Empirical Approaches
to Language Typology

EUROTYP   20-7

Editors

Georg Bossong
Bernard Comrie

Noun Phrase Structure
in the Languages of Europe

edited by

Frans Plank

Frans Plank

Double articulation

1. What to expect

In languages which supply NPs with markers that specialize, if perhaps not exclusively, in distinguishing definiteness and indefiniteness – i.e., with articles or functionally equivalent bound forms – the expectation is that at most one such marker will be used per simple NP. My modest taxonomic aim here is to survey the kinds of circumstances where NPs appear to manage to surpass this expectation and to permit or require double (or even more exuberant) articulation. Despite the European provenance of the bulk of the examples, it is hoped that the typology of double articulation set out in §2 will be reasonably comprehensive. (Which would only confirm that when it comes to overdoing it the ingenuity of boring old Standard Average European is virtually matchless.)

Since no systematic effort has been made to explore how this typology might be correlated with any others, pertaining to (in)definiteness or whatever other realms of grammar, the discovery of *implicantia* or *implicata* of the various kinds of double articulation remains as a task for the future. An obvious candidate is that no language will practise double articulation of any kind unless it also articulates its NPs singly, but not vice versa; but that is, perhaps, trivial (see §2.16.2, though). There is, however, a typology of a more general nature which the typology of kinds of double articulation will be related to in §3, and that is a medley of possible reasons for any overmarking. If the cross-linguistic distribution of double articulation is uneven, it might be because not all languages have equally good reasons for such indulgence.

In a more general sense, this chapter is intended (i) as a further instalment of the saga of double marking and (ii) as a reminder of the complexities of determining whether an NP is indeed simple.

The responsibility for the marking of (in)definiteness may be shared by separate parts of a clause, such as articulated object NPs and verbs inflecting differently in the company of definite and indefinite objects, as in Hungarian (1) (see Moravcsik in Part II of this volume); such distributed double marking is outside the present remit.

(1) a. Lát-ok   egy asztalt
        see-1SG.SBJ/INDEF.OBJ a   table:ACC

  b. Lát-om   az asztalt
        see-1SG.SBJ/DEF.OBJ the table:ACC
        'I see a/the table'

What will likewise be disregarded here is double marking inside an NP that arises from articles being combined with other forms rendering the NP definite or indefinite, such as demonstratives or the numeral 'one', as in Hungarian (2) (see again Moravcsik, or also Plank 1991) or in dialectal Ladin (Rhaeto-Romance, (3)) (Haiman & Benincà 1992: 152).

(2)   ez a fiú
        this the boy
        'this boy'

(3)   da   øna na skwadra
        from one a team
        'from one team'

There are no indications that a propensity for overdoing (in)definiteness marking as such predisposes a language to letting one article keep another article company.

Much as I would have loved belatedly to dedicate these lines to Raoul de la Grasserie on the occasion of the centenary of his "De l'article", what he promisingly referred to as 'surdétermination' and 'surindétermination' (1896: passim) turned out to be somewhat too protean notions to be rightfully invoked as anticipations of my plain 'double articulation'; and 'l'article double' (1896: 290f.) proved a false lead too, for it emerged that this was his term for the coexistence of a definite and an indefinite article in one language. It was not until he reached the last page but one of "De l'article" that de la Grasserie conclusively earned an honourable mention as a precursor, addressing himself, if en passant and without much ado, to 'le double article' (with the adjective now ahead of its noun), 'la répétition de l'article', or 'la superposition de deux articles' — which is exactly what 'double articulation', to use the handier modern term, is all about.

2.   Phenomenology of excess

2.1.   The more noun phrases, the more articles

Not unexpectedly, NPs may be doubly (or multiply) articulated when they actually consist of two (or more) NPs, each endowed with an article of its own.

2.1.1.   Thus, one articulated NP may be in construction with another articulated NP (or noun) as its coordinate conjunct (4), its attributive (5), or its appositive (6).

(4)   the pit and the pendulum

(5)   the masque of the red death

(6)   the vicar, a/the best-selling author

There are no more articles in such constructions than there are NPs; normal articulation expectations would only be exceeded if yet another article were added, as for example in (5').

(5')   *the masque *the* of the red death

Interestingly, one article in such complex NPs may be suppressed on certain conditions even though it is not really supernumerary. Thus, in English and elsewhere, an article may or must be omitted from a second conjunct when it forms some kind of referential unity with the first conjunct (7),[1] from a head noun when it is preceded rather than followed by the attributive nominal (8), or from an appositive when the information it contributes is standardly associated with the head noun's referent anyhow (9).

(7)   the life and (the) opinions of Tristram Shandy

(8)   (*the) the red death's masque

(9)   the vicar, (the) best-selling author of *Tristram Shandy*

2.1.2.   An NP may also be hidden inside another one in a variation of the attributive theme illustrated in (5). In what is known as hypostasis or inflected-genitive formations,[2] NPs marked by the genitive or other attributive cases are used with reference to a non-overt head ('one of a/the N'), taking all kinds of further grammatical marking appropriate to the heads of attributives. In Basque, where definiteness is marked inflectionally, cumulated with case and number (10),[3] such inflected genitives ('surdéclinaison'), as exemplified in (11) and (12) for definite and indefinite attributives, thus show double marking for this category (examples from Navarro-Labourdin; Lafitte 1962):

(10)   gizon-Ø   gizon-a   gizon-ak
        man-ABS.INDEF   man-SG.ABS.DEF   man-PL.ABS.DEF

        gizon-en   gizon-aren   gizon-en
        man-GEN.INDEF   man-SG.GEN.DEF   man-PL.GEN.DEF

(11)   gizon-aren-Ø   gizon-aren-a
        man-SG.GEN.DEF-ABS.INDEF   man-SG.GEN.DEF-SG.ABS.DEF
        'one(s) of the man'   'the one of the man'

        gizon-aren-en   gizon-aren-aren
        man-SG.GEN.DEF-GEN.INDEF   man-SG.GEN.DEF-SG.GEN.DEF
        'of one(s) of the man'   'of the one of the man'

gizon-en-Ø   gizon-en-a
man-PL.GEN.DEF-ABS.INDEF   man-PL.GEN.DEF-SG.ABS.DEF
'one(s) of the men'   'the one of the men'

gizon-en-en   gizon-en-aren
man-PL.GEN.DEF-GEN.INDEF   man-PL.GEN.DEF-SG.GEN.DEF
'of one(s) of the men'   'of the one of the men'

(12)   gizon-en-Ø   gizon-en-a
        man-GEN.INDEF-ABS.INDEF   man-GEN.INDEF-SG.ABS.DEF
        'one(s) of a man/of men'   'the one of a man/of men'

Although they consist of single words, with the pronominal heads unexpressed, such doubly definite, doubly indefinite, or mixed definite-indefinite NPs are arguably complex, with the inner inflection for definiteness or indefiniteness accruing to the attributive and the outer to the non-overt head.

2.2.   Apposition, sort of: One noun phrase or two?

However, the complexity of NPs, with the NP-hood of their constituent parts justifying double or indeed multiple articulation, is not always as obvious as in the previous examples, especially where both NPs were overtly expressed ((4)–(6)). It is in particular in constructions with an appositive look that independent NP-hood is arguably not a categorical matter but one of degrees.

2.2.1.   Thus, while the appositives in (6) and even (9) are evidently NPs in their own right, that in (13a), from German, differs from them in lacking an overt noun or pronoun (like English *one*) identical or coreferential with the head.

(13) a.   Gib mir das / ein Schnitzel, das größere / ein mageres!
           give me the / a schnitzel, the bigger / a lean [one]!

Nevertheless, insofar as they present addenda or afterthoughts, with the adjective in an unusual position relative to the overt noun, such appositives are constituents which are to some extent independent of their heads, as is signalled by intonation (with a break between head and appositive) and stress (with two main stresses on the head noun and on the adjective). It is therefore not too surprising that such appositives should carry articles of their own, which are missing if adjectives are well-integrated attributive parts of NPs in their usual prenominal position (13b).

(13) b.   Gib mir das größere / ein mageres (*das / *ein) Schnitzel!
           give me the bigger / a lean (*the / *a) schnitzel!

However, there are postnominal epithets which do not really add any unpredictable information but rather comment, often depreciatingly, on the head, as in (14), and here intonation (no break) and stress (no second main stress on the adjective) – and perhaps punctuation too, since the temptation to omit the comma is hard to resist (for those who dare write what others would only speak) – suggest that the appositive (if this is what it is) is somewhat lacking in syntactic independence and is not really a paradigm instance of a full NP, despite its own article which resumes that of the noun.

(14)   Vergiß das Schnitzel(,) das zähe!
        forget the schnitzel(,) the tough [one]!

2.2.2.   Combinations of proper names with titles, terms of address, or determinative or classifying nouns – like *Doctor Templeton*, *Uncle Toby*, *Lake Constance*, or *London town* in English – are perhaps the closest-knit constructions from the whole gamut of apposition, and the case for their analysis as simple rather than complex NPs would seem even stronger than in instances of at least semi-integrated addenda like (14). Now, if proper names take a definite article to begin with, they may either shed or retain it in the company of close companions that are themselves articulated, rendering such constructions singly or doubly articulated. While English economizes on articles in such circumstances (15), Modern Greek is inclined to indulge (16) (Joseph & Philippaki-Warburton 1987: 153).

(15)   the river (*the) Thames

(16) a.   o θíos / fílos mu (o) aléksis
           the uncle / friend of.me (the) Alexis
           '(my) uncle Alexis / my friend Alexis'
     b.   i póli i aθína
           the town the Athens

The frugal English pattern is more popular in languages where proper names are articulated, no matter how intimate the bond between noun and definiteness marker; thus, Swedish (17) (Börjars 1994: 237f.) and Albanian (18) (Buchholz & Fiedler 1987: 241) are two languages where the bond is arguably morphological, and they both side with English in this respect:[4]

(17) a.   Thames / Thems-en;   flod-en   Thames / *flod-en   Thems-en
           Thames / Thames-DEF; river-DEF Thames / *river-DEF Thames-DEF
     b.   *Nil / Nil-en;   *flod-en   Nil / *flod-en   Nil-en
           *Nile / Nile-DEF, *river-DEF Nile / *river-DEF Nile-DEF

(18)   Elbasan-i;   qytet-i Elbasan(*-i)
        Elbasan-DEF; city-DEF Elbasan(*-DEF)[5]

(In (17b) *flod-en Nil is bad because Nil is a river name that requires a definiteness marker, and *flod-en Nil-en is bad because such close-knit constructions do not permit more than one such marker.)   When a surname follows a title or a first name in what is probably even closer apposition than in (16), it obligatorily abandons its article in such an articulate language as Modern Greek too:[6]

(19)   o   kírios (*o) zórbas; o aléksis (*o) zórbas
       the mister (*the) Zorbas; the Alexis (*the) Zorbas
       'Mr Zorbas'; 'Alexis Zorbas'

However strong the evidence is in favour of simple, or not-so-complex, NP-hood in doubly articulated constructions such as (14) and (16), their second constituents – adjectives on their own, proper names – may still occur independently and are articulable in their own right.

2.3. Attributives re-ordered to follow their nouns

In constructions such as (13a) and (14), the re-articulated adjectives could be made sense of as being themselves NPs of sorts, loosely or more tightly attached to a preceding NP. After all, while it would be unusual for a plain adjective to be postnominal in a language like German, this is precisely the place where you expect to encounter NPs, even incomplete ones, in apposition. However, as was already suggested by the subtle contrast between (13a) and (14), this kind of rationalization may be more convincing in some cases and less convincing in others.

2.3.1.   It is especially in situations where an unmarked prenominal position of attributives alternates with a marked postnominal one that the latter is conducive to re-articulation. The differences between such alternative arrangements in respect of structural integration and separate NP-hood are hardly categorical, though.

Ancient Greek (Attic) illustrates the repetition of a definite article with attributive adjectives, genitives, or prepositional phrases that are placed after the noun in more formal style or in order to put greater emphasis on the attributive (Goodwin 1894: 208f.):

(20) a.   ho sophòs anér
          the wise   man
    b.   (ho) anér ho sophós
          (the) man the wise

(21) a.   hoi tôn   Thēbaíōn stratēgoí
          the of:the Thebans generals
    b.   (hoi) stratēgoì hoi tôn   Thēbaíōn
          (the) generals the of:the Thebans

(22) a.   hoi en ástei ánthrōpoi
          the in city   men
    b.   (hoi) ánthrōpoi hoi en ástei
          (the) men   the in city

In the case of more than one attributive, each of them is worthy of an article when moved after the noun:

(23)   ta teíchē tà heautôn   tà makrá
          the walls the their (own) the long

If the doubly or triply articulated constructions are less well integrated than their singly articulated counterparts at all, it is not by such a wide margin as in the German pair of (13b) and (13a); the difference is hardly one between apposition or afterthought and close-knit attribution. Double articulation of NPs with a postnominal attributive is not in fact always obligatory in Attic Greek. First, the definite article is in principle omissible from the noun itself (as indicated in the (b)-examples); more frequently, however, it is indeed there. Second, unlike adjectives and prepositional phrases, postnominal genitives occasionally do not repeat the definite article of their head:

(21') b.   dià tòn ólethron tôn   systratiōtôn
           by the death   of:the fellow:soldiers

Third, genitives of personal pronouns and partitive genitives, which unlike the attributives illustrated previously must (pronouns) or may (partitives) precede the definite article when in prenominal position, never repeat the definite article when postnominal:

(24) a.   hēmôn hē pólis
          of:us the city
    b.   hē pólis (*hē) hēmôn
          the city (*the) of:us

(25) a.   tôn   politôn hoi kakoí   / hoi tôn   politôn kakoí
          of:the citizens the bad.ones / the of:the citizens bad.ones
    b.   hoi kakoì   (*hoi) tôn   politôn
          the bad.ones (*the) of:the citizens

NPs with a single attributive in its normal prenominal position are never doubly articulated in Attic Greek (in contrast to Modern Greek, on which see below, §2.4.2):

(20') a.   *ho sophòs ho anér
           *the wise   the man

Modern Greek has essentially retained this alternation between prenominal and more emphatic as well as re-articulated postnominal attributives (Joseph & Philippaki-Warburton 1987: 51f.):

(26) a.   i   kondés fústes
            the short skirts
     b.   i   fústes i   kondés
            the skirts the short

Genitives appearing before the article in prenominal position continue not to trigger re-articulation when moved after the noun:

(27) a.   tis   marías   to   vivlío
            the:GEN.SG Mary:GEN.SG the book
     b.   to   vivlío (*to)   tis   marías
            the book (*the) the:GEN.SG Mary:GEN.SG

When the NP has an indefinite article, only incipiently grammaticalized from the numeral 'one' and still only optionally used with singular non-mass nouns, it is not repeated either if an adjective or adjective phrase is moved into its marked postnominal position (Joseph & Philippaki-Warburton 1987: 43f.):

(28) a.   énas polí aɣapitós se ména fílos
            a   very beloved to me   friend
     b.   énas fílos   (*énas) polí aɣapitós se ména
            a   friend (*a)   very beloved to me

Looked at superficially, Kalderaš Romani as once spoken by the Swedish coppersmith gypsy Johan Dimitri Taikon (Gjerdman & Ljungberg 1963), and apparently Vlax Romani in general, shows the same pattern as Greek: there is a single definite article in front of an adjective followed by its noun (29a) but re-articulation when the adjective is moved after the noun for emphasis (29b).[7]

(29) a.   le   baré raklés
            the big boy (masculine oblique)
     b.   le   raklés le   barés
            the boy   the big

In prenominal position possessive pronouns preclude a definite article (30a) and demonstrative pronouns permit one, whose position is after rather than before the demonstrative (31a); when possessives or demonstratives are moved after a noun, there is re-articulation as with adjectives:

(30) a.   murré raklés
            my   boy (masculine oblique)

     b.   le   raklés le   murrés
            the boy   the my

(31) a.   kodolé (le)   raklés
            that   (the) boy (masculine oblique)
     b.   le   raklés le   kodolés
            the boy   the that

(32) a.   kodolé murré raklés
            that   my   boy (masculine oblique)
     b.   le   raklés le   kodolés le   murrés
            the boy   the that   the my

Upon closer inspection the form of adjectives or pronominals in postnominal position is seen to differ from that in front of the noun: prenominal adjectives, possessives, and demonstratives inflect adjectivally (masculine singular oblique *bar-é*), but when postnominal they follow the inflectional example of nouns (thus, *bar-és* like *rakl-és*; Gjerdman & Ljungberg 1963: 82–84, 145). While re-articulated postnominal adjectives or pronominals in Vlax Romani are certainly no loose appositives or disjointed afterthoughts, the evidence of their inflection thus points to a higher degree of nominality than that of their (at best) singly articulated prenominal counterparts. And presumably, the more nominal an attributive or other companion of a noun, the more deserving it is of an article of its own.[8]

Yiddish has a similar alternation between prenominal and re-articulated postnominal adjectives and other modifiers (Jacobs, Prince, & van der Auwera 1994: 408):

(33) a.   di   grine oygn
            the green eyes
     b.   di   oygn di   grine
            the eyes the green

While the latter construction is far less exceptional than what appears to be its German equivalent (13a), there are also indications that it is not quite as close-knit as attribution can be at its best. Comparing the two arrangements in (34), this time with indefinite articles, the inflectional forms of the adjectives are again seen to differ:

(34) a.   a sheyn-Ø   meydl
            a pretty-NEUT.SG.NOM.INDEF girl
     b.   a meydl a sheyn-e   / sheyn-s
            a girl   a pretty-FEM.SG.NOM / pretty-NEUT.SG.NOM.PRED

When prenominal, the adjective obligatorily agrees with its noun in gender on a morphological basis: as a diminutive (derived from feminine *moyd* 'maid'), *meydl* is

neuter, and the nominative singular neuter ending of attributive adjectives in indefinite NPs is -Ø. When postnominal, the adjective is either feminine (*sheyn-e*, with no contrast between definite and indefinite), in accordance with the referential semantics rather than the morphological gender of its noun, or it is neuter, but takes the form otherwise used for predicative adjectives when accompanied by an indefinite article (35b).[9]

(35) a.   Dos meydl iz sheyn
           the girl   is pretty
     b.   Dos meydl iz a sheyns
           the girl   is a pretty (one)

Both semantic agreement and a more nominal inflection of the postnominal adjective would seem to reflect a certain loosening of the ties to its noun, but it would presumably be exaggerated to take it for an appositive or afterthought NP instead, deserving of articulation on account of its own NP-hood.

2.3.2.   The evidence surveyed in the preceding section suggests that when attributives can be either prenominal or postnominal, it will be in the marked postnominal constructions that they tend to be added more loosely, without necessarily amounting to fully independent NPs. There is no dearth of languages where – as in Rumanian (36/37), poised to return in a moment – the unmarked position of (most) attributive adjectives in particular is postnominal and the marked one prenominal instead, but fronting of an adjective for emphasis or for other purposes (including that of semantic differentiation) does not normally seem to detach it from its noun.

(36) a.   un soldat bun
           a soldier good
     b.   un bun soldat
           a good soldier

(37) a.   soldat=ul bun
           soldier=the good
     b.   bun=ul   soldat
           good=the soldier

Whatever the language-particular rules for ordering attributives, postnominal position seems more appropriate in general for disjoined additions to heads. And if structural looseness of an attributive from its noun is conducive to double articulation, then it is not surprising that actual examples of the reverse pattern of Greek et al. – double articulation of NPs with prenominal attributives and simple articulation of NPs with postnominal ones – are hard to find.

Maltese would almost have been such a prized find. The regular position of Maltese adjectives is postnominal (see below, §2.4.1). However, nouns denoting inalienable possessions, such as body parts and kin relations, resist being modified by an attributive adjective in the normal manner, with the possessor nominal intervening between the noun and its adjective, regardless of whether the adjective carries a definite marker (38b) or not (38a); here an alternative construction is resorted to where the adjective is fronted (38c), now requiring the definite marker (Fabri 1993: 53f.):

(38) a.   ??missier Karla xiħ
           ??father Karla old
     b.   *missier Karla ix-xiħ
           *father Karla DEF-old
     c.   ix-xiħ   missier Karla
           DEF-old father Karla
           'Karla's old father'

Alas, there is no double articulation in (38c), though, because definiteness marking on the head noun itself is precluded by the accompanying possession nominal (**ix-xiħ il-missier Karla*).[10]

2.4.   Highlighting adjectives in their accustomed position

Adjectives need not be moved around a noun to qualify for possible re-articulation. It is also in NPs where adjectives are in their normal position that single and double articulation are found to alternate.

2.4.1.   In Rumanian, most adjectives are normally postnominal. When fronted for emphasis, semantic differentiation, or other purposes, the definite article cliticizes onto the adjective, which is now the first word in the NP, but no second article, definite or indefinite, is added (§2.3.2). As Raoul de la Grasserie (1896: 312) saw it, "c'est le substantif ou l'adjectif qui prennent l'article; ils ne le prennent pas tous les deux à la fois, ce serait une surdétetermination inutile".[11] However, faulting de la Grasserie's belief in economy, adjectives can be re-articulated in their original postnominal position itself, in order to put special and often contrastive emphasis on them (Mallinson 1986: 112f.):[12]

(39) a.   soldat=ul bun
           soldier=the good
     b.   soldat=ul cel bun
           soldier=the the good

The second article is formally similar to a distal demonstrative (*acel*), but there is no clear evidence that the construction thus re-articulated is necessarily appositive in the way its English rendering 'the soldier, the/that good one' might suggest. For one thing, the article that may accompany postnominal adjectives also occurs in what are close-knit definite NPs, viz. ones consisting of a noun, not itself marked for definiteness, and a cardinal numeral, whose normal position is prenominal:

(40)   cei şapte fraţi
        the seven brothers

For another, in Rumanian, NPs in apposition either agree in case with their heads or are, sometimes obligatorily, in the unmarked nominative case (Mallinson 1986: 112), and such non-agreement is not what straightforwardly re-articulated adjectives favour:

(41) a.   fete=i   cel-ei
           girl:FEM.SG.GEN=the:FEM.SG.GEN the-FEM.SG.GEN
           bun-e
           good-FEM.SG.GEN
     b.   *fete=i   cea
           *girl:FEM.SG.GEN=the:FEM.SG.GEN the:FEM.SG.NOM
           bun-ă
           good-FEM.SG.NOM
           'of the good girl'

But, as shown in (42), non-agreement of the adjectival article itself is not absolutely out of the question here either (the case-agreeing genitive form of the article would be *cel-or*; Beyrer, Bochmann, & Bronsert 1987: 310, 316, 321f.), which underlines the somewhat ambiguous status of re-articulated adjectives between attribution and apposition.

(42)   evidenţierea   desene=lor   cel-e   mai
        honouring:the drawing:PL.GEN=the:PL.GEN the-FEM.PL.NOM most
        reuşit-e
        accomplished-FEM.PL.NOM/GEN
        'the honouring of the most accomplished drawings'

At any rate, NPs with an indefinite article, such as (36a), lack re-articulated counterparts that would be structurally on a par with (39b); what is illustrated in (43), corresponding to (36a), is a genuine afterthought construction consisting of two suprasegmentally separated NPs, with the second an adjective nominalized by the indefinite article (Beyrer, Bochmann, & Bronsert 1987: 129).

(43)   un soldat, un bun
        a soldier, an old [one]

The evidence as to whether definitely re-articulated adjectives are nominalized, or more nominal than those in NPs with single articles, is not clear-cut either. All demonstratives show inflectional differences depending on their position relative to the noun: when preceding their noun, which lacks a definite article, they inflect adjectivally (44a); when following the noun, which now requires a definite article, they inflect pronominally, as they do when representing (the head of) a full NP (44b) – which arguably reflects a greater degree of nominal autonomy of this second alternative ('the soldier, that one').[13]

(44) a.   acel-Ø   soldat (bun-Ø)
           that-MASC.SG.NOM soldier (good-MASC.SG.NOM)
     b.   soldat=ul   acel-a   (bun-Ø)
           soldier=the that-MASC.SG.NOM.PRO (good-MASC.SG.NOM)

By contrast, the repeated article, as in (39b), only inflects adjectivally, not pronominally (*cela*) in contemporary standard Rumanian. On the other hand, this same article, again inflected adjectivally rather than pronominally, is used with predicative adjectives of a more nominal kind, as in (45b) (Mallinson 1986: 296), and it generally serves to nominalize adjectives, often in free variation or random semantic contrast with the enclitic definite article, as shown in (46) (Beyrer, Bochmann, & Bronsert 1987: 95).

(45) a.   Acest soldat e bun
           this   soldier is good
     b.   Acest soldat e cel bun
           this   soldier is the good.one

(46) a.   cel bun; cel leneş
           the good; the lazy
           'the good/lazy one'
     b.   bun=ul;   leneş=ul
           good=the; lazy=the
           'the good one'; 'the sloth [animal]'

When they accompany proper names in the genitive, adjectives nominalized by means of *cel* or the enclitic article as in (46a/b) obligatorily fail to agree in case, which is an appositional feature and again sets nominalized adjectives apart from plain re-articulated adjectives (Beyrer, Bochmann, & Bronsert 1987: 321):

(47) a.   în timp=ul lui   Ştefan cel-Ø   Mare-Ø
           in time=the of.him Ştefan the-MASC.SG.NOM Great-MASC.SG.NOM
           'in the time of Ştefan the Great'
     b.   lupte=le   lui   Mihai Viteaz=ul-Ø
           battle:PL=the:PL of.him Mihael Brave=the-MASC.SG.NOM
           'the battles of Mihael the Brave'

In earlier Rumanian it was possible to inflect the article that precedes a postnominal attributive adjective pronominally, with the adjective itself carrying a definite article (48); and another historical and dialectal variant is to combine an adjectivally inflecting article with an articulated adjective (49) (Hasdeu 1885: 426, 430):

(48)   soldat=ul   cel-a   bun=ul
        soldier=the the-MASC.SG.NOM.PRO good=the

(49)   soldat=ul   cel bun=ul
        soldier=the the good=the

Such triply articulated constructions certainly look more like complex NPs, with a typical nominalized adjective in typical apposition, than the doubly articulated construction into which they were to develop (39b), which in turn may be a little less cohesive than the singly articulated basic construction (39a).

In Maltese, attributive adjectives, which are more strictly confined to postnominal position than in Rumanian, may resume the bound definite article of their noun, in its appropriate allomorphic form (50a), or may do without it (50b);[14] in indefinite NPs, zero-marked or with the fledgling indefinite article *wiehed* of animates, adjectives themselves are obligatorily unarticulated (50c).

(50) a.   ir-raġel   l-ohxon
          DEF-man DEF-fat

     b.   ir-raġel   ohxon
          DEF-man fat

     c.   (wiehed)   raġel (*wiehed) ohxon
          (a/a certain) man (*a)   fat

Re-articulated and bare adjectives are not in free variation. Essentially, adjectives need to make a significant contribution to the identifiability of the NP's referent – or, in other terms, to be restrictive – to deserve a definite article of their own (see Sutcliffe 1936: 20f.; Fabri 1993: 38–56). Thus, in (50a) a contrast is likely to be implied to a man that is not fat, while in (50b) the fatness of the man is likely to be part of the addressee's advance knowledge. Accordingly, adjectives whose meaning is such as to rule out the possibility of a referential choice resist re-articulation (51a), and adjectives that are inherently contrastive demand it (51b).

(51) a.   ir-rumanz (*l-)ewlieni
          DEF-novel (*DEF-)single

     b.   il-kwadru   l-lemini
          DEF-painting DEF-left

Other adjectives refusing re-articulation even when contrastive are those based on proper names:

(52)   l-ilsien   (*il-)Gharbi
        DEF-language (*DEF-)Arabic

If there is more than one adjective meeting the criterion for re-articulation, all of them may indeed get an article:

(53)   ir-raġel   it-twil l-irqieq
        DEF-man DEF-tall DEF-thin

Although singly and doubly (or also triply etc.) articulated NPs in Maltese do tend to differ in the referential contribution of their adjectives, there is no good evidence of a corresponding structural contrast. Apparently, re-articulated adjectives are no less tightly bound to their nouns than unarticulated ones are, and they do not surpass the latter in nominality either (with any adjective being capable of serving as a noun – unarticulated when indefinite and articulated when definite). In fact, it is less clear than in Rumanian that re-articulated NPs are non-basic constructions vis-à-vis singly articulated ones.

2.4.2.   The re-articulation of adjectives in their normal position is not an exclusively postnominal phenomenon. Thus, in Modern Greek, where adjectives moved behind their nouns get another article (26b), this may happen to them when they stay ahead too:

(54) a.   i   kondés fústes
          the short   skirts

     b.   i   kondés i   fústes
          the short   the skirts

Although possibly more marginal than the postnominal variant, this manner of specially emphasizing the adjective is firmly on record as an addendum to the classical heritage.[15] It is unlikely that NPs such as (54b) are really two.

In Turkish, where adjectives are strictly prenominal, it is the indefinite article that may appear twice, in NPs that do not look especially complex either. The indefinite article differs from its source, the numeral 'one', in its preferred position and its greater positional versatility: while *bir* 'one' is exclusively NP-initial, like other numerals, *bir* 'a' prefers the position between adjective and noun, but it may also move ahead of the adjective when it is the noun rather than the adjective that is the focus of contrast:

(55) a.   bir   güzel   kız
          one/a beautiful girl

     b.   güzel   bir   kız
          beautiful a/*one girl

When the emphasis is to be both on the adjective and on the NP's indefiniteness (rather than singularity), an indefinite article may show up in both its accustomed position and NP-initially:[16]

(56)   bir güzel   bir kız
        a beautiful a   girl

2.5.   Attributives in a row

It may need more than one attributive for articulation to be repeated.

As was seen above (§§2.3.1 and 2.4.2), Ancient Greek (Attic) showed greater moderation than Modern Greek in denying itself a second article with prenominal attributives. However, when this standard position for attributives was filled more than once, Attic shook off almost all restraint too. The second attributive got a second definite article, although the noun itself had to do without one, unlike in cases of postposed and repeatedly articulated attributives (23); and this luxury was optional rather than obligatory, as examples like (57b) show (Goodwin 1894: 208f.):

(57) a.   katà   tèn Attikèn tèn palaiàn (*tèn) phōnén
            according.to the Attic   the old   (*the) dialect
     b.   eis tàs állas Arkadikàs póleis
            to the other Arcadian   cities

Conceivably, re-articulation in cases like (57a) is prompted by a re-ordering of at-tributives among one another. Adjectives denoting age normally come before ones denoting provenance, and the more natural sequence is probably less conducive to double articulation:

(57') a.   katà tèn palaiàn (??tèn) Attikèn phōnén

It is doubtful, though, whether the re-ordering of adjectives is able to split up a single NP into two or otherwise to disrupt it so severely as to warrant (optional) re-articulation on the grounds of complexity.

Outside Europe we find an analogous pattern in Ethiopia, and there can be no question of such NPs in Amharic (South Semitic) having been meddled with. In Amharic, definiteness is marked by an enclitic leaning on the first constituent of an NP capable of supporting it – which is the adjective in NPs that have one, because attributive adjectives always precede their nouns (58a). In NPs with two adjectives, the first alone (58b) or both of them (58c) may host a definite enclitic (58b) (Leslau 1995: 209f.).

(58) a.   tolloq=u färäs
            big=the horse

     b.   tolloq=u toqur(=u)   färäs
            big=the black(=the) horse

Evidently, re-articulation here is not contingent on any re-ordering among adjec-tives or among adjectives and their head; and the doubly articulated NP does not seem more disjointed than its singly articulated counterpart either. While such re-articulation is optional with the second of two adjectives, it is impossible when an adjective is preceded by an attributive NP (59a), unless this attributive NP itself con-tains an adjective, which carries the first definite enclitic in its stead (59b) (Leslau 1995: 193, 195):[17]

(59) a.   yä=tämari-w   qäyy(*=u) däbtär
            of=student=the red(*=the) notebook
            'the student's red notebook'
     b.   yä=toguh=u   tämari qäyy(=u) däbtär
            of=diligent=the student red(=the) notebook
            'the diligent student's red notebook'

(Note that it is the head noun which is supposed to be definitized by both enclitics.) And being part of an attributive NP also prohibits a second adjective itself from being re-articulated:

(60)   yä=tolloq=u toqur(*=u)   färäs waga(-w)
        of=big=the black(*=the) horse price(-its)
        'the price of the/a big black horse'

However complex the conditions on the optional double articulation of NPs with more than one attributive are in Amharic, the loosening of NP-internal structure does not seem to be a factor.

2.6.   Adjectives pure and simple

In the variations on the theme of articulatory excess that have been surveyed in §§2.3–5 the NPs that were doubly articulated did not represent the most basic and formally least lavish constructions of the constituents involved: whether removed from their accustomed position or not, re-articulated attributives had alternative con-structions, whose force was as a rule less emphatic or contrastive, lacking such ad-ditional marking. But double articulation can also be the only option a language has when attributives are being added to an NP. This is something the Scandinavian branch of Germanic shares with (non-Ethiopic) Semitic.[18]

2.6.1.   In simple unamplified NPs in Swedish, the indefinite article precedes the noun and the definiteness marker is bound to the noun as a suffix (or, as has also been claimed, an enclitic) (61a/b). The addition of an attributive adjective, invariably in prenominal position, leaves the NP otherwise unaltered when the article is indefinite, except that adjectives themselves introduce another marker of indefiniteness, owing to their inflectional contrast of strong (indefinite) and weak (definite) forms (61c). This kind of (in)definiteness marking through adjectival inflection differs from those considered so far in that it is contingent on (in)definiteness marking elsewhere in an NP; owing to its lack of independence its contribution to the overmarking of NPs is probably not so dramatic. Now, the addition of an adjective (itself inflected definitely) to an NP that is definite requires another definite article in front of the adjective, known as the adjective-article, which is formally identical to a distal demonstrative (61d).

(61) a.   ett hus
           a house

     b.   hus-et
           house-DEF

     c.   ett stor-t   hus
           a large-STRONG house

     d.   det   stor-a   hus-et
           the/that large-WEAK house-DEF

While adjectival modification is recursive, there will always be only one additional, NP-initial definite article no matter how many adjectives follow:

(62)   det   stor-a   (*det)   vit-a   hus-et
        the/that large-WEAK (*the/that) white-WEAK house-DEF

A genitival attributive precludes all separate definiteness marking, except that contributed by adjectival inflection:

(63)   (*det)   Kersti-s   stor-a   hus(*-et)
        (*the/that) Kersti-GEN large-WEAK house(*-DEF)

With a following restrictive relative clause the noun-article tends to be suppressed too:

(64)   det   stor-a   hus(??-et)   som ligger vid Vasagatan
        the/that large-WEAK house(??-DEF) that lies   in Vasa:Street

There are a few more or less systematic exceptions to the requirement of complementing the noun's definiteness marker by another definite article – set phrases (65a/b), certain prepositional phrases (65c), nationality (65d) and certain other definite-ish adjectives (65e/f) –, but otherwise there is no question that the pattern in

(61d) is the basic construction of a definite NP with the overwhelming majority of attributive adjectives.

(65) a.   (*det) Vit-a   Hus-et
           (*the) white-WEAK house-DEF
           'the White House' (not 'the white house')

     b.   (*den) hel-a   dag-en
           (*the) whole-WEAK day-DEF

     c.   i (*den) sist-a   minut-en
           in (*the) last-WEAK minute-DEF

     d.   (*det) svensk-a   språk-et
           (*the) Swedish-WEAK language-DEF

     e.   (*det) förr-a   år-et
           (*the) preceding-WEAK year-DEF

     f.   (*den) bestämd-a   artikel-n
           (*the) definite-WEAK article-DEF

And what is doubly articulated in Swedish gives the convincing impression of being a well-integrated simple NP. One might be tempted to assume that in such doubly articulated basic NPs adjectives are, nonetheless, more nominal than they would be without the additional article. That the adjective-article acts as a kind of nominalizer is suggested by its occurrence with adjectives representing elliptical NPs whose missing noun is supplied by the immediate context:

(66)   'Did they buy the large house or the small house?'
        – Det stor-a [sc. hus-et]

Dialectally, however, the noun-article is also used for such purposes (66'), and in general it is the noun-article rather than the adjective-article that turns adjectives into full-fledged nouns (67) (Börjars 1994: 233f.):

(66')   – Stor-a-t
         tall-SG.DEF-the

(67)   vänster-n 'the [political] Left', Stora-n 'the Large [sc. Theatre]'

It is doubtful, therefore, whether re-articulation can be blamed on a nominal character of the attributive.

    Differing from Swedish, Classical Arabic (like most varieties of Colloquial Arabic too) puts the attributive adjective after the noun and the definite article before the noun as a prefix (or perhaps a proclitic), and it lacks a free indefinite article, with indefiniteness being signalled in most singular and many plural inflections of nouns and adjectives by nunation. Its pattern of definite re-articulation is, however, essentially the same (Lecomte 1976: 99–105):

(68) a.   kalbu-n
            dog-INDEF

      b.   al-kalbu
            DEF-dog

      c.   kalbu-n   qabīhu-n
            dog-INDEF vicious-INDEF

      d.   al-kalbu   l-qabīhu
            DEF-dog DEF-vicious

Unlike in Swedish, each adjective in a sequence takes its own article:

(69)   al-kalbu   l-kabīru   l-qabīhu
            DEF-dog DEF-big DEF-vicious

As in Swedish, attributive NPs preclude any further definiteness marking of their host NPs, other than requiring a non-nunated head; differing from Swedish, an adjective modifiying a head noun accompanied by an attributive NP does take the definite article – but that does not yield any supernumerary article:

(70)   (*al-)kalbu(*-n)   (*al-)l-jārati   l-qabīhu
            (*DEF-)dog(*-INDEF) (*DEF-)DEF-female.neighbour DEF-vicious
            'the female neighbour's vicious dog'

The adjective-article is not such a close relative of a demonstrative as in Swedish but a mere copy, contextually adapted, of the noun-article (which in turn does figure as a constituent in a distal demonstrative). Unlike in Swedish there are no subclasses of adjectives resistant to re-articulation. Doubly articulated NPs as exemplified by (68d) appear to be as basic and simple as simply articulated ones such as (68c), and their attributives are not vastly more nominal either.

One way of making sense of double definiteness marking in basic attributive constructions is in terms of agreement, especially if the markers on both nouns and adjectives are bound, as they are in Arabic. For Swedish, where the adjective-article is formally identical with a demonstrative pronoun and is certainly not inflectional, it is less plausible to assume that the adjective is accompanied by a definite article by virtue of agreement with a noun carrying a definite suffix. (What is plausibly a matter of agreement or government in Swedish is the choice between the strong/indefinite and weak/definite inflection of adjectives.) Nonetheless, it is perhaps not by sheer coincidence that at least one marker of definiteness is bound, presumably as an affix rather than a clitic, in the languages on record as requiring re-articulation in basic attributive constructions – even though in general markers of definiteness that are bound, either to nouns or to the first or last word in an NP (as in Basque, Albanian, Armenian, or Mordvin), tend not to be distributed over attributives and nouns by rules of agreement. And it is perhaps also worth noticing that what is doubly

marked is, essentially (ignoring Arabic nunation and the strong adjective declension of Swedish), definiteness rather than indefiniteness.

Although Swedish and Classical Arabic are not unique within the circle of their close relatives in showing the patterns just exemplified,[19] there is an inclination within their respective families to make do with less marking. As was seen above (§2.4.1), adjectives in Maltese are only re-articulated when they are restrictive. Within the Scandinavian branch of Germanic, Norwegian (Nynorsk and informal Bokmål) and Faroese permit re-articulation in the Swedish manner but are less eager to practice it. (Written) Faroese often omits the adjective-article (71a); but it may also, especially with certain adjectives (such as absolute superlatives) or before restrictive relative clauses, keep the adjective-article and drop the noun-article (71b), or it may, especially in set phrases, indeed do without either, with the weak adjective inflection as the only indicator of the NP's definiteness (71c) (Barnes & Weyhe 1984: 207).

(71) a.   (tann)   gaml-i   bátur-in
            (the/that) old-WEAK boat-DEF

      b.   tann   verst-i   ránsmaður
            the/that worst-WEAK bandit

      c.   Svart-i   Deyði
            black-WEAK death
            'the Black Death'

However, a restrictive relative clause may trigger double articulation of a noun unaccompanied by an adjective in Faroese (72) (Lockwood 1964: 107), where in Swedish a choice has to be made between the definiteness suffix or the definite article (73) (Börjars 1994: 236):

(72)   tann maður(-in) sum gjørdi hettar
            the man(-DEF) who did   this

(73)   mann-en   / den man som gjorde det
            man-DEF / the man who did   this

Icelandic knows both the noun-article and the adjective-article but in the presence of an adjective uses either one or the other rather than both at the same time, with the adjective-article (74b) being increasingly dispreferred (Sigurðsson 1992: 121):[20]

(74) a.   gull-i   hestur-inn
            yellow-WEAK horse-DEF

      b.   hinn   gull-i   hestur
            the/that yellow-WEAK horse

And, as the last modern Scandinavian variation on this theme, Danish and the formal Bokmål variety of Norwegian obligatorily shed the noun-article when an attributive adjective is added along with its adjective-article:

(75)   den ung-e   mand(*-en)
        the young-WEAK man(*-DEF)

2.6.2.   On the face of it, Albanian appears to replicate the Swedish-Arabic pattern of re-articulation of an adjective in the basic attributive construction. When definite, the noun has a suffix for definiteness (also indicating number and case), and the addition of an attributive adjective or similar amplifier in its normal postnominal position (inflecting for gender and number, and being invariably in the indefinite form) requires what might be taken for the equivalent of a definite adjective-article (labelled ART in the following glosses, with its agreement inflection unglossed); compare (63) and (68) with (76) (Buchholz & Fiedler 1987: 188–201, 232–241):

(76) a.   një   djalë-Ø
           a/one boy-SG.NOM.INDEF
     b.   djal-i
           boy-SG.NOM.DEF
     c.   djal-i   i   shkretë-Ø
           boy-SG.NOM.DEF ART poor-MASC.SG.INDEF
     c'.   i   shkret-i   djalë-Ø
           ART poor-MASC.SG.NOM.DEF boy-SG.INDEF

When the adjective is moved ahead of the noun, taking the article with it, as in (76c'), it is the adjective that inflects definitely while the noun is now indefinite. Attributives of a nominal kind, whether definite (77a) or indefinite (77b), also require the article:

(77) a.   nën-a   e   djal-it
           mother-SG.NOM.DEF ART boy-SG.GEN.DEF
           'the mother of the boy'
     b.   hartim-i   i   një gramatike-Ø
           writing-SG.NOM.DEF ART a   grammar-SG.GEN.INDEF
           'the writing of a grammar'

And, comparable again to Swedish, there is a morphological subclass of adjectives (including *besnik* 'true') that among other things forgo re-articulation:

(78) a.   një shok-Ø   besnik
           a   friend-SG.NOM.INDEF true
     b.   shok-u   besnik
           friend-SG.NOM.DEF true
     b'.   besnik-i   shok-Ø
           true-SG.NOM.MASC.DEF friend-SG.NOM.INDEF

However, what crucially distinguishes the Albanian adjective-article from that in Swedish or Arabic is that it does not primarily, or at any rate not exclusively, mark definiteness. It also occurs in indefinite NPs, as long as there is an attributive accompanying the noun; compare (63c) and (68c) with (76'c):

(76') c.   një djalë-Ø   i   shkretë-Ø
            a   boy-SG.NOM.INDEF ART poor-MASC.SG.INDEF

Insofar as we are faced with an attributive marker rather than an article, Albanian does not qualify as doubly articulating, as this term is being used here.[21] There is a sense or two, though, in which this attributive marker does participate in definiteness marking after all. First, it is not only the gender and number of the head noun and the case of the whole NP that determine its form, but also the (in)definiteness of the NP. For instance, while in the nominative singular masculine the attributive marker is *i* regardless of whether the NP is definite or indefinite (76d/c), in the corresponding accusative there is a difference: definite *e* (79a) contrasts with indefinite *të* (79b).

(79) a.   djal-in   e   shkretë-Ø
           boy-SG.ACC.DEF ART poor-MASC.SG.INDEF
     b.   një djalë-Ø   të   shkretë-Ø
           a   boy-SG.ACC.INDEF ART poor-MASC.SG.INDEF

Second, when definite, NPs containing a cardinal numeral may take the attributive marker, which is absent from corresponding indefinites (80), and NPs consisting of a cardinal numeral indeed must take it when definite (81).[22]

(80) a.   I kam parë tre   djem-Ø
           I have seen three boys-PL.ACC.INDEF
           'I have seen three boys'
     b.   I kam parë (të)   tre   djem-të
           I have seen (ART) three boys-PL.ACC.DEF
           'I have seen the three boys'

(81) a.   I kam parë tre
           I have seen three
           'I have seen three'
     b.   I kam parë të   tre
           I have seen ART three
           'I have seen the three'

Thus, owing to sporadic paradigmatic contrasts and to definiteness distinctions in the company of cardinal numerals, it is not entirely inappropriate to analyse Albanian NPs with adjectives in basic attributive constructions as requiring two definiteness markers.

2.7. Superlative adjectives

When the mere presence of an adjective does not entail any enrichment of the definiteness marking of NPs, putting the adjective in the superlative degree of comparison may nonetheless trigger what looks like re-articulation. This is what frequently happens in Romance.

The positive, comparative, and superlative degrees of ordinary postnominal adjectives in definite NPs in French are illustrated in (82).

(82) a.   l'homme fort
          the man   strong

     b.   l'homme plus / moins fort
          the man   more / less   strong

     c.   l'homme le   plus / moins fort
          the man   the more / less   strong
          'the strongest / least strong man'

It is the *le* of the superlative which appears to repeat the definite article. If the normal position of an adjective is prenominal, it may be shifted after the noun in the superlative (83c), producing the same pattern as in (82c), or it may stay prenominal and fail to distinguish comparative and superlative because one *le* is suppressed here (83b):

(83) a.   le jeune homme
          the young man

     b.   le (*le) plus / moins jeune homme
          the (*the) more / less   young man
          'the younger / less young man', 'the youngest / least young man'

     c.   l'homme le   plus / moins jeune
          the man   the more / less   young
          'the youngest / least young man'

In the case of adjectives which may be prenominal or postnominal, their meanings tend to be different depending on their position (e.g., *grand* 'great, large'), which precludes the shifting solution for a distinctive superlative:

(84) a.   le plus / moins grand homme
          the more / less   great man
          'the greatest / least great man', 'the greater / less great man'

     b.   l'homme le   plus / moins grand
          the man   the more / less   large
          'the largest / least large man'

While Rumantsch ((85), from Vallader), Rumanian (86), and certain local and historical varieties of Italian (Rohlfs 1969: 35–36) essentially follow the French example in obligatorily re-articulating postnominal superlatives,[23] contemporary standard Italian, Sardinian, Catalan, Spanish, and Portuguese do not consistently distinguish the superlative from the comparative even postnominally, using the repeated article only for purposes of putting greater emphasis on the adjective, if at all ((87), from Italian) (Lausberg 1972: 94f.).

(85)   l'hom il pü   ferm
         the man the more strong

(86)   om=ul   cel mai tare
         man=the the more strong
         'the strongest man'

(87) a. l'uomo più   forte
         the man more strong
         'the stronger / strongest man'

     b. l'uomo il più   forte
         the man the more strong
         'the strongest man'

Maltese resembles Romance in its use of the definite article for distinguishing superlatives from comparatives, which are themselves formed from positives synthetically or analytically (e.g. *qawwi* 'powerful' – *aqwa* 'more powerful', *sabih* 'beautiful' – *aktar sabih* 'more beautiful'). It will be remembered (from §2.4.1) that attributive adjectives in Maltese are re-articulated when restrictive, and that they take the definite article from the noun in the exceptional case of being fronted. The re-articulability of any restrictive adjective would create a danger of attributive superlatives being indistinguishable from comparatives, but this is avoided by regularly placing superlatives in front of their nouns, themselves unarticulated (Sutcliffe 1936: 60–65):

(88) a. il-belt   il-qawwi
         DEF-city DEF-powerful

     b. il-belt   l-aqwa
         DEF-city DEF-more:powerful
         'the more powerful city'

     c. l-aqwa   belt
         DEF-more:powerful city
         'the most powerful city'

Paradoxically, as a result of this fronting, NPs with superlatives thus end up less articulated than NPs with other adjectives in normal postnominal position. Just like

le plus jeune homme (83b) in French, they are in fact under-articulated: there ought to be two definiteness markers on the initial superlative, one by virtue of it being a superlative, another by virtue of it being NP-initial – thus, **il-l-aqwa belt.*

In fact, for superlatives based on analytic comparatives matters are somewhat different. These regularly follow the noun when the NP is indefinite (89a); and they may also stay behind when it is definite, neutralizing superlative and comparative (89b); but more commonly the articulated comparative-forming adverb moves ahead of the noun, now again unarticulated (89c).

(89) a.   ktieb l-aktar   sabih
           book DEF-more beautiful
           'a most beautiful book'
     b.   il-ktieb   l-aktar   sabih
           DEF-book DEF-more beautiful
           'the more/most beautiful book'
     c.   l-aktar   ktieb sabih
           DEF-more book beautiful
           'the most beautiful book'

It is only the postnominal superlatives of analytic comparatives that yield doubly articulated NPs (89b). Even so they do not realize their full articulatory potential: they might have been one up on comparatives here, getting one definiteness marker by virtue of being postnominal restrictive adjectives in definite NPs (like comparatives) and another by virtue of being superlatives (which are articulated even if an NP is indefinite, see (89a)) – thus, **il-ktieb il-l-aktar sabih.*

Disregarding absolute superlatives or elatives (such as 'a most beautiful book'), the natural environment for superlative adjectives is obviously NPs that are definite, and this intercategorial affinity is sometimes reflected in the actual use of definiteness markers for forming superlatives.[24] There is a question, however, whether definite NPs with superlatives formed with the help of definiteness markers represent genuine cases of double articulation. The question, more particularly, is whether *le* in French or *il-* in Maltese are really the same items categorially when forming superlatives and when marking NPs as definite. We might also be dealing with homonymy here – as for example in English, where the word that introduces the two parts of correlative constructions such as *the sooner the better* cannot be the definite article on distributional grounds, even though it looks like it.[25] In fact, the behaviour of superlative markers occasionally diverges from that of their definite look-alikes. Thus, the definite article is omissible under identity from the second conjunct in adjectival coordination in French (90a) (where the non-omission of the second article indeed suggests that reference is being made to two men), but the superlative marker is not (90b) (with no implications for reference):

(90) a.   le grand et (le) beau   homme
           the great and (the) beautiful man
           'the great and beautiful man'
     b.   l'homme le plus grand et   *(le) plus fort
           the man the more large and *(the) more strong
           'the largest and strongest man'

On the other hand, the suppression of one of the two items when a definiteness and a superlative marker would happen to be adjacent – recall French **le le plus jeune homme* or Maltese **il-l-aqwa belt* and **il-ktieb il-l-aktar sabih* – would hardly be so irresistible if they were categorially different. Mere haplology would not strike so relentlessly.

Even if the appropriate analysis is to say that it really is the definiteness marker itself, rather than a homonymous adverb or particle, that is used to form superlatives from comparatives, there is a mitigating circumstance for double articulation in definite NPs with superlatives in basic attributive constructions: the second article is there to perform a separate function, though one that is possibly related to that of distinguishing definite and indefinite NPs.

2.8.   Ordinal numerals

Another such function with an affinity to definiteness is that of forming ordinal numerals from cardinal ones: the most natural, though not the only, environments of cardinal and ordinal numerals are indefinite and definite NPs respectively. Maltese (91), Sardinian (92), and Rumanian (93) are among the languages to use a definite article for this purpose.[26]

(91) a.   sitt irġiel
           six man:PL
           'six men'
     b.   is-sitt   irġiel
           DEF-six man:PL
           'the six men'
     c.   is-sitt   raġel
           DEF-six man:SG
           'the sixth man'[27]

(92) a.   tres vacca-s
           three cow-PL
           'three cows'
     b.   sa-s   tres vacca-s
           the-PL three cow-PL
           'the three cows'

c. sa de tres vacca
    the of three cow
    'the third cow'

(93) a. trei soldaţ-i
         three soldier-PL
         'three soldiers'

     b. cei   trei soldaţ-i
         the:MASC.PL three soldier-PL
         'the three soldiers'

     c. al   trei-lea   soldat
         the:MASC.SG three-PRO soldier
         'the third soldier'

In Rumanian (Beyrer, Bochmann, & Bronsert 1987: 143–145) it is not the normal noun-article (=*ul*) nor the demonstrative-like article (*cel*) that transform cardinal numerals into ordinals but yet another variety of definite article, viz. the possessive article (*al*), otherwise used with possessive pronouns and other possessive phrases. The additional suffix of the ordinal numeral (-*lea*) is of a pronominal nature, and contributes to the overall impression of definiteness too, if less transparently.

However, as was the case with superlatives, such ordinals do not perforce render definite NPs doubly definite. As is seen in the (c)-examples, ordinal-forming and definiteness-marking elements are not allowed overtly to co-occur; one such marker simultaneously performs both functions, perhaps aided by further means (such as the preposition *de* in Sardinian and the pronominal suffix -*lea* in Rumanian).[28]

At least in Rumanian there are circumstances where the articulatory potential of ordinals is realized more fully. When the ordinal is postnominal, as it often is in certain kinds of expressions, it retains the possessive article and the NP-initial noun acquires the noun-article, with the ordinal-forming and definiteness-marking functions now disentangled:

(94) secol=ul   al   XIX-lea
      century=the the:MASC.SG nineteen-PRO
      'the nineteenth century'

Also, if NPs with ordinals other than 'first' are in the genitive-dative[29] they need the support of the demonstrative-like article plus the preposition *de*, with the possessive article cliticizing onto the preposition:

(95) cel-ui   de=al   trei-lea   soldat
      the-MASC.SG.GEN of=the:MASC.SG three-PRO soldier
      'of the third soldier'

Finally, the affinity between ordinals and definiteness notwithstanding, it is possible to have an ordinal numeral in an indefinite NP, and here Rumanian does not hesitate to combine an indefinite and a definite (possessive) article:

(96) un   al   trei-lea   soldat
      a:MASC.SG the:MASC.SG three-PRO soldier
      'a third soldier'

Sardinian balks at partnering the indefinite article with the ordinal-definite one (97),[30] and God knows what they do in Malta when they need to refer to a sixth man, a third cow, or a Second Coming.[31]

(97)   *una sa de tres vacca
        *a   the of three cow

In principle, though, the presence of an ordinal ought to be considered a factor conducive to re-articulation (of the function-sharing sort) in basic and simple NPs.

2.9. Blends of alternative orders due to disorderly adverbs

Another possible source of double articulation is, ultimately, the human propensity to indecisiveness. When there is a choice of doing things one way or the other, man is inclined either not to do them at all or to try to do them both ways at the same time – which is what made life so miserable for Prince Hamlet and King Lear respectively. When constructing phrases or clauses, having it both ways means blending.

Thus, when an article can alternatively appear in different positions relative to the attributive or parts of it, or also of other amplifiers of the noun, it may simultaneously – as it were, erroneously – show up in more than one place.

Intensifying adverbs are particularly prone to mess up the orderly arrangement of NPs. Too impatient to await their turn, they are inclined to hop ahead of whatever rightfully comes before them, including articles, those natural introducers of NPs. Assuming the normal order in an NP to be as in (98a), with the adverb adjacent to the adjective it intensifies (or grades, also interrogatively), the advancement of the adverb as in (98b) not only severs the neighbourly bond between intensifier and intensified but also dislodges the article from its accustomed position. Combining the two templates, as in (98c), would be one way of having one's cake (an initial article) and eating it too (dealing with the urgent business of intensification earlier than with other adverbial modification) – if at the expense of having one article too many.

(98) a. Article [Adverb [Adjective]] Noun
     b. Adverb Article Adjective Noun
     c. Article Adverb Article Adjective Noun

What is shown schematically in (98) is routinely put into practice in Bavarian with a wide selection of volatile intensifiers or graders and with both indefinite and definite articles (Merkle 1975: 89f.):

(99) a.   ein recht / ?so   / ganz / (viel)   zu / wie warms Bier
            a   quite / ?such / very / (much) too / how warm beer

      b.   recht / so   / ganz / (viel)   zu / wie ein warms Bier
            quite / such / very / (much) too / how a   warm beer

      c.   ein recht / so   / ganz / (viel)   zu / wie ein warms Bier
            a   quite / such / very / (much) too / how a   warm beer

(100) a.   ein noch wärmers Bier
            a   still warmer beer

      b.   noch ein wärmers Bier
            still a   warmer beer

      c.   ein noch ein wärmers Bier
            a   still a   warmer beer

(101) a.   die ganz großn Brezn
            the very big   pretzels

      b.   ?ganz die großn Brezn
            ?very the big   pretzels

      c.   die ganz die großn Brezn
            the very the big   pretzels

Numerals and indefinite determiner pronouns share this proclivity for doubling with articles:

(102) a.   zwei ganz alte Brezn
            two very old pretzels

      b.   ??ganz zwei alte Brezn
            ??very two old pretzels

      c.   zwei ganz zwei alte Brezn
            two very two old pretzels

(103) a.   was   ganz Neues
            something very new

      b.   ganz was   Neues
            very something new

      c.   was   ganz was   Neues
            something very something new

As indicated by question marks in the (a)- or (b)-examples, not all intensifiers which invite re-articulation are equally mobile. Although some (such as *so* or *ganz*) may not be wholly comfortable in both pre-adjectival and pre-determiner position, the general availability of two alternative slots for items of this kind apparently suffices to licence an extra article. In fact, at least one of the relevant intensifiers, *so*, may co-occur with a noun without an intervening adjective, and its only position here is NP-initial; nonetheless, it also permits a second article in front of it, as do NPs with *so* and an intensified adjective:[32]

(104) a.   *ein so   Depp
            *a   such fool

      b.   so   ein Depp
            such a   fool

      c.   ein so   ein Depp
            a   such a   fool

In Standard German, blendings like the (c)-examples of (99)–(104) may now and then be encountered as slips of the tongue or perhaps even the pen. For Bavarians, especially when airing their opinions with customary force, they are the rule rather than the exception, even in utterances whose dialectal flavour is otherwise not particularly strong.[33]

English is not without a potential for such blendings either. While intensifying or grading adverbs are not as mobile in English as their equivalents are in Bavarian, they are still responsible for deviations from normal NP order. As is exemplified in (105), the basic template for English, as well as for Bavarian, is (98a), but some such items, again as in Bavarian, wrest first place from the article (98b), and others drag its adjective along on their way to the top (98b′), which is unparalleled in Bavarian.

(98) b′.   [Adverb [Adjective]] Article Noun

(105) a.   an awfully big schnitzel
      b.   such/what a (big) schnitzel
      b′.   so/as/too/how/however big a schnitzel

Even though *such*, *so* etc. are not themselves mobile, one might expect NPs containing them to succumb, at least occasionally, to the influence of what is otherwise the normal order, with articles in front of the NP. However, English is not conspicuous for such lapses as have become a habit in Bavarian:

(105) c.   *a such/what a big schnitzel
      c′.   *a so/as/too/how/however big a schnitzel

In fact there is some real mobility in certain intensified NPs, more so for some speakers than for others, but to no effect on articulation for any, however impassioned:

(106) a.   a more elegant dirndl
       b.   more elegant a dirndl
       c.   *a more elegant a dirndl

(107) a.   a far bigger schnitzel than ...
       b.   far bigger a schnitzel than ...
       c.   *a far bigger a schnitzel than ...

(108) a.   what an enormous rucksack
       b.   ?what enormous a rucksack
       c.   *what an enormous a rucksack

While remarkably resistant to double articulation of the straightforward blending kind, English has been observed now and then, and even in writing, to give in to the temptation of double determination in precisely these circumstances. It is only in the company of intensifiers shifting ahead of articles, perhaps along with their adjectives, that indefinite articles have been able to sneak into NPs with an initial demonstrative or indefinite pronoun, not otherwise compatible with an article (*this an awfully big schnitzel) (Jespersen 1949: II, 365f.):

(109) a.   thys so deyntye and delycate an opinion
       b.   for this so rare a present
       c.   this his so inestimable a jewell
       d.   anye so horible an offence
       e.   another such a night
       f.   there is not another so callous and insensible a member
       g.   there isn't another such a dropsy in the parish

Assuming that indefinite *another* is analysable into an indefinite article plus *other*, there would in fact be double articulation in examples such as (109e/f/g).

And there is one volatile word to do with grading or quantifying that is on record as having misled even none-too-overarticulate English into blending and re-articulation: *half* (Jespersen 1949: II, 308f., 361; VII, 470). The position that *half* has come to prefer is that in front of everything else (a), but it is also found to attach closely to the noun or nouny numeral it quantifies (b) – which is the sort of mobility to encourage blending (c):

(110) a.   half a dollar
       b.   a half(-)dollar
       c.   a half a dollar

(111) a.   half a dozen times
       b.   a half(-)dozen times
       c.   [I've told you] a half a dozen times [before]

One of the alternatives involved in such blends is not really produced by live syntax: direct combinations of *half* with a noun or nouny numeral have to some extent acquired the status of fixed expressions or compounds (hence the frequent hyphenated spellings). Perhaps this is one reason why *double* and also (with the noun's number as an extra complication) *many*, which share the positional mobility of *half*, do not succumb to blending:

(112) a.   double the amount
       b.   the double amount
       c.   *the double the amount

(113) a.   many a liverwurst
       b.   a (great) many liverwursts
       c.   *a (great) many a liverwurst(s)

2.10. Definiteness and indefiniteness blended

What indecisive speakers may attempt to realize simultaneously are not only constructions where the same constituent parts appear in alternative linear order, but also constructions with different constituents, though ones of a similar kind and with about equally good chances of being selected in the contexts at issue. Thus, sometimes, there are no particularly good reasons for preferring a definite article over an indefinite one and vice versa, and one possible outcome are blendings where both make it into an NP side by side.

In Middle High German such combinations of indefinite and definite articles, in this order, appear to have enjoyed unusual popularity (Behaghel 1923: 137f.). In typical examples such as (114c) the noun to be articulated is accompanied by a relative clause and a superlative, pointing to a partitive construction as one of the alternatives blended (114a); and in (115c), again with a relative clause, the definiteness of the relative pronoun is as it were anticipated on the external head, which would be indefinite if the relative clause were missing.[34]

(114) a.   diu was ein   der   schoensten   magete, von der   uns ie   wart
             she was a/one of.the most.beautiful maidens, of   whom us   ever was
             gesaget
             told
       b.   diu was die schoenste   maget, von der   ...
             she was the most.beautiful maiden, of   whom ...
       c.   diu was ein   diu schoenste   maget, von der   ...
             she was a/one the most.beautiful maiden, of   whom ...

(115) a.   so bin ich ein man, der sich   iu   nennet   ane   schame
             so am I   a   man, who himself to.you mentions without shame

b. so bin ich der man, der sich   iu   nennet   ane   schame
    so am I   the man, who himself to.you mentions without shame

c. so bin ich ein der man, der sich   iu   nennet   ane   schame
    so am I   a   the man, who himself to.you mentions without shame

Superlatives as such reek of definiteness. Nonetheless, nouns that would be indefinite when on their own or when accompanied by a non-superlative adjective may manage to retain their indefinite article in such company, and when the superlative insists on the NP being definite, there will be re-articulation – as in (116), where the superlative adjective is postnominal, which is rare in Middle High German.

(116)   en pert   das beste
        a horse the best

Similarly, in pre-standard Italian, when postnominal superlatives would repeat the definite article à la French (cf. §2.7 above), nouns themselves could in fact be marked indefinite (Rohlfs 1969: 35–36, pointed out to me by Georg Bossong):

(117)   per un motivo il piú   ridicolo della terra
        for a motive the more [i.e., most] ridiculous of.the earth
        (Goldoni)

In English it is again *half* which is involved in what is the closest analogue to such blendings of indefinitely and definitely articulated NPs (Jespersen 1949: VII, 470f.). When the entire NP is introduced by the definite article (118) or such definite determiners as demonstratives or genitives (119),[35] an indefinite article, the natural companion of a quantifier such as *half*, may stand its ground too, though tucked away in its alternative position behind *half* (see above) and perhaps protected by the familiarity of the environment.

(118) a. for the next half an hour
      b. You will get the half a crown a week which your leaders demand
      c. if we turn to the half-a-dozen lines which are so translated
      d. so did the half a dozen fellows who …

(119) a. that half a crown a week will come to you
      b. the old Surveyor's half a dozen sheets of foolscap
      c. an inventory of my half a dozen shirts and silk pair of breeches

Otherwise English is extremely resistant to double articulation of such a kind (and of any other kind too), and even suppresses one article when two in a row would actually be justified, owing to a part of the NP being regularly endowed with an article of its own (Jespersen 1949: VII, 468f.):

(120)   the + a(n) > the
      a. during the [a] century and a half which followed the Conquest
      b. the [a] dozen Europeans who have crossed the Sahara
      c. the cocktail takes the place of the [a] cake and a glass of wine

(121)   the + the > the
      a. any sleepers on the [the] Prince of Wales Road side of the house

(122)   a + the > a
      a. some of his former associates established a new [the] Lord Chamberlain's company

(123)   an + a > a
      a. a[n a] month old baby would have eaten more[36]
      b. I wish it was a[n a] little heavier one
      c. this looked like a[n a] good deal bigger affair than he had anticipated

Once the article that belongs with the whole NP is at a distance from an inherent article, the latter may resurface, however uneasily:

(120′) a. the ten or [the] a dozen Europeans who …[37]

(121′) a. any sleepers on the noisy the Prince of Wales Road side of the house

(122′) a. some of his former associates established a new the Lord Chamberlain's company

(123′) a. a healthy a month old baby would have eaten more

However, there are arguably two NPs corresponding to the two articles in virtually all such constructions, except (123b).

2.11.   Noun phrase downgraded to modifier

NPs may get degraded, though. Earlier we have met with situations where a second NP, full or nounless, is amplifying a first NP and the relationship between them is shading from that of loose apposition into that of closer-knit attribution, with the NP-hood of the amplifying constituent being increasingly less obvious (§§2.2–5). An alternative scenario of NP-integration is for an NP that is the head of another NP to be reanalysed as a modifier, with the erstwhile modifier correspondingly rising to the rank of the head. In the process of downgrading, the constituent affected may partly or fully lose its NP-hood while retaining its article.

This is what has happened, and is still happening, to *ein bißchen* 'a bit' in German. This expression is used as a modifier of predicative adjectives (124), of mass

nouns, themselves without article, or of nominalizations headed by indefinite pro-
nouns (125), but also of certain count nouns (126) and especially in conjunction
with attributive adjectives with excessive *zu* 'too' (127).

(124)   Der Schnaps ist ein bißchen warm
         the schnapps is a   bit   warm

(125) a.   Gib mir ein bißchen Sauerkraut!
            give me a   bit   sauerkraut!

      b.   Gib mir ein bißchen was   zu lesen!
            give me a   bit   something to read!

(126)   Gib mir ein bißchen einen Vorsprung!
         give me a   bit   an   advantage!

(127) a.   Er gab mir einen ein bißchen zu großen Vorsprung
            he gave me an   a   bit   too big   advantage

      b.   Er gab mir ein bißchen einen zu großen Vorsprung
            he gave me a   bit   a   too big   advantage

The current status of *ein bißchen* is not unequivocal. Like a noun, including the near
synonym *Stückchen* (129), *bißchen* admits modifying adjectives of suitable mean-
ing (128a) and is accompanied by the indefinite article, governing their gender and
number (neuter singular); and together with its own amplifiers it precedes those con-
stituents to which it is to be related semantically (like *zu groß* in (129a)). How-
ever, it differs from nouns in being consistently spelled with a lower-case initial (like
words other than nouns are), in permitting its own modifying adjective to drop its
agreement inflection (128b/129b), and in being able to move ahead of entire articu-
lated NPs without requiring them to be in the genitive case (126/129c, 127b/129e);[38]
furthermore, while *bißchen* is transparently a diminutive of the noun *Biß* 'bite', its
meaning has been extended to that of a general quantifier for any small quantity or
extent.

(128) a.   ein klein-es   bißchen Sauerkraut
            a little-NEUT.SG bit   sauerkraut

      b.   ein klein-Ø bißchen Sauerkraut
            a little-Ø bit   sauerkraut

(129) a.   ein klein-es   Stückchen Schnitzel
            a little-NEUT.SG morsel   schnitzel

      b.   *ein klein-Ø Stückchen Schnitzel
            *a little-Ø morsel   schnitzel

      c.   *Gib mir ein Stückchen einen Vorsprung!
            *give me a   morsel   an   advantage!

      d.   Er gab mir einen ein Stückchen zu großen Vorsprung
            he gave me an   a   morsel   too big   advantage

      e.   *Er gab mir ein Stückchen einen zu großen Vorsprung
            *he gave me a   morsel   a   too big   advantage

Thus, despite its indefinite article, *ein bißchen* is not – diachronically speaking, no
longer – a full-blown NP in its own right, and doubly articulated NPs containing this
newly developed modifier, such as (126) and (127), must accordingly be considered
to lack, to some extent, an NP constituent. Being obligatorily indefinite, the article
of *bißchen* is more of a lexical than of a syntactic nature, though.

Although the equivalents of *ein bißchen* in languages such as Dutch (*een beetje*),[39]
English (*a bit*), French (*un peu*), or Italian (*un poco/po'*) would all seem to be drifting
towards modifierhood, none is as resolute in retaining its indefinite article while
shedding much of its NP-hood. For instance, there is an inclination to continue to
structurally subjugate the NP quantified by means of prepositions (*a bit of*, *un peu de*,
un po' di NP), but this is perhaps weakening with English *a bit*, and it has subsided
completely with *een beetje* in Dutch:

(130)   Percival is a bit [??](of) a bungler

(131)   Perceval is een beetje (*van) een broddelaar

When in construction with an attributive adjective, *een beetje* is also found in front
of the NP's own article (132), as is possible in German (127b), whereas *a bit* stays
by its adjective (133a), but is not entirely happy there either because English would
much rather suppress one of two articles in a row (see (123) above); shifting the NP's
article after the adjective when this is permitted by an intensifier like *too* provides
some relief (133b).

(132)   Perceval is een beetje een (te)   oud paard
         Perceval is a   bit   a   (too) old horse

(133) a.   Percival is ([??]an) a bit (too) old horse
      b.   [?]Percival is a bit too old a horse

One English modifier of this kind, and perhaps the only one, that is clearly non-
nominal is *little*, which presumably derives by ellipsis from *little bit*, whence its
unusual article; but this article too tends to get dropped in the company of another
(123b), such is the horror English has of any double articulation of simple and even
some complex NPs.

In the Egyptian Arabic variation on this theme, NPs are sometimes more permis-
sive (Woidich 1995: 267). When nouns such as *ḥitta* 'piece', *ḥabba* 'grain', and
šuwayya 'small thing' are grammaticalized as quantifiers ('a grain of gasoline' >
'a little gasoline'), they are turned from heads into modifiers on a par with numer-
als. However, while NPs with a numeral take only a single definite article, prefixed

or proclitic to the numeral (134a), ex-noun quantifiers in substandard Cairo Arabic retain their definite article upon the combination with a noun itself marked as definite in what are clearly simple modifier-head constructions on all relevant evidence (134b).

(134) a.   it-talat   kutub
           DEF-three book.PL
           'the three books'

      b.   il-ḥabbit   il-banzīn
           DEF-little DEF-gasoline
           'the/this little gasoline'

2.12.   Strong nouns on their own

In our survey so far the nouns in doubly articulated NPs were always accompanied by lexical material of one kind or another, and it was such additional constituents which could, in one way or another, be held responsible for re-articulation. Amplification of an NP is not, however, a necessary condition for double articulation.[40]

In the Bavarian dialect of German, especially as spoken by the more masculine parts of the indigenous population, NPs are not infrequent where all that follows the definitely articulated head noun is another definite article (or also a 2nd or 1st person personal pronoun, if this is what precedes the head noun in lieu of an article[41]), and it makes no difference whether or not the noun itself is accompanied by an adjective:

(135) a.   die (bsuffane) Sau   die!
           the (drunken) swine the!

      b.   Hast   die (bsuffane) Sau   die gsehng?
           have:you the (drunken) swine the seen?

(136) a.   du/ich (alter) Depp du/ich!
           you/I (old) fool you/I!

      b.   Woher weißt du (alter) Depp du das?
           how   know you (old) fool you that?

Especially in their second occurrence, the definite articles here appear in their strongest form, which they share with the independent or determiner demonstrative pronoun – as is seen when the orthography is truer to dialectal sound than it was in (135) and (136):[42]

(137) a.   Brennd   a Haus / (a)s Haus / (a)s/dees Haus wo   am   Sepp
           is.on.fire a house / the house / the   house which to:the Sepp
           gheard   / dees oder dees Haus?
           belongs / this or   that house (Neuter)?

      b.   Brennd   ??(a)s/dees Haus *as/dees etzat endli?
           is.on.fire the   house the   now after.all?

The force of such article or pronoun repetition, with NPs used independently as exclamations (135a/136a) or also properly embedded in complete clauses (135b/136b/137b), is to impart a characteristically emotional flavour to one's words. To be able to receive such special emphasis, an NP should have a certain inherent potential for affective charge. An indefinite article can only be repeated, for similar effects of spirited emphasis, when it is in the company of an intensifying adjective:

(138)   ein solcherner (alter) Depp ein solcherner
           a   such   (old) fool a   such

The lack of any extra lexical material would seem to argue against the NP-hood of the plain definite article or the indefinite article plus an intensifying element that are following the properly articulated NPs in such constructions. On the other hand, it will be remembered that the purely referential value of non-overt heads in hypostasis formations (§2.1.2) did not preclude their recognition as NPs in their own right either. Moreover, it is possible, with no great difference in meaning or force, to repeat an adjective, if the NP contains one, along with the article, or indeed to have an adjective only after the second article, yielding a pattern in Bavarian that is reminiscent of that illustrated earlier from Greek (Merkle 1975: 168f.):

(135′) a. die (bsuffane) Sau   die bsuffane!
           the (drunken) swine the drunken!

       b. Hast   die (bsuffane) Sau   die bsuffane gsehng?
           have:you the (drunken) swine the drunken seen?

While the preference in such more substantial constructions is again for the strongest forms of the definite article (those shared with the demonstrative) in both its occurrences, their weaker alternatives seem more acceptable than when there is no adjective to support them:

(137′) b. Brennd   ?(a)s/dees Haus ?as/dees varreggde etzat endli?
           is.on.fire the   house the   damned   now after.all?

At any rate, should articles (or whatever kinds of pronouns they turn out to be on closer examination of such formal subtleties) which are repeated on their own in the Bavarian style be analysable as remnants of NPs, the ties between such rudimentary NPs and those they accompany are far tighter than in afterthoughts or run-of-the-mill apposition.

2.13.   Emphatically indefinite

While the repetition of an article in Bavarian lends special emotional force to the entire NP, the effect of repeated marking for definiteness, or rather indefiniteness, may also be confined to this category itself. To place emphasis on indefiniteness as such has been claimed to be an effect that is produced by multiple marking.

According to Krámský (1972: 142–145), who gives no source and does not identify the relevant dialects, Kurdish (Iranian) has two ways of marking plural indefiniteness, the suffix (or enclitic) -nə, derived from the indefinite pronoun hınə 'some, several', and this indefinite pronoun itself, serving as an indefinite article. The indefinite suffix and article are used interchangeably under normal circumstances, but they combine when the NP's indefiniteness needs emphasizing:

(139) a.   xort-nə
            youth-PL.INDEF
      b.   hınə   xort
            some ([sm]) youth(s)
      c.   hınə xort-nə
            some youth-PL.INDEF

In Ubykh (North-West Caucasian), indefiniteness is marked by the omission of the definite prefix/proclitic or by the cardinal numeral 'one' used as an indefinite article, which can be an independent word or a proclitic. In order to emphasize the indefiniteness of an NP a further indefinite element can be added (enclitically or by way of compounding) to the noun in an NP already equipped with an indefinite article (140b); and if the NP has further constituents, the indefinite article can, in proclitic form, be repeated with all of them for particularly strong emphasis (140c), and it can also be combined with the added indefinite itself (140d) (Krámský 1972: 152, after Dumézil 1931: 13–16).[43]

(140) a.   za-tət
            a-man
      b.   za-tət-g°ara
            a-man-INDEF
            'a (certain) man'
      c.   za-č'ɔɔ za-bγa-s   za-tət-g°ara
            a-horse a-on-sitting a-man-INDEF
            'a (certain) man sitting on horseback'
      d.   za-g°ɔčáq'a za-g°ara
            a-word   a-INDEF
            'a (certain) word'

There are no indications of added structural complexity in NPs in Kurdish and Ubykh with more than one marker of indefiniteness (unless za-g°ara in (140d) is to be taken for the independent indefinite pronoun, which is indeed formed by combining these two components, and the whole expression accordingly consists of two NPs in apposition: 'a word, some(thing)'). What should perhaps not be taken for granted is that the purpose of such double marking really is to lay emphasis on indefiniteness; judging by the translations provided, it might also be a way of endowing indefinite NPs with specific reference.

2.14.   Specific reference or discourse prominence

In fact, it is not uncommon for specific reference, a category rarely if ever endowed with marking entirely of its own, to be expressed by double marking for (in)definiteness.

In Sinhalese (Indo-Aryan), this is done by combining markers of indefiniteness, viz. the suffixal (or enclitic) indefinite article grammaticalized from the numeral 'one' and that numeral itself (a definite article is lacking; Geiger 1938: 115–116):

(141)   ek-goviy-ek
         one-cultivator-INDEF
         'a certain cultivator'

Elsewhere markers of indefiniteness and definiteness are combined for this purpose. Thus, while non-specific indefiniteness is simply marked by prefix (or proclitic) ši- in Moroccan Arabic, specific indefiniteness requires two forms, the indefinite article wahed (identical to the numeral 'one') plus the regular definite prefix (Harrell 1962):[44]

(142) a.   ši-ktab
            INDEF-book
            'some book (or other)'
      b.   l-bent
            DEF-girl
      c.   wahed l-bent
            a   DEF-girl
            'a (specific) girl'

Direct objects in Kirghiz (Northern Turkic) show a four-way contrast: when inherently uncommitted as to definiteness they are unarticulated and in the zero-marked absolutive (143a); when indefinite they press the numeral 'one' into service as an article (143b); when definite they take the accusative ending (143c); and for specific reference they avail themselves of both the indefinite article and the definite accusative ending at the same time (143d) (Krámský 1972: 170).[45]

(143) a.   alma ǰedim
           apple I.ate
           'I ate a/the apple; I was apple-eating'
      b.   bir alma ǰedim
           a   apple I.ate
           'I ate an (i.e. any) apple'
      c.   alma-nɨ   ǰedim
           apple-ACC.DEF I.ate
           'I ate the apple'
      d.   bir alma-nɨ   ǰedim
           a   apple-ACC.DEF I.ate
           'I ate some specific apple'

However, as is pointed out in Comrie (1981: 169) apropos of Tajik (South-West Iranian), what direct objects like that in (143c) are marked for may not be definiteness per se but the relevance of an NP for the subsequent discourse. If the sole business of articles and equivalent bound forms is taken to be the distinction of definite and indefinite ('referent assumed or not assumed by the speaker to be identifiable by the addressee'), then NPs like the Tajik specimen in (144) would not strictly speaking qualify as doubly articulated, because the precise contribution of the "definite" accusative ending is to signal referential prominence; but that would arguably be too narrow a view on definiteness and articles, drawing a strict line through an overall semantic-pragmatic domain where several focal areas shade into each other almost imperceptibly.

(144)   parda-e-ro
           curtain-SG.INDEF-ACC.DEF
           'a certain curtain'

On the present evidence, it seems that at least one of the markers which may join forces in simple, unamplified NPs in order to render the NP's reference specific or its discourse status prominent must be a bound form.

2.15.   Doubly (in)definite for no (good) reason other than the availability of several markers

Markers of (in)definiteness may also combine redundantly rather than for a semantic or pragmatic purpose. As in amplified NPs, a mechanism that may occasion such vacuous over-articulation is that of blending: when there are different forms and/or positions for markers of (in)definiteness, a single NP may conflate such alternatives.

Like Kurdish (§2.13), Modern Persian is another Iranian language to have two overt forms for indefiniteness: the enclitic -i (grammaticalized from the Old Iranian

numeral 'one') and the article yek (identical to the current numeral 'one'), favoured in formal and colloquial style respectively (145b/c). The bare noun without any suffix or determiner can be interpreted as indefinite or definite depending on the context (145a). Especially in colloquial language both indefinite markers may also show up simultaneously (145d), but, unlike in Kurdish or also Sinhalese (§2.14), with no attendant difference in meaning or force (Lazard 1992: 66, 71f.):[46]

(145) a.   ketâb
           'book, a (or some) book(s), the book (in question)'
      b.   ketâb=i
           book=INDEF
      c.   yek ketâb
           a   book
      d.   yek ketâb=i
           a   book=INDEF
           'a book, whatever book, a certain book'

When the noun is modified by an adjective, the indefinite enclitic may attach to the adjective or (without ezâfe) to the noun (146a/b), and in both cases there may also be an indefinite article (146d/e), but the indefinite article apparently does not occur without its clitic partner (146c):

(146) a.   ketâb-e   kamyâb=i
           book-EZÂFE rare=INDEF
      b.   ketâb=i   kamyâb
           book=INDEF rare
      c.   *yek ketâb-e   kamyâb
           *a   book-EZÂFE rare
      d.   yek ketâb-e   kamyâb=i
           a   book-EZÂFE rare=INDEF
      e.   yek ketâb=i   kamyâb
           a   book=INDEF rare

2.16.   Sole nouns with layered (in)definiteness marking

In principle it may also be the normal and only legitimate state of affairs in simple NPs for unaccompanied nouns to be doubly marked for plain definiteness or indefiniteness. Languages with such a penchant for overdoing articulation appear to be rare, though. And it is not always clear, to speakers as well as grammarians, how the relevant patterns are best analysed.

What may happen now and again is that two generations of articles come to cluster around nouns; but since such co-occurring forms should be at far-apart stages in what

has been claimed to be the typical life cycle of articles – demonstrative > definite article > marker of definite/indefinite specific reference > gender/class marker or mere noun marker (Greenberg 1978, 1991), and *mutatis mutandis* for indefinites – they will hardly qualify as instances of essentially the same thing being done twice to a simple NP.[47]

2.16.1.   Where permissible, genuine overmarking, being recognizable as such synchronically, may be something that not all nouns (or other relevant words) of a language are prepared to engage in.

Thus, while the general mode of definiteness marking with Albanian nouns is inflectional (147), a subset of nouns that comprises kin terms as well as *zot* 'master' and *zojë* 'lady' in addition takes the prepositive "article" (148), whose main function otherwise is to link attributives to their heads, regardless of their definiteness (Buchholz & Fiedler 1987: 200, 290f.).

(147) a. djal-i
          boy-SG.NOM.DEF

      b. një   djalë-Ø
          a/one boy-SG.NOM.INDEF

(148) a. i   nip-i
          the nephew-SG.NOM.DEF

      b. një   nip-Ø
          a/one nephew-SG.NOM.INDEF

It has been shown above (§2.6) that the attributive article does have a share in the coding of definiteness, and it follows from the contrast with indefinites (148a/b) that marking definiteness indeed is what this article is doing with kin terms, in concert with nominal inflection.[48] It is also prone to do something else, however. Presumably owing to the article's redundancy as a marker of definiteness, it has been reinterpreted as a 3rd person possessive pronoun, and as such has become equivalent to genuine possessive pronouns, except that unlike these it does not distinguish gender and number of the possessor:

(149) a. i   nip-i
          the/his/her/their nephew-SG.NOM.DEF

      b. nip-i   i   tij / saj / tyre
          nephew-SG.NOM.DEF ART his / her / their

Another way of dealing with the redundant definite article turned possessive pronoun in recent Albanian is to omit it in contexts that suggest a natural identification of the possessor, which partly realigns kin terms with ordinary nouns that are not marked twice for definiteness:

(150)   Vajti   te (i)   nip-i
          he.has.gone to (his/the) nephew-SG.NOM.DEF
          'He has gone to his nephew'

Cardinal numerals, when occurring on their own in an NP, are another kind of word to be doubly marked for definiteness in Albanian (Buchholz & Fiedler 1987: 233), without reinterpretation or loss threatening to befall the prepositive article:

(151)   të gjashtëmbëdhjetë-t
          ART sixteen-PL.NOM.DEF
          'the sixteen'

2.16.2.   It is also conceivable for regular overmarking to be completely general, affecting all articulable nouns (or other relevant words) under all circumstances.

This is indeed what we appear to find again in Albanian, where all nouns are obligatorily distinguished as definite and indefinite by their inflection, and when they are indefinite they are accompanied, frequently if not obligatorily, by the indefinite article, as was seen in (147b) and (148b).

In Arabic it is definiteness which arguably has two exponents even in unamplified NPs, one negative and the other positive. Many singular and most plural inflections of nouns signal indefiniteness by nunation, whose absence is therefore a fairly reliable indicator of definiteness; and when definite, an unnunated noun requires the definite prefix (or proclitic):

(152) a. kalbu-n
          dog-INDEF

      b. al-kalbu-Ø
          DEF-dog-DEF

And to rehash yet another language of those given to re-articulation when NPs are amplified (§2.6), Swedish might be argued on the same grounds to mark indefiniteness twice on bare nouns. By virtue of the absence of a definite suffix a noun is already recognizable as indefinite, and this status is confirmed by the indefinite article:

(153) a. hus-et
          house-DEF

      b. ett hus-Ø
          a   house-INDEF

What renders the analysis of such nouns as doubly (in)definite somewhat suspect is that their overt marking is always simple. It is only if the absence of an exponent of definiteness (Albanian, Swedish) or of indefiniteness (Arabic) is taken to contribute to the marking of the opposite category – indefiniteness in Albanian and Swedish

and definiteness in Arabic – that this latter category comes out as doubly marked. However, when zeroes are as systematic as in our three cases, perhaps they wish to be taken literally and do not want their nothingness to be imbued with meaning.

There is a further question of analysis here, even if the present evidence makes it seem academic. If a language were like Albanian, Arabic, or Swedish except that the zeroes in examples such as (147b/148b), (152b), (153b) were replaced by something more tangible, would this perforce amount to genuinely double, repeated marking of nouns for (in)definiteness? An obvious alternative would be to analyse such patterns as involving simple marking, superficially split into two interdependent parts. Presumably, owing to its very generality, such bipartite marking would be prone to be unified, with the two parts that occur in tandem on all nouns being linked to each other as the extended and possibly discontinuous exponents of a single marker.

Another, syntactic way for co-occurring forms of the same categories to be regularly partnered, when at least one of them is bound and its host is in syntactic construction with its partner, is to be distributed by rules of government or agreement. Accordingly, when nouns inflect for definiteness and indefiniteness, this would naturally be analysed as being due to agreement or government if there are words (i.e., articles) in their permanent company which are also distinguished as definite and indefinite.

2.17.   Fossilized markers

Finally, an article may be added to a noun whose basic lexical form includes what used to be an article but was re-analysed as an integral part of the noun. Synchronically, therefore, such nouns do not count as articulated and are no liability to their NPs.

Cases in point are Maltese *ilma* and *nuccali*, which historically consist of the definite prefix and a noun stem (154) (Sutcliffe 1936: 19), and English *newt* and *nickname*, which historically incorporate a fragment of an article, with the final consonant of the prevocalic form of the indefinite article having been missegmented as the initial consonant of these nouns (155).[49]

(154) a.   l-ilma   <   il-ma
             DEF-water   DEF-water
       b.   in-nuccali   <   n- (< l-)uccali (< Sicilian *ucc[h]iali*)[50]
             DEF-glasses   DEF-glasses

(155) a.   a newt   <   an ewte
       b.   a nickname   <   an ekename

It is in an even more indirect sense that English nouns such as *alcove, alcohol, algebra, almanac, alpaca,* or *albatross* can be said to include an article, for their first syllables can be traced back, ultimately, to the definite prefix of Arabic (156).

(156)   the/an alcove   <   al-qobbah (Arabic)
                                 DEF-vault

The most fertile ground for such fossilizations and subsequent regular re-articulations are creoles, such as French-based Haitian (157), and other languages in intensive contact, such as Arabic-infiltrated Spanish (158) (Noll 1996).[51]

(157)   lanfan-la   <   lanfan   <   l'enfant
           child-DEF   child   DEF child

(158) a. el (al)corán   <   (al)corán   <   al-qur'ān
           DEF koran   koran   DEF-reading
       b. el azúcar   <   azúcar   <   as-sokkar
           DEF sugar   sugar   DEF-sugar
                                                   (< Skt. śárkarā)

3.   Etiology of excess

3.1.   Seven reasons for overmarking

However diverse the phenomena may seem that have been sampled in §2, it is only for a limited number of reasons that NPs tend to be doubly articulated – and these reasons are essentially the same as those behind other overmarking, such as for number or case.

3.1.1.   When a constituent to be marked consists of one or more parts which are of the same kind as the whole, these parts may thus themselves be worthy of the same externally-assigned marking as the whole.

This is how case, for example, may get marked on all conjuncts of a coordinate NP rather than just once, or on both the head and an appositive. The lesson of double articulation in this respect is that the distinction between constructions consisting of two NPs, with one NP loosely added to another as an appositive or an afterthought or with one NP recursively embedded in another, and of only one NP, amplified by an attributive or a noun in closer-knit apposition, is not a categorical one. Judging by the evidence of §§2.1–5 and 2.11–12, articulation can be highly sensitive to even minimal disturbances of the simplicity and integrity of an NP, being ready to reapply whenever an adjectival attributive approaches nominal status or begins to detach itself from its head or leaves its customary position.

3.1.2.   Particular categories may be utilized for purposes of indicating the syntagmatic relatedness of parts of well-integrated phrases and clauses, and are accordingly marked, typically in morphologically bound form, on the parts to be related by virtue of rules of agreement or government.

(In)definiteness is a less popular category of relatedness-indication within the NP than number, case, gender/class or person, but there are instances where agreement or government might be held responsible for such double marking in simple NPs (§§2.6 and 2.16.2).

3.1.3.   A category may be marked more than once on the same constituent in order to express a meaning that compositionally results from the combination of this category with itself.

Thus, adding a second plural marker may transform a paucal into a multal; a dual meaning, without a form of its own, may be constructed by combining a singular with a plural; or two local cases may be required for a meaning (such as 'from under') unexpressible by a single case. Simultaneously marking a simple NP as definite and indefinite, or perhaps also as doubly indefinite, is a comparable combinatorial strategy for compensating the lack of a special form for specific reference (§§2.13–14).

3.1.4.   There may be what looks like double marking for one category although in actual fact the duplication is more apparent than real because the two identical markers have different, although perhaps related functions, or are even homonyms, whose overt sameness is merely coincidental.

Thus, when a noun carries what are ostensibly two cases this may turn out to be a case of mistaken categorial identity, insofar as one "case" is really something else, such as a derivational affix or a topic marker. The superlative degree and ordinal numerals are categories with a formal and presumably also functional affinity to definiteness; and if definitely articulated NPs are amplified by superlatives or ordinals what looks like the same marking (but isn't) may appear twice, unless the formally identical but functionally different markers fall prey to reduction (§§2.7–8). What second articles may also turn out to be upon closer inspection is nominalizers or attributivizers, with nominalization and attributive marking being other functional domains that overlap with (in)definiteness (§§2.6 and 2.16.1).

3.1.5.   Like whole words or groups of words, marking may be repeated for a pragmatic rather than a semantic effect, especially for the purposes of emphasizing the category concerned or of lending greater affective force to the entire expression containing it. As Hugo Schuchardt put it more generally, "Das Affektische und das Logische durchdringen … das ganze Sprachleben; jenes vermannigfacht, dieses vereinfacht" (1928: 324).[52]

Negation, diminution or gradation are categories with a well-known proclivity to emphatic or affective doubling. Re-articulation for analogous reasons, or at least with such reasons as an influence among others, has been amply documented above (§§2.3.1, 2.4, 2.7, 2.9, 2.12, 2.13).

3.1.6.   A constituent may get doubly marked as a result of the simultaneous realization of two roughly equivalent but syntagmatically mutually exclusive ways of marking it, with the execution of the utterance plan strictly speaking going astray. That is to say, two alternative constructions, with the same elements in different linear order or with different elements in the same position, may get blended or contaminated.

It is by way of blending, for example, that double plural marking sometimes originates from the sequential combination of plural allomorphs, and such complex exponents may subsequently be reanalysed as simple (cf. Paul 1920: 160–173; Plank 1981: 76–89). And blending is sometimes the reason also for double articulation in NPs, bare or amplified, that do not contain another NP but are relatable to an equivalent NP with a single article in a different position or with a different article in the same position (§§2.9, 2.10, 2.15).

3.1.7.   When a first marker is not really very distinctive or is no longer recognizable as what it used to be, as a result of formal erosion or owing to its having been reanalysed as something else, such as an integral part of its carrier, a constituent may be marked anew for the same category in the interest of transparency.

The lack of distinctiveness is a frequent reason for overmarking for categories of any kind (cf. Plank 1981: 67–89, 1985). In the sporadic cases on record where an original article or parts of an article have become amalgamated with a noun (§2.17), the reanalyses responsible are not synchronic processes and the subsequent re-articulation of such nouns therefore does not count as synchronic doubling. Also, when articles age and develop into whatever they are destined to be recycled as, and eventually come to coexist with their successors (§2.16), it is only in a historical sense that the two generations of articles share a categorial identity.

3.2.   Favourable conditions

It needs special reasons such as these for an NP to be doubly articulated one way or another. Like other overmarking, double articulation is not something the ordinary simple NP should be expected to engage in as a matter of course.

3.2.1.   In the most normal manifestation of this abnormality, doubly articulated NPs indeed hide another NP inside themselves, or something close to being an NP

or otherwise struggling for independence, that justifies the extra articulatory effort. Double articulation of this kind therefore ought to thrive in languages whose normal mode of NP syntax is that of loose apposition rather than of hierarchical constituency (cf. Plank (ed.) 1995a), provided they have grammaticalized marking of (in)definiteness.

3.2.2.   Affectivity and negligent monitoring have also proved strongly conducive to double articulation of various sorts. It is only natural therefore that peoples ruled by passions and given to laissez-faire should have gone on record as being among the most prolific double articulators – such as the rustics of Bavaria, who seldom weigh their words, let alone articles.

Acknowledgments

Notes

1. Further requirements may pertain to the formal or categorial identity of the two articles, when these are formally or categorially variable (Plank 1991).
2. This is a subject that is frequently touched on in Plank (ed.) (1995a).
3. In the indefinite subparadigm number is neutralized.
4. The scope of the asterisk for ungrammaticality is always narrow; it does not extend beyond a slash. An asterisk inside a parenthesis means an expression is ungrammatical if what is in parentheses were added.
   Among its relatives and neighbours Dutch is the odd man out insofar as river names retain their definite article after a classifying noun (Jan Rijkhoff, personal communication):

   (i)   de Rijn;   de rivier de Rijn
            the Rhine; the river the Rhine

   Like English and the rest, Hungarian does not permit two articles, although it looks like the one to be dropped is that of the accompanying noun rather than the proper name's:

   (ii)   (a) Feri; a bácsi; a Feri (*a) bácsi
             (the) Feri; the uncle; the Feri (*the) uncle

   Taking underarticulation one step farther, nouns which require an article when on their own in a definite NP may occasionally lose it when they accompany proper names in such constructions in Hungarian (Tompa 1972: 148, 180):

   (iii)   (*a) Budapest; a város; (*a) Budapest (*a) város
             (*the) Budapest; the town; (*the) Budapest (*the) town

5. In the corresponding genitive construction the place name is articulated (see below, §2.6, on ART):

   (i)   qytet-i   i   Elbasan-it
            city-DEF ART Elbasan-SG.GEN.DEF

6. In the example that Krámský (1972: 82) adduces to show that both first name and family name are articulated in Modern Greek, *o pétros o nomikós*, the second part of the proper name has the definite article because it is an adjectival epithet ('Peter the Scribe, the one of the Scriptures')
7. Although all non-Vlax European dialects of Romani developed from a language once in close contact with Greek, not all of them are doubly articulated in this manner.
8. The information about possessives and demonstratives derives from Ian Hancock (via Mily Crevels and Jan Rijkhoff). Hancock's examples are direct rather than oblique forms, and thus show no overt contrast between adjectival and nominal inflection (e.g., *kodó (o) rakló – o rakló o kodó*). Hancock seems to imply that the re-articulation of postnominal possessives and determiners is optional rather than obligatory; Boretzky (2000) does not give examples that would confirm the re-articulated patterns (30b), (31b), and (32b).
9. This would seem to be the only occasion where a nounless adjective inflects differently from an adjective followed by a noun (pace Weinreich 1971: 326).
10. Krámský (1972: 92) mentions Label (Bismarck Archipelago) as requiring only a single NP-initial article when an adjective follows a noun but articles on both the adjective and the noun when the adjective comes first. From the examples Krámský adduces, *(n)a* looks more like a ligature linking the parts of NPs (see Foley 1980 on the patterning of such forms in Austronesian), at least on its second occurrence, or also like a general NP-marker rather than a marker of definiteness and indefiniteness. Since ligatures are also supposed to reflect degrees of bondedness, though, postnominal adjectives would still seem more strongly tied up with their nouns than prenominal ones in Label.
11. It is the noun or the adjective which takes the article; they do not take it both at the same time, because that would be useless overdetermination.
12. Masculine proper names in the genitive-dative do not take the enclitic definite article but are preceded by the genitive (masculine singular) of the 3rd person personal pronoun – but this makes no difference for purposes of the articulation of a following adjective:

    (i)   mărime lui   Dumnezeu (celuĭ) bun
             might:the of.him God   (of.the) good
             'the power of the good God'

13. Börjars (1994: 246) instead suggests that the "pronominal" demonstrative is adjectival, since it occurs after a noun with the definite article, which is an environment shared with adjectives. Mallinson (1986: 265) recognizes an appositional appearance of pronominally inflected postnominal demonstratives, although they form a suprasegmental unit with the noun.

14. It is controversial whether the Maltese definite article is a proclitic or a prefix. The rare NPs with a prenominal adjective have only a single, initial marker for definiteness: *il-kiefra Misilmin* the-fierce Moslems (Sutcliffe 1936: 63).

15. It is mentioned by Schwyzer (1936: 153), Kurzová (1974: 44), and Rijkhoff (1992: 234, personal communication from Chryssoula Lascaratou of Athens).

16. See Rijkhoff (1992: 237), who quotes Krámský (1972: 112), who relies on Dmitriev (1939) and/or Majzel (1957).

17. To complicate matters further, when there is no following adjective, the adjective or the noun of the attributive NP may host the definite enclitic:

    (i)   yä=təguh=u   tämari däbtär
           of=diligent=DEF student notebook

    (ii)   yä=təguh tämari=w   däbtär
           of=diligent student=DEF notebook

18. The contributions by Börjars, van der Auwera, Koptjevskaja-Tamm, and Gil to Plank (ed.) (1995b) add to the ample literature on these languages. For Scandinavian see also Lundeby (1965) for a general comparative and historical survey, and several contributions in Holmberg (ed.) (1992) and Börjars (1994) for recent differential views on the formal and distributional properties of the bound articles involved.

19. In Europe, Ladino (Judeo-Spanish) strikingly differs from other varieties of Spanish in following this Semitic structural model (*el ombre el grande* 'the man the big') (Georg Bossong, personal communication).

20. Old Icelandic had preferred pattern (74b) or an alternative with the articulated adjective after the noun, 'horse the yellow', giving rise to the enclitic/suffixal noun-article through reanalysis. But occasionally additional noun-articles are also found, both when adjectives were prenominal (especially comparatives and ordinal numerals; (i)) or postnominal (especially with a demonstrative or other adjective intervening; (ii)) (Heusler 1932: 124–127):

    (i)   enn þriþe maþr-enn
           the third man-DEF

    (ii)   liþ-et   alt   et dauþa
           army-DEF entire the dead

21. Actually, calling it an attributive marker does not do justice to this versatile marker, because some adjectives can also take it when used predicatively:

    (i)   Djal-i   është i   shkretë
           boy-SG.NOM.DEF is   ART poor
           'The boy is poor'

22. Cardinals unaccompanied by a noun may in addition take definite inflection themselves (e.g., *të gjashtëmbëdhjetë-t* the sixteen-DEF), being thus doubly marked for definiteness.

23. Remember from §2.4.1 that postnominal adjectives as such, regardless of their degree of comparison, can also be re-articulated for emphasis in Rumanian, and it is this same form of the article that is used for superlatives. When a superlative is moved ahead of its noun in Rumanian, it is this article which remains while that on the noun itself is dropped (as with other prenominal attributives):

    (i)   cel mai tare   om
           the more strong man

24. In Albanian it is in predicative function (articulated just like the attributive one – see above) that the definite inflection transforms a comparative into a superlative (Buchholz & Fiedler 1987: 239):

    (i)   Liria është më   e   bukur-Ø/bukur-a
           Liria is   more ART handsome-FEM.SG.NOM.INDEF/DEF
           'Liria is more / the most handsome'

    See Moravcsik (1969: 83) on further interrelations between definiteness and superlatives.

25. In superlative constructions like *He likes you the best* it is perhaps less clear whether we merely have a homonym of the definite article or the real thing.

26. See also Moravcsik (1969: 83) for further evidence of this affinity. Sometimes, however, it is indefinite determiners that form ordinals – as in Susu (Mande, Niger-Congo; Friedländer 1974: 84):

    (i)   lefure firin
           orange two
           'two oranges'

    (ii)   lefure firin-nde
           orange two-INDEF
           '(a/the) second orange'

    Apparently, the indefinite determiner *nde* 'a (certain), some' cannot be added once more to an NP with an ordinal numeral in Susu, to yield the meaning 'a (certain) second orange'.

27. With numerals above 10 nouns are in the singular in Maltese, which obliterates the distinction between definite NPs with cardinal and corresponding ordinal numerals; for instance:

    (i)   l-ghoxrin   student
           DEF-twenty student:SG
           'the twenty students'/'the twentieth student'

28. There would in principle be a definiteness marker in Rumanian that would not be adjacent with the joint ordinal-definiteness marker *al*, viz. the noun-article (*soldat=ul*), which may actually co-occur with *al* in certain possessive phrases; but its use here is ruled out because the noun is not NP-initial.

29. Or also in the plural, to take care of meanings such as 'the third [group of] soldiers'.
30. Stefanu Marongiu, personal communication.
31. Several native consultants balked at the request of such reference and preferred to evade the issue by paraphrase.
32. Perhaps an adjective is understood in such constructions:

(i)   ein so   [großer] Depp
         a   such [big]   fool

This, at any rate, is what the NP means, rather than, say, 'such a handsome fool'.
33. I would not be flabbergasted to hear a speaker of, for instance, Low German utter NPs like *'n so'n sööten Appel!* (a such a sweet apple!), but I doubt that any other German dialect, with the possible exception of Alemannic, is a match for Bavarian in respect of overarticulation.
34. See, for instance, Perlmutter (1970) on the frequent interchangeability of definite and indefinite articles in the presence of relative clauses, and Moravcsik (1969: 77–81) on general affinities between relativization and definitization.
35. The NP-initial determiner may in fact also be indefinite:

(i)   the Pleasure of enjoying some half a score of Mistresses

(ii)   some half an hour before

36. There is an additional complication in this kind of example, since it remains bad even with a plural head not requiring an overt article of its own: *a month old babies*. Postposing leads to improvement: *babies a month old*.
37. Compare also *[the] a glass of wine* in (120c).
38. If the NP is definite, *ein bißchen* cannot move ahead:

(i)   der ein bißchen zu große Vorsprung
         the a   bit   too big   advantage

(ii)   *ein bißchen der zu große Vorsprung
         *a   bit   the too big   advantage

39. It was a native speaker of this language, Jan Rijkhoff, who first broached this subject to me in conversation.
40. Single marking for definiteness may in fact also be limited to amplified NPs. Thus, in Nkore-Kiga (Bantu, Niger-Congo), NPs are only distinguished as definite or indefinite when nouns are accompanied by an adjective or relative clause; to signal definiteness, the adjective or relative modifier retains the initial vowel of its agreeing class-number prefix (Taylor 1985: 125):

(i)   omu-shaija   omu-rungi
         CL1.SG-man CL1.SG-kind
         'the kind man'

(ii)   omu-shaija   mu-rungi
         CL1.SG-man CL1.SG-kind
         'a kind man'

The retention or loss of the vowel of the noun's own class-number prefix in Nkore-Kiga is subject to conditions unrelated (or at best indirectly related) to definiteness, such as being the object of a negative verb, the complement of certain prepositions, or in the vocative (in which cases it is dropped). Such evidence suggests, then, that the distinction of definiteness in bare NPs implies that in amplified NPs, but not vice versa – which should also give amplified NPs the edge over bare ones when it comes to double articulation.
41. Once more attesting to the close affinity between definite article and personal pronoun. In general, personal pronouns appear to repeat more easily than articles, at least in extra-clausal NPs (such as vocatives). Analogues of (135a) are found, for instance, in Georgian (Fähnrich 1986: 56):

(i)   še k̇ai k̇ac-o,   šena!
         you good man-VOC, you!

42. Owing to the partial similarity, formal and functional, of definite article and demonstrative it is in fact hard to determine the identity of the elements at issue. The weakest proclitic forms of the articles (if this is what these words are) would be banned from postnominal position because there is nothing they could lean on.
43. See also Charachidze (1989: 372), who does not, however, give relevant examples that would confirm complexities such as those in (140c/d). Dumézil's original transcription of Ubykh has been modernized in (140) (by courtesy of Georg Bossong), in line with his own later practice.
44. In Supyire (Gur family, Niger-Congo), non-specific indefinite NPs remain unmarked while specific indefinite NPs resemble Moroccan Arabic in that they take an indefinite article plus the regular definite suffix of nouns. It is such more elaborately marked indefinites which tend to become highly topical further on (Carlson 1994: 195).
45. An analogous four-way contrast is also found in other Turkic as well as in Iranian and other languages of this area; see Bossong (1985: 83).
46. Similar bracketings of nouns by indefinite markers have also been reported for another Iranian relative, and one within the domain of EUROTYP, the Digor dialect of Ossetic (Isaev 1966). In the Iron dialect the only trace left of abandoned segmental indefinite markers is a retraction of stress on non-initially stressed indefinite direct object NPs.
47. See also de la Grasserie (1896: 301f.) on what he calls "superfétation d'un article sur un article" (superfluous addition of one article to another).
48. Days of the week and nominalized adjectives share the double definite marking of kin terms, but here the functions of the prepositive article are those of an attributive marker (with days of the week deriving from attributive constructions, e.g., 'Monday' < 'moon-day') and/or of a nominalizer, and these articles are also present when such nouns are indefinite. See also de la Grasserie (1896: 313).
49. The other way round, nouns such as *adder, apron* or *umpire* lost their initial /n/ to the indefinite article.

50. An alternative explanation reconstructs Maltese *nuċċali* as containing the Sicilian indefinite article *n*, an allomorph of *nu/na*: *n ucciali* (Sgroi 1987/88).
51. Thanks to Georg Bossong for bringing these cases to my attention.
52. The affective and the logical are pervasive influences on the whole life of language: the former multiplies, the latter simplifies.

References

Barnes, Michael P., with Eivind Weyhe
1994   "Faroese", in: König & van der Auwera (eds.), 190–218.

Behaghel, Otto
1923   *Deutsche Syntax. Eine geschichtliche Darstellung. Vol. 2: Die Wortklassen und Wortformen*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Beyrer, Arthur, Klaus Bochmann, & Siegfrid Bronsert
1987   *Grammatik der rumänischen Sprache der Gegenwart*. Leipzig: Enzyklopädie.

Boretzky, Norbert
2000   "The definite article in Romani dialects", in: Viktor Elšík & Yaron Matras (eds.), *Grammatical relations in Romani: The noun phrase*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Börjars, Kersti
1994   "Swedish double determination in a European typological perspective", *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 17: 219–252.
1995   "Double determination in Swedish (mainly)", in: Plank (ed.) 1995b, 61–73.

Bossong, Georg
1985   *Empirische Universalienforschung: Differentielle Objektmarkierung in den neuiranischen Sprachen*. Tübingen: Narr.

Buchholz, Oda & Wilfried Fiedler
1987   *Albanische Grammatik*. Leipzig: Enzyklopädie.

Carlson, Robert
1994   *A grammar of Supyire*. (Mouton Grammar Library 14.) Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Charachidze, Georges
1989   "Ubykh", in: B. George Hewitt (ed.), *The indigenous languages of the Caucasus. Volume 2: The North West Caucasian languages*. Delmar: Caravan Books, 357–459.

Comrie, Bernard
1981   *The languages of the Soviet Union*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dmitriev, N. K.
1939   *Stroj tureckogo jazyka*. Leningrad.

Dumézil, Georges
1931   *La langue des Oubykhs*. Paris: Champion.

Fabri, Ray
1993   *Kongruenz und die Grammatik des Maltesischen*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Fähnrich, Heinz
1986   *Kurze Grammatik der georgischen Sprache*. Leipzig: Enzyklopädie.

Foley, William A.
1970   "Toward a universal typology of the noun phrase", *Studies in Language* 4: 171–199.

Friedländer, Marianne
1974   *Lehrbuch des Susu*. Leipzig: Enzyklopädie.

Geiger, Wilhelm
1938   *A grammar of the Sinhalese language*. Colombo: Royal Asiatic Society, Ceylon Branch.

Gil, David
1995   "Multiple (in)definiteness marking in Hebrew, Mandarin, Tagalog, Indonesian and Singlish", in: Plank (ed.) 1995b, 189–227.

Gjerdman, Olof & Erik Ljungberg
1963   *The language of the Swedish coppersmith gipsy Johan Dimitri Taikon*. (Acta Academiae Regiae Gustavi Adolphi 40.) Uppsala: Lundequist.

Goodwin, William W.
1894   *A Greek grammar*. (2nd edition.) London: Macmillan.

Grasserie, Raoul de la
1896   "De l'article (Morphologie et syntaxe)", *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 9: 285–322, 381–394.

Greenberg, Joseph H.
1978   "How does a language acquire gender markers?", in: Joseph H. Greenberg, Charles A. Ferguson, & Edith A. Moravesik (eds.), *Universals of human language*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, vol. 3, 47–82.
1991   "The last stages of grammatical elements: Contractive and expansive desemanticization", in: Elizabeth Closs Traugott & Bernd Heine (eds.), *Approaches to grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, vol. 1, 301–314.

Haiman, John & Paola Benincà
1992   *The Rhaeto-Romance languages*. London: Routledge.

Harrell, Richard S.
1962   *A short reference grammar of Moroccan Arabic*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Hasdeu, B. P.
1885   "Le type syntactique homo-ille ille-bonus et sa parentele", *Archivio glottologico italiano* 3: 420–441.

Heusler, Andreas
1932   *Altisländisches Elementarbuch*. (3rd edition.) Heidelberg: Winter.

Holmberg, Anders (ed.)
1992   *Papers from the workshop on the Scandinavian noun phrase*. (DGL-UUM Report, 32.) Umeå: Department of General Linguistics, University of Umeå.

Isaev, M. I.
1966   *Digorskij dialekt osetinskogo jazyka*. Moskva.

Jacobs, Neil G., Ellen F. Prince, & Johan van der Auwera
1994   "Yiddish", in: König & van der Auwera (eds.), 388–419.

Jespersen, Otto
1949   *A Modern English grammar on historical principles*. Volumes 2 (2nd edition) and 7. London: Allen & Unwin.

Joseph, Brian & Irene Philippaki-Warburton
1987   *Modern Greek*. (Croom Helm Descriptive Grammars.) London: Croom Helm.

König, Ekkehard & Johan van der Auwera (eds.)
1994   *The Germanic languages*. London: Routledge

Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria
1995   "'A woman of sin', 'a man of duty' and 'a hell of a mess': Non-determiner genitives in Swedish", in: Plank (ed.) 1995b, 75–112. Revised in this volume.

Krámský, Jiří
1972   *The article and the concept of definiteness in language*. The Hague: Mouton.

Kurzová, Helena
1974   "Strukturell-typologische Charakteristik der Balkansprachen", *Linguistique balkanique* 17: 41–50.

Lafitte, Pierre
    1962   *Grammaire basque (navarro-labourdin littéraire).* (2nd edition.) Bayonne: Amis du Musée Basque & Ikas.

Lausberg, Heinrich
    1972   *Romanische Sprachwissenschaft, III: Formenlehre.* (2nd edition.) Berlin: de Gruyter.

Lazard, Gilbert
    1992   *A grammar of contemporary Persian.* Costa Mesa, Cal.: Mazda.

Lecomte, Gérard
    1976   *Grammaire de l'arabe.* (2nd edition.) Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Leslau, Wolf
    1995   *Reference grammar of Amharic.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Lockwood, W. B.
    1964   *An introduction to Modern Faroese.* (1st printing 1955.) Munksgaard: København.

Lundeby, Einar
    1965   *Overbestemt substantiv i norsk og de andre nordiske språk.* Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Majzel, S. S.
    1957   *Izafet i tureckom jazyke.* Moskva.

Mallinson, Graham
    1986   *Rumanian.* (Croom Helm Descriptive Grammars.) London: Croom Helm.

Merkle, Ludwig
    1975   *Bairische Grammatik.* München: Heimeran.

Moravcsik, Edith A.
    1969   "Determination", *Working Papers on Language Universals* 1: 64–98.
    1995   "The distribution of definiteness marking in Hungarian noun phrases", in: Plank (ed.) 1995b, 121–187. Revised in this volume.

Noll, Volker
    1996   "Der arabische Artikel *al* und das Iberoromanische", in: Jens Lüdtke (ed.), *Romania Arabica: Festschrift Kontzi.* Tübingen: Narr, 299–314.

Paul, Hermann
    1920   *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte.* (5th edition.) Halle (Saale): Niemeyer.

Perlmutter, David M.
    1970   "On the article in English", in: Manfred Bierwisch & Karl-Erich Heidolph (eds.), *Progress in linguistics.* The Hague: Mouton, 233–248.

Plank, Frans
    1981   *Morphologische (Ir-)Regularitäten. Aspekte der Wortstrukturtheorie.* Tübingen: Narr.
    1985   "On the reapplication of morphological rules after phonological rules and other resolutions of functional conflicts between morphology and phonology", *Linguistics* 23: 45–82.
    1991   "On determiners: 1. Ellipsis and inflection; 2. Co-occurrence of possessives", *EUROTYP Working Papers* VII/11.

Plank, Frans (ed.)
    1995a   *Double case: Agreement by Suffixaufnahme.* New York: Oxford University Press.
    1995b   *Overdetermination.* (*EUROTYP Working Papers* VII/24.)

Rijkhoff, Jan
    1992   *The noun phrase: A typological study of its form and structure.* Ph.D. dissertation, Universiteit van Amsterdam.

Rohlfs, Gerhard
    1969   *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti. Vol. 3: Sintassi e formazione delle parole.* Torino: Einaudi.

Schuchardt, Hugo
    1928   *Hugo Schuchardt-Brevier. Ein Vademecum der allgemeinen Sprachwissenschaft.* Zusammengestellt und eingeleitet von Leo Spitzer. Halle (Saale): Niemeyer.

Schwyzer, Eduard
    1936   "Die nominale Determination in den indogermanischen Sprachen", *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft* 63: 145–167.

Sgroi, Salvatore Claudio
    1987/88   "L'articolo indeterminativo del siciliano e la sua agglutinazione nei sicilianismi del maltese", *Journal of Maltese Studies* 17/18: 32–53.

Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann
    1992   "Aspects of the DP analysis of the Icelandic NP", in: Holmberg (ed.), 119–144.

Sutcliffe, Edmund F.
    1936   *A grammar of the Maltese language, with chrestomathy and vocabulary.* London: Oxford University Press.

Taylor, Charles
    1985   *Nkore-Kiga.* (Croom Helm Descriptive Grammars.) London: Croom Helm.

Tompa, József
    1972   *Kleine ungarische Grammatik.* Leipzig: Enzyklopädie.

van der Auwera, Johan
    1995   "On double definiteness in Dutch, Lebanese Arabic, Swedish, and Danish", in: Plank (ed.) 1995b, 113–119.

Weinreich, Uriel
    1971   *College Yiddish: An introduction to the Yiddish language and to Jewish life and culture.* (5th edition.) New York: YIVO Institute for Jewish Research.

Woidich, Manfred
    1995   "Some cases of grammaticalization in Egyptian Arabic", in: *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference of L'Association Internationale pour la Dialectologie Arabe.* Cambridge: Trinity Hall, University of Cambridge. 259–268.