

Mara Panaitescu*
University of Bucharest

THE DISTRIBUTION OF ROMANIAN PRE- AND POSTNOMINAL DEMONSTRATIVES: A COMPARISON WITH SPANISH

Abstract: The aim of the paper is to identify the restrictions that operate on the postnominal demonstrative in Romanian by investigating its distribution in contrast to the prenominal construction. The main uses of demonstratives identified in the literature (deictic, anaphoric, etc.) are tested with the two Romanian constructions, with the result that the postnominal demonstrative, although having a wider distribution in terms of register, has a narrower distribution from a semantic perspective, in terms of the limited options available for the fixing of a referent. Crucially, these limitations are distinct from the narrower distribution of the Spanish postnominal demonstrative as opposed to the prenominal demonstrative in the same language. The differences are assumed to stem from the distinct syntactic positions that the Romanian and Spanish postnominal demonstratives occur in.

Keywords: postnominal demonstrative, deixis, anaphora, indexed adjective

1. Introduction

The demonstrative in Romanian, Spanish and many other languages can be found in two syntactic constructions: the demonstrative followed by the NP (henceforth the prenominal demonstrative, in short PreDem) and NP + affixal definite determiner + demonstrative (henceforth the postnominal construction, in short PostDem).

In the syntactic literature, these two types of demonstratives have been associated with two different syntactic positions (Giusti 1997, Cornilescu and Nicolae 2011, Alexiadou 2014, Ahn 2022 a.o.): a high position in the D area, sometimes in complementary distribution with the definite determiner and a low position below D and possibly above NP. The low determiner has been assigned to an adjectival position in certain languages and to an intermediate functional layer in other languages (including Romanian)¹.

In terms of allowed interpretations for demonstratives, I will follow the classification in Giurgea (forthcoming) into four classes: deictic, anaphoric, recognitional (evocative) and bleached. The first two uses have been discussed at length in the literature, therefore only the latter two uses will be illustrated here. The recognitional (evocative) use is similar to the anaphoric use in requiring the identification of an antecedent, only this antecedent is

* mara.panaitescu@lils.unibuc.ro

¹ One of the strongest arguments in favor of an inter-linguistic difference is the position of the PostDem w.r.t. to adjectives (see section 4 for discussion).

not available in the immediately preceding discourse, but is part of the experience shared between the speaker and addressee and is to be called upon from memory. Gundel et al.'s (1993) example below illustrates this use.

- (1) I couldn't sleep last night. That dog (next door) kept me awake.
(Gundel et al. 1993: 278, example 5)

The demonstrative above counts as recognitional if the addressee must be familiar with the referent, i.e. must have a representation of the referent in memory, without there necessarily being any previous explicit mention of this referent.

Bleached uses involve contexts where the discourse referent introduced by the demonstrative DP is unique and not familiar to either the speaker or the hearer. These uses are syntactically constrained in that the DP containing the demonstrative must also contain a restrictive relative clause:

- (2) That person who invented the computer was a genius.
(Wolter 2006: 115, examples 14-15)

The paper is organized as follows: section 2 is dedicated to an overview of the distribution of Spanish demonstratives, as presented in Bombi (2023). The data exhibit a sharp contrast between the PreDem and PostDem in the sense that the PostDem is more restricted and lacks the deictic use (unfortunately, no information on the bleached use is provided). Certain pragmatic effects are also noticeable with PostDems. Section 3 is concerned with the distribution of the Romanian demonstratives. Even though both the PreDem and the PostDem display the four uses, the distribution of the PostDem is more limited. Interestingly, these limitations are almost completely disjoint from the PreDem-PostDem contrast in Spanish. These inter-linguistic differences are addressed in section 3.5. Section 4 concludes the paper.

2. Spanish PostDems and their special constraints

The following section presents a summary of Bombi (2023)'s analysis of Spanish demonstratives. Spanish possesses three demonstrative forms: proximal (*este*), medial (*ese*) and distal (*aquel*). The three kinds of demonstratives can occur in two possible syntactic constructions: PreDem and PostDem (the difference from Romanian being that the definite determiner is a free morpheme that precedes the NP, while Romanian has an affixal definite determiner). The medial demonstrative is used as an illustration below:

- (3) a. PreDem
ese libro
DEM.MED book
'that book'

- b. el libro ese
 DEF book DEM.MED
 ‘that book’

The two constructions display different semantic and pragmatic behavior, with the PostDem being more restricted in distribution and displaying special pragmatic effects such as indirectness, ignorance, indifference, colloquial register. Taking the classification of possible demonstrative interpretations in the literature, Bombi (2023) notices that the PreDem is unconstrained, displaying deictic, recognitional, anaphoric and exophoric uses while the PostDem always requires an antecedent. This antecedent may be provided explicitly in the previous discourse (see the anaphoric example (4)) or by the larger context (see the exophoric example (5)). The exophoric use is to be distinguished from deixis in the narrow sense (Grosz 2019), where exophoric reference is established with an entity that is present in the context of discourse, even though not explicitly mentioned. The narrow deictic use is present in direct pointing situations and not available for PostDem according to Bombi (2023)².

- (4) no recordaba haber probado **estas pizzas**₁ así que el otro día compre y no veas lo buenas que están [. . .] a partir de ahora van a ser **las pizzas estas**₁ la cena de los jueves
 ‘I didn’t remember having tried **these pizzas**₁, and so the other day I bought some and you just don’t know how tasty they are [. . .] without a doubt from now on the dinner for Thursdays is going to be **the pizzas these**₁’ [esTenTen18]
 (Bombi 2023, example 5)
- (5) Context: A parent is sorting out washed and ironed clothes and distributing them to the people in the household.
 Toma la chaqueta esta tuya
 take DEF jacket DEM yours
 ‘Take this jacket of yours’ (naturalistic)
 (Bombi 2023, example 6)

Most importantly, the following data suggest that the PostDem is an adjective. Firstly, it is obligatorily preceded by a determiner. Secondly, PostDem can appear in different positions in the NP (Roca 2009):

- (6) el libro (ese) amarillo (ese) de sintaxis (ese)
 DEF book DEM yellow DEM of syntax DEM
 ‘that yellow syntax book’

Thirdly, just like adjectives, the PostDem cannot follow a restrictive relative clause:

² See (10) below.

- (7) a. el libro **ese** [que vimos ayer]
 DEF book DEM which saw.1PL yesterday
 ‘that book we saw yesterday’
 b. *el libro [que vimos ayer] **ese**
 DEF book which saw.1PL yesterday DEM

Bombi (2023) analyses the PostDem in Spanish as an adjectival modifier of NP with an index (following Jenks and Konate 2022 on the semantics of indexed expressions). In a nutshell, the PostDem denotes a property which establishes an identity relation with some assignment: $\lambda x. x=g(i)$. The fact that only a definite determiner may precede such an adjective follows from the fact that the identity function in the denotation of the adjective yields a unique individual. By Maximize Presupposition (Heim 1991), the definite determiner is selected as the strongest candidate.

A further set of distributional data also invite an analysis of PostDem as a weak pronoun (Cardinaletti and Starke 1999, Beaver and Clark 2008). Following Bernstein (1997), the following tests that distinguish between strong and weak pronouns were applied to Spanish demonstratives: contrastive focus (8), ellipsis in short answers (9), deixis (see (10), where the arrow represents pointing) and modification by *only* (11). On a par with strong pronouns, PreDem exhibits all four of the patterns. On a par with weak pronouns, PostDem is excluded in the four types of expressions.

- (8) PostDem with contrastive focus:
 ??Me llevaré el libro [este]_f (no [aquel]_f).
 REFL take.FUT-1SG DEF book DEM not DEM
 Intended: ‘I will take this book, not that one.’
- (9) PostDem and ellipsis:
 (Which book did you buy?)
 ??El ~~libro~~ este.
 DEF book DEM
 Intended: ‘This one.’
- (10) Post Dem and deixis:
 (What did you read/ which book did you read?)
 #El libro este→.
 DEF book that
- (11) PostDem and focus particle *only*:
 Context: Carla wants to organise a party, and sends Dzhuma to buy drinks – different kinds of wine, and different kinds of beer. When she comes back, Dzhuma is carrying different bottles of wine and only one brand of beer. She says:
 #Lo siento, sólo tenían [la cerveza esta]_f.
 it regret.1SG only had.3PL DEF beer DEM
 Intended: ‘I’m sorry, they only had this beer.’

Bombi (2023) presents some further pragmatic effects of the PostDem construction are presented: indirectness, indifference, ignorance and colloquial register (a tendency observed in grammars of Spanish). These pragmatic effects are absent in the PreDem construction.

The term ‘indirectness’ is mainly employed to refer to recognitional uses (12) and anaphoric uses (4) of the demonstrative, the idea being that the referent is accessible indirectly and needs to be retrieved from memory or from previous discourse:

- (12) Si estás un día en casa, con mono de las fresitas estas de nata
 if be.2SG INDEF day in house with monkey of DEF.PL strawberries DEM of cream
 que venden en las tiendas de chuches...
 which sell.3PL in DEF.PL shops of candy.PL
 ‘If you are at home and get a craving for those little strawberries sold in candy shops...’ [esTenTen18]

The candy shops mentioned above are familiar to both speaker and addressee. The addressee is invited to retrieve these shops from memory, which qualifies the use of the demonstrative as recognitional (evocative).

Another means of obeying indirectness is by anaphoric retrieval (see (4), repeated below):

- (4) no recordaba haber probado **estas pizzas₁** así que el otro día compre y no veas lo buenas que están [. . .] a partir de ahora van a ser **las pizzas estas₁** la cena de los jueves
 ‘I didn’t remember having tried **these pizzas₁**, and so the other day I bought some and you just don’t know how tasty they are [. . .] without a doubt from now on the dinner for Thursdays is going to be **the pizzas these₁**’ [esTenTen18]
 (Bombi 2023, example 5)

Finally direct indexicals are excluded in PostDem constructions:

- (13) #La semana esta tengo mucho trabajo.
 DEF week DEM have.1SG much work
 Intended: ‘I have a lot of work this week.’

The indifference flavor manifests itself as a tendency to interpret PostDem as having as pejorative meaning (the referent is seen as unimportant or even inferior).

- (14) Y, además, **los politicachos estos** lo toman como que es un fenómeno pasajero y que las aguas volverán dócilmente a sus cauces naturales...
 ‘And, on top, **these politicians** take it as a temporary phenomenon and that the waters will meekly return to their natural course...’ [esTenTen18]

The ignorance use was elicited by Bombi (2023) in the following setting and presented to native speakers of Spanish:

(15) Two high school students are revising some chemistry materials.

A: Para convertir el hielo en agua, lo tienes que poner a su
to turn DEF ice in water it have.2SG that put at its
temperatura de fusión.
temperature of fusion

B: Entonces, si pongo el hielo a la **temperatura esa** (de fusión), se derrite?
then if put.1SG DEF ice at DEF temperature DEM of fusion it melts?

A: ‘To turn ice into water, you have to set it to its melting temperature.’

B: ‘So, if I set the ice at the (melting) temperature that, it will melt?’ (elicited)

Speaker comments:

“I get that someone doesn’t know what melting temperature is... it’s ‘the temperature that you’re saying’”

“The person is less knowledgeable. I don’t think a chemist would say ‘la temperatura esa’”

“It’s perfect: because of the lack of knowledge on the topic”

3. Romanian PostDems

The present section is concerned with the distributional properties of PostDems in Romanian, by contrast to PreDems in the same language, as well as with PostDems in Spanish. It will become apparent that PreDems in both Romanian and Spanish have a similar distribution as far as the possible means of establishing a referent are concerned (deictic, anaphoric, recognitional, bleached). The most noticeable difference is in terms of register: the Spanish PreDem seems to be the neutral in terms of register, while in Romanian the PreDem is marked as formal. On the other hand, PostDems in both languages are subject to certain semantic and pragmatic constraints. It will become clear in the following discussion (section 3.5) that these constraints are quite different in the two languages. This difference is attributed to a distinction in the underlying syntactic structures of PostDems in Spanish and Romanian. This difference has been under scrutiny in the literature for a long time. The modest goal of this paper is merely to provide a richer set of data in terms which might lead to the establishment of a correlation between syntactic structure and semantic/pragmatic effects.

Taking the classification presented in the Introduction (section 1), Romanian PreDems display all of the types identified in the literature, while PostDems only display a subset thereof.

3.1 Deictic uses

Deictic uses are possible with both PreDems and PostDems (as opposed to Spanish, which excludes PostDems; see (16)). The examples are given with the proximal demonstrative,

but the same pattern is observable with the distal demonstrative. The colloquial short form *asta* is only allowed postnominally³. Also, there is no medial demonstrative in Romanian. The arrow signifies an accompanying pointing gesture:

- (16) Deictic demonstratives in Romanian:
(What did you read/ which book did you read?)
- a. Această→ carte.
DEM book
'This book.'
 - b. Cartea aceasta→/ asta→.
book.DEF DEM

True indexicals in the sense of Kaplan (1989) are compatible with both syntactic positions in Romanian (unlike in Spanish, see (17)):

- (17) Indexical expressions:
- a. **Această săptămână** am mult de lucru.
DEM week have.1SG much of work
 - b. **Săptămâna aceasta** am mult de lucru.
week.DEF DEM have.1SG much of work
 - c. **Săptămâna asta** am mult de lucru.
week.DEF DEM have.1SG much of work
'This week I have a lot of work.'

Concerning exophoric uses, the PostDem is present just as in the Spanish counterpart (5). The PreDem would also be possible in a more formal context:

- (18) Context: A parent is sorting out washed and ironed clothes and distributing them to the people in the household.
Geaca aia a ta era plină de pete.
jacket.DEF that GEN you.GEN was full of stains
'That jacket of yours was full of stains.'

3.2 Anaphoric uses

The anaphoric use is also possible with both constructions. The following example is a Romanian translation of a saying from the Talmud:

³ The differences between the three expressions are as follows: PreDem is formal, PostDem with *aceasta* can be either formal or informal and PostDem with *asta* is informal, colloquial. This distinction applies to all types of readings (deictic, anaphoric etc.).

- (19) Prietenul tău are **un prieten**_i, iar **acel prieten**_i al prietenului tău
 friend.DEF your has INDEF friend and DEM friend GEN friend.GEN you.GEN
 are și el un prieten, așa că fii discret.
 has also he INDEF friend so that be discreet
 ‘Thy friend has a friend, and thy friend’s friend has a friend; be discreet.’
 (Literally: Your friend has a friend and that friend of your friend also has a friend,
 so be discreet)

PostDem is also possible, without there being a preference towards such anaphoric uses by contrast to PreDem, as reported for Spanish in section 2. The differences in register mentioned in footnote 3 apply here as well (*ăla* in (21) is the colloquial distal demonstrative):

- (20) ...și tu, la rândul tău, ai fost **un copil**_i; ce a avut nevoi
 also you at turn your have.2SG been INDEF child that has had needs
 și părinți, iar **copilul acela**_i se află încă în interiorul tău.
 and parents and child.DEF DEM REFL finds still in interior.DEF you.GEN
 ‘You too, in turn, were a child who had needs and parents and that child is still inside
 you.’ (<https://www.paginadepsihologie.ro/psihodescooperiri-ce-te-face-un-parinte-bun/>)
- (21) Sora mea are **un amic care vine des în vizită**_i
 sister.DEF my has INDEF buddy who comes often in visit
 și pe **amicul ăla**_i nu-l suport deloc.
 and DOM buddy DEM not-CL.3SG.ACC stand whatsoever
 ‘My sister has a buddy who comes by often and I can’t stand that buddy at all.’

Bridging anaphoric contexts reveal a distinction between the two constructions. PreDem is acceptable, while PostDem is not. Giurgea (forthcoming: fn14) provides the Romanian translation of a German example in Schwarz (2009) which exhibits the PreDem in a bridging context:

- (22) De câte ori lui Ion îi place deosebit un tablou
 of how-many times DAT Ion CL.DAT likes especially a painting
 într-un muzeu, cumpără după aceea o biografie a aceluși pictor.
 in-INDEF museum buys after that a biography GEN that.GEN painter
 ‘Every time Ion likes very much a painting in a museum, he buys a biography of
 the/that painter afterwards.’
 (modeled after Schwarz 2009, example 279)

In the example above the painter was not previously mentioned and need not be familiar to either the speaker or addressee. The only required connection is that between the author and the work which is present in the preceding discourse. It is not possible to use the PreDem in this kind of examples. In order to exclude anaphoric binding as a reason

for the exclusion of PreDems (see discussion below) I will offer another modification of the example in which the author and their work do not co-vary with times:

- (23) a. PreDem:
 Lui Ion i-a plăcut deosebit un tablou din muzeu
 DAT Ion CL.DAT-has liked especially a painting from museum.DEF
 și a cumpărat după aceea o biografie a **acelui pictor**.
 and has bought after that a biography GEN that.GEN painter
 ‘Ion liked very much a painting in the museum and bought a biography of the/that painter afterwards.’
- b. PostDem:
 ?? Lui Ion i-a plăcut deosebit un tablou din muzeu
 DAT Ion CL.DAT-has liked especially a painting from museum.DEF
 și a cumpărat după aceea o biografie a **pictorului acela**.
 and has bought after that a biography GEN painter.GEN that

Moving on to donkey anaphora and (locally) bound variable anaphoric readings, a contrast is again visible between PreDem and PostDem. The following English examples are quoted in Giurgea (forthcoming), but they are only instrumental in making a theoretical point, therefore no comment is provided about possibly constructing Romanian counterparts:

- (24) Donkey anaphora:
 a. Every time I meet [**a linguist**]_i, [that linguist]_i looks happy.
 (Ahn 2022: 1346, example 5)
 b. Everyone who bought **a sageplant**_i bought eight others beside **that sageplant**_i.
 (Heim 1990)
- (25) Bound variable anaphora:
 Mary talked to [**no senator**]_i before [**that senator**]_i was lobbied.
 (Elbourne 2008: 410)

As for Romanian, following my own judgment as a native speaker, I consider both PreDem and PostDem to be acceptable in both types of constructions, with possibly a preference in favor of the former, the latter being slightly degraded or stylistically marked:

- (26) Donkey anaphora:
 a. De câte ori întâlnesc [**un lingvist**]_i, [**acel lingvist**]_i/
 of how-many times meet.1SG INDEF linguist DEM linguist
 [**lingvistul acela**]_i pare fericit.
 linguist.DEF DEM seems happy
 ‘Each time I meet a linguist, that linguist seems happy.’

- b. Toți cei care au cumpărat [o **salvie**]_i au mai cumpărat
 all those who have bought INDEF sageplant have PART bought
 încă opt pe lângă [**acea salvie**]_i/ [**salvia aceea**]_i.
 another eight on next DEM sageplant sageplant DEM
 ‘Everyone who bought a sageplant bought eight others beside that sageplant.’
- (27) Bound variable:
 Maria nu a vorbit cu [**niciun senator**]_i după ce [**acel senator**]_i/
 Maria not has spoken with no senator after what DEM senator
 [**senatorul acela**]_i s-a pensionat.
 senator.DEF DEM REFL-has retired
 ‘Mary spoke to no senator after that senator retired.’

3.3 *Recognitional uses*

Recognitional uses are also possible with both forms. As mentioned in the introduction, recognitional (or evocative) uses of the demonstrative involve a referent which is assumed to be familiar to the addressee and which has either been previously explicitly mentioned but is not part of the present QUD, or is part of the shared experience between the speaker and addressee.

A third type of example is in approximate definitions where the speaker is unable to find a clearer expression and the addressee is invited to retrieve the exact term. This kind of recognitional demonstrative is mentioned in Giurgea (forthcoming)’s example (60) and attributed to Himmelmann (1996), where the expected precise term is ‘paddles’.

- (28) those wooden things that you hit with a ball.
 (Himmelmann 1996: 234)

An example of the latter type in Romanian is provided below:

- (29) Referring to the platypus: How did you call...
 a. (?) **acel** animal care depune ouă și își hrănește puii cu lapte?
 DEM animal which lays eggs and REFL.DAT feeds cubs.DEF with milk
 b. **animalul acela** care depune ouă și își hrănește puii cu lapte?
 animal.DEF DEM which lays eggs and REFL.DAT feeds cubs.DEF with milk
 ‘that animal that lays eggs and feeds its young with milk?’
 c. **animalul ăla** care depune ouă și își hrănește puii cu lapte?
 animal.DEF DEM.COLL which lays eggs and REFL.DAT feeds cubs.DEF with milk
 ‘that animal that lays eggs and feeds its young with milk?’

As seen above, the PreDem is quite unnatural even when controlling for register (it would be acceptable for instance in the context of a biology teacher asking a student, but the condition on the addressee mentioned above – inability to retrieve the exact term – would be lost in this case). Examples can be found instead of novel definitions for states

- (35) #prieteni sunt persoanele acelea cărora le pasă de mine
 friends are persons-the those who.PL.DAT CL.DAT cares of me

The previous four subsections have catalogued the environments in which PreDems and PostDems occur. Certain differences between the two constructions have been identified. Nevertheless, the overall picture is quite different from the contrast between Spanish PreDems and PostDems. These differences are addressed in the next section. Since in both languages it is PostDems that seem to be subject to certain semantic and pragmatic restrictions, the discussion will focus on these constructions.

3.5 A comparison between Spanish and Romanian PostDems

The first difference between Spanish and Romanian PostDems concerns deictic uses: the former but not the latter are ill-formed in such contexts. The requirement that there should be an available antecedent, which was assumed for Spanish by Bombi (2023) does seem to play a part in Romanian as well, however, in the case of bleached uses (section 3.4). In bleached uses, the PostDem is degraded.

Regarding the evidence in favor of the analysis of Spanish PostDems as adjectives or weak pronouns, the Romanian data point in a different direction: the PostDem construction is syntactically rigid, which supports the claims in the literature that it is part of a functional layer intermediate between the determiner and the NP, not an NP modifier (compare Sp. (4), repeated below, to Rom. (36)):

- (4) el libro (ese) amarillo (ese) de sintaxis (ese)
 DEF book DEM yellow DEM of syntax DEM
 ‘that yellow syntax book’
- (36) cartea (aceea) galbenă (*aceea) de sintaxă (*aceea)
 book.DEF DEM yellow DEM of syntax DEM

The PostDem in Romanian can only follow an unmodified noun, not any other fronted head:

- (37) a. acea frumoasă carte
 DEM beautiful book
 ‘that beautiful book’
 b. *frumoasa aceea carte
 beautiful.DEF DEM book

Also, as observed in Giurgea (forthcoming), the PostDem even separates the parts of a lexicalized unit such as *față de masă* ‘table cloth’:

- (38) fața (*de masă) aceasta (de masă)
 face.DEF of table DEM of table
 ‘this table cloth’

This pattern in the distribution of PostDems has been taken as evidence of head-movement of N to D, with the demonstrative occupying an intermediate functional layer (see Cornilescu 1992, Giusti 1993, Giurgea forthcoming and references therein):

- (39) [DP [N+D] [DemP Dem (tN) [MeasP Card (tN) [.. tN...]]]]

Regarding the similarities between Spanish PostDems and weak pronouns, it is again evident that these observations do not carry over to the Romanian PostDem. The four environments where weak pronouns and Spanish PostDems were shown to be unacceptable (see section 2) are compatible with Romanian PostDems⁴:

- (40) PostDem with contrastive focus:
 Iau cartea [asta]_f (nu [pe aceea]_f).
 take.1SG book.DEF DEM.PROX not DOM DEM.DIST
 ‘I am taking this book, not that one.’
- (41) Post Dem and deixis:
 (What did you read/ which book did you read?)
 #Cartea aceasta→.
 book.DEF DEM
- (42) PostDem and focus particle *only*:
 Context: Carla wants to organise a party, and sends Dzhuma to buy drinks – different kinds of wine, and different kinds of beer. When she comes back, Dzhuma is carrying different bottles of wine and only one brand of beer. She says:
 Îmi pare rău, aveau doar [berea asta]_f.
 me.DAT seems bad had.IMPF.3PL only beer.DEF DEM
 ‘I’m sorry, they only had this beer.’

A final remark concerning the pragmatic effects signaled in the case of the Spanish PostDem. The Romanian PostDem does not seem to display any preference to eliciting the pragmatic effects discussed in section 2. There is no inclination towards indirectness, since deictic uses are present alongside anaphoric and recognitional ones. On the contrary, bridging contexts do not supply sufficient salience for the PostDem (see (23b)), thus arguably counting as too indirect. There is no particular preference for ignorance or indifference/ pejorative readings, although these interpretations are not excluded as long as the context supports them. Finally, in what concerns matters of register, it is the PreDem which is marked as formal. The PostDem long form of the determiner (e.g. *acesta/ acela*,

⁴ The ellipsis test cannot be performed since the definite determiner in Romanian is affixal.

‘this_{MASC}/ that_{MASC}’) can be used in any kind of register, while the colloquial short forms (e.g. *ăsta/ ăla*, ‘this_{MASC.COLL}/ that_{MASC.COLL}’) are specialized for informal uses. Indeed, the short forms are only allowed in postnominal position⁵.

4. Conclusion

The main focus of the paper has been the contrast in distribution between Romanian PreDem and PostDem constructions. Firstly, the more constrained distribution of PostDem in Romanian as opposed to the PreDem has been compared to the narrower distribution of the PostDem in Spanish (as opposed to the corresponding PreDem). It turns out that the Romanian and Spanish PostDems are different from their respective PreDem versions in the two languages in clearly distinct ways. These distinctions were put down to a difference in the syntactic structure of the PostDems in the two languages: the Romanian PostDem occupies a functional layer below D, while the Spanish PostDem seems to behave like an adjective or a weak pronoun.

The purpose of the paper was merely to provide a richer picture regarding the distribution of Romanian demonstratives, as well as to point towards some interesting correlations between the syntax of PostDems in Romanian and Spanish and their associated semantic and pragmatic effects. An explanation as to why these particular correlations are observed is left for further investigation.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by a grant of the Romanian Ministry of Research, Innovation and Digitization, CNCS-UEFISCDI: project number PN-III-P5_PCE-2021-0042.

References

- Ahn, D. 2022. Indirectly direct: An account of demonstratives and pointing. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 45: 1345–1393.
- Alexiadou, A. 2014. *Multiple Determiners and the Structure of DPs*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Beaver, D., Clark, B. 2008. *Sense and Sensitivity: How Focus Determines Meaning*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bernstein, J. 1997. Demonstratives and reinforcers in Romance and Germanic languages. *Lingua*, 102: 87–113.
- Bombi, C. 2023. Decomposing demonstratives: pre- and postnominal *that* in Spanish. Paper presented at *Workshop on Definiteness*, Bucharest, December 8th–9th.
- Cardinaletti, A., Starke, M. 1999. The typology of structural deficiency: A case study of the three classes of pronouns. In H. van Riemsdijk (ed.), *5 Clitics in the Languages of Europe*, 145–234. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Cornilescu, A. 1992. Remarks on the determiner system of Romanian: the demonstratives *al* and *cel*. *Probus* 4: 189–260.

⁵ Except for some temporal expressions (probably registered in the lexicon/frozen): *astă seară* ‘this.FEM.COLL evening.FEM’, *astă iarnă*, ‘this.FEM.COLL winter.FEM’ (but not in the masculine: **ăst an*, ‘this.MASC.COLL year.MASC’), the prenominal colloquial form is lost in contemporary Romanian (Ion Giurgea, p.c.).

- Cornilescu, A., Nicolae, A. 2011. Nominal Peripheries and Phase Structure in the Romanian DP. *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 56(1): 35–68.
- Elbourne, P. 2008. Demonstratives as individual concepts. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 31(4): 409–466.
- Giurgea, I. Forthcoming. Romanian double definites: the view from demonstratives. To be published in *Lingua*.
- Giusti, G. 1993. *La sintassi dei determinanti*. Padova: Unipress.
- Giusti, G. 1997. The categorial status of determiners. In L. Haegeman (ed.), *The new comparative syntax*, 95–124. London: Longman.
- Grosz, P. 2019. Pronominal typology and reference to the external world. In *Proceedings of the 22nd Amsterdam Colloquium*, 563–573.
- Gundel, J. K., Hedberg, N., Zacharski, R. 1993. Cognitive Status and the Form of Referring Expressions in Discourse. *Language* 69(2): 274–307. <https://doi.org/10.2307/416535>
- Heim, I. 1990. E-type pronouns and donkey anaphora. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 13: 137–177.
- Heim, I. 1991. Artikel und Definitheit. In A. von Stechow and D. Wunderlich (eds.), *Semantik: Ein internationales Handbuch der zeitgenössischen Forschung*, 487–535. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Himmelman, N. 1996. Demonstratives in Narrative Discourse: A Taxonomy of Universal Uses. In B. Fox (ed.), *Studies in Anaphora*, 205–254. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Jenks, P., Konate, R. 2022. Indexed definiteness. *Glossa: A journal of general linguistics* 7(1): 103–124.
- Kaplan, D. 1989. Demonstratives: An Essay on the Semantics, Logic, Metaphysics and Epistemology of Demonstratives and other Indexicals. In J. Almog, J. Perry and H. Wettstein (eds.), *Themes From Kaplan*, 481–563. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Roca, F. 2009. The left periphery of nominal constructions and the evolution of definite determiners in Romance. In J. R. Cufí (ed.), *Diachronic linguistics*, 497–553. Documenta Universitaria, Universitat de Girona.
- Schwarz, F. 2009. *Two types of definites in natural language*. PhD dissertation, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.
- Wolter, L.K. 2006. That's that: The Semantics and Pragmatics of Demonstrative Noun Phrases. PhD dissertation, University of California – Santa Cruz.