterfly-the that

---

[8] A similar proposal is given in Campos (2005) who regards *cel* as a pseudo-article spelled out as a last resort operation in order to check phi-features and EPP.

Secondly, only one *cel* can appear per DP; the definite determiner in DS can have multiple occurrences, if a further adjective is present:

(17)  a.  *fluturele    cel frumos, \*(cel) colorat  si \*(cel) zglobiu*
          butterfly-the cel beautiful, colourful   and   lively
          "the beautiful, colored and lively, butterfly"
     b.  *i petaluda    i orea        i polihromi*
          the butterfly the beautiful the colourful

Thirdly, *cel* does not only precede adjectives but also PPs or other modifiers; this is not possible for Modern Greek DS, though such orders were possible in Classical Greek (18b-c):[9]

(18)  a.  *casa        cea de piatră*
          house.the  cel of stone
     b.  *\*to spiti to apo petra*
          the house the from stone
     c.  *oi anthropoi oi para sou        (Classical Greek)*
          the people    the near you

Fourthly, as already mentioned, the word order is strict, *cel* always follows the definite noun. Greek DS, however, permits word order permutations:

(19)  a.  *to vivlio to kokino*
          the book the red
     b.  *to kokino to vivlio*
          the red   the book

Finally, *cel* behaves like the demonstrative *acest*, in that it is able to have a deictic/anaphoric interpretation. According to Giusti (1994, 2002), the enclitic definite article in Romanian is a mere functional category with no semantic content. Giusti (2002) argues that D, the locus for the enclitic definite article, is instantiated for syntactic reasons whereas the specifier of the DP is occupied by the demonstrative which has a semantic value. This property is triggered only by those categories in Spec,DP and is crucial for the interpretation of the referential index of the noun phrase:

---

[9] As an anonymous reviewer notes, the fact that in Classical Greek articles could introduce PPs brings these constructions closer to the *cel* patterns, and suggests that the definite article in Greek has undergone a full change, while *cel* is in a case of transition.

(20)  a.  *Directorul de departament şi preşedintele de*
          Director-the of department and president-the of
          *facultate  a venit/ au venit.*
          faculty has come/have come.

      b.  *Acest director de departament şi acel preşedinte de*
          This director of department and that president of
          *facultate au venit.*
          faculty have come.

The examples in (20) show that the double definiteness within the nominal phrase does not necessary lead to two referents, the construction is ambiguous between one and the same referent and two different individuals.

Unlike the definite article, the demonstrative in Romanian triggers not only reference but also deictic interpretation. The complementary distribution between the definite article and the demonstrative can be explained by Giusti's (2002) doubly-filled DP Filter[10]. Importantly, *cel* shows the same syntactic and interpretive effects like the demonstrative from which it originates:

(21)      *fluturele cel albastru si cel roz   au zburat*
          Butterfly-the *cel* blue and *cel* pink have flown.

Unlike the definite article, *cel* introduces reference to the nominal phrase and apart from that it triggers also a restrictive meaning. As a result, the behaviour of *cel* is very unlike Greek DS where the presence of multiple determiners does not create independent reference.

The general consensus in the literature is that demonstrative elements are XPs located in Spec,DP;[11] they are relevant for the interpretation of the referential index of the noun phrase.[12] This would mean that *cel* is also an XP element.[13] We thus conclude that the *cel* construction is very unlike Greek DS.

---

[10] 'Once SpecDP contains a functional projection satisfies the requirements on the DP, D' need not, and therefore cannot be lexically filled' (from Giusti 2002).

[11] The complementary distribution between the definite article and the demonstrative can be explained by Giusti's (2002) doubly-filled DP Filter.

[12] See Dobrovie-Sorin (2000:4) who argues that *cel* is a maximal projection in Spec,DP.

[13] Dobrovie (1987) proposes that *cel* is a phrasal element, pretty much like French *celui*. The context of *cel* is larger than that of *celui*. See the appendix for discussion.

### 5. The analysis of the cel construction[14]

As already mentioned both in the presence of a noun (7) and in the context of ellipsis (8), *cel* can occur only with predicative/intersective adjectives. Our analysis must capture this behaviour. If the source of predicative adjectives is within a relative clause structure, then such a structure should also be present in the *cel* construction and be involved in both environments where *cel* appears.

But we have shown that the *cel*-construction differs from DS in important respects. Moreover, the *cel*-construction cannot be analysed on the basis of the structure proposed in e.g. Cinque (2005) for the restrictive reading of post-nominal adjectives, which is again a reduced relative clause with the adjective in predicative position, though generated in prenominal position. In this case the noun would have to move over the relative clause in order to combine with the (suffixed) article. Importantly recall that *cel* accepts only one adjective, while in the other two constructions, DS and post-nominal adjectives in Romance, we can have more than one adjective. Hence we cannot make use of base structures of this kind.

Recall further that *cel* is available with all kinds of modifiers, adjective as well as PPs (18, Cornilescu 2005). This behaviour in connection to its XP status constitutes important clues in understanding the role of *cel*. We believe that *cel* introduces a reduced relative clause, which has a specifying function, rendered in English via the use of e.g. the adverb *namely* in (22):

 (22)   the horse, namely the beautiful one

In other words, the *cel* construction is an appositive specification clause, in the form of a reduced relative clause.[15] The analysis of *cel* as introducing a relative clause is supported by the fact that it can generally be found in relative clauses (23):[16]

---

[14] The analysis proposed here differs from the one presented during the conference, where we attempted to make use of Kaynes's analysis of *celui* for *cel*. In the appendix, we discuss some differences and similarities between *cel* and *celui*.

[15] Lekakou & Szendroi (2007) analyse DS as a form of apposition, which crucially involves adjunction. We argue here that DS involves restrictive clause modification, while the *cel* construction involves a specification clause.

[16] Note that the demonstrative *acest* can so as well. An anonymous reviewer suggests that one should be more cautious with this comparison between *cel* and *acest*. Indeed more needs to be said about that; our claim is that they are alike in that *cel* is an XP. The reviewer further points out that e.g. in the context of relative clause extraposition, only the demonstrative can extrapose, but not *cel*:

 (i)    a. *băiatul acela n-a mai venit, pe care l-a invitat Maria*

(23)     *băiatul cel care a plecat*
         boy-the *ce*  who left

In (23) *cel* introduces the relative clause. In the typological literature it is also widely known, that demonstratives, as *cel* originated, have grammaticalized as subordinate, including relative, complementizers in a number of language groupings around the world, including Germanic.

Building on the above, we claim that *cel* clauses are appositive specification relative clauses. Discussion of the syntax of such clauses is found in de Vries (2002), upon which we build here. As de Vries (2002: 211ff.) discusses in detail, restrictive appositions do not only involve adjectives, but can also include PPs. In his analysis, appositive relatives involve specifying co-ordination. Semantically, in such a clause the second element specifies the first, and necessarily the second is a logical subset of the first element. The semantics crucially involve set intersection, giving thus the restrictions on the adjectives presented here. In addition this structure explains the fact that the adjective is never ambiguous, it is always generated in the predicative position of the relative clause. It also explains why it cannot be iterated, since the NP can receive only one specification. The relevant structure is as in (24).

(24)   [[&:P [XP ]  &: [DP [CP [C' [IP ]]]]

As in the languages de Vries discusses, and in the case of Romanian, a relative clause must be introduced by a relative element, we propose that *cel* is this element. On the basis of structure (24), there are two options for *cel*, either it is located in Spec,CP in a state of reanalysis from a demonstrative pronoun to a relative marker, see also the references in de Vries (2002), or it is placed in Spec, DP (cf. Cornilescu's claim that *cel* is a predicative head). This analysis is faith-full to the fact that *cel* is a complex phrasal determiner (pronoun-determiner) which contains an invariant form *ce* and a morpheme similar to the suffixal definite article (section 2.1). We come back to that in the following paragraphs.

If we are right in analysis cel clauses as appositive clauses with a specification function, this explains the strict word order associated with the

---

boy-the that not has more come, PE whom Cl-has invited Mary.
      *b. *băiatul cel n-a venit pe care l-a invitat Maria.*
This behavior is predicted by our analysis of *cel* as involving an appositive relative clause. As is well known, appositive relative clauses, as opposed to restrictive relative clauses cannot extrapose and need to be immediately adjacent to their anchor. The demonstrative, however, introduces a restrictive relative clause, and hence is subject to extraposition.

pattern as well as the single occurrence of *cel,* and also the differences between the *cel* construction and DS. Since, there can only be one specification, no iteration is allowed. The structure of (25a) is given in (25b).

(25) a. băiatul cel frumos
b. [&:P [DP baiatul] $_i$ &: [DP cel [CP [C'
[IP $\varnothing$ AP]]]]

The adjective is generated in the predicative position within the relative clause. The second conjunct is co-indexed with the first one, hence they both agree in all features and have unique reference.

As mentioned above, several options are available for *cel*: it can either be inserted in DP or be moved there from inside the clause. To the extent that it moves via Spec,CP to Spec, DP again either the subject of the small clause is a pronominal zero element co-indexed with *cel* or pronominal *cel* is generated as the subject of the small clause. An anonymous reviewer suggests that there is a way to choose between the different analyses, and provided evidence against a raising analysis of *cel*. This comes from the observation that *cel* agrees in Case with the antecedent. In addition *cel* can co-occur with wh-pronouns in Spec,CP, see (23) and (26) below, suggesting that it is actually external to clause:

(26) a. *fiul celui prospăt decorat*
son.the cel.gen recently decorated
"son of the recently decorated person"
b. *omul cel pe care nimeni nu-l mai iubeşte*
man.the cel pe whom nobody loaves any more

We now turn to the presence of *cel* in the context of nominal ellipsis, where it precedes APs. The relevant example is repeated below:

(8) *cel frumos*
Cel beautiful
"The beautiful one"

As already mentioned, the same restrictions on the adjectives apply to the ellipsis environment, i.e. the adjective has to be an intersective, predicative one. This is illustrated in (27) below:[17]

---

[17] An anonymous reviewer points out that ellipsis is more encompassing than the *cel* construction. Note that classifying adjectives are out with cel, but occur in the ellipsis case:
(i) a. tragedia clasică/*tragedia cea clasică

(27)  a.    * *L-am văzut pe preşedintele cel fost.*
            Pro clitic-have seen president-the cel former.
      b.    f. *\*L-am văzut pe cel fost.*
            Pro clitic-have seen cel(masc.) former.

In order to capture these similarities, we propose that (25b) is involved also in the context of ellipsis. This is supported by the fact that the English translation contains the pronoun *one* in both (25b) and (8), the form English generally uses in ellipsis. When the first conjunct has previously been mentioned in the discourse it can be elided; ellipsis is licensed as the remaining part is informative/contrastive (see section 3).

(28)   [&:P [DP ~~baiatul~~]$_i$ &: [DP cel$_i$ [CP [C' [IP $\varnothing_i$
       frumos]]]]


### *6. Summary and conclusions*

Although the distribution of *cel* in the presence of an N in Romanian is superficially similar to the phenomenon of DS in Greek, the syntactic differences between DS in Greek and *cel* in Romanian lead us to the conclusion that *cel* is not a definite article and, consequently, the optional *cel* construction is not a case of DS in Romanian.

On our analysis, *cel* is a complex phrasal determiner (pronoun-determiner) which contains an invariant form *ce* and a morpheme similar to the suffixal definite article. Syntactically, *cel* is an element located in Spec,DP in a state of reanalysis from a demonstrative pronoun to a relative marker, which introduces an appositive specification clause (see also the references in de Vries (2002)). The proposed analysis, departing from Kayne's analysis, explains the differences between the *cel* construction and DS and argues that the same structure is also involved in the context of nominal ellipsis, the second environment in which *cel* is found.

---

tragedy   classic/tragedy cel classic
  b. tragedia clasică si  (nu) cea romantică
tragedy classic and not  cel romantic
According to Bosque & Picallo (1996), classifying as well as thematic adjectives are mapped into SpecNP. We claim that *cel* is out with relational adjectives as it introduces an appositive specification clause and cannot intervene between thematic modifiers or subcategorized arguments. In (ib) we note that the adjective has a contrastive reading which is expected under our analysis.

# References

Alexiadou, Artemis. 2001. "Adjective Syntax and noun raising. Word order asymmetries in the DPs as the result of adjective distribution". *Studia Linguistica* 55.217- 248.

Alexiadou, Artemis. 2006. "*On the cross-linguistic distribution of (in)defineteness spreading*". Ms. University of Stuttgart.

Alexiadou, Artemis & Chris Wilder. 1998. "Adjectival modification and multiple determiners". *Possessors, Predicates and Movement in the DP* ed. by Artemis Alexiadou & Chris Wilder, 303-332. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 1994. C*litic dependencies in Modern Greek*. Ph. D. dissertation, University of Salzburg.

Androutsopolou, Antonia 1995. "The licensing of adjectival modification". *Proceedings of WCCFL* 13. 17-31.

Bosque, Ignacio & Carmen Picallo 1996. "Postnominal adjectives in Spanish DPs". *Journal of Linguistics* 32. 349-385

Campos, Hector, 2005. "Noun Modification, pseudo-articles, and last resort operations in Arvantovlaxika and in Romanian". *Lingua* 115. 311-347.

Campos, H. & M. Stavrou. 2004. "Polydefinite constructions in Modern Greek and in Aromanian". *Topics in Balkan Sprachbund Syntax and Semantics* ed. by Olga Tomic, 147-189. Amsterdam:John Benjamins.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 2004. "A phrasal movement analysis of the Romanian DP". *Studia Linguistica et Philologica in Honorem D. Irimia* ed. by A. Minut & E. Munteanu,, 129-142. Iasi, Editura Universitatii 'Al.I. Cuza'.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 2005. "The dual sources of adjectives and XP vs. N-raising in the Romance DP". Ms. University of Venice.

Coene, Marie. 1994. "Adjectival articles". Ms. Antwerp University.

Cornilescu, Alexandra. 2005. "Modes of semantic combinations: NP/DP-adjectives". Ms. University of Bucharest.

Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen. 1987. *Syntaxe du Roumain.* Ph. D. dissertation, Université de Paris 7.

Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen 2000. "Indefiniteness Spread: from Romanian to Hebrew Construct State". *Comparative Studies in Romanian Syntax* ed. by Virginia Motapanayane, 177- 226. Oxford:Elsevier.

Giusti, Giuliana. 2002. "The functional structure of noun phrases: a bare phrase structure approach". *Functional Structure in DP and IP* ed. by G. Cinque, 54- 99. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kayne, Richard. 1994. *The antisymmetry of syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Kolliakou, D. 2004. Monadic definites and polydefinites: their form meaning and use. *Journal of Linguistics* 40, 263-333.

Lekakou, Marika & Krista Szendroi. 2007. "Eliding the noun in close apposition, or Greek polydefinites revisited". Paper presented at the MIT Workshop on Syntax and Semantics, May 2007.

Marchis, M. 2007. The semantics and syntax of adjectives in Spanish and Romanian. M.A. Thesis, Universität Stuttgart.

Ronat, Mitsou. 1974. *Echelles de base et mutation en syntaxe française*. M.A. thesis, Vincennes University, Paris.

Ronat, Mitsou. 1977. "Une contrainte sur l'effacement du nom". *Langue* ed. by Mitsou Ronat, 153-169. Paris: Hermann.

Sleeman, Petra. 1996. *Licensing empty nouns in French*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Amsterdam.

Sproat, Richard & Chilin Shih. 1988. "Prenominal Adjectival Ordering in English and Mandarin". *Proceeding of NELS* 12. 465-489.

de Vries, Mark. 2002. *The syntax of relativization*. Ph. D. dissertation, University of Utrecht.

Vulchanova, M. & G. Giusti. 1998. "Fragments of Balkan nominal structure". In A. Alexiadou & C. Wilder (eds.) Possessors, predicates and movement in the DP. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 333-360.

**Appendix: *cel* and celui**

Dobrovie-Sorin (1987) and Cornilescu (2005) discuss certain distributional differences between *cel* and *celui*. Importantly, *celui* cannot be followed by bare adjectives, it can precede present and past participles as well as PPs:

(29)  a.  *celui + full relative*
          Celui que tu as lu
          the one that you have read
      b.  *Celui + past participle*
          Celui envoyé à Jean
          the one sent to Jean
      c.  *Celui + present participle*
          Ceux parlants quatre langues
          Those speaking four languages
      d.  *Celui + PP*
          Celui de Jean
          that of John
      e.  *Celui + complement taking AP*
          ceux contents de leur sort
          those happy with their kind
      f.  * c*elui + Bare AP*
          * celui rouge
          this red

Kayne (1994: 101) points out that *celui* is not an N°. Rather it is an XP composed of *ce+lui*. This is similar to what we said about Romanian *cel*. But one cannot analyse *celui* similarly to *cel*, as (29f) is out.

While we do not have a detailed analysis of the above pattern, we would like to mention here that the bare adjectives in French seem to have a special status. For instance, Ronat (1974, 1977) in her study of noun ellipsis in French makes a distinction between intransitive, i.e. bare, adjectives and transitive ones, i.e. adjectives followed by complements. While the transitive ones are reduced relative clauses, the intransitive ones have a very

different analysis (see also Sleeman 1996 for further discussion). In particular, Sleeman (1996: 55), citing joint work by Sleeman & Verheugd, states that bare adjectives in French can only be attributes within the extended projection of the NP. The ungrammaticality of (29f) is related to the fact that intransitive adjectives cannot appear in predicative position in French reduced relatives. If correct, this raises questions as to the general analysis of bare adjectives in French, as bare adjectives can appear in post-nominal position:

(30)    *le livre jaune*
         the book yellow

On Kayne's analysis, (30) involves a reduced relative clause. On the basis of the remarks in Sleeman, however, (30) should be rather analysed as involving an adjective within the extended projection of NP, which is the analysis Sleeman herself gives. See also the discussion in Alexiadou & Wilder (1998), who pointed out that adjectives are not always amenable to a reduced relative clause basic construction.