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1. **Aim and claim:** Previous analyses of N/A-of-an-N qualitative constructions do not distinguish between (1a) and (1b). It is the aim of the paper to operate a distinction between 'single-DP' qualitatives SDPQs (1a) and ‘double-DP’ qualitatives DDPQs (1b) in Romanian.

(1) a. Am vorbit cu [un prost de doctor]NP
   (I) have talked with a stupid of doctor.
   ‘I have talked to a stupid of a doctor’

   (I) have talked with stupid-the that of doctor-the Popescu.
   ‘I have talked to that stupid of doctor Popescu’

In the framework we adopt (apud Svenonius 2004, Laenzlinger 2005, a.o.), i.e. DPs-as-phases, DDPQs will be analyzed as periphery constructions, checking P-features in an outer D and conforming to the (contrastive) Topic – Focus information packaging.

2. **Background:** DDPQs qualify as a distinct category of qualitative constructions because they display syntactic behavior and semantic interpretation that are different from those of the ‘single-DP’ qualitative.

One such difference is the presence of exclusively prenominal adjectives, which feature in DDPQs but are impossible in SDPQs (3-4):

(3) a. bietu de tine poor-the of you
   ‘poor you’

b. *un biet de doctor a poor of doctor

(4) a. sărmanul de copilul ăla de la ţară pitable-the of child-the that from at countryside
   ‘that poor child from the countryside’

b. *un sărman de copil a pitiable of child

The fact that these adjectives are exclusively prenominal and cannot be predicative may be taken to imply the presence of an empty head noun (apud Cornilescu 2010); the same fact suggests that the preposition is case-related. This will be shown to argue strongly against an analysis in terms of predicate inversion. The semantic type of DDPQs is always <e>, i.e. *individual*, as in the case of partitives (cf. Ladusaw 1982); this, in conjunction with the logic of the ‘DPs-as-arguments’ contention, is another solid argument against predicate inversion.

Other differences in syntax and interpretation between SDPQs and DDPQs relate to the absence vs. presence of presuppositional effects and absence vs. presence of definiteness agreement. SDPQs are part of the main assertion and fall in the scope of main verb negation (5a), while DDPQs are independent comments of the speaker (5b).

(5) a. N-am vorbit cu (vre)un prost de doctor.
   Not-have talked with (any) stupid of doctor
   ‘I haven’t talked to any stupid of a doctor.’

b. N-am văzut-o pe (*vreo) frumuseţea de soră-ta la petrecere.
   Not-have seen-her pe (*any) beauty-the of sister-your at party.
   ‘I haven’t seen your beauty of a sister at the party’

With DDPQs, there is agreement in definiteness. If the lower term is a definite DP, the higher one must also be definite (6a, b). With SDPQs there is no agreement in definiteness, i.e. if the lower term is not definite, the higher is either definite or indefinite, function of its position in the discourse (7a, b).

(6) a. prostul de doctorul ăla stupid-the of doctor-the that
   ‘that stupid of a doctor’

b. *un prost de doctorul ăla a stupid of doctor-the that

(7) a. un prost de doctor
   a stupid of doctor

b. prostul de doctor (anaphoric)
A stupid of doctor stupid-the of doctor
’a stupid of a doctor’ ‘that stupid of a doctor’

DDPQs conform to the contrastive Topic – Focus information packaging, because they allow focalized postnominal demonstratives in DP2 (8a), strong pronouns (8b) and focalized wh-elements in situ (contra Villalba & Bartra-Kaufmann 2010):

(8) a. idiotul-topic de profesorul ăsta.focus ‘that idiot of a professor’
    idiot-the of professor-the this ‘that idiot of a professor’
    N=ai vorbit cu idiotul ăla de CARE primar?
not have.2sg talked with idiot-the of WHICH mayor?
    ‘You haven’t talked to the idiot of WHICH mayor?’

3. Proposal: DDPQs are quantificational double-definite d*-periphery constructions.
3.1. Analysis: The syntactic analysis of DDPQs vs. SDPQs will rely on the split-D hypothesis (cf. Aboh 2004, Ihssane & Puskas 2001 a.o.) claiming that DDPQs are double definite constructions or ‘polydefinites’ (cf. Lekakou & Szendrői 2008) which realize the [+definite] feature twice, i.e. in D_{outer} and in D_{inner}.

3.2. DDPQs. DDPQs resemble adjectival article constructions in Romanian AACs (9), which are attributive, d*-periphery constructions (cf. Cornilescu & Nicolae to appear).

(9) a. măruľ cel roșu
    apple-the cel.def.sg. red
    ‘the red apple’
    b. [DP_{outer} [NP măruľ D’ D_{outer}^0 cel [QP AP roșu Q’ Q^0 [DP_{inner} t_{NP} D’ D^0 [NumP t_{NP} N’]]]]]
    Exclusively prenominal adjective are DP-periphery adjectives and, therefore, cannot appear in AAC (10a). The fact that such adjectives feature in DDPQs (10b) indicates the presence of an outer D, which contains the adjective modifying an empty noun (10c). The functional element de is the head of a quantificational projection, similar to the Monotonic Phrase proposed by Schwarzschild (2005) for pseudopartitives:

(10) a. *copilul cel biet
    child-the cel.def.sg poor
    ‘the poor child’
    b. bietul de Ion
    ‘poor Ion’
    c. [DP_{outer} D’ D^0_{outer} [NP AP bietul N’ N [e] [QuantP Quant’ Quant^0 de [DP_{inner} D’ D^0 [NP N’ N Ion]]]]]

3.3. SDPQs. The syntactic structure of SDPQs will be argued to consist of a single DP which dominates a split-NP structure (11):

(11) a. un idiot de doctor
    an idiot of doctor
    b. [DP D’ D^0 un [NP N’ N^0 idiot [QuantP Quant’ Quant^0 de [NP N’ N^0 doctor]]]]

4. Results. (i) DDPQs are a distinct type of qualitative constructions; (ii) DDPQs are periphery quantificational double-definite constructions, checking P-feature in an outer D; (iii) DDPQs conform to the contrastive Topic – Focus information-packaging; the semantic type of DDPQs is always <e>, i.e. individual. (iv) no need for predicate inversion; DDPQs and SDPQs are not derived by movement.