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Structure of the talk:
1. Imperfect parallels
2. Motivating the tripartition
3. Agree and φ
4. Concord is not Agreement
5. Deriving the imperfect parallels

Terminological caveat: Nominal Expression (NE) to refer to the complete nominal constituent, cf Bošković 2008 TNP, traditional noun phrase)

1. Imperfect parallels

A. Both Ns and Vs project an argument structure [1] BUT in NEs argument structure appears to be “less” obligatory, or optional [2]-[4] (Grimshaw 1990, a. o.), or even impossible [5]-[8] (Haegeman and Guéron (1999)).

(1) a. [The frequent expression *(of one’s feelings)] is desirable. complex event Ns
b. [The constant assignment *(of unsolvable problems)] is to be avoided.
c. [The instructor’s examination *(of the papers)] took a long time.

(2) a. [That the doctor frequently examines *(the patient)] is advisable. transitive V/N
b. [the doctor’s frequent examination *(of the patient)] is advisable.

(3) a. [That John fears *(the earthquake)] proves that he is sensible. psychological V/N
b. [John’s fear (of the earthquake)] proves that he is sensible.

(4) a. [That Bill donated *(his paintings) (to the museum)] is well-known. ditransitive V/N
b. [Bill’s donation (of his paintings) (to the museum)] is well-known.

(5) a. John considers Mary (to be) the best candidate.
b. *John’s consideration of Mary (to be) the best candidate.

(6) a. John appears (to Mary) to be eating too much.
b. *John’s appearance (to Mary) to be eating too much.

(7) a. John believes Mary to be leaving soon. ECM
b. *John’s belief of Mary to be leaving soon.

(8) a. *Mary’s consideration (by John) to be the best candidate.
b. *Mary’s belief (by John) to be leaving soon.

B. Both NEs and clauses have a “subject” which must respect the hierarchy of the theta grid (Cinque 1980) BUT in nominal expressions the subject can be missing tout court.

(9) a. The enemy destroyed *(the city).
b. the enemy’s destruction (of the city) [AGENT > PATIENT / *PATIENT / AGENT]
c. the city’s destruction (by the enemy) [PATIENT > (ADJOINED AGENT)]
d. ##the city’s destruction of the enemy
e. the destruction was complete.

(10) a. John’s picture of Mary [AGENT > THEME / *THEME > AGENT]
b. his picture of her [AGENT > THEME / *THEME > AGENT]
c. her picture [AGENT / THEME]
d. the picture was beautiful

(11) a. Mary likes [John’s pictures of her/*herself] DP with a possessor is a binding domain
b. Mary never likes [any picture of herself/*her] DP without a possessor is not a BD
C. Both NEs and clauses have been claimed to have three layers [12]-[13] all of which can be split according to a universal hierarchy BUT nominal expressions display a simpler structure.

(i) If NEs have a left periphery, it is much more reduced than in clauses.
   - In Italian, only emphatic topical adjectives [14]-[16], no focus [17]-[18], no PPs [19], cf. Giusti (1996, 2006):
     (14) a. le sue lunghe treccie bionde
     b. *le sue bionde treccie lunghe
     (15) a. le lunghe sue treccie bionde
     b. le bionde sue treccie lunghe
     (16) a. le lunghe, bionde sue treccie
     b. le bionde, lunghe sue treccie
     (17) a. le LUNGHE, (bionde) sue treccie
     b. le (lunghe), BIONDE sue treccie
     (18) a. le sue bionde treccie LUNGHE
     b. le sue lunghe sue treccie BIONDE
     (19) a. le di lei lunghe treccie bionde
     b. *le di Maria lunghe treccie bionde
   - In Bulgarian, only topical or focused possessive PPs [20]-[21], no adjectives [22], cf. Dimitrova-Vulchanova and Giusti 1998, 1999):
     (20) a. na Ivan tazi (mu) nova kniga
     b. NA IVAN tazi (*mu) nova kniga
     (21) a. na Aristotel portretut (mu)
     b. na Rembrand portretut (mu)
     c. na Ivan portretut (mu)
     (22) a. novata šekspirova kniga
     b. šekspirovata (*nova) kniga
     c. *nova(ta) tazi kniga
     (ii) Wh-elements cannot be checked inside the NE
     (23) a. I wonder [whose book] you bought / [what time] it is
     b. *I wonder whose book /what time
     (iii) NEs display only second position clitics [25], no T-clitics [24], no clitic doubling [26]:
     (24) a. ne ho apprezzato la generosità
     b. **la ne generosità
     c. **la generosità ne
(25) a. to vivlio mu (Greek) Balkan poss second, cf. Bulgarian [20]-[21]
     the book my
b. cartea-i (Romanian) restricted to 3rd person
     book.the-CL3P.SG.GEN

c. mammeta (Neapolitan, Ledgeway 2009) only some kinship terms
     mother-your

(26) a. to vivlio mu emena/EMENA (Greek, Giusti and Stavrou 2008)
     the book his
b. to vivlio-tu (*tu Iani/ *tu fititi) no clitic doubling in the DP despite appearances
     casa-i (*lui/*ci/*sa/*fetei) (Romanian, Avram and Coene 2008)
     house.the- CL3P.SG.GEN

D. In both NEs and clauses we find structural Case BUT clauses have two (nominative and accusative) while in in NEs we typically find one (genitive) if any.

(27) a. John’s/his description of Mary structural genitive > PP
     la sua descrizione di Maria
b. the his description of Mary
     la descrizione di Gianni di Maria
     the description of John of Mary
     la recensione di Gianni su/??di quel film
     John’s review on/of that film

(28) a. la tua descrizione (*mia) only one possAP (Cinque 1980, G&L 1991)
     la (*tua) descrizione mia possAP > PP [AGENT > THEME]
     la tua descrizione di me
     the your description of me
     la descrizione tua di me
c. *la descrizione di me tua

2. Motivating the tripartition

(29) Merge operates to satisfy Selection or Modification. (Giusti 2008, 2009, 2011)
     a. Selection merges a lexical head (e.g., K), specified in the lexicon for selectional features, with a fully fledged constituent, or “perfect projection” that can satisfy such selectional features (e.g. WP, and in case of a second argument LP). This constituent is the projection of a head (K, L) that has an uninterpretable feature $uF$.
     b. Modification merges a fully fledged constituent (GP, HP) as a modifier of a lexical head K. This constituent is the projection of a head (G, H, etc.) that has an uninterpretable feature $uF$.
     c. In order for Selection and Modification to take place, the head remerges, as many times as needed. Projection creates a spine of copies of the head and a recursive label (KP) which is the extended projection in the sense of Grimshaw (1991).
     d. The highest projection of the head provides the left edge of the Phase, which is the locus of interpretation and the interface to the higher phase (an extended projection of the head X).


The tripartition in [12]-[13] derives from Selection and Modification in a theory of Phases
- Selection takes place in the Lexical layer,
- Modification takes place in the Inflectional layer,
- the Complementation layer provides the left edge that allows the newly formed syntactic object to interact in a new selectional environment.
   a. Agreement is a consequence of selection. The selector is associated to a functional head which targets the \( \phi \)-features of an argument, (e.g. the subject or the object in the clause, the possessor in the NE) onto the projection of the predicate selecting it. This is done at a high rank in the inflectional layer and has the effect of remerging the \( \phi \)-features of the targeted argument into a higher projection of the selecting head. This relation also results in the assignment of Case to the targeted argument.
   b. Concord is a consequence of modification. It is a transfer of features, (e.g. Number, Word Class, and Case specifications present in the functional projections of a NE) from the head onto its specifier (e.g. an adjective phrase with its functional structure). This is triggered by \( \delta \)F features of the modifier.
   c. Projection results in feature scattering. It builds the spine of an extended constituent. In so doing, it creates “copies” of the head. The result is that all features of the head are shared at all instances of remerge. The realization of such features may be scattered in the created chain, giving rise to redundancy in some cases, but always constrained by the internal hierarchy of the bundle.

3. Agree and \( \phi \)

(32) Empirical differences between Clauses and Nominal Expressions
   a. Clauses typically refer to TIME. NEs typically refer to an INDIVIDUAL (term or variable).
   b. Finiteness, Mood, Aspect are modulations of TIME. \( \phi \)-features (notably person and number) are modulations of INDIVIDUAL.
   c. Argument NEs typically need Case. Argument clauses typically escape Case.
   d. Clauses need a subject. NEs do not need a possessor (but may have one).

(33) The features that are interpretable on N identify the individual:
   a. Gender may be part of the substantive content.
   b. Number is related to the mass/count nature of N.
   c. Person/Deixis sets the individual in the space.
   d. Case is \( \delta T \) (cf. Pesetsky and Torrego 2001, 2004), allows the individual to be interpreted as a participant of a situation which occurs at a given Time.

Claim 1: Ns have \( \delta \)Person. Clauses have \( \delta T \).

(34) EPP is a defining feature of the clause but not of a NE
   a. For a proposition to be assigned a truth value, the situation referred to in the predicate must hold at the given TIME for the given SUBJECT (the “aboutness” relation). Tense is endowed with \( \delta \)Person.
   b. A NEs is valued for individual reference (identifies an individual in space not in time). Its \( \delta \)Person is all is needed. \( \delta T \) is necessary only when it is part of a higher projection (e.g. it is part of a situation, or in the discourse).

Question 1: Is there Agree in NEs? Yes (Giusti 2008)

(35) \( \delta \)Person on N in Hungarian, (Szabolcsi 1987, 1994)
   a. az en kalapom
      the I.NOM. hat.1.PERS.SING
   b. a te kalapod
      the you.NOM hat .2 PERS.SING
   c. a Mari kalapja
      the Mari.NOM hat .3 PERS.SING
Italian possessive APs and the pronoun *loro* move to a high specifier, relational APs don’t:

(36) a. La sua/loro inarrestabile invasione della Francia. D poss AP N AP PP
   The his/their relentless invasion of France
   a’. La sua/loro invasione inarrestabile della Francia.
   b. #l’inarrestabile loro/sua invasione della Francia. (OK if *inarrestabile* is dislocated)
   c. #l’inarrestabile invasione sua/loro della Francia (OK if *loro/sua* is contrastive focus)

(37) a. L’inarrestabile invasione tedesca della Francia. D AP N RelAP PP
   the relentless German invasion of France
   b. *la tedesca inarrestabile invasione
   c. *l’inarrestabile tedesca invasione
   d. *la tedesca invasione inarrestabile

(38) [DP D [FP PossAP [Φ-PROBE uPerson] [... N [... [NP [suo/loro /Persongoal] ... N]]]]]

(39) Italian possAP and genitive *loro* have Person features, relational adjectives do not:
   a. La sua/loro avanzata lo/lori ha condotti fino a Parigi.
      the his/their advance took him/them to Paris
   b. #L’avanzata tedesca, li-lri ha condotti fino a Parigi

(40) In Italian only light possessors move (Giusti 2008)
   a. John’s book
   b. il libro di Gianni
   c. #il di lui libro
   d. *il di Gianni libro

Claim 2: D in NE targets the person feature of the possessor.

(41) Verbal predication structure, Pesetsky and Torrego (2004)
   SUBJ Ts [vp ν To [VP V OBJ]]

(42) Inheritability (Richards 2007)
   uF must spread from edge to non-edge (i.e., from C to T, v* to V, etc.).

(43) Principle of Phasal Composition (Hintzen 2012:325)
   When a referential argument becomes part of a higher phase, it functions as a descriptive
   predicate that helps to identify the referent of the higher phase.

(44) Threefold semantic ontology (parallel to the typology of phases) (Hintzen 2012:325):
   a. objects (reference in space)
   b. events (reference in time)
   c. propositions (reference in discourse)

Question 2: What *uF* does the possessor have?

(45) It cannot be *uT*
   a. #The king of France is bold. if *uT* if valued by /T the proposition is not true.
   b. The crown of the king of France is at the Louvre.

(46) A goal that satisfies the *uPerson* of a T-probe receives a *uF* according to the different
typology of probes.
(47) Structural Case is a $uF$ on a goal.
   c. Genitive $uD$
   d. Prepositional Case $uP$ (supertentative!)
   e. Vocative $uDisc(ourse)$ (also supertentative!!)

(48) Agree is asymmetric in all dimensions:
   a. structurally: the probe c-commands the goal (not vice versa)
   b. featurally: the $uF$ of the probe are part of the specification of the lexical head, the $uF$ of the goal depends on the goal.

(49) Embedded Force (CP) cannot carry $uT$, but can have an antecedent carrying $uT$.
   a. Is it possible in all Romance languages $[CP$ that the subject is missing]$?$
   b. *Is $[CP$ that the subject is missing]$ possible in all Romance languages$?
   c. Is $[DP$ the fact $[CP$ that the subject is missing]$ possible in all Romance languages$?

(50) The aboutness relation is necessary to obtain propositional reference.
   a. Embedded CPs refer to facts/truths and include interpretable T.
   b. They are incompatible with $uT$.
   c. The expletive allows for the aboutness relation to occur in the higher predicate.

4. Concord is not Agreement

(51) Differences between Agreement and Concord
   a. Agreement involves Person (which includes number), Concord involves Case, Number, Gender/word class (cf. Baker 2007).
   b. Agreement is a c-command relation between a head (the probe) and a syntactic object in its c-domain (38). Concord is a Spec-Head relation.
   c. Agreement triggers internal merge, Concord does not cf. (36)-(37).
   d. Agreement is a property of the Phase (Chomsky 2005, 2008), inherited by the non-phase (Richards 2007). Concord is insensitive to the phase/non-phase distinction.
   e. Agreement is typically a one-to-one relation. Concord is serial.
   f. Agreement and Concord may occur between the same pair of syntactic objects (e.g. possessive adjectives in Italian (36) above):

5. Deriving the “imperfect” parallels

Summarizing the proposals so far:
1. Ns have $\#Person$. Clauses have $\#T$.
2. D in NE targets the person feature of the possessor.
3. Genitive Case is $uD$
4. NEs have one phase only.

A. Obligatory vs. Optional argument structure (31)-(4):
   • V is associated to an $\#T$, for an argument to be interpreted as taking part in the situation, it must have not only reference in space, but also in Time.
   • N is associated to a $\#Person$. It needs no further specification to be interpreted in its phase.
   • The only case of obligatory internal argument in complex event NEs is compatible only with a minimal $\#Person$ (singular, definite, non deictic, non-quantified):

(52) a. The assignment *(of the problem) took a long time. (Grimshaw 1990)
   b. This semester’s assignment led to disaster
   c. The constant assignment of unsolvable problems this semester led to disaster.
   d. They observed the/*an/*one/*that assignment of the problem.
   e. The assignment(*s) of the problems took a long time.
A’. Lack of reduced clausal complements (5)-(8):  
- ECM/Raising complements have a defective T which restructures (Cinque 2004) with the T of the selecting V.  
- N does not have a T at all. An infinitival TP cannot restructure with an N that can only have a T.  

B. Optional genitive subjects (9)-(11)  
- Nominative Case satisfies the aboutness requirement at the propositional level (cf. Rizzi and Shlonsky 2004). There is no propositional reference in NEs  
- A possessor restricts the object reference of the NE if present, but it is not required.  

C-D. Reduced capacity.  
- The lexical NP-layer is reduced because individual reference does not need participants.  
- The inflectional NP-layer only includes modifiers, it does not include interpretable TAM Fs.  
  - /T can be further modified by aspectual and modal adverbs in the inflectional layer (TP);  
  - /Person is modified by deixis, specificity, quantification in the complementation layer (DP).  
- Clauses are articulated into two phases CP and vP, NEs only have one phase. This brings with it:  
  - one position for clitic (only the second position, cf Roberts 2012);  
  - one position for structural Case,  
  - impossibility of iterated extraction,  

(53) a. una persona di cui ho interrotto la/una descrizione degli avvenimenti (Agent extraction)  
    a person of whom I interrupted the/a description of the events  
  b. Ne ho interrotto la/una descrizione la descrizione degli avvenimenti  
    we have the description of the events  

(54) a. gli avvenimenti di cui ho interrotto la descrizione (*di Maria) (Theme extraction)  
    the events of whom I have interrupted the description of Mary  
  b. Ne ho interrotto la descrizione (*di Maria).  
    we have the description by Mary  

(55) a. gli avvenimenti di cui ho interrotto la/una (*tua) descrizione...  
    the events of whom I have interrupted your description...  
  b. Ne ho interrotto la (*tua) descrizione.  
    we have interrupted your description  

- Discourse features (Foc, Wh-) are interpreted at the level of discourse (root clauses), the nominal LeftEdge makes the element interpretable at the next phase:  
  - only wh-pied-piping (I wondered [Ph2 [Ph1 what time it was])  
  - only contrastive (topics of foci) (14)-(19)  
  - determiners that identify the whole NEs as a topic or a focus (Aboh 2004)  

6. Conclusions  

Wellcome properties of the proposal  
- Compliance with Brody’s (1997) THESIS OF RADICAL INTERPRETABILITY “Each feature must receive a semantic interpretation in some syntactic location.”  
- Agree is limited to phases (Chomsky 2008)  
- Phases are limited to syntactic objects that have reference
Results

- Imperfect parallels are related to one constitutive difference: VPs denote situations, NEs denote individuals.
- Clauses denote propositions (a situation which holds at a given time about a given individual), so they are the only syntactic object which contains two phases.
- NEs are made of a single phase.
- The highest projection in the NE is Case, parallel to Force in the CP.
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