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1. The problem

In several languages when the noun is modified by an adjective, this adjective can surface with a determiner or a determiner-like particle. The phenomenon has been given different labels in the literature, e.g. double definiteness, definiteness spreading, determiner spreading, and is illustrated in (1-4). I call these special determiners *adjectival determiners* here:

1a. to vivlio *(to) kokino
   the book      the red
1b. to kokino (to) vivlio
   the red      the book
2. djali *(i) mirë
   boy.der      the good
3. ha smalot *(ha) yapot
   the dresses  the nice
4a. stilo-lu lai-lu
    pen-the      black-the
4b. baiatul (cel) frumos
    boy.the      this good

1 Earlier versions of this paper were presented at the Seminar für Sprachwissenschaft of the University of Tübingen in May 2002, and at the University of Athens in April 2005. Many thanks to these audiences for comments and discussion.

2 A Romance Balkan language spoken in Northern Greece, Bulgaria, Serbia and Albania.
A similar situation has been described for Chinese, where de is a determiner-like particle. Note though that generally nouns are not accompanied by determiners in this language:

5. lüde-de xiao-de huaping    Chinese
   green-de small-de vases

As (1-5) show, the phenomenon is independent of the type of determiner. It is found in languages which have affixal determiners, e.g. Aromanian and Romanian, and also in languages that have word type determiners e.g. Greek.³

The presence of a further adjective will trigger the presence of a further determiner in Greek, Hebrew, Chinese, but NOT in Albanian (where coordination of adjectives is the only possibility) and Romanian.

6. to vivlio to kokino to megalo    Greek
   the book the red the big
7. lüde-de xiao-de huaping    Chinese
   green-de small-de vases
8. he smalot ha yapot ha elle             Hebrew
   the dresses the nice the these

The presence and the properties of adjectival determiners in the above languages constitute the factual domain of this paper. The phenomenon raises a number of questions for syntax and semantics, in particular as far as the semantic import of this determiner is concerned. I will have very little to say about that. The aim of this paper is to show that in spite of the superficial similarity the data in (1-5) differ in systematic ways, and hence cannot all be subsumed under the same analysis.

Here I will be concerned with only a subset of the languages that show adjectival determiners. But it should be kept in mind that the phenomenon is wide-spread: we find adjectival determiners in e.g. Chadic, Austronesian, Malayo-Polynesian languages as well. I will have nothing to say about these here. Adjectival determiners are also found in Swedish/Norwegian (cf. Börjars 1998) and in German dialects (South German dialects and Swiss German, cf. Lindauer 1991). I will not discuss these cases here. For a discussion of the Scandinavian pattern and how it differs from that of Greek, see Alexiadou (2003):

³ For Hebrew it has been argued that the determiner is an affix, cf. Siloni (1997), or a word, cf. Shlonsky (2000).
As is well known, adjectival determiners are not permitted in English, German, Slavic languages (which lacks determiners altogether), Romance (with the exception of Romanian, and Aromanian).4

The following questions arise, which the present paper will attempt to answer:

(a) Does the language permit the counterpart of (1-5) without an adjectival determiner, i.e. monadic constructions?
(b) Does the adjectival determiner influence the interpretation of the noun phrase?
(c) Is the construction permitted with all kinds of adjectives?
(d) How can the above patterns be analysed syntactically?
(e) Does the same syntactic analysis hold for all languages?

In what follows I examine each of the above questions in turn.

2. Adjectival determiners vs. 'monadic constructions'5

In this section I will examine how the languages introduced in (1-5) above fare with respect to the presence of monadic constructions.

Beginning with Greek, we note that the language permits both constructions with and without an adjectival determiner; the canonical word order in the noun phrase is Det-Adj N. Adjectives, determiners and nouns agree in all features:

4 But consider (i)-(iv) below discussed in Kayne (2004). Kayne adopts for these the analysis proposed for Greek by Alexiadou & Wilder (1998):

(i) la fille (ii) la fille la plus belle
the girl the girl the most nice
(iii) Marie (iv) la petite Marie
 the little Marie

5 Term due to Campos & Stavrou (2002).
12a. to megalο vivlio
the big book
12b. *to vivlio megalο
the book big

The determiner is obligatory when the adjective is postnominal:

13. to vivlio to megalο
the book the big

The Det-Adj complex can precede the Det N complex:

14. to megalο to vivlio
the big book

Turning to Albanian (cf. Newmark et al. 1982), we note the following. In (15a) a determiner precedes the adjective when it is in postnominal position. In that case both the noun and the adjective are marked for definiteness. In (15b), where the adjective precedes the noun, the latter is in the indefinite form. This is already different from the Greek pattern, where the noun may be preceded by a determiner.

15a. djali i mirë
boy.the the good
15b. i miri djalë
the good boy

Let us now see how the two Romance languages fare. Romanian permits monadic constructions. The word order in the noun phrase is normally N-Adj:

16a. poetul mare
poet.the big
16b. baiatul (cel) frumos
boy.the this good

The order Det-Adj Det N is impossible:

17. *cel frumos baiatul
this good boy.the

Aromanian permits monadic constructions (cf. Campos & Stavrou 2002) and again the order Det-Adj Det N is impossible:
Turning to Semitic, Hebrew permits monadic constructions but only with demonstratives and also with numerals, but only for some speakers and in some dialects (cf. Borer 1999, Siloni 1998, Shlonsky 2000, Sichel 2002):

20a. yalda zot tikra et ha-Sir (Borer 1999)
   girl this will read.acc the-poem
   ‘This girl will read the poem’
20b. ha-yalda ha-zot tikra et ha-Sir
   the-girl the-this will read.acc the-poem

21. el xamas banaat (Cairo Arabic, from Shlonsky 2000)
   the five girls

There is one other construction in which the adjective is not introduced by a determiner, namely in the adjectival construct; there it is the non-head member of the construction that carries the article:

22a. *ha yalda ha yefat ha mar’e (from Siloni 1998)
   the girl the beautiful the look
   ‘the good looking girl’
22b. ha yalda yefat *(ha) mar’e
   the girl beautiful the look

The order Det-Adj Det N is impossible.

Finally, Chinese permits monadic constructions:

23a. xiao lü huaping
   small green vases
23b. lüde-de xiao-de huaping
   green-de small-de vases (cf. Sproat & Shih 1988, Simpson 2001)

As has been noted in the literature word order variation is permitted with DE constructions only.

To summarise, in this section we have seen that monadic constructions are possible in Greek, Chinese, Albanian, and the Romance Balkan languages. Hebrew permits monadic constructions only with specific adjectives. Second, languages differ as to whether the Det-Adj
complex can precede the Det-N complex. This seems to be possible only in Greek, and in Chinese. Third, languages differ as to the word order they allow in monadic construction, e.g. this is Det Adj N in Greek and Hebrew, but N-Det Adj (with some adjectives, see below) and Adj-D N in Albanian, Romanian and Aromanian.

In the next section I turn to the presence of interpretational differences related to the adjectival determiner. I begin with Greek, which provides the clearest evidence for the presence of interpretational differences.

3. Interpretational differences due to the presence of the adjectival determiner

As has been discussed in the literature, in Greek the construction with the extra determiner implies a contrast and is organized around the focus-presupposition distinction, see Kolliakou (1997), Alexiadou (2003), Campos & Stavrou (2002):

24a. ti tha paris tu Petru, to fako i tin pena? what will you.buy Peter, the lense or the pen (Campos & Stavrou 2002)
24b. tin pena the pen
24c. pia pena, ti hrisi i tin asimenia? which pen, the golden or the silver
24d. nomizo tin asimenia tin pena I.think the silver the pen

Had the extra determiner not been present in (24d), the example would be odd, since the noun phrase *the pen* as well as different colours of pens have already been introduced in the discourse.

(25), from Kolliakou (1997), further shows that adjectival determiners narrow down the denotation of the noun:

25a. o diefthindis ipe oti i ikani erevnites tha apolithun the director said that the efficient researchers will be.fired
25b. o diefthindis ipe oti i ikani i erevnites tha apolithun the director said that the efficient the researchers will be.fired

According to Kolliakou, (25a) is ambiguous between two readings in the absence of the extra determiner. On the first reading, only the efficient
researchers will be fired; on the second reading, the efficient researchers happen to be part of the larger group that will be fired. In the presence of the determiner, however, the example (25b) is not ambiguous: it only means that only the efficient researchers will be fired. In fact this is very similar to the import of clitic-doubling cf. 26); in (25b) the attributive function of the adjective is suppressed (Anagnostopoulou 1994):

26. tin ida ti gata  
her I.saw the cat

The doubled NP is ‘familiar’, strong presuppositional

In Aromanian and Romanian, the postnominal Det-Adj is interpreted contrastively, but this is the general pattern for postnominal adjectives in Romance (see also the discussion in the next section).

On the other hand, no semantic differences are observed in Hebrew (and in Albanian):

27a. yalda zot tikra et ha-Sir  
girl this will read.acc the-poem
‘This girl will read the poem’
27b. ha-yalda ha-zot tikra et ha-Sir  
the-girl the-this will read.acc the-poem

The examples in (27a) and (27b) are synonymous. The presence of an article on the demonstrative is clearly semantically vacuous. There is absolutely no difference in meaning between the two examples.

4. Restriction as to the type of adjectives

In Greek, the type of adjectives that are permitted in this construction are those than can necessarily restrict the set denoted by the noun (Manolessou 2000, Alexiadou 2003):

28a. *o monos tu o erotas ine i doulia tu  
the only his the love is the work his
28b. *o ipotithemenos o dolofonos  
the alleged the murderer
28c. *ta kapia/tria ta vivlia numerals  
the some/three the books
28d. *i italiki i isvoli thematic  
the Italian the invasion
The semantics of the adjectives in (28) are quite different from those attributive adjectives. These are non-intersective. Alexiadou (2003) has suggested that adjectives ambiguous between an intersective and a non-intersective reading only have the intersective reading in this construction:

29a. i  orea  horeftria
    the beautiful  dancer
   i. 'the dancer who is beautiful'
   ii. ‘the dancer who dances beautifully’
29b. i  orea  i  horeftria
    the beautiful  the  dancer
    ‘only the dancer who is beautiful’

Subjective/evaluative adjectives cannot participate in the construction; this is made transparent in (30) when we modify the adjective ‘nice’ thus forcing a subjective reading cf. Campos & Stavrou (2002):

30a. *to  poli  oreo  to  vivlio
    the very  nice  the book
30b. to  poli  oreo  vivlio
    the very  nice  book

In principle the following generalization about the type of adjectives that can participate in the construction can be formulated (Manolessou 2000, Alexiadou 2003):

31. Adjectives which ‘have’ determiners permit restrictive readings and can bear contrastive focus.

Similar differences to the ones seen in Greek are observed in Chinese (cf. Simpson 2001):

32a. *qian-de  zongtong
    former-DE  president
32b. *zhei-ge  zongtong  quian
    this-cl  president  former
    ‘this president is former’
33a. *wei-de  yao
    fake-DE  medicine
The situation in Aromanian and Romanian cannot be seen independently from a general comparison between Greek and Romance, which I discuss here. First, adjectival determiners in Aromanian and Romanian are permitted only with postnominal adjectives. Second, Alexiadou (2001) has argued that postnominal modifiers in Romance are subject to the similar restrictions as adjectives preceded by determiners in Greek. This argument is summarized below:

First, those adjectives that cannot appear with a determiner in Greek, i.e. temporal and quantificational ones, occur strictly prenominally in Romance (34):

34a. un mero accidente (*un accidente mero)  
   a mere accident
34b. un secondo ragazzo 
   a second boy
34c. *un ragazzo secondo 
   a boy second
35a. o proin prothipurgos 
   the former prime.minister
35b. *o proin o prothipurgos 
35c. i tris mathites 
   the three students
35d. *i mathites i tris 
   the students the three

The same holds for Romanian (see Vulchanova & Giusti 1998):

36a. *bàiatul prim/ultim/biet 
   boy.the first/last/poor
36b. primul/ultimul/bietul bàiat 
   first.the/last.the/poor.the boy

Second, in Greek adjectival determiners are impossible relative to that special reading of certain adjectives such as ‘poor’, see Alexiadou & Wilder (1998).

37a. the poor man 
   (‘impoverished’ / ‘pitiable’)
37b. the man is poor 
   (‘impoverished’ / ‘pitiable’)

33b. *nei-fu yao wei
    this-cl medicine fake
    ‘this medicine is fake’
In Spanish and French, the meaning difference is reflected in the pre- vs. postnominal position of the adjective:

38a. o anthropos o ftohos (‘impoverished’ / ‘pitiable’)
the man           the poor
38b. o ftohos o anthropos (‘impoverished’ / ‘pitiable’)
the poor           the man
38c. o ftohos anthropos (‘impoverished’ / ‘pitiable’)
the poor           man

A similar state of affairs is found in Romanian, as noted by Bouchard (1998):

39a. el chico pobre
‘the poor (impoverished) boy’
39b. el pobre chico
‘the poor (pitiable) boy’
39c. la francaise pauvre
‘the impoverished French woman’
39d. la pauvre francaise
‘the pitiable French woman’

When the adjective occurs in postnominal position, in which case the affixal article surfaces on the noun (N-to-D raising), it means tall. When the adjective occurs prenominal, in which case the affixal article surfaces on the adjective, it means great. This pattern suggests that the adjective in (40a) is generated in a position not related the one in (40a).

Third, according to Cinque (1993) and Laenzlinger (2000), certain adjectives can occur both prenominally and postnominally; strong subjective readings are detected when these occur in prenominal position:

40a. poetul      mare
    poet.def   tall
    ‘the tall poet’
40b. marele   poet
    tall.def  poet
    ‘the great poet’

41a. une voiture splendide
    a car      splendid
41b. une splendide voiture
41c. la loro aggressione brutale  
the their aggression brutal
41d. la loro brutale aggressione

In Romanian subjective adjectives are in prenominal position always:

42. foarte frumos-ul băiat  
very nice-the boy

Finally, it has been noted that in Romance the postnominal position of the adjective denotes contrast, the establishment of a difference, whereas the prenominal position merely provides a characterization without providing a contrast:

43a. i pietre preziose  
the stones precious
43b. i preziosi gioielli  
the precious jewels

In (43a), the stones are contrasted to ordinary ones. In (43b), however, the value is taken for granted. The same holds for Romanian, it is even more transparent when the adjective is preceded by the determiner.

To conclude, postnominal adjectives in Romance in general are related to adjectives preceded by determiners in Greek\(^6\). In Aromanian and Romanian they also happen to be preceded by a determiner.

Interestingly, no restrictions as to the type of adjectives that can occur in the construction are found in Hebrew:

44. ha-hafcaca ha-yisre'el 'et levanon  
the-bombing the-Israeli acc Lebanon
45. ha-xaver ha-kodem / ha-yaxid Sel rina  
the-friend the-former / the-single of rina  
‘the former / only friend of Rina’

Similar observations also hold for Albanian.

The table in (46) summarizes the factual situation:

\(^6\) However, the situation is far more complex. See Alexiadou (2005) and Cinque (2005) for discussion.
46. **semantic difference**  |  **adjectival restrictions**
--- | ---
Greek | + | +
Romanian/Aromanian | + | +
Chinese | + | +
Hebrew | - | -
Albanian | - | -

On the basis of (46), we can formulate the generalization in (47):

**Generalization:**

47. Languages that show semantic differences in the presence of an adjectival determiner exhibit restrictions as to the type of adjectives that can participate in the construction.

In the next section I turn to the syntactic analyses of the constructions.

### 5. Structural analysis

#### 5.1. Greek

Alexiadou (2001, 2003) has argued that the restrictions observed with Greek adjectival determiners can be accounted for under a predicative source for adjectives.

Building on Kayne (1994), adjectives derive from a predicative position within a relative clause (see Jacobs & Rosenbaum 1968). Different word order patterns obtain via NP or AP raising see (48):

48a. \[ \text{DP}_1 \text{ D } [\text{CP } \text{IP} \text{DP AP} ]] \]
48b. \[ \text{DP}_1 \text{ D } [\text{CP DP}_j \text{IP t}_j \text{AP} ]] \]
48c. \[ \text{DP}_1 \text{ D } [\text{CP AP}_j \text{IP DP t}_j ]] \]

**head-raising**

the book big

**predicate-raising**

the big the book

Alexiadou & Wilder (1998) and Alexiadou (2001) proposed that this correctly predicts the presence of an adjectival determiner in Greek:

49. \[ \text{DP}_1 \text{ to } [\text{CP megal o } \text{IP to vivlio t } ]] \]

the big the book
The sequence *to vivlio to megalo* ‘the book the big’ is derived by moving the DP *the book* to Spec DP\(^7\). The analysis further correctly predicts that those adjectives that cannot occur in predicative position cannot occur in DS, e.g. non-intersective adjectives like *ipotithemenos* (‘alleged’) and thematic adjectives such as *italiki* (‘Italian’). This type of movement to Spec,CP is similar to focalization thus correctly accounting for the focus effect associated with the presence of adjectival determiners.

On the other hand, 'monadic' constructions receive a different structure, namely the one in (50):

50. \[[DP [FP A [NP N]]]^{8}\]

5.2. Aromanian and Romanian

These two Romance languages, unlike the rest of the Romance languages, developed clitic-like determiners. Thus we can propose that (i) postnominal adjectives in these languages have a predicative source such as the Greek adjectives with determiners and (ii) prenominal adjectives have the structure in (50).

In particular, we could assume the following derivations\(^9\):

---

\(^7\) Campos & Stavrou (2002) note phonological differences between monadic and constructions with adjectival determiners. In constructions with an adjectival determiner the adjective bears focus. When no adjectival determiner is present, the stress goes on N or on A:

(i) a. *to vivlio to KOKINO*
   - the book the red
   b. *to KOKINO to vivlio*
   c. *to VIVLIO to kokino*
   d. *to kokino to VIVLIO*

(ii) a. *to kokino VIVLIO*
   - the red book
   b. *to KOKINO vivlio*

The phonological properties observed are accounted for if we assume that movement to Spec,CP is similar to Focus-movement, Tsimpli (1995), e.g. to KOKINO to vivlio. In (ii) it is expected that the noun receives stress as a result of the nuclear stress rule since it is the most embedded constituent in the phrase. Pattern (ii)b is a marked stress pattern and must be explained otherwise.

\(^8\) A similar analysis is proposed for Chinese (Simpson 2001).

\(^9\) A more complex derivation exists for Romanian, if we assume that *cel* is a demonstrative:

(i) \[[DP3 [CP [IP DP2 [CP [IP calul cel ] alb ]]]]]

*cel* and *alb* raise to their respective Spec,CP, DP1 raises to Spec,DP2 and DP2 raises to Spec,DP3. This would not work for Aromanian.
Romanian:

51a. \([\text{DP1 } \text{cel } [\text{CP alb } [\text{IP calul } t ]]]\)  \(\text{AP movement to Spec,CP}\)
    the white horse.the

and:

51b. \([\text{DP1 } \text{calul }\text{cel } [\text{CP alb } [\text{IP t } ]]]\)  \(\text{DP movement to Spec,DP1}\)
    horse.the the white

Aromanian:

52a. \([\text{DP1 } \text{lu } [\text{CP lai } [\text{IP stilo-lu } t ]]]\)  \(\text{AP movement to Spec,CP}\)
    the black pen-the

52b. \([\text{DP1 } \text{lai-lu } [\text{CP [IP stilo-lu } t ]]]\)  \(A\text{-to }D\text{ movement}\)

52c. \([\text{DP1 stilo-lu lai-lu } [\text{CP [IP t ]}]]\)  \(\text{DP movement to Spec,DP1}\)

The order Det-Adj Det N is impossible, i.e. (51a) and (52b) are impossible. This order was also impossible in classical and Biblical Greek, according to Manolessou (2000). It is not immediately clear why this should be so. The situation does suggest that in these languages Spec,DP1 must always be filled, for reasons that need to be further looked into.

5.3 Hebrew

Turning to Hebrew, Sichel (2002) has argued that \textit{ha-} is not an inflectional component of the adjective, it heads D. In Hebrew material can intervene between the determiner preceding the adjective and the adjective (53a-b).

53a. \([\text{ha-miS’ada } \text{ha-lo } \text{kSera } \text{ha-yexida be-bnei brak} ] \text{nizgera ha-Savu’a the-restaurant the-neg kosher the-sole in-bnei brak closed this-week}\)
    ‘The only non-kosher restaurant in Bnei Brak closed this week’

53b. \([\text{ze } \text{kvar } [\text{ha-pakid ha-legamrey mebulbal ha-revi’i} ]\) \text{this already the-clerk the-completely confused the-forth}\)
    Se-dibarti ito hayom
    ‘This is already the forth completely confused clerk I’ve talked to today’
Since, we find no restrictions as to the type of adjectives, we can conclude that D does not introduce a CP.

An alternative would be to propose that such a spread is not structurally encoded. Rather it is a formal marking of agreement. In fact such a spread can be seen in other areas of the language as well, e.g. possession (see Alexiadou 2004).

5.4 Albanian: a marker on the adjective?

In Albanian adjectives are accompanied by determiners even when they appear in predicative position (55a). This is not possible in Greek as the
ungrammaticality of (55b) shows:

55a. mësuesi ishte i lumtur
   teacher.def was det happy
   ‘the teacher was happy’
55b. *o daskalos itan o kalos
   the teacher was the good

In Albanian, the determiner can also surface after adverbials modifying
the adjective as shown in (56).

56. domethënje jashtëzakonisht të madhe
   significance unusually det great
   ‘unusually great significance’

In comparison constructions the determiner precedes the adjective and the
degree modifier precedes the whole complex (57):

57. më ëmël
   more the sweet
   ‘sweeter’
58. tepër besnik-u ndaj së shoqes burrë
   extremely truthful-the to his wife husband

The adjectival determiner appears in indefinite noun phrases. Again this
is not possible in Greek:

59. nje djalë i mirë
   a boy the good
   ‘a good boy’
60. *ena agori to kalo
   a boy the good

In Greek the determiner always precedes the degree modifier:

61. to pio kalo pedi
   the most nice boy
   ‘the nicest boy’

Moreover, Vulchanova & Giusti (1998) have argued that in Albanian the
adjectival article is not in D.
Taking all this into account, let us see whether a different type of analysis exists for the Albanian data. As Trommer (2001) notes, the pre-adjectival determiner in Albanian shows allomorphy which depends not only on the features present in the matrix DP but also on its surface consistency. To see this consider the following table that contains the forms of the article for all occurring feature combinations and positions (from Trommer 2001: 5-6):

62a. Prenominal position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>të</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc</td>
<td>të</td>
<td>të</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obl</td>
<td>të</td>
<td>të</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

62b. Postnominal position without intervening material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obl</td>
<td>të</td>
<td>të</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

62c. Postnominal position with intervening material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>të</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc</td>
<td>të</td>
<td>të</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obl</td>
<td>të</td>
<td>të</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For instance, in (63) $e$ is neutralized to të as $më$ intervenes, but $i$ is not:

63a. vajz-at më të shkret-a
    girl-pl.def more def poor-pl.def
    ‘the poorest girls’

63b. djal-i më i mirë
    boy-def more art good
    ‘the best boy’

These data point to a morphological analysis of the definiteness agreement pattern in Albanian, as suggested in Newmark et al, see also Trommer (2001).
As Vulchanova & Giusti (1998) also point out the adjective is inflected for the article before any movement takes place, and checks it in its own functional structure, as represented in (64). The agreement with the head D is achieved through a Spec-Head configuration.

[Diagram]

64.

6. Summary

With respect to the questions raised in the introduction of this paper, the following answers can be given. With the exception of Hebrew, all the languages under discussion permit the counterpart of (1-5) without an adjectival determiner, i.e. monadic constructions. Only in Greek and in the Romance Balkan languages as well as in Chinese does the presence of an extra determiner influence the meaning of the constructions. In these languages the construction is not permitted with all kinds of adjectives. It was argued that for this sub-group the correct analysis of adjectival determiners involves a reduced relative clause. This analysis does not extend to Hebrew and Albanian, which obey different restrictions. In fact for e.g. Albanian a morphological analysis seems more appropriate. This suggests that the presence of adjectival determiners cuts across syntax, semantics and morphology and is subject to different features and restrictions in the languages in which it is found. Further research is necessary in order to establish a typology of adjectival determiners.
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