




November 6ish, 2018

1 DP and pronouns

- (1) The linguists should yodel.
- (2) We linguists should yodel.
- (3) They looked at us linguists.
- (4) They looked at the linguists.




These constructions are kind of rare; normally, pronouns are just DP containing no NPs.




2 A not-quite-argument for X-bar structure in noun phrases


The canonical X-bar structure of the early 1980s looked like this:



We almost had an argument for an NP, N', N structure. If we say determiners go in the specifier of NP, then *one* must replace N', and N' is recursive based on the ability to attach arbitrarily many adjectives between the determiner and head noun. That is: there must be a projection (node) between N and NP that is recursive. So, N'.



We lost that argument, though, when we decided that determiners head a higher DP.



The difference is where adjuncts (modifiers, like adjectives and adverbs) attach. Do they attach (recursively) to X' or to XP? We don't really have any evidence yet for a X' level from this, nor really any evidence for adjoining adjuncts anywhere by to the XP level.

Where I think we're going to end up: There *are* X' nodes (and therefore specifiers), but adjunction is to the XP and not to the X'.


3 Possessors and subjects and X'

There's at least an argument from simplicity to suppose that there is a specifier, and an X' level, of DP. And from there, it's a short leap to suppose that there's a T' in TP, and we'll see one for CP as well.

This was mostly in the previous handout. But the basic point is that: D “seems” like a head, and there’s an XP to its left that can be either a possessor or the subject of nominalized clause. And if that’s where the subject is in DP, seems reasonable that it’s in the same place in TP.

Also, to a certain extent we can reveal a constituent within TP that excludes the subject but includes the head and complement.

- (5) Pat should always eat lunch and might never eat dinner.
- (6) Each boy should eat his lunch and might eat his dinner.




Maybe slightly more convincing is the fact that there seems to be a parameterization of the order of specifiers and complements. This makes more sense if “initial” really refers to a constituent containing the head.

- Head-initial (English, French) vs. Head-final (Japanese)
- Spec-initial (*everything* except maybe ASL CP)


4 PP and measure phrases

Most of the PPs that we have seen so far are just a head and a complement. No real evidence of a P' node.



Measure phrases might arguably go into the specifier position of a PP, though.

- (7) Pat drove two miles into the woods and through a puddle.
- (8) The car rolled 300 feet down the road and up the hill.
- (9) The illness began three days after the festival and before the cruise.



- (10) The drone flew 10 feet above the fence.
- (11) The drone flew right above the fence.
- (12) * The drone flew 10 feet right above the fence.
- (13) * The drone flew right 10 feet above the fence.