The noun phrase in Germanic and Romance: common developments and differences

Perridon, H.; Sleeman, P.

[Link to publication](#)

THE NOUN PHRASE IN GERMANIC AND ROMANCE
COMMON DEVELOPMENTS AND DIFFERENCES

HARRY PERRIDON & PETRA SLEEMAN
ACLC, University of Amsterdam

Abstract

In this introductory chapter some of the main (dis)similarities in DP-syntax between the Germanic and Romance languages, as well as between the individual languages of each group, are explored. We take a look at the following subjects: (a) the ways in which the various languages express definiteness; (b) the position of adjectives; (c) the function of the weak declension of adjectives in Germanic; (d) the evolution of genitive equivalents; and (e) the emergence of determining possessives in Germanic. In each case we try to find out whether a given construction is inherited from the parent language or is an independent development in each of the languages or language groups. Special attention is paid to common developments after the languages split up into separate entities, since they might indicate some inherent properties of human language that restrict the way in which languages may develop.

1. *Relatedness and (dis)similarities*

During the last twenty years research on the internal structural of noun phrases has to a great extent been inspired by the assumption that the basic structure of such phrases is part of universal grammar (UG). The enormous variation found in the structures that surface in actual languages is in this 'maximalist' version of UG explained as the result of the various choices that languages make among the options that UG holds available. The task of a child learning the grammar of its mother tongue would then mainly consist in detecting in the linguistic input how the different parameters are set in this particular language.

At least since the appearance of Hauser, Chomsky & Fitch (2002; Fitch, Hauser & Chomsky 2005), however, this strong version of UG (or 'the faculty of language in the narrow sense') seems slowly to give way to more prudent, less detailed hypotheses as to the nature of what makes human language unique. In a 'minimalist' version of UG, containing for instance just one component, viz. recursion, there would hardly be room for

elaborate innate structures of the DP or CP kind, as proposed in much of the rich literature written in the generative tradition. In such a view there is no reason to assume that every category that is overtly present in a given language L_x, belongs to UG, and hence lives a hidden life in a language L_y in which this category lacks any observable form.

In a recent paper, Longobardi & Guardiano (2009) claim to have found evidence that the parametric theory of UG is on the right track after all, and, hence, that the basic lay-out of all languages is much more similar than 'minimalists' and skeptics may have thought. They identified 63 binary parameters, all within the domain of the noun phrase, and looked at the ways these were set in a sample of 22 Indo-European (17 modern and 5 'dead' languages) and 6 non-Indo-European languages. First the number of identities (*i*) and differences (*d*) in the parameter settings of each pair of languages was calculated, then the distance between the languages in each pair was measured by means of a method that computes what the authors call a 'normalized Hamming distance,' a figure between 0 and 1 resulting from the division of the number of differences by the sum of identities and differences: *d/(i+d)*. Finally a (series of) genealogical tree(s) was generated by a philogenetic program (*Kitsch*) with the set of distances between the languages in each pair as input. At first sight the trees the program produced look quite similar to the ones traditional historical linguistics has come up with. This would be good news for anybody interested in language history, since the new method (the 'parametric comparative method' or PCM for short) seems to be much more efficient and effective than the time and energy consuming methods of traditional comparative linguistics. Moreover, the debate on the nature of UG seemed to have been settled in favor of the maximalists, since "the historical success of PCM provides evidence of an unprecedented type for Principles & Parameters models of grammatical variation" (Longobardi & Guardiano 2009:1696). But, unfortunately, a closer look at both the primary data (the normalized Hamming distances of each pair of languages) and the trees generated with these data as input reveals some worrying anomalies and inconsistencies, which cast doubt on the usefulness of a model that only uses (dis)similarities as a basis for genetic classification.[1] According to Longobardi & Guardiano the branching within the Indo-European phylum as generated by Kitsch "is overwhelmingly the expected one", but any serious Indo-Europeanist cannot but shake his/her head in disbelief when being told that Celtic is the first subgroup to branch off from the IE-stem, that Slavic and Indian share a forefather (apart from PIE), that Rumanian does not belong to the same subgroup as Latin, etc. The distance between Latin and Classical Greek as measured by PCM is less than between Latin and Italian or Spanish, or between Spanish and Italian or French; Gothic seems to have more in

---

[1] For anyone wanting to venture into linguistic cladistics, Holm (2007) should be obligatory reading.

common with New Testament Greek than with any Germanic language, the examples could be multiplied ad infinitum; very few of the measured distances make any sense if one's goal is to establish the genealogical relations between the languages in the sample. With hindsight this result was to be expected: a genealogical tree is defined by shared innovations (changes), not by (dis)similarities. The Germanic languages, for instance, are defined as a separate subgroup of Indo-European by the changes their Proto-Germanic ancestor underwent, such as the change of word-initial *p, t, k* into *f, þ, x* (*h*), the use of a dental suffix to mark past tense, and the differentiation of the weak and strong declension of adjectives. Subsequent changes in the individual Germanic languages may completely alter the way they appear, and make them look more similar to other, distantly related or even unrelated, languages, but their family ties cannot be broken, nor can any language that does not descend from Proto-Germanic ever become a member of the family.

2. *Definiteness and the definite article*

Ten of the parameters Longobardi & Guardiano used in their analysis deal with the ways definiteness is (or is not) expressed. In the languages of Central and Western Europe the definite article and/or suffix is relatively recent. In the Romance languages it may have started its life at the end of the Late Latin/Early Romance period, but it first came to maturity in the individual languages (Bauer 2007). The Germanic languages, on the other hand, did not inherit an incipient definite article from their parent language Proto-Germanic. They had become separate entities long before they developed the definite article (West-Germanic) or suffix (North Germanic). Given that the emergence of definiteness as a distinct grammatical category belongs to the history of the individual languages, and hence was not inherited from a common parent language, it is clear that none of the parameters that deal with definiteness can shed any light on the genealogical relations of the languages that were compared by means of PCM.

The emergence of the article in three branches of Indo-European, Romance, Celtic and Germanic, at approximately the same time, viz. between the eighth and the twelfth century, raises a number of other questions. Is it the outcome of a completely autonomous process in each of the languages? This does not seem very likely, since it emerged in one continuous area at roughly the same time. If it was not invented over and over again, then in what language did it originate, and how did it spread? Grammar is not that easily borrowed: if it is, it usually means that contact between the two languages involved is intensive; there are, however, no indications that the language contacts were very intensive in that time and place, unless one assumes that the Christian preachers had a great impact not only on the culture, but also on the language of their audiences. If they

did, what then prevented the speakers of West-Slavic languages who also came under the spell of Rome from developing a definite article?

In the debate on the nature of the DP-layer between maximalists, who claim that is universal, and minimalists, who argue that it is not, it has been suggested that Germanic was destined to develop a definite article, since it had lost, or was on its way of losing, its aspectual system: "definiteness and perfective aspect are […] just two instantiations of the same grammatical function.[2] So are indefiniteness and imperfective aspect" (Leiss 2007:73). Seen in this light the simultaneity of the development of the article in the Romance and Germanic languages could well be a mere coincidence, although contact with Romance may have functioned as a catalyst. Problematic for the hypothesis that (im)perfectivity and (in)definiteness tend to show a complementary distribution in language ("Aspect languages avoid article systems, and article languages avoid aspect," Leiss 2007:87) is the existence of languages like Bulgarian that combine an intricate aspectual system with a well-developed article system, on the one hand, and languages like Proto-Norse that could do without either, on the other hand: there lie at least four centuries between the loss of the prefixes that Leiss claims expressed perfectivity (approx. 5th c.) and the emergence of the definite suffix (9th or 10th c.) in this poorly attested language. A more fundamental problem for the theory, however, is that perfectivity is a binary feature while definiteness is a privative one; a verbal construction in a language that has a systematic opposition between two aspects has either perfective or imperfective aspect, it cannot be aspectless. Definite and indefinite noun phrases, on the other hand, only differ in the presence or absence of definiteness.

The more or less simultaneous emergence of definiteness as a grammatical category in all the Germanic and Romance languages and dialects does not only pose some challenging questions to historical linguistics, but offers at the same time a rare opportunity to study the ways in which languages with partly different genetic backgrounds integrate a new nominal category in their grammar. In both branches this new category seems to have led to a tighter organization of the noun phrase, or perhaps even to its genesis: in the parent languages (Latin, Old English, Proto-Norse etc.) an attribute was to a certain extent still an apposition, which for reasons of emphasis or style could be placed in other positions than in the immediate vicinity of the noun it qualified, e.g.:

(1)   ***meo***   *tu epistulam   dedisti* ***servo***
         my.DAT.SG you letter.ACC.SG gave   slave.DAT.SG
         "to *my* slave you gave a letter?"   (Plautus; Latin)

---

[2] See e.g. the papers by Abraham, Lohndal, Leiss and others in Stark, Leiss & Abraham (2007), with many useful references to previous contributions to this debate.

(2)   *Fugl*   ***vælva***   *slæit*   ***falvan***
         Bird   thief.ACC.SG   tore   pale.ACC.SG
         "the bird tore apart the pale thief"   (Sigtuna box; runic
         Swedish, 11th c.)

Although it seems likely that discontinuous phrases like the ones in (1) and (2) were exceptions rather than the norm (cf. Pinkster 1990:187 for Latin), the mere fact that they were possible indicates that word order within a nominal group was not yet as rigid as it is in the modern Romance and Germanic languages.[3] All attributes could in principle occur both before and after the noun they modified, but with a difference in emphasis. The distal demonstratives grammaticalized into definite articles in a position in which they were not stressed: before the noun in West-Germanic and all the Romance languages except Rumanian, after the noun in North-Germanic and Rumanian. In this way the foundations of a more or less rigid word order in the noun phrase were laid: definite article and noun formed a phrase with a fixed order.

It is possible that the demonstratives in French and the West-Germanic languages could no longer be used in postnominal position at the time the unstressed distal demonstrative developed into a definite article. In these languages, then, the article and the demonstratives occupy the same prenominal position, and belong hence to the same word class, viz. the definite determiners. In North-Germanic and Rumanian, on the other hand, the grammaticalization of the unstressed distal demonstrative led to a lexical split, as the postnominal article turned into a clitic, and eventually (at least in Scandinavian) into a nominal suffix. Rumanian demonstratives can still appear in both pre- and postnominal position, but in the latter case the definite article has to be used as well, e.g.:[4,5]

(3)   a.   *acest an*
                 this   year
         b.   *an-ul   acesta*
                 year.DEF this
                 "this year"

---

[3] Cf. Magni (this vol.) who argues that: "Latin adjectives form loose paratactic structures where the modifier-modified distinction is left unspecified, and items from the same category are juxtaposed." The opposite view is defended by Platzack (2008), who assumes that there is a difference in structure between the old and modern languages, which allows modifiers to be extracted in Latin and Old Norse, but not in e.g. French or Modern Icelandic.

[4] Cornilescu & Nicolae (this vol.) argue that the Rumanian enclitic article *-(u)l* is a suffix, too.

[5] In Spanish, too, the demonstrative may appear in postnominal position, see, e.g., Alarcos Llorach (1987:287-306), Bernstein (2001), and Alexander (2007).

In the modern North-Germanic languages demonstratives may no longer follow their head noun. In the so-called 'double-definiteness' languages (Norwegian, Swedish and Faroese) a noun that is determined by means of a demonstrative has to carry the suffixed article:

(4)   *dette år-et*   (Norwegian)
       this   year.DEF
       "this year"

Comparing the demonstrative constructions in (3b) and (4) with the corresponding ones in e.g. English and French, one notices that in the latter languages demonstratives are definite by themselves, whereas in Rumanian and Norwegian they require definiteness to be marked separately on the noun. In Greek a similar situation obtains:

(5)   *avtó   to   chróno*
       this   the   year
       "this year"

Definiteness is hence part of the meaning of the demonstrative, which is 'spelled out' in languages like Rumanian, Greek and Norwegian. In West-Germanic and West-Romance the definite article is only used when no other definite determiner is present. It is a kind of 'tool of last resort' for expressing definiteness.

Possessive adjectives followed more or less the same course of development as the demonstratives. In the parent languages the possessives could follow or precede the head noun, or even be separated from it, as in the Latin example in (1). Postposition of the possessive was probably the unmarked order; in front position possessives were stressed, either for emphasis or contrastively. Judging from the situation in the modern Romance languages, the markedness of both word orders seems to have reversed at some point in time. In Spanish, for example, a construction with a possessive adjective (*mia* "my" in 6a) following the head noun (here: *casa* "house") is used when one wants to emphasize the 'possessor'; (6b) with a weak form of the possessive (*mi*) preceding the head noun is the unmarked alternative:

(6)   a.   *la   casa   mía*
             the   house   mine
             "*mý* house"
       b.   *mi   casa*
             "my house"

In the North-Germanic languages that have retained both word orders (Norwegian, Icelandic and Faroese) markedness is unaltered: postposition is

unmarked, front position emphasizes the possessive (Faarlund et al. 1997:265):

(7)   a.   *hus-et   mitt*
                house.DEF my
                "my house"
        b.   *mitt hus*
                "*mý* house"

It is to be noted that possessives are not definite determiners in the languages that allow both word orders.[6] In Italian and (European) Portuguese possessive adjectives behave like ordinary adjectives that can be used in both definite and indefinite noun phrases. The 'strong' possessives in Spanish function in much the same way. In Norwegian, Rumanian and, to a certain extent, Icelandic the possessives follow a noun that has been made definite by other means (cf. 7a).[7] Thus it is not the possessive itself that makes a noun phrase definite, it is rather its prenominal position that turns it into a determiner. In French, Swedish, Danish and West-Germanic this position (the determiner-position, or 'D' for short) is the only one available to possessives, which hence have become definite determiners on a par with demonstratives and the definite article. In a similar way the weak possessives in Spanish (*mi*, *tu, su*) turned into determiners, thus parting company with the strong possessives (*mio, tuyo, suyo*), which remained 'genitival' adjectives, semantically akin to the PP-'genitives' (*de* + DP/NP in Spanish and French, *of* + DP/NP in English, *von* + DP/NP in German, *van* + DP/NP in Dutch).

Definiteness in the Germanic and Romance languages is not only an inherent property of some lexical elements, such as the definite article and the demonstratives, but also of a specific position in the noun phrase, viz. the D-position in the prenominal field. All elements that are placed in D ('promoted/raised to D') function as definite determiners: demonstratives, articles, genitival constructions, possessives, and even 'identifying' adjectives like Dutch *voornoemd* "aforementioned" and *bedoeld* "intended", as described by van de Velde (this vol.), and Swedish *samma* "the same", *nästa* "the next", *ovannämnda* "aforementioned", etc. (Ågren 1912:64-70; Perridon 1989:207).

---

[6] Faroese is the exception here: a possessive adjective (or genitive of a pronoun functioning as a possessive) makes its head noun definite, even in postposition: *hús mítt* (*hús-ið mítt) "my house" and *mítt hús* "*mý* house" (Thráinsson et al. 2004:96-7; 118).

[7] The situation in Icelandic is fairly complicated. Concrete nouns require the suffixed article when followed by a possessive, whereas abstract nouns and kinship terms disallow it, e.g.:

(i)   *hús-ið   mítt*   vs.   ??*hús   mitt*
           house.DEF my
(ii)   *skoðun min*   vs.   *skoðun-in mín
           opinion my

See Sigurðsson (2006) for a thorough discussion of these and related constructions.

In West-Germanic and West-Romance the histories of the definite article and the D-position coincide to a large extent, since it was exactly in this prenominal D-position that the definite article was born. In Rumanian and North-Germanic, on the other hand, the article emerged in postnominal position, and became eventually a suffix which only modifies the meaning of the noun but does not head a phrase. A separate D was created in these languages when demonstratives increasingly started to appear in prenominal position. In North-Germanic this leftward movement of the demonstratives ended with their no longer being able to follow their head noun, but having to precede it. At a later stage the possessives followed suit. In the runic inscriptions of the 10th and 11th centuries, possessives usually followed the noun, but preceded other adjectives, e.g. on runic stone Sö 10 (Södermanland, Sweden):

> (8)   **[…]   *þaiR * litu * raisa * stain * at * iarl * faþur* :**
>   they   let   raise   stone   at [Jarl father
>   ***sin : kuþan : […]***
>   their good].ACC.SG.M
>   "they had the stone raised in memory of Jarl, their good father"

The adjective *kuþan* (Old Norse *góðan*) has a strong, non-definite form; the weak form would have been *góða*. When both possessive and adjective were fronted, the adjective could keep its strong form until the end of the 14th c., as e.g. in the phrase *hans siukt ben* "his sick leg" (Codex Bureanus Sweden, around 1350; cf. Delsing 1994), with strong *siukt* instead of weak *siuka*. After 1400 the adjective must appear in a weak form if a determiner is present in D that is, in the form it always had when occurring within the scope of a demonstrative.

Apart from a suffix 'defining' the noun to which it attaches and a D-position that takes scope over whatever is to the right of it in the DP, North-Germanic and Rumanian developed an 'adjectival article', which in principle only has scope over an adjective. In North-Germanic this article seems to be older than either the nominal suffix or the D-position. It is only used with a following weak adjective, which often functions as an epithet, e.g. in the inscription on the runic stone DR 84 (10th c.; Skern in Denmark):

> (9)   ***soskiriþr : risþi : stin : finulfs : tutiR : at : uþinkaur :***
>   ***usbiarnaR : sun : þoh : tura : uk : hin : turutin:fasta :***
>   *Sasgærþr resþi sten, Finulfs dottiR, at Oþinkor AsbiarnaR sun,*
>   *þan dyra ok hin drottinfasta.* ('translated' to standardized Old Swedish)
>   "Sasgerðr, Finnulfr's daughter, raised the stone, in memory of Óðinkárr Ásbjörn's son, the valued and loyal to his lord."

The epithets *þann dýra* "the dear (one)" and *hinn dróttinfasta* "the (one who is) loyal to his lord" consist each of a demonstrative and a weak adjective. In this use both demonstratives have a bleached meaning, which comes close to that of the definite article in e.g. English. In Old Norse prose the construction 'adjectival article + weak adjective' is not only used as an epithet, but also in ordinary attributive use, as e.g. in:

> (10) *hendi inni hoegri*   (Völuspá 5; poetic Edda)
>   [hand the right.WEAK].F.SG.DAT
>   "with the/her right hand"

The whole phrase could be placed before the noun, in which case it alternates with just the weak adjective. It may thus follow a demonstrative, as in (11), or even a possessive, as in (12):

> (11) *þau   hin stóru   skip*
>   [those the big.WEAK ships].N.PL.NOM
>   "those big ships"
> (12) *minn inn hvassi   hjörr* (Fáfnismál 6; poetic Edda)
>   [my   the sharp.WEAK sword].M.SG.NOM
>   "my sharp sword"

In Mainland Scandinavian it was the demonstrative *sá, sú, þat* → *den, det* "that" that was used as a preadjectival article, in Icelandic it was *(h)inn* "that". *Den/det* is the article that appears in double-definite constructions in Swedish and Norwegian, e.g.:

> (13) *den mjuka   säng-en*   Swedish
>   the soft.WEAK bed.DEF
>   "the soft bed"

It has the same forms as the distal demonstrative *den/det/de* in D-position, and is therefore difficult to keep apart from it. Since article, demonstrative and pronoun all changed their plural form in exactly the same way from [di] to [dɔm] in (standard) Swedish, it seems reasonable to assume that there is in fact only one lexical item. The difference in interpretation is then the result of a difference in stress and position. If this is correct, the phrases in (14) and (15) with *den* immediately following a demonstrative should not be analysed as the modern counterparts of the Old Norse constructions in (11) and (12), but rather as DP's in which the head noun is a DP,

> (14) *dette (det) høje flotte   hus* (Danish; Leu 2008:31; 63)
>   this   (the) tall stylish house
> (15) *denna den bästa av alla världar* (Swedish; Perridon 989:186)
>   this   the best   of all worlds

Under such an interpretation they display basically the same structure as (16):

> (16)   *den skønne Jordens Sol* (Danish; Diderichsen 1946:225)
>   the beautiful.WEAK earth.DEF.GEN sun
>   "the beautiful sun of the world"

which was analysed by Diderichsen (1946) as: [NP den skønne [NP jordens sol]], with *jordens* as the determiner in the inner NP (DP), and *den* as the determiner of the whole NP/DP.

In Modern Icelandic it is no longer possible to use an adjectival article after a demonstrative or a possessive. But even in its normal position at the left edge of the DP the existence of this article is threatened: "the preposed free article is almost non-existent in common everyday language" Sigurðsson (2006:195) writes; it is "mostly confined to abstract nouns in formal written style" (*ibid.*). When it occurs it appears to function as any other prenominal determiner, by requiring the noun it determines to be suffixless:

> (17)   *Hið langa kvæði var frekar leiðinlegt* (Thráinsson 2005:97)
>   the long.WEAK poem was rather boring

But since it cannot be used in any other context than before a weak adjective it has not really changed its function of just making the following adjective definite. It became superfluous as soon as the weak form of the adjective had become an unambiguous marker of definiteness by itself. This weak form without the 'free article' is followed by the definite form of the noun (noun + suffix): *langa kvæði-ð* long.WEAK poem.DEF "the long poem".

In Rumanian, the only Romance language to develop a suffix instead of an article, the suffix is attached to the first element in a Noun + Adj. or Adj. + Noun combination:

> (18)   a.   *trandafir-ul (frumos)* (Cornilescu & Nicolae, this
>   vol.)
>   rose.DEF (beautiful)
>   "the beautiful rose"
>   b.   *frumos-ul   trandafir*
>   beautiful.DEF rose

The construction in (18b) is similar to the Icelandic one in (17): the adjectival suffix signals in much the same way as its Icelandic counterpart, the preadjectival article/clitic, that the adjective is definite. The definite adjective functions as a determiner in D-position which like other prenominal determiners prevents the noun from taking the definite suffix.

Apart from the adjectival suffix, Rumanian developed an adjectival article *cel* which is used with postposed adjectives:

(18) c.   *trandafir-ul cel frumos*
             rose.DEF   the beautiful
             "the beautiful rose"

Article + adjective cannot precede the noun: **cel frumos trandafir(ul)*, unless the adjective (phrase) is a superlative (19), or a numeral (20):

(19) *cel mai   frumos   trandafir*
        the more beautiful rose
        "the most beautiful rose"
(20) *cei   doi trandafiri*
        the.PL two rose.PL
        "the two roses"

These two constructions are structurally almost identical to their Icelandic counterpart in (17). The whole phrase *cel* + adjective in (19) functions as a determiner in D, not just *cel*, which is part of the superlative AP.

From this short overview of the various ways in which definite noun phrases are construed in the Germanic and Romance languages it is clear that the similarities and differences between the individual languages are not due to a common genetic background. The main dividing line runs between D-languages that developed a definite article in D, which has scope over the rest of the DP, and suffixing languages that developed a number of articles and suffixes with only local scope: over a noun, an adjective or adjective phrase, etc. In each of the two language groups there are languages of both types: West-Germanic has D-articles, North-Germanic suffixes or prefixes (the South- and West Jutlandic dialects of Danish), all Romance languages are D-languages, with the exception of Rumanian, which has a rich inventory of local articles and suffixes.

3. *Position of adjectives*

In the Romance languages attributive adjectives may either precede or follow their head noun. The question of what exactly determines the choice of the order A-N or N-A has been hotly debated within Romance linguistics and stylistics, but has not been given a final answer yet.

There is, however, some agreement on what are the most important factors that influence the choice of either order. One of these factors is the semantic nature of the adjective. In French, adjectives designating an objective property are predominantly placed after the noun, whereas evaluating, emotive adjectives regularly precede the noun: "plus un adjectif

est réservé à des emplois définitionnels, techniques, excluant toute émotivité, plus régulièrement cet adjectif sera placé après le substantif," (Blinkenberg 1969:84). In the other Romance languages a similar distribution of pre- and postposed adjectives is found. Lepschy & Lepschy (1994:165-8) stress the individuating, restrictive nature of postnominal modifiers in Italian, and ascribe a purely descriptive, epithetic function to the prenominal ones. Solé & Solé (1977:230-239) express the same view on the position of the adjective in Spanish: "Post-nominal adjectives usually restrict, clarify or specify the meaning of the modified noun by adding an idea not expressed by the noun".

In the modern Germanic languages attributive adjectives and other modifiers do not enjoy the same freedom as their Romance counterparts: they are in principle restricted to prenominal position. In English, however, postposition of an adjective is not unusual, as in the following well-known examples:

(21)   a.   the only river navigable *vs*   the only navigable river
        b.   stars visible   *vs*   visible stars

Bolinger (1967) argues that the adjectives in postposition in (21) express an occasional property, i.e. a property which the object designated by the noun has on some particular occasion. This might be a suitable characterization of the effect which postposition of the modifier has on the meaning of the noun phrases in (21), but it does not account for the meaning that the adjective *adjacent* has in (22):

(22)   buildings adjacent will be closed for three days
        (Ferris 1993:45)

Adjacency is hardly an occasional property of an object, as Ferris (1993) remarks in his penetrating analysis of the various uses of adjectives in English. According to Ferris both postnominal and predicative adjectives assign a property to their head nouns, whereas prenominal adjectives only modify the meaning of the nouns they are subordinated to. Pre- and postnominal adjectives are part of the noun phrase, predicative adjectives of the sentence. In postnominal position adjectives are a kind of predicative attribute.[8] Some confirmation for the predicative status of postnominal adjectives comes from languages like Dutch and German, which in general only marginally allow adjectives or adjective phrases in postposition. In

---

[8] Writing about adjective position in Old English, Fischer (2001:257) describes the meaning of the postposed adjective in the same vein: "[…] the Old English postnominal strong adjectives act very much like secondary predicates; they are rhematic, and as such belong to an adjectival category that is very close to the Verb category. Their postnominal position, in other words, can be seen as iconic (because the meaning of the adjective is not incorporated into the noun."

these languages adjectives are inflected in prenominal position (as in 23a), but remain uninflected when used predicatively. In postnominal position (23b) they are not inflected either:[9]

(23) a. *als tennisballen zo **grote** hagelstenen*   (Dutch)
          as tennis balls   so big.PL hailstones
          "hailstones (as) big as tennis balls"
      b. *hagelstenen zo **groot** als tennisballen*
          hailstones   as big   as tennisballs

Most of the rules that govern the placement of adjectives in the Romance languages were already in force in the parent language, Latin. As in the daughter languages, adjectives in Latin usually follow the noun "unless pragmatic factors such as Focus cause them to be preposed" (Pinkster 1990:186). The prenominal position of the adjective in Latin entails according to Magni (this vol.) "a tighter syntactic bond between attribute and head noun, which for the adjectives corresponds to the expression of inherent and essential properties, and to the function of description and concept formation. […] Conversely, the postnominal position entails a looser nexus, which is more suited to the expression of accidental properties, to object identification, and to discriminate an entity."

In the oldest phases of the Germanic languages the same freedom in position of the adjective is found. In Gothic, for instance, the adjective normally follows the noun, as in (24a), but may also precede it (24b):

(24) a. *miliþ   háiþiwisk*   (Wulfila, Marc 1, 6)
          [honey wild.STRONG]N.SG.ACC
          "wild honey"
      b. *unhráinjamma   ahmin* (Wulfila, Marc 1,23)
          [unclean.STRONG spirit]M.SG.DAT
          "(with an) unclean spirit"

As in Latin, classifying, individuating adjectives, like *háiþiwisk* "wild", derived from *haiþi* "field, heath", follow the noun, whereas qualifying adjectives like *unhráins* "unclean, dirty" in (24b) precede its head noun.

In Old English, Old High German and Old Norse both positions were still available to the adjective, but at some point of time the default order had become A + N, instead of N + A, as in Gothic and Latin. In the modern Germanic languages the default order has become the fixed order. Since the change from N-A to A-N, and the subsequent fixation of A-N, took place in each of the Germanic languages separately, the question forces itself upon us what they had in common in this part of their grammar that caused them

---

[9] Sleeman (2007) draws attention to this same difference in morphological form, when discussing the verbal nature of postnominal (past) participles.

to follow the same course of development.

The one major feature that sets apart the Germanic adjective from its counterparts in Latin and the other Indo-European languages is its capacity to take two separate sets of endings. The 'weak' adjective with endings based on a suffix *−e/on* is a Germanic innovation, albeit that the construction type as such is also known from other Indo-European languages. In Ancient Greek nouns, esp. cognomens, could be derived from adjectives by means of this suffix, e.g.: *Platōn* "(the) broad one" from *platys* "broad". In the same way nicknames were derived in Latin, e.g.: *Catō* "(the) smart guy" from *catus* "smart". It is certainly this use of the suffix that lies at the origin of the Germanic weak adjective. In Germanic, nouns derived from adjectives by means of the *−e/on*-suffix were always used together with the name, as a kind of extension of it, as e.g. in Old Norse *Haraldr hárfagri* "Harald Fairhair": here the weak form of the compounded adjective *hárfagr* (*hár* "hair" + *fagr* "fair") could in principle still be analyzed as a substantivized adjective apposed to the proper name *Haraldr*. In contrast to its Latin and Ancient Greek counterparts they could not be used in isolation as cognomens. Later they came to be used with common nouns as well, expressing an inherent property of the entity designated by the noun they were apposed to. In this way the derivational suffix *−e/on*- gradually grammaticalized into an inflectional suffix to be used with attributive adjectives. Already in Gothic the identifying function of the appositive weak adjective was strengthened by means of a definite article, as e.g. in (25):

(25)   *fōn þata unhvapnandō*   (Wulfila, Marc 9, 43 and 45)
       [fire the unquenchable.WEAK].N.SG.N/ACC
       "the unquenchable fire (-s of hell)"

Weak adjectives preceded by the adjectival article are usually postposed in Gothic. In Old Norse and Old Saxon they occur both before and after the noun, but in Old High German and Old English they almost exclusively precede the noun, as they do in all the modern Germanic languages that still distinguish between strong and weak adjectives. The unmarked order seems thus to have changed from 'N + art + adjW' to 'art +adjW + N,' a change in word order that calls for an explanation. According to Fischer (2001) word order in the Old English noun phrase is iconic: what is known (given information) precedes what is new. Identifying elements, such as determiners and the noun itself, are presented first, predicative elements which give new information, follow (both in real time and in writing). Since in Fischer's view the basic meaning of weak adjectives is to give additional information that enables the hearer to identify the entity the speaker wants to say something about, it stands to reason that it stands as closely together with the noun as possible: "[…] adjective position is iconically motivated in that prenominal adjectives, when they are weak and definite, convey given

information; they behave typically like attributive adjectives which are closer to the nominal pole of the adjective cline, they are therefore an inseparable part of the head: together with the noun phrase they form the 'theme' of the utterance" (Fischer 2001:271). This does not explain the original word order in Germanic, exemplified by Gothic in (25). Moreover, there is no reason to assume that additional information that is needed in order to identify the entity the speaker wants to talk about, should precede the primary identifier, the noun.

The most likely scenario for the change in word order in the West-Germanic noun phrase is in our view the following: when the prenominal distal demonstrative grammaticalized into a definite article, the adjectival article was reinterpreted as an instance of that article, and hence placed in the prenominal slot for determiners, D. Since adjectival article and weak adjective formed a unity, the weak adjective moved with the article to a position before the noun. Strong adjectives could originally appear both before and after the noun, but in the course of time they lost this freedom of placement, and became restricted to prenominal position. In North Germanic, too, the adjectival article was reinterpreted as a determiner to be placed in D, and like its West Germanic counterpart it dragged along its companion, the weak adjective.

4. *Function and position of genitives and genitivals*

Adjectives, genitives and genitivals (*i.e.* constructions that have more or less the same function as genitives in inflectional languages, e.g. the *of-* 'genitive' in English) have much in common: they are all subordinated to the noun and provide additional information on the entity designated by that noun. Often there is little difference in meaning between a construction with an adjective and one with a genitival, as e.g. in the examples in (26):

(26) a.   the French team   *l'équipe française*
       b.   the team of France   *l'équipe de France*

According to Wackernagel (1908:145), as quoted by Magni (this vol.), the use of adjectives for expressing a genitival relation predates in Indo-European the use of genitive case in that function. Since the kind of objective, individuating meaning mediated by these adjectives agrees well with the postnominal position in Latin (see section 3 above), it is hardly surprising "that, when the genitive supersedes the adjective in possessive constructions, the new structure parallels the older one, and postnominal genitives replace postnominal adjectives" (Magni, this vol.:§ 3.6). In the Late Latin/Early Romance period the morphological genitives gave way to constructions with a preposition: head noun ('possessum') – *de* (preposition "of") – dependent noun ('possessor').

The Germanic languages followed a different course of development. In the Germanic parent language the position of adjectives and genitives was presumably the same as in Latin, and expressed the same semantic distinctions: in prenominal position modifiers were closely connected with the head noun, in postposition the connection was much looser.

When adjectives lost their positional freedom and became fixed to prenominal position (see section 3), the position of genitives did not change. What changed, however, was what kind of elements could occur in either position. In postposition all kinds of genitive constructions were allowed, with or without modifiers, determiners and even relative clauses. This is still the case in those Germanic languages that have retained a morphological genitive (Icelandic and German). The prenominal position became gradually restricted to the genitives of bare nouns, and the resulting combinations of genitive + noun turned into noun-noun compounds. In the languages that shed their case morphology, the endings that signalled genitive case were reinterpreted as meaningless interfixes, which function as a kind of glue between the parts of a compound. In English bare nouns are placed directly before the noun they modify, without any linker, as in: *a stone bridge*, *an arms treaty*, *a holiday treat*, *a birthday present*. The modifying noun can be modified itself by an adjective, as in: *a long distance runner* or *sick building syndrome*. In the other Germanic languages adjectives specifying a modifying noun often keep their inflected form:

(27)   *langeafstandsloper*   (Dutch)
         long.INFL-distance-*s*-runner
         "long distance runner"

In cases like these the dividing line between morphology ("is it a compound?") and syntax ("is it a phrase?") is rather thin.

In the Germanic languages that lost the genitive as a morphological case the postnominal genitive was replaced by a construction in which the genitival (or 'possessor phrase') is linked to the head noun ('possessum phrase') by means of a preposition with a reduced meaning (*of* in English, *van* in Dutch). In the two languages that kept the genitive, German and Icelandic, similar constructions emerged as alternatives to the morphological genitives.

In the languages in which possessive pronouns have become determiners, a new type of genitive emerged, the determining genitive. It comes in two flavors: the element that links the two parts of the genitival construction, and functions as a determiner, is either (a) −*s* or (b) a possessive pronoun.[10] The −*s* genitive is found in English, Danish, Swedish,

---

[10] The first scholar to describe the origin of the −*s* genitive in English is Jespersen (1894), who mainly focussed on 'group genitives' like *The man I saw yesterday's son*. Jespersen's view that −*s* emancipated from a mere ending to a grammatical element , an "interposition,"

Norwegian (Bokmål) and (marginally) Dutch, the pronominal linker in Afrikaans, Dutch, Low Saxon, German, Norwegian (Nynorsk) and the West-Jutlandic dialect of Danish. In Faroese the linking element is –*sa*, of unknown origin, which like the Dutch –*s* genitive can only be used with names. These may have phrasal structure, as in (28):

(28)   *Tummas á Dómarakontórinumsa bilur*   (Faroese;
        Thráinsson *et al.* 2004:64)
        Thomas at legal office.DEF.DAT.SG-*sa* car
        "Thomas at the legal office's car"

The remarkable fact that the Germanic languages, except Icelandic, each individually developed the same kind of construction suggests that they were all subject to the same pressure to fill a structural gap in their determiner system. The factors that made the emergence of the determining genitive possible, or even necessary, are the following: (a) there is a prenominal slot for determiners; (b) possessive pronouns are placed (or can be placed) in this slot, and function as determiners; (c) relational adjectives precede the noun. The triggering factor seems to have been the loss of the morphological genitive. In German, it is true, the morphological genitive is still alive, but its main domain is the written language, from which the construction with the pronominal linker is banned.

5. *An overview of the contributions to this volume*

The discussion in the preceding sections shows that, in our view, the DP-structure in Romance and Germanic developed from rather loose relations between its constituting elements. The emergence of the definite article, which developed from a prenominal demonstrative, paved the way for a DP-structure with tighter relations between its constituents. The emergence of definiteness led to the grammaticalization of various prenominal adjectival and genitival elements as determiners. Individual languages or language groups differ in the extent to which grammaticalization has taken place. Although the Germanic languages differ in a number of respects from the Romance languages (prenominal adjectives, the determining genitive, a weak/strong adjectival inflection), individual languages do not always behave like the other languages from their language family. Both North-Germanic and Romanian have or had a postnominal, suffixal, definite

---

has in recent years led to an intense debate among historical linguists with an interest in grammaticalization theory, since such a development towards greater and greater freedom seems to contradict the main tenet of that theory, viz. that grammatical change is unidirectional, from more to less freedom, see e.g.: Janda (1980; 2001), Allen (1997; 2002; 2003) and Rosenbach (2004) for English, Norde (1997; 2001; 2006) and Börjars (2003) for Swedish.

determiner and an adjectival article, and German, Icelandic and Romanian still have morphological genitives.

In this volume, similarities and differences between and within the Germanic and Romance language families are discussed. In all papers the discussion is restricted to the DP, although the discussion is not limited to the subjects introduced in this introductory chapter.

The papers in this book are grouped together according to two themes: (a) variation and (b) change with respect to the DP in the Germanic and Romance languages. The papers are presented in what follows.

5.1 *Variation*

Alexiadou, Iordâchioaia, and Schäfer argue that there is no parametric difference between Germanic and Romance with respect to nominalized infinitives. Both language families have two types of nominalized infinitives: a verbal type and a nominal type. Within a Distributed Morphology approach, the authors propose that languages may only differ with respect to the distribution of verbal and nominal layers within the DP representing the nominalized infinitive.

Cirillo shows that although both in Romance and Germanic universal quantifiers such as "all" can select DP as their complement and can be floated/stranded by that DP, there is variation between Romance and Germanic and also among the Germanic languages with respect to the combination of a universal quantifier with an interrogative DP. In Romance, universal quantifiers cannot be combined with an interrogative DP. In Germanic, there is variation. In German, "all" can occur to the right of the wh-word and can be stranded, possibly because it also allows split DPs. American English has only the first option, and Swedish only the second. British English has neither of them. Cirillo proposes that the variation is the result of a lexical difference between the languages.

Corver & van Koppen's paper deals with micro-variation in a split DP-construction, the *wat voor*-construction, in one of the Germanic languages, Dutch. Corver and van Koppen adopt a predicate displacement analysis for all variants, but show that predicate displacement of *wat* is not allowed in all dialects. Corver and van Koppen relate the variation to differences in the internal syntax of the cross-dialectal variants of the *wat voor*-construction.

Wood and Vikner discuss pre-article "so/such"-constructions in three Germanic languages: English, Danish, and German. They analyze these pre-article constructions as predicate inversion constructions. Wood and Vikner show that there is variation with respect to the "so/such"-constructions in Germanic. They furthermore argue that the "so"/"such"-constructions are changing their functions in English and German.

Lohrmann discusses the expression of definiteness in Scandinavian, assuming that it is possible to describe the variation found in these languages by means of a single model. She argues that the three different markers of definiteness, viz. the pre-adjectival determiner, the definite suffix, and the weak adjectival inflection each express a separate aspect of the notion of definiteness. Within a Distributed Morphology approach, Lohrmann proposes a unified (double) DP structure for all Scandinavian languages and dialects she discusses in her paper, but she claims that the double definiteness languages (Norwegian, Swedish and Faroese) differ from the single definiteness languages (Danish and Icelandic) with respect to the realization of the syntactic heads representing the three different types of morphemes.

Stroh-Wollin also proposes a unified (double) DP structure within a Distributed Morphology approach, both for Germanic and Romance languages. She claims that the differences in the expression of definite, indefinite, and generic noun phrases and the position of attributive adjectives in the various Scandinavian languages, in English, and in Romance are the result of a different lexical realization of both DP heads (DP and dP in her analysis) and of a difference in movement operations.

Bobyleva claims that the distribution of the definite determiner in two English-based creoles, Jamaican and Sranan, is basically due to the amount of contact with their main lexifier, English, which has a definiteness-based determiner use, and not to the influence of Gbe, one of their most important substrate languages, which has a specificity-based determiner use. Bobyleva argues that the more extended use of bare nouns in Jamaican and Sranan as compared to English is not due to the influence of Gbe either, but is the result of pragmatic non-referentiality.

5.2 *Change*

Lucas shows, just like Bobyleva (this vol.), that pragmatic non-referentiality may or may not be expressed by a definite determiner. He discusses two classes of so-called 'weak definites' in English, and outlines a diachronic explanation for the form-function mismatch of these two classes. According to Lucas such mismatches are to be expected, since definite articles in diachrony have a tendency to spread into contexts where they no longer signal semantic definiteness.

Crisma argues that the definite article in Old English emerged no later than the last quarter of the 9th century. Starting out from the assumption that grammatical change does not happen without some external cause, Crisma proposes that the definite article emerged in Old English through the

influence of the Celtic substratum/adstratum.

Cornilescu and Nicolae claim that the existence of the lower article in Old Romanian is evidence that the Romanian enclitic definite article originates as a post-posed demonstrative and is a suffix rather than a second position clitic. Romanian developed an inflectional genitive system (bare inflected genitives and inflected DPs preceded by the genitival article *al*) alongside the prepositional *de*-genitive, each with its own function and/or distribution. Cornilescu & Nicolae show that there is a strong statistical correlation between the lower article and the (postnominal) inflectional bare genitive.

Magni discusses the development and the functions of prenominal and postnominal genitives in English and Latin. She argues that, both in English and in Latin, the coexistence of both positions can be explained through diachrony, which also accounts for the functional specialization of both positions.

Van de Velde claims that 'anaphoric adjectives', i.e. adjectives that fulfil a discourse-deictic function, such as *voornoemd* 'aforementioned' and *vermeld* 'mentioned', are increasingly used as determiners in Present-day Dutch, rather than as adjectives. This suggests that anaphoric adjectives are gradually changing into Ds in Late Modern Dutch.

Déprez argues that French n-words like *personne* 'nobody' and *rien* 'nothing' have undergone a change from nouns into determiners in the course of time, climbing from N, via NumP, to D. Déprez proposes that in contemporary French, n-words are merged as a strong quantifier in the highest layer of the DP, the strong determiner phrase (SDP), which accounts for their change into negative quantificational expressions.

References

Abraham, Werner. 2007. "The Discourse-functional Crystallization of the Historically Original Demonstrative". Stark, Leiss & Abraham 2007. 241-256.

Ågren, Karl. 1912. Om Användningen av Bestämd Slutartikel i Svenskan. Uppsala: Almquist.

Alarcos Llorach, Emilio. 1987. *Estudios de Gramática Funcional del Español*. Madrid: Editorial Gredos.

Alexander, David B. 2007. *The Spanish Postnominal Demonstrative in Synchrony and Diachrony*. PhD dissertation, Ohio State University.

Allen, Cynthia. 1997. "The origins of the 'group genitive' in English". *Transactions of the Philological Society* 95:1.111–131.

Allen, Cynthia. 2002. **"**The Early English '*his* Genitives' from a Germanic Perspective"**.** *Proceedings of the 2002 Conference of the Australian Linguistic Society* ed. by Peter Collins & Mingistu Amberer.

Allen, Cynthia. 2003. Deflexion and the Development of the Genitive in English. *English Language and Linguistics* 7:1.1–28.

Bauer, 2007. "The Definite Article in Indo-European: Emergence of a new grammatical category?". Stark, Leiss & Abraham. 103-140.

Bernstein, Judy. 2001. "Focusing the 'Right' Way in Romance Determiner Phrases." *Probus* 13.1-29.

Blinkenberg, Andreas. 1969. *L'ordre des Mots en Français Moderne. Deuxième partie*. København: Munksgaard.

Bolinger, Dwight. 1967. "Adjectives in English: Attribution and predication". *Lingua* 18.1-34.

Börjars, Kersti. 2003. "Morphological Status and (De)grammaticalisation: the Swedish Possessive". *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 26:2.133–163.

Delsing, Lars-Olof. 1994. "'Hans sjukt ben' – om Starka och Svaga Adjektiv i Fornsvenskan". *Språkbruk, grammatik och språkförändring. En festskrift till Ulf Teleman*, ed. by Nils Jörgensen, Christer Platzack & Jan Svensson, 99-108. Lund: Lund University.

Diderichsen, Paul. 1946. *Elementær Dansk Grammatik*. København: Gyldendal.

Faarlund, Jan Terje, Svein Lie & Kjell Vannebo. 1997. *Norsk Referanse-Grammatikk*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Ferris, Connor. 1993. *The Meaning of Syntax. A study in the adjectives of English*. London/NewYork: Longman.

Fischer, Olga. 2001. "The Position of the Adjective in (Old) English from an Iconic Perspective". *The Motivated Sign. Iconicity in language and literature 2* ed. by Olga Fischer & Max Nänny, 249-276. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Fitch, W. Tecumseh, Marc D. Hauser & Noam Chomsky. 2005. "The Evolution of the Language Faculty: Clarifications and implications". *Cognition* 97,179–210.

Hauser, Marc, Noam Chomsky & W. Tecumseh Fitch. 2002. "The Language Faculty: What is it, who has it, and how did it evolve?". *Science* 298.1569–1579.

Holm, Hans J. 2007. "The New Arboretum of Indo-Europeum 'Trees'. Can new algorithms reveal the phylogeny and even prehistory of Indo-European?". *Journal of Quantitative Linguistics* 14.167-214.

Janda Richard. 1980. "On the Decline of Declensional Systems: The loss of OE nominal case and the ME reanalysis of *-es* as his". *Papers From the Fourth International Conference on Historical Linguistics* ed. by Elizabeth Closs Traugott, Rebecca Labrum & Susan Shepard, 243-252. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Janda, Richard D. 2001. "Beyond 'Pathways' and 'Unidirectionality': On the discontinuity of language transmission and the counterability of

grammaticalization". *Language Sciences* 23.265-340.

Jespersen, Otto. 1894. *Progress in Language With Special Reference to English.* London & New York: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.

Leiss, Elisabeth. 2007. "Covert Patterns of Definiteness/Indefiniteness and Aspectuality in Old Icelandic, Gothic, and Old High German". Stark, Leiss & Abraham 2007. 73-102.

Lepschy, Laura & Giulio Lepschy. 1994. *La Lingua Italiana. Storia, varietà dell' uso, grammatica*. Milana: Bompiani.

Leu, Thomas. 2008. *The Internal Syntax of Determiners*. (= *Groninger Arbeiten zur Germanistischen Linguistik* 47). Ph.D. dissertation, New York University.

Lohndal, Terje. 2007. "On the Structure and Development of Nominal Phrases in Norwegian". Stark, Leiss & Abraham 2007. 287-310.

Longobardi, Giuseppe & Christina Guardiano. 2009. "Evidence for Syntax as a Signal of Historical Relatedness". *Lingua* 119.1679–1706.

Norde, Muriel. 1997. *The History of the Genitive in Swedish: A case study in degrammaticalization* Ph.D. dissertation, University of Amsterdam.

Norde, Muriel. 2001. "The History of the Genitive in Swedish – the Full Story: A reply to Lars-Olof Delsing". *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 24.1.107–118.

Norde, Muriel. 2006. "Demarcating Degrammaticalization: The Swedish *s*-genitive revisited". *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 29.2.201–238.

Perridon, Harry. 1989. *Reference, Definiteness and the Noun Phrase in Swedish*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Amsterdam.

Pinkster, Harm. 1990. *Latin Syntax and Semantics.* London: Routledge. Electronic edition http://cybergreek.uchicago.edu/lss/

Platzack, Christer. 2008. "Left Branch Extraction of Nominal Modifiers in Old Scandinavian". *Grammatical Change and Linguistic Theory. The Rosendal Papers* ed. by Thórhallur Eythórsson, 357-374. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Rosenbach, Anette. 2004. "The English *s*-Genitive. *Up and down the Cline. The Nature of Grammaticalization* ed. by Olga Fischer, Muriel Norde & Harry Perridon, 73-96. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 2006. "The Icelandic Noun Phrase: Central traits". *Arkiv för Nordisk Filologi* 121.193-236.

Sleeman, Petra. 2007. "Prenominal and Postnominal Reduced Relative Clauses: Arguments against unitary analyses. *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics* IX.5-16.

Solé, Yolanda R. & Carlos A. Solé. 1977. *Modern Spanish Syntax. A Study in Contrast*. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Company.

Stark, Elisabeth, Elisabeth Leiss, & Werner Abraham (eds.). 2007. *Nominal Determination. Typology, Context Constraints, and Historical Emergence*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 2005. *Íslensk tunga. 3 bindi. Setningar. Handbók*

um setningafræði. Reykjavík: Almenna bókafélagið.

Thráinsson, Höskuldur, Hjalmar Petersen, Jógvan í Lon Jacobsen & Zakaris Svabo Hansen. 2004. *Faroese. An Overview and Reference Grammar*. Tórshavn: Føroya fróðskaparfelag.

Wackernagel, Jacob. 1908. "Genetiv und Adjektiv". *Mélanges de Linguistique Offerts à M. Ferdinand de Saussure*, 125–152. Paris: Champion.