Concerning the readings for next time (where this time = 1/23/01)


DP’s and NP’s:

Are the like this: DP or like this: NP ?

How might we tell? Well, if we see N moving to D, that’s expected in the first structure and not in the second.

Basic idea is to argue that this happens, often diagnosed by semantic effects:


Basic argument is that there is a NumP inside the DP, which is responsible for the number features of a noun (singular/plural)—this corresponds to Agr in the clause.

This is based pretty much entirely on Hebrew noun phrases with possessors.

Construct state (CS) contains a bare genitive immediately after the bare noun.

(*the) cow farmer ‘farmer’s cow.’

Free genitive (FG) contains a genitive with an overt case marker preceding genitive.

(the) house of the-teacher ‘the teacher’s house’

Ritter proposes that the noun moves to Num in FG:

Along the way, he proposes that only DPs can be arguments (not NPs), and so anything in an argument position—anything that needs to get a θ-role like AGENT, PATIENT, GOAL—has to be a DP. Hence bare (determiner-less) nouns must also be DPs.

In cases where D is Ø (seems [in Italian anyway] to only happen with plural or mass nouns), it is an empty category and may be constrained by the ECP.

One way to get around the ECP is to raise N to D—then D is no longer empty.

Skip the appendix (on Minimalism)