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1. Changing to the DP-analysis (from the NP/Det-analysis)

In many treatments, including not just Chomsky (1981:154) and Radford (1988:173-196) but also the analysis that I particularly want to discuss here, namely Jensen (2011, 2012), constituents such as [these green chairs], [the brutal destruction of the city], [a new hammer], [John's book] and [he] are taken to be NPs.

However, following the analysis in Abney (1987) and Chomsky (1995:246, (8a)), as applied to Scandinavian in e.g. Hellan (1986), Delsing (1993, 1998) and Julien (2005), I would like to argue that there are good reasons to assume that the NP does not include the determiner. The minimal NP thus consists only of the head (N°) followed by its complement. Modifiers (such as AdjPs or PPs) may be adjoined to the left or to the right of NP.

(1) a.  
   
   b. 

(2) En. a. The [NP picture [PP of the castle]] [PP on the mantelpiece]
   b. The [NP [Adj faded] picture [PP of the castle]]
Then what about the determiner, such as these in these green chairs, my in my favourite movie, or the in the faded picture, (2)?

The determiner is analysed as the head (D°) of its own projection, a Determiner Phrase (DP). (This means that the typical subject or object of a clause is now a DP, rather than an NP.)

I thus suggest replacing (3)a/(4)a with (3)b/(4)b:

(3) a. NP/DET-ANALYSIS

```
NP
  \---Det
     the
     N°
     picture
```

(3) b. DP-ANALYSIS

```
DP
  \---D°
     the
     N°
     picture
```

(4) a. NP/DET-ANALYSIS

```
NP
  \---Det
     the
     N°
     picture
   \---AdjP
   \----Adj° faded
```

(4) b. DP-ANALYSIS

```
DP
  \---D°
     the
     N°
     castle
```

```
1.1 Differences between NP and DP

One argument for making a distinction between DP and NP is that NPs and DPs occur under different circumstances, i.e. they have different distributions. This can be seen in cases where an NP can occur without being part of a DP:

(5) En. a. [NP Nice man] though he is, my uncle can be a bit boring. NP
   b. * [DP A [NP nice man]] though he is, my uncle can be a bit boring. *DP

(6) En. a. * I met [NP nice man]. *NP
   b. I met [DP a [NP nice man]]. DP

(7) En. a. * I consider my uncle [NP nice man]. *NP
   b. I consider my uncle [DP a [NP nice man]]. DP

(8) Da. a. [NP Stor dyreven] som han var, den lille Emil, lukkede han katten ud. NP
   b. * [DP En [NP stor dyreven]] som han var, den lille Emil, lukkede han katten ud. *DP

   (A) great animal-lover as he was, little Emil, he let the cat out

(9) Da. a. * Ida kender [NP stor dyreven]. *NP
   b. Ida kender [DP en [NP stor dyreven]]. DP

   Ida knows (a) great animal-lover

(In the NP/Det-analysis, (5) and (8) would have to be only N’ (N-bar), which would make them into something very rare, a context in which an X-bar category is possible but the corresponding XP impossible.)

Another difference between DP and NP is the fact that DPs may be substituted by pronouns like it or they/them, whereas NPs may be substituted by one/ones.

(10) En. [DP These beautiful pictures of the palace ] had been lost for a long time, but now [DP they ] have turned up again.

(11) En. These [NP beautiful pictures of the palace ] are much less valuable than those [NP ones ].

(12) En. These beautiful [NP pictures of the palace ] are much less valuable than those awful [NP ones ].

(In the NP/Det-analysis, one would substitute an N-bar category only.)

1.2 Parallels between pronouns and (other) determiners

Another argument for distinguishing between DP and NP is that it allows an analysis of pronouns as a kind of determiner:
In the NP/Det-analysis, pronouns are N°, whereas determiners are of a different category, which for some reason does not have a phrase level.

In the DP-analysis, pronouns and other determiners are all instances of D°. Taking pronouns to be D°s (with no sisters) gives a better account of the large number of elements across languages that occur both as pronouns and as articles/demonstratives – not just in English but also in other languages:

In (16) and (17), you will find two lists of the elements that occur as the head of DP (i.e. D°).

They include both pronouns (16) and determiners (17) and. The difference is that pronouns (16) usually do not take any complements (it, you, yours), whereas determiners (17) take an NP complement (the book, your book). Although the two lists are not identical, there are many parallels, as would also have been the case with similar pairs of lists from Danish, German or French.

Pronouns: (14)a

(16) a. Demonstrative pronouns  
   b. Personal Pronouns  
   c. Reflexive pronouns  
   d. Possessive pronouns  
   e. Indefinite pronouns  
   f. Interrogative pronouns

Determiners: (14)b

(17) a. Articles  
   b. Demonstrative determiners  
   c. Possessive determiners  
   d. Interrogative determiners  
   e. Quantifiers
The DP-analysis also allows a straightforward analysis of the somewhat special cases where a personal pronoun occurs as a determiner:

(18) En. a. **The** Danes really admire *the* Americans.  
b. **We** Danes really admire *you* Americans.

(19) a.  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\text{D'} \\
\text{D}^\circ \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{The} \\
\text{N'} \\
\text{N}^\circ \\
\text{Danes}
\end{array}
\]

b.  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\text{D'} \\
\text{D}^\circ \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{We} \\
\text{N'} \\
\text{N}^\circ \\
\text{Danes}
\end{array}
\]

2. Possessive constructions (DP-spec-analysis vs GP-analysis)

Another consequence of the DP-analysis is that it makes the following analysis of possessive constructions possible, where the possessor is in the specifier position of DP (DP-spec), cf. e.g. Carnie (2007:199), Chomsky (1995:246, (8a)) and many others:

(20)  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{THE SPECIFIER OF DP} \\
\text{(DP-SPEC)} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{D'} \\
\text{D}^\circ \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{'}s \\
\text{big smile}
\end{array}
\]

The possessor is in the specifier position of DP (DP-spec).

d. [DP [The creature from beyond the Moon] 's [NP big smile] ] suddenly faded.

Such an analysis of possessive constructions has two positive aspects:

**ONE**, it predicts that possessors and e.g. articles do not co-occur, because both -'s and the article have to be in D°.

TWO, it predicts that -'s occurs not on the head noun in the possessor phrase (as it would if it was a real case ending) but after the entire possessor phrase:

(23) En. a. * The [N° young woman's ] from Denmark new job  
b. [DP The young woman from Denmark ]'s new job 

b. [DP Den unge kvinde fra Danmark ]'s nye job  
*The young woman('s) from Denmark ('s) new job

b. [DP The people next door ]'s old car 

(26) En. a. * The [N° man's ] over there shoe  
b. [DP The man over there ]'s shoe

b. [DP The man who stepped on my toe ]'s shoe

(28) En. a. * In a [N° year's ] or so time  
3 Google hits  
89,600 BNC hits 

b. In [DP a year or so ]'s time  
0 ('s or so [n°])  
11 (or so 's [n°])  
(site: .uk, Nov. 2012)

b. [DP De borgere der ikke stemte ]'s egen skyld  
*The citizens(') who did not vote ('s) own fault

Within the framework of the NP/Det-analysis, Jensen (1994, 2012) suggests the following alternative analysis of possessive constructions, which involve a GP (for "genitive phrase"):

(30) THE SPECIFIER OF NP  
(NP-SPEC)  

THE COMPLEMENT  
of G

NP  

GP  

N°

G  

's

big smile

a. Freddie  
b. The actor  
c. The big, bad wolf  
d. The creature from beyond the Moon

The GP-analysis also captures the two data sets above:  
(22) as the specifier of NP can either be a determiner or a GP, and  
(23)-(29) as G follows an entire NP, not just the noun/N° itself.
So far the differences between the two analyses of possessive constructions (the **DP-spec-analysis** which is part of the **DP-analysis** vs. the **GP-analysis** which is part of the **NP/Det-analysis**) are thus not differences of empirical coverage, but instead differences as to the theoretical assumptions. Where the DP-spec-analysis assumes a version of X-bar theory similar to the one discussed in the introduction yesterday, cf. (31):

![Diagram](image-url)

(31)  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{XP} \\
\text{specifier} \\
\text{MINIMAL PROJECTION (HEAD)} \\
\text{complement}
\end{array} \quad \rightarrow \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{XP} \\
\text{modifier} \\
\text{MAXIMAL PROJECTIONS} \quad (\text{PHRASES})
\end{array}
\]

where adjunction is only to phrases, and where every projection has a phrase level, the GP-analysis also assumes **not only** (31) **but also** two further possibilities, namely

- the possibility of adjoining to X-bar categories (which raises the question of whether the adjunct then should also be an X-bar category rather than an XP) and
- the possibility of projections including or not including a phrase level (G and N project a phrase level, whereas Det does not).

In the rest of the paper, I shall address some of the empirical consequences of the two analyses that Jensen (2012) brings up.

### 2.1 Do possessive pronouns correspond to -'s or the boy's?

Jensen (2012:111) points out that whereas a possessive pronoun in the GP-analysis corresponds to the entire GP, (32), in the DP-spec-analysis a possessive pronoun only corresponds to the possessive -'s, (33):

(32) Da. a. \([\text{GP} [\text{NP} \text{Den unge kvinde fra Danmark }] \quad s \quad \text{nye job} \quad \text{GP-ANALYSIS}\]

b. \([\text{GP} \quad \text{Hendes} \quad \text{nye job} \quad \text{GP-ANALYSIS} \]

c. \([\text{GP} [\text{NP} \text{The young woman from Denmark }] \quad s' \quad \text{new job} \quad \text{GP-ANALYSIS} \]

d. \([\text{GP} \quad \text{Her} \quad \text{new job} \quad \text{GP-ANALYSIS} \]

(33) Da. a. \([\text{DP} [\text{NP} \text{Den unge kvinde fra Danmark }] [\text{DP} \quad s \quad \text{nye job} \quad \text{DP-spec-ANALYSIS} \]

b. \([\text{DP} \quad \text{Hendes} \quad \text{nye job} \quad \text{DP-spec-ANALYSIS} \]

c. \([\text{DP} [\text{NP} \text{The young woman from Denmark }] [\text{DP} \quad s' \quad \text{new job} \quad \text{DP-spec-ANALYSIS} \]

d. \([\text{DP} \quad \text{Her} \quad \text{new job} \quad \text{DP-spec-ANALYSIS} \]

As he assumes that *hendes/her* substitutes the entire GP, Jensen (2012:111) claims these data to be a very strong argument in favour of the GP-hypothesis.

As is clear from (33), the DP-spec-hypothesis will have to say that the difference between the two types of D° *her*'s is that only the possessive pronoun (*hendes/her*) does not require its specifier position to be filled.

This claim, that possessive pronouns only replace the -'s and not the entire possessor plus -‘s receives support from the data in (34)c-e:
(34) Specifier (of DP) | Head (D°) | Complement (NP)
--- | --- | ---
a. English | Anna | 's car
b. Danish | Anna | -s bil
c. Norwegian | Anna | sin bil
d. West Jutland | Anna | hinner bil
e. Southern German | Der Anna | ihr Auto

In the entry *han*, 'he', the Dictionary of Jutlandic (www.jyskordbog.dk) gives the following example of (34)d from Western Jutland:

(35) WJ. Do ska fo [DP a sme ] [D° hans ] næwe o småq
   You shall get the smith his fists to taste
   (= 'You will be treated to a taste of the smith's fists.')

and the dictionary also gives the following map of the density of occurrence of the construction:

(36)

As this construction also exists in parts of Southern Jutland, examples may be found with the reflexive possessive *sin/sit* (which originally did not exist in Western Jutland)

(37) SJ. [DP æ brugdom ] [D° sit ] hus
        the bridegroom REFL's house
        (= 'the house of the bridegroom')

Jensen (2012:110) also mentions stacking of possessors as something that both analyses can handle, and I would therefore like to mention that the above construction may also stack:

(38) WJ. a. [DP [DP [DP Per ]] [D° hans ]] far [D° sin ]bil ]
          Da. b. [DP [DP [DP Per ]] [D° -s ]] far [D° -s ]bil ]
          En. c. [DP [DP [DP Peter ]] [D° -'s ]] dad [D° -'s ]car ]

Summing up, given the syntax of three languages very close to Danish (West Jutlandic, Norwegian, Southern German), it would seem to be desirable that the possessive pronoun corresponds only to the -'s rather than the entire possessor.
2.2 -'s requires the occurrence of a possessor

Jensen (2012:115) points out that –'s requires the occurrence of a possessor, e.g. *Anna herself, and he claims that this is more naturally accounted for in the GP-analysis, (39), than in the DP-spec-analysis, (40):

(39)

In the GP-analysis, (39), the possessor Anna is the complement of G, and so like a preposition or a transitive verb, G must simply subcategorise for a possessor. (It has to be noted that G is extremely rare in Danish in being a head that occurs to the right of its complement.)

(40)

In the DP-spec-analysis, (40), this avenue is not open, as heads only subcategorise for complements, not for specifiers (cf. that different sentences have different syntactic restrictions with respect to the object, but not the subject). In this analysis, one would therefore have to say that –'s is a clitic and needs something in its specifier to cliticise on to:

(41) En. a. [dp Anna] [d° 's] new car has been stolen.
    b. * [d° 's] new car has been stolen.
    c. [d° Her] new car has been stolen.

Such requirements are not unknown, cf. that the English clitic negation also cannot cliticise to just anything, (42)b:

(42) En. a. John does n't know it yet.
    b. * Why does John n't know it yet?
    c. Why does John not know it yet?
Jensen (2012:114) also points out that the possessor preceding –’s may not just consist of a possessive pronoun. This would again follow from the GP-analysis, (39), as my/min would be a GP without a G, i.e. with no room for –’s. (Of course, my/min being a GP was precisely the problem in section 2.1).

In the DP-spec-analysis, this would follow from something else, perhaps conditions on ellipsis or on what –’s can cliticise to. Notice the peculiar situation that is required for this to even be relevant, (44)c,d and (46)c,d, maybe there is something generally wrong with elision is this situation:

(43) En. Peter's Jaguar cost 1'000'000 £.
   a. Mine cost 2'000'000 £.
   b. My Jaguar cost 2'000'000 £.

(44) En. Peter's mum ’s Jaguar cost 1'000'000 £.
   a. My mum ’s cost 2'000'000 £.
   b. My mum ’s Aston Martin cost 2'000'000 £.
   c. * Mine ’ s cost 2'000'000 £.
   d. * Mine ’ s Aston Martin cost 2'000'000 £.

(45) Da. Peters Jaguar kostede 1.000.000 £.
   a. Min kostede 2.000.000 £.
   b. Min Jaguar kostede 2.000.000 £.

(46) Da. Peters mor s Jaguar kostede 1.000.000 £.
   a. Min mor s kostede 2.000.000 £.
   b. Min mor s Aston Martin kostede 2.000.000 £.
   c. * Min s kostede 2.000.000 £.
   d. * Min s Aston Martin kostede 2.000.000 £.

Notice finally one exceptional case of –’s not requiring a possessor in Danish:

(47) Da. a. Det er Peter s cykel.
        Da. b. Hvem er det s cykel?
        WJ. c. Hvem er det sin cykel?

(Who) (is) that (is) (Peter) ’s bicycle

but it does not carry over to even closely related cases:

(48) Da. a. Det kan være Peter s cykel.
        b. * Hvem kan det være s cykel?

(Who) (can) that (can) be (Peter) ’s bicycle

(49) Da. a. Det ligner Peter s cykel.
        b. * Hvem ligner det s cykel?

(Who) (resembles) that (resembles) (Peter) ’s bicycle

2.3 Parallels between DPs and clauses (IPs)

Clauses are seen as IPs (Chomsky 1986:3-8, Haegeman & Guéron 1999:93-101, and many others), inflection phrases, i.e. built around the inflection position (I°). This results in three parallels between DPs and clauses, which hold only for the DP-analysis, and not for the NP/Det-analysis:
Parallel 1: A DP is a functional category 'built' on top of an NP, the lexical 'core', for example [DP the [NP animal]]. Likewise, an IP is a functional category 'built' on top of a VP, the lexical core of a clause.

(50) a. DP
    D° NP
    N°

    b. IP
    I° VP
    V°

Parallel 2: Modifiers are adjoined to the lexical projection (NP or VP) below the functional one (DP or IP). The modifier of an NP is an AdjP which adjoins to the NP (forming a 'new' NP dominating the 'old' NP and the modifier), whereas the modifier of a VP is an AdvP which adjoins to the VP.

(51) a. The doctor’s careful examination of the patient
    (Tree structures in (53)a,b below)

    b. The doctor will carefully examine the patient

Parallel 3: The subject is in the specifier. The subject of a DP is in DP-spec, the subject of a clause is in IP-spec.

(52) a. The doctor’s careful examination of the patient
    (Tree structures in (53)a,b below)

    b. The doctor will carefully examine the patient

(53) a.

    DP
    D° NP
    The doctor
    ‘s

    AdjP
    N°
    careful
    NP
    examination

    b.

    IP
    I° VP
    the patient
    of

    AdvP
    V°
    carefully
    examine
    the patient
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2.4 C-command and coreference

As already pointed out in the introduction yesterday, it has turned out to be useful to assume the existence of the following relation, which goes by the name of **C-command**: 

(54) **C-command**: X c-commands Y if and only if  
   a. all constituents that contain X also contain Y,  
   b. neither X nor Y dominates the other.

(55) In other words:  
   If Y is either the sister of X or part of the sister of X, then X c-commands Y.

(56) In other words again:  
   If you can get from X to Y in the tree by taking one step upwards and then climb downwards the rest of the way (not passing via X), then X c-commands Y.

C-command is used in a multitude of different generalisations, e.g. concerning where reflexive pronouns may and may not be used (e.g. Vikner 1985), where negative polarity items may be used (e.g. Vikner 2011), and also where personal pronouns and DPs may or may not corefer:

(57) a. A reflexive must be c-commanded by a coreferential DP inside its own clause.  
   b. A pronoun may only be c-commanded by a coreferential DP from outside its own clause.  
   c. A full DP may never be c-commanded by a coreferential DP.

(58) En. a. **John** thinks **he** is intelligent  
   b. **He** thinks **John** is intelligent

(59) En. a. **John** thinks **he** is intelligent  
   b. **He** thinks **John** is intelligent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>\textbf{En.}</th>
<th>\textbf{NAME C-COMMANDS PRONOUN, COREFERENCE POSSIBLE}</th>
<th>\textbf{PRONOUN C-COMMANDS NAME, COREFERENCE IMPOSSIBLE}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. <strong>John</strong> thinks <strong>he</strong> is intelligent</td>
<td>NAME C-COMMANDS PRONOUN, COREFERENCE POSSIBLE</td>
<td>PRONOUN C-COMMANDS NAME, COREFERENCE IMPOSSIBLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. <strong>He</strong> thinks <strong>John</strong> is intelligent</td>
<td>NAME C-COMMANDS PRONOUN, COREFERENCE POSSIBLE</td>
<td>PRONOUN C-COMMANDS NAME, COREFERENCE IMPOSSIBLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Given the parallels between the clause and the DP from section 2.3, the DP-analysis will yield the desired and parallel results for why there can and must be coreference in (60)a,b, given (57)a above:

(60) a.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\text{DP}_1 \\
\text{D'} \\
\text{D}^o \\
\text{N}^o \\
\text{AdjP} \\
\text{N}^o \\
\text{PP} \\
\text{P}^o \\
\text{The doctor} \\
\text{'s} \\
\text{careful} \\
\text{examination} \\
\end{array}
\]

b.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{IP} \\
\text{DP}_1 \\
\text{I'} \\
\text{I}^o \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{AdvP} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{P}^o \\
\text{of} \\
\text{herself}_{1/2} \\
\text{The doctor} \\
\text{will} \\
\text{carefully} \\
\text{examine} \\
\text{herself}_{1/2} \\
\end{array}
\]

... and why there cannot possibly be coreference in (61)a,b, given (57)b above:

(61) a.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\text{DP}_1 \\
\text{D'} \\
\text{D}^o \\
\text{N}^o \\
\text{AdjP} \\
\text{N}^o \\
\text{PP} \\
\text{P}^o \\
\text{The doctor} \\
\text{'s} \\
\text{careful} \\
\text{examination} \\
\end{array}
\]

b.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{IP} \\
\text{DP}_1 \\
\text{I'} \\
\text{I}^o \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{AdvP} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{P}^o \\
\text{of} \\
\text{herself}_{1/2} \\
\text{The doctor} \\
\text{will} \\
\text{carefully} \\
\text{examine} \\
\text{herself}_{1/2} \\
\end{array}
\]
Because of the lack of parallels between the NP and the clause in the NP/Det-analysis, the doctor does not c-command the "object" herself/her in the NP in (62)a the way it does in the clause in (62)b, and therefore the prediction would be that in (62)a there could be no coreference with herself but that there could be coreference with her, still given (57)a,b above:

(62)  a.

Neither of the two predictions concerning (62)a are correct.¹

¹ Notice also that there is a mistake in Jensen (2012:123) when it says that the GP-analysis gives the correct analysis of his example (47) *en fars billede af ham*, 'a father's picture of him'. It says right after (47) that because (in the GP-analysis) a father does not c-command him, there can be no binding, but when there is no binding of a pronoun like him, then coreference is precisely predicted to be possible, not predicted to be impossible (as it is in the example under discussion, there can be no coreference between a father and him).
3. Conclusions

(1.1) In the NP/Det-analysis, *nice man* without any determiner is just an N′, and you would therefore not expect it to ever occur without the NP-level, but it does, see (5) and (8). In the DP-analysis, *nice man* without any determiner is a full NP, and you might therefore very well expect to occur without the DP-level.

(1.2) The obvious parallels between a number of pronouns and determiners are captured by the DP-analysis, but not by the NP/Det-analysis.

(2.) It is possible to adapt both the DP-analysis and the NP/Det-analysis to deal with possessive constructions: In the NP/Det-analysis, the possessor is a GP. In the DP-analysis, the possessor is in DP-spec. However, the GP-analysis necessitates additions to X-bar structure, whereas the DP-spec analysis does not.

(2.1) It might seem that it is an advantage for the GP-analysis that the possessive pronoun, e.g. *her*, corresponds to the entire GP, e.g. *Anna’s*. But this is less obvious when West Jutlandic, Norwegian and Southern German are considered, where the possessive pronoun, e.g. *her*, may cooccur with the possessor DP, e.g. *Anna*.

(2.2) The fact that *’s* requires the occurrence of a possessor is easily handled in the GP-analysis, and not quite so easily in the DP-spec analysis. On the other hand, the GP-analysis makes it necessary to interpret GP as a head-final phrase, and these are otherwise extremely rare in Danish.

(2.3) A number of parallels between DPs and clauses are handled better in DP analysis than in NP/Det-analysis.

(2.4) C-command and reference are only handled correctly by the DP-spec analysis, and not by GP-analysis at all.

I therefore continue to belong to that group of linguists who used to assume an NP/Det-analysis, but now find themselves assuming a DP-analysis instead.
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