

# Table of contents

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>Preface</b>  | <b>XI</b> |
| <b>CHAPTER 1</b>  |           |
| <b>Introduction</b>   | <b>1</b>  |
| 1. Introduction   | 1         |
| 2. Basic proposal   | 6         |
| 3. Assumptions and their motivation   | 12        |
| 3.1 The structure of the DP   | 12        |
| 3.2 Concord and movement inside the DP  | 22        |
| 4. Overview of the chapters   | 25        |
| 4.1 Chapter 2   | 25        |
| 4.2 Chapter 3   | 27        |
| 4.3 Chapter 4   | 28        |
| <b>CHAPTER 2</b>  |           |
| <b>The syntactic distribution of determiners</b>                                    | <b>31</b> |
| 1. Introduction   | 31        |
| 2. Word order possibilities of demonstratives and articles<br>in Early Scandinavian | 33        |
| 2.1 Proto-Scandinavian  | 34        |
| 2.2 Common Scandinavian   | 35        |
| 2.3 Old Norse   | 36        |
| 2.4 Schematic summary   | 37        |
| 3. Formalizing the development of the suffixed article                              | 38        |
| 3.1 Demonstratives are phrases  | 38        |
| 3.2 Three options to derive the order N-dem   | 40        |
| 3.3 Reanalysis from demonstrative to article  | 44        |
| 3.4 Some immediate consequences   | 47        |
| 4. Unifying the different determiner systems  | 48        |
| 4.1 Demonstratives in different positions   | 49        |
| 4.2 "Split" demonstratives  | 51        |

|           |  |            |
|-----------|--|------------|
| 5.        | “Split” articles in the Scandinavian languages                   | 52         |
| 5.1       | The basic data   | 52         |
| 5.2       | The semantic and syntactic relations of the two determiners      | 54         |
| 5.2.1     | Semantic differences overtly reflected                           | 54         |
| 5.2.2     | The syntactic relation   | 60         |
| 5.2.3     | “Split” determiners  | 65         |
| 5.3       | Induced agreement domains  | 67         |
| 5.3.1     | Assumptions  | 67         |
| 5.3.1.1   | The suffixal determiner  | 67         |
| 5.3.1.2   | The free-standing determiner                                     | 71         |
| 5.3.2     | Modified DP  | 74         |
| 5.3.3     | Unmodified DP  | 76         |
| 5.3.4     | “Violations” of the double definiteness effect                   | 76         |
| 5.4       | Summary  | 77         |
| 6.        | An alternative proposal: Julien (2002 [2005])                    | 78         |
| 7.        | Conclusion   | 80         |
| CHAPTER 3 |  |            |
|           | <b>The syntax and semantics of non-/restrictive modifiers</b>    | <b>83</b>  |
| 1.        | Introduction   | 83         |
| 2.        | The syntax and semantics of restrictive modifiers                | 85         |
| 2.1       | Derivation of the restrictive reading                            | 87         |
| 2.2       | Syntactic consequences: Scandinavian relative clauses            | 90         |
| 3.        | The syntax and semantics of non-restrictive modifiers            | 97         |
| 3.1       | Derivation of the non-restrictive reading                        | 102        |
| 3.2       | Syntactic consequences: more on Scandinavian relative clauses    | 106        |
| 4.        | Extension to Romance adjectives                                  | 107        |
| 5.        | Some further issues  | 111        |
| 5.1       | Summary of the syntax of modifiers                               | 111        |
| 5.2       | Some differences and idiosyncracies                              | 112        |
| 5.3       | Some restrictions on the “free” interpretation of the determiner | 113        |
| 6.        | Conclusion   | 116        |
| CHAPTER 4 |  |            |
|           | <b>The strong and weak alternation in German</b>                 | <b>117</b> |
| 1.        | Introduction   | 117        |
| 2.        | The strong and weak inflections: The traditional endings         | 120        |
| 3.        | The problem: Determiners with different endings                  | 123        |
| 3.1       | The definite article   | 123        |
| 3.2       | The indefinite article   | 125        |

|           |   |            |
|-----------|---|------------|
| 4.        | The proposal: Weak and strong null endings more generally     | 130        |
| 5.        | Null endings as no endings: The new inflections               | 133        |
| 6.        | Distribution of inflections: The traditional picture          | 134        |
| 7.        | The new picture   | 139        |
| 8.        | The strong and weak alternation as a reflex of Impoverishment | 145        |
| 9.        | Basic derivations   | 151        |
| 9.1       | The stereotypical cases                                       | 151        |
| 9.2       | The genitive masculine and neuter                             | 157        |
| 10.       | Special cases   | 160        |
| 10.1      | Split-NPs   | 160        |
| 10.2      | Indefinite pronoun constructions                              | 162        |
| 10.3      | Lexically ambiguous elements                                  | 163        |
| 10.3.1    | Determiner-like pronouns                                      | 166        |
| 10.3.2    | Determiner-like adjectives                                    | 167        |
| 10.3.3    | Determiner-like intensifiers                                  | 169        |
| 10.3.3.1  | Alle  | 169        |
| 10.3.3.2  | Ein   | 170        |
| 10.4      | Summary and feature realization                               | 172        |
| 11.       | Conclusion  | 175        |
| CHAPTER 5 |   |            |
|           | <b>Conclusion</b>   | <b>177</b> |
|           | <b>References</b>   | <b>179</b> |
|           | <b>Language index</b>   | <b>193</b> |
|           | <b>Subject index</b>  | <b>195</b> |

Over the years, many people have helped me form my ideas about this and other linguistic topics. In particular, I would like to mention my teachers at the University of Connecticut (Željko Bošković and Howard Lasnik) and Indiana University (Rex Sprouse, Kari Gade, Steven Franks, and Yoshihisa Kitagawa). They supported me in countless ways. Furthermore, I would like to thank an anonymous reviewer and Ely van Gelderen for numerous and substantial comments on earlier drafts of this book and Werner Abraham for inviting me to submit the manuscript to the *Linguistik Aktuell* Series. Finally, I would like to gratefully acknowledge the receipt of a Faculty Research Grant (G 33669) from the University of North Texas.

Denton, October 2008

Dorian Roehrs