

# P-drop, D-drop, D-spread

Linguistics Colloquium • Linguistic Studies Program • Syracuse University • New York • 28 April 2006  
Alexandra Ioannidou & Marcel den Dikken — Linguistics Program — CUNY Graduate Center

## 1 The key questions

Longobardi (2001:289) reports that in modern Veneto dialects, the basic locative/directional preposition *a* ('at', 'to') can be omitted from the directional complement of motion verbs (cf. (1a) for Veneto), and points out that similar such P-drop was attested in Latin and Ancient Greek. Modern Greek (MG) manifests it as well, as shown in (1b), which contrasts minimally with both definite, overt-P (1b'), and indefinite (1c).<sup>1</sup>

- |     |     |   |   |
|-----|-----|---|---|
| (1) | a.  | vago casa (mia)                             | [Veneto dialect; Longobardi (2001:289)] |
|     |     | I-go home my                                |   |
|     | b.  | pao spiti (mou)                             | [Modern Greek]                          |
|     |     | I-go house my                               |   |
|     |     | both: 'I am going home'                     |   |
|     | b'. | pao se to (> sto <sup>2</sup> ) spiti (mou) |   |
|     |     | I-go to the house my                        |   |
|     |     | 'I am going to the/my house'                |   |
|     | c.  | pao se (ena) spiti                          |   |
|     |     | I-go to a house                             |   |
|     |     | 'I am going to a house'                     |   |

Dropping *se* 'to' is possible in MG under a variety of motion verbs (including intransitive 'go', 'return', 'reach', 'run', 'jump', 'swim', and transitive 'export', 'throw'; cf. (2a'–c')), contingent on the morphological properties of these motion verbs (to be highlighted and analysed in section 2).

- |     |    |   |     |                          |
|-----|----|---|-----|--------------------------|
| (2) | a. | gyrizo sto spiti  | a'. | gyrizo (*to) spiti       |
|     |    | I-return to-the(ACC) house  |     | I-return the(ACC) house  |
|     | b. | ftano stin paralia  | b'. | ftano (*tin) paralia     |
|     |    | I-reach to-the-ACC beach  |     | I-reach the-ACC beach    |
|     | c. | pao ston kinematografo  | c'. | pao (*ton) kinematografo |
|     |    | I-go to-the-ACC cinema-ACC  |     | I-go the-ACC cinema-ACC  |
|     |    | 'I am returning home' / 'I am approaching the beach' / 'I am going to the movies' |     |                          |

In MG, P-drop is particularly revealing because of the restrictions it imposes on the DP that follows the dropped preposition. In (2a'–c'), the noun phrase must be articleless, as indicated. It is nonetheless interpreted as a definite DP, unlike the articleless indefinite complement of *se* 'to' in (1c) — the noun phrases in (2a'–c') can pick out a definite and specific referent; they can be possessed (cf. (1b)); and they can serve as antecedents for anaphoric pronouns in subsequent discourse (*pao paralia*; *tin episkeptome kathimerina* 'I go to the beach; I visit it daily'). MG noun phrases show a variety of surface patterns in adjectival modification contexts, with indefinite noun phrases showing more flexibility than single-article definite DPs (cf. (3a,b)), but with definite DPs making up for the rigidity of (3b) in so-called 'polydefinite' or 'D-spreading' contexts, illustrated in (4a,b). Interestingly, in P-drop constructions of the type in (1b) and (2a'–c'), the noun accepts no articles or adjectives at all, as (5) shows.

<sup>1</sup> Similar P-drop phenomena are attested in Aromanian and Serbo-Macedonian (Tomic, to appear), and, to a limited degree, in English (*go home/there*). We have not undertaken a representative study of the distribution of P-drop cross-linguistically, however.

<sup>2</sup> In prepositional phrases headed by *se* 'to' and featuring a noun phrase complement introduced by the definite article, the preposition and the article must amalgamate in MG: *se+to(N)>sto*, *se+ton(M)>ston*, *se+tin(F)>stin* (cf. Triantafyllidis 1991).

- |     |    |  |
|-----|----|--|
| (3) | a. | pao se (ena) <megalo> spiti <megalo>       |
|     |    | I-go to a big house big                    |
|     |    | 'I am going to a big house'                |
|     | b. | pao se to (> sto) <megalo> spiti <*megalo> |
|     |    | I-go to the big house big                  |
|     |    | 'I am going to the big house'              |
| (4) | a. | pao sto megalo <u>to</u> spiti             |
|     |    | I-go to-the big the house                  |
|     | b. | pao sto spiti <u>to</u> megalo             |
|     |    | I-go to-the house the big                  |
| (5) | a. | *pao – (to) megalo ( <u>to</u> ) spiti     |
|     |    | I-go the big the house                     |
|     | b. | *pao – (to) spiti ( <u>to</u> ) megalo     |
|     |    | I-go the house the big                     |

These facts raise two major questions:

- (I) what is the nature of P-drop?
- (II) what is the structure and derivation of the noun phrase such that it explains the word-order and 'D-spread' facts, as well as the determiner restrictions and the ban on modification in P-drop constructions illustrated in (5)?

In this paper, we present an integrated perspective on these questions from a minimalist point of view.

## 2 P-less 'to' source?

We will argue for the systematic presence of a PP complement to motion verbs even in P-drop contexts. That is, we will argue that, of the logically possible hypotheses in (a)–(d), the last one is the only one that delivers an analysis of MG P-drop that can successfully accommodate the facts.

- (a) radical absence of PP structure
- (b) 'headlinese'/telegraphic speech
- (c) PF-ellipsis
- (d) a null-headed PP

Of the four options listed above, analysis (a) raises immediate theoretical concerns of a thematic nature: on the assumption (cf. e.g. Den Dikken 1995, 2004) that prepositions are  $\theta$ -role assigners, the noun phrase following *se* in (1b') receives its  $\theta$ -role from *se*, not from the verb *pao* 'I-go', which is incapable of assigning a  $\theta$ -role to a noun phrase. Hence the example in (1b), from which *se* is absent, cannot plausibly involve the base-generation of *spiti* directly as the complement of *pao*. We could only salvage hypothesis (a) if we allowed otherwise unaccusative verbs such as 'go' to 'switch' to transitive behaviour in P-drop contexts — concretely, we would have to assume, if we wanted to maintain an analysis along the lines of option (a), that 'go' in P-drop constructions assigns an internal  $\theta$ -role to the noun phrase that follows it, instead of taking a small clausal complement; the absence of a small clause in V's complement would force one to assume that the surface subject of, say, (1b) is  $\theta$ -marked by V itself: in other words, 'go' in P-drop contexts would have to be a transitive verb. But V does not behave at all like a transitive verb in P-drop constructions — this is particularly clear from the fact that P-drop constructions cannot be medialised or passivised (*\*spiti pijenete/pijenome*). Thus there are strong reasons to believe that an analysis along the lines of (a) must be discarded.

Hypothesis (b) is compromised by the fact that MG ‘headline’ is more liberal than conversational speech in allowing P-drop under particle verbs (cf. (6)).

- (6) <sup>(\*)</sup> *ana-dhythike* *epifania* *epitelous* [okay in ‘headline’ only]  
 PRT-emerge-3SG-PST surface finally  
 ‘it finally emerged on the surface’

Particle verbs (*ana-dhyome* ‘emerge’, *kata-dhyome* ‘submerge’, *kata-reo* ‘collapse’, *eks-aplonome* ‘spread’, etc.) do not allow the dropping of the head of their directional PP complements in conversational Greek.<sup>3</sup> That particle verbs resist P-drop in conversational speech in fact supplies an argument distinguishing between (c) and (d) as well: (d) can explain the ban on particle verbs in terms of the licensing requirements on null P.

Concretely, we propose that P<sub>o</sub>, the null preposition postulated in V’s complement by hypothesis (d), must be licensed via *incorporation* into V. In the structure in (7b’), which is modelled on Den Dikken’s (1995) analysis of complex verb-particle constructions of the type *it floated up to the surface* or *he walked down to the village*, P-to-V incorporation is blocked by the intervening particle.

- (7) a. V [<sub>PP</sub> P<sub>overt</sub> DP] a’. V [<sub>PP</sub> P<sub>o</sub> DP]  
 b. V [<sub>PrtP</sub> Prt [<sub>PP</sub> P<sub>overt</sub> DP]] b’. V [<sub>PrtP</sub> Prt [<sub>PP</sub> P<sub>o</sub> DP]]
- X

Analysis (c), the PF-ellipsis approach, would give the P-drop and overt-P cases identical syntaxes. So it could not account for the particle restriction on conversational (i.e., non-telegraphic) P-drop illustrated in (6). Eliding *s-to* from (4a,b) at PF will not guarantee either that in P-drop contexts, the adjective and the second instance of the article must be absent as well (cf. (5)). The analysis in (d) (our answer to question (I) from section 1) explains this, in conjunction with the analysis of MG DPs to be developed in section 3, to which we now turn.

### 3 D-drop and D-spread

#### 3.1 The birthplace of the definite article, and its function

The central claim around which our analysis of definite noun phrases is built is that definite articles do not originate D: they are born in a lower head, the counterpart to T in DP (cf. Pesetsky & Torrego 2001:403), which we identify as ‘Dx’, for ‘deixis’ — Dx<sup>[PERSON]</sup>, to be more specific, the counterpart in the noun phrase to Dx<sup>[TENSE]</sup> in the clause. For first and second person noun phrases, the Dx<sup>[PERSON]</sup> head is (in languages such as English) invariably occupied by a personal pronoun (*I, we, you* and their various case forms); the third-person Dx<sup>[PERSON]</sup> head can also be filled by a personal pronoun (*she, he, they*), but alternatively, third-person Dx<sup>[PERSON]</sup> may also host a definite article (*the*).<sup>4</sup> The D-head, which projects outside the maximal projection of Dx<sup>[PERSON]</sup>, is the equivalent, in the extended projection of the noun, of the C-head in the structure of the clause (cf. Szabolcsi 1994). This gives us the skeletal structures in (8).

<sup>3</sup> There are a few exceptions to this generalisation: *an-evaino* ‘ascend’, *epi-strefo* ‘return’, *eks-ago* ‘export’ and *is-erhomo* ‘enter’ all can be used without an overt P. These are high-frequency particle verbs; it is conceivable that they do not represent the particle autonomously in the syntax but pattern like simple (non-particle) verbs instead. (In this connection, note that English *exit*, while transparently descending from a particle verb in Latin, accepts the Germanic particle *out* in its complement, as in *to exit out*. Apparently, *exit* is not recognised, in synchronic English, as a particle verb: genuine particle verbs do not allow the addition of a second particle.)

<sup>4</sup> Our proposal thus preserves the basic insight of Postal (1966), pushing things down to the DxP level but continuing to assume that the origination site for definite articles and pronouns is the same.

- (8) a. [<sub>CP</sub> C [<sub>DxP</sub> Dx<sup>[TENSE]</sup> [... V ...]]]  
 b. [<sub>DP</sub> D [<sub>DxP</sub> Dx<sup>[PERSON]</sup> [... N ...]]]

We follow Pesetsky & Torrego (2001) in assuming that neither the C-head nor the D-head comes equipped with a lexical filler in the base — both heads represent abstract bundles of morphological features; the answer to the question of whether some overt element will end up spelling out C or D depends on whether something raises up to C/D in the course of the derivation. Concretely, when Dx<sup>[TENSE]</sup> (a.k.a. T) raises up to C in English, C is spelled out as *that* (Pesetsky & Torrego 2001), and when Dx<sup>[PERSON]</sup> raises up to D, D is realised on the surface as *the* in English; but in the absence of raising up to C/D, these heads remain phonologically empty.

The T-head (Dx<sup>[TENSE]</sup>) can serve as a relator of a predicate and its subject, as in copular sentences such as (9a), where the copula base-lexicalises T. Being the counterpart inside the noun phrase of the T-head, the Dx<sup>[PERSON]</sup> head would be expected to also be able to function as a subject–predicate relator — as in (9b) and (9b’). Predication inside the noun phrase is non-directional: the predicate can originate in principle either as the complement of the relator (Dx) or as its specifier (cf. Den Dikken 2006a). Reverse predications of the type in (9c) cannot converge as primary predications at the clausal level, for reasons discussed in Den Dikken (2006a:Chapter 2); so there is no counterpart to (9a), but this is for independent reasons not impinging on the general non-directionality of predication relationships.

- (9) a. [<sub>CP</sub> C [<sub>DxP</sub> [SUBJECT] [Dx<sup>[TENSE]</sup> [PREDICATE]]]]  
 a’. \* [<sub>CP</sub> C [<sub>DxP</sub> [PREDICATE] [Dx<sup>[TENSE]</sup> [SUBJECT]]]]  
 b. [<sub>DP</sub> D [<sub>DxP</sub> [SUBJECT] [Dx<sup>[PERSON]</sup> [PREDICATE]]]]  
 b’. [<sub>DP</sub> D [<sub>DxP</sub> [PREDICATE] [Dx<sup>[PERSON]</sup> [SUBJECT]]]]

Of course, even though it is *possible* for Dx to relate a predicate to its subject (in the technical sense of Den Dikken 2006a), it does not *have* to serve as a relator. Tense does not necessarily help establish a subject–predicate relationship in the base: in simple unaccusative clauses such as *the dog died*, the verb discharges its sole argument role inside its own maximal projection; no additional argument is introduced in SpecTP. Similarly, simple noun phrases such as *the dog* arguably feature no predication relationship mediated by Dx<sup>[PERSON]</sup>. The structures in (8) are thus well-formed as they stand; the SpecDxP position is not necessarily occupied by anything in the base.

#### 3.2 Movement to D and the multiplication of definite articles

For Modern Greek, the language under discussion in this paper, we assume that the D head comes equipped with an EPP property. Following Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou (1998), we assume that this property can in principle be satisfied either by attracting Dx (head movement) or a phrase (phrasal movement) — the phrase in question, in the context of DP, will typically be NP. For the MG TP, Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou demonstrate at length that head movement (to T, in their case) can satisfy the EPP. Taking this to establish the general availability of EPP satisfaction via head movement in MG, we submit that raising to D can check D’s EPP property as well. From a theoretical perspective, checking D’s EPP property via head movement is a more economical option than satisfying it via phrasal movement: the less you pied-pipe, the better it is. So head movement will be the mechanism of choice to take care of D’s EPP property in MG noun phrases — to be eschewed only if Dx-to-D leads to a crashing derivation.

Dx-to-D movement leads to the phonological lexicalisation of the D head. Whereas in the clause, T-to-C raising typically delivers discrete spell-outs of the two heads (i.e., complementisers, though often inflected or marked in some other way for tense, typically are not identical with the realisation of T), it seems that the noun phrase is morphologically poorer in that there are (at least in MG) no distinct forms for Dx and D: both get spelled out in the form of the definite article. Concretely, then, raising Dx to D may result in *two copies* of the definite article. Whether it actually does result in two surface definite articles depends on two things, though:

- (a) the nature of the complement of Dx  
 (b) the question of whether anything follows Dx within the confines of the complex noun phrase

Let us comment briefly on each of these points.

As for (a), Den Dikken (2006a) points out (basing himself on a variety of evidence from several languages) that, in reverse predications of the type in (9b'), the relator of the predicate and its subject is never an article — thus, in Italian, (10b) (which features a definite article in between the predicative noun phrase and its subject) is unambiguously *comparative* ('the doctor is like an ignoramus'), instantiating a predicate-complement structure that has undergone Predicate Inversion; (10a), by contrast, is unambiguously *attributive* ('the doctor is an ignoramus in his capacity as a doctor'), representing a structure in which the predicate originates in the specifier position of the relator, as in (9b'). In *attributive* qualitative binominal noun phrases, therefore, no article may show up between the predicate-specifier and its subject.

- |      |    |        |           |        |         |                            |           |
|------|----|--------|-----------|--------|---------|----------------------------|-----------|
| (10) | a. | quell' | ignorante | di     | dottore | ( <i>attributive</i> QBNP) | [Italian] |
|      |    | that   | ignoramus | of     | doctor  |                            |           |
|      | b. | quell' | ignorante | de-]   | dottore | ( <i>comparative</i> QBNP) |           |
|      |    | that   | ignoramus | of-the | doctor  |                            |           |

The same point emerges from the facts of Dutch qualitative binominal noun phrases: (11b), featuring a so-called 'spurious' indefinite article between the predicate nominal and its subject, only supports a *comparative* interpretation; to get an *attributive* reading, one has to forgo the insertion of an article between the two nouns, as in (11a).<sup>5</sup>

- |      |    |       |         |     |            |  |                            |
|------|----|-------|---------|-----|------------|--|----------------------------|
| (11) | a. | die   | idioten | van | doktoren   | ( <i>attributive/comparative</i> QBNP) | [Dutch]                    |
|      |    | those | idiots  | of  | doctors    |  |                            |
|      | b. | die   | idioten | van | <u>een</u> | doktoren                               | ( <i>comparative</i> QBNP) |
|      |    | those | idiots  | of  | a          | doctors                                |                            |

We conclude, therefore, that no articles can occur in between a predicate-specifier and its subject in reverse predication structures of the type in (9b') (which represents *attributive* QBNPs). Exactly what the roots of this generalisation are is not clear, but we suspect that it has to do with the nature of the complement of the article: we conjecture that an overt article, 'spurious' or otherwise, cannot take a bare NP as its complement; so whenever the Dx head in our structures has a bare NP complement, it must remain empty. In cases of type (9b'), then, Dx-to-D movement delivers precisely *one* copy of the definite article: the one in D is licensed to be overt, but the base copy in Dx must remain unrealised because otherwise it could contravene the ban on articles with bare-NP complements.<sup>6</sup> The same ban also rules out lexicalisation of Dx in (8b); only the raised copy of the article in D will be overt. This is what (a) is about.

As regards (b), the phonological properties of the MG definite articles is such that they demand something to their right within the complex noun phrase: being proclitic, they cannot be final in DP. So whenever, at the end of the derivation, the base copy of the definite article in Dx should end up being final within the containing DP, this copy will be prevented from getting a phonological realisation — put differently, whenever Dx is stranded in final position, the copy of the definite article in this position must remain silent.

<sup>5</sup> (11a), alongside the attributive reading, also supports a comparative interpretation, unlike Italian (10a), which is unambiguous. This is because the use of a 'spurious' indefinite article (one which shows no number agreement with the nouns participating in the QBNP) is not obligatory in the context in (11), whereas in Italian a definite article must be used in comparative QBNPs.

<sup>6</sup> Note that we take this ban to be a *surface* ban, not a *deep* ban — that is, an overt article may certainly be generated in Dx so long as it raises to a higher position in the course of the derivation, leaving a silent copy behind.

The special circumstances in (a) and (b) aside, however, we expect that whenever Dx raises to D, we will encounter two instantiations of the definite article in the surface string. It is this which will serve us well in the account of so-called 'polydefiniteness' or 'D-spread' in MG.

### 3.3 D-spread

Let us start our discussion of the distribution of definite articles in Greek noun phrases off with a brief note on simple noun phrases of the type in (12a). Here, Dx-to-D will readily apply, resulting in the lexicalisation of D as 'the'; but because the complement of Dx is a bare NP, there will be no copy of the definite article spelled out under Dx. The result is a single-article noun phrase of the form in (12b).

- |      |    |  |
|------|----|--|
| (12) | a. | [ <sub>DP</sub> D [ <sub>DxP</sub> Dx <sup>[PERSON]</sup> [ <sub>NP</sub> N]]] |
|      | →  | Dx-to-D, resulting in lexicalisation of D as 'the'; Dx remains silent          |
|      | b. | to spiti<br>the house  |

The Dx head can also serve as a relator of a subject-predicate relationship established within the complex noun phrase. One way this can materialise is for Dx to take the predicate as its complement, with the subject sitting in SpecDxP, as depicted in (13a). This is a 'straight', canonical predication structure. Once again, Dx raises to D, resulting in the lexicalisation of D as 'the' — and this time, since Dx does not take a bare NP as its complement, Dx itself will be spelled out by a copy of the definite article as well. The output will be a D-spread construction of the type illustrated by (13b).

- |      |    |   |
|------|----|---|
| (13) | a. | [ <sub>DP</sub> D [ <sub>DxP</sub> [ <sub>NP</sub> N] [Dx <sup>[PERSON]</sup> [ <sub>AP</sub> A]]]] |
|      | →  | Dx-to-D, resulting in lexicalisation of both D and Dx as 'the'                                      |
|      | b. | to spiti to megalo<br>the house the big   |

In the D-spread construction in (13b), there should be no requirement for special information-structural properties associated with either the noun or the adjective: their projections are in their base positions. It certainly seems to be correct that the 'the N the A' type of D-spread construction in Greek can be used in the absence of any particular contrastive focus within the complex noun phrase. In a context of the type in (14), uttering (14a) (from Kariaeva 2004) is felicitous — here the entire complex noun phrase is in focus (in fact, it seems the complex noun phrase *has* to be in focus: Kariaeva notes that polydefinite noun phrases are not suitable for use in a context such as (17), where the entire content of the polydefinite noun phrase is old information<sup>7</sup>), but *within* the complex noun phrase neither major constituent is contrastive. It appears to be possible to contrastively stress the *noun* in 'the N the A' constructions, as in the context in (15).<sup>8</sup> This can be accommodated on our assumptions by allowing the NP in (13b) to raise to a SpecFocP projection between DxP and D (though see fn. 11, below: *in-situ* focus is probably a better alternative). Interestingly, as (16) (taken from Kariaeva 2004) shows, the *adjective* cannot be contrastively focused in 'the N the A' polydefinites: (16a) is infelicitous in the context given.

<sup>7</sup> It is not clear to us at this time why polydefinite noun phrases cannot be fully discourse-old — we have as yet no account for the infelicity of (17b,c).

<sup>8</sup> This seems to run counter to Campos & Stavrou's (2002) claim that in polydefinite constructions with either word order, the noun can never be contrastively stressed. The felicity of (15a) may be a matter of speaker variation; that of (16a) may be, too (i.e., not all speakers may concur with Kariaeva's judgement on (16a), though we will accept it here). We do not at this time have detailed information on this. This paper's first author accepts (15a) in the context given (while finding (15b) infelicitous here).

- (14) *context* o Janis taise ta zoa  
 the Janis fed the animals  
 a. i gates i mikres itan pinasmenes  
 the cats the small were hungry  
 b. #i mikres i gates itan pinasmenes  
 the small the cats were hungry  
 '[<sub>DP=focus</sub> the SMALL CATS] were hungry'
- (15) *context* o Janis taise ta mikra zoa  
 the Janis fed the small animals  
 a. i gates i mikres itan pinasmenes  
 the cats the small were hungry  
 b. #i mikres i gates itan pinasmenes  
 the small the cats were hungry  
 '[<sub>DP</sub> the small [<sub>NP</sub> CATS]] were hungry'
- (16) *context* o Janis taise tis gates  
 the Janis fed the cats  
 a. #i gates i mikres itan pinasmenes  
 the cats the small were hungry  
 b. i mikres i gates itan pinasmenes  
 the small the cats were hungry  
 '[<sub>DP</sub> the [<sub>AP=focus</sub> SMALL] cats] were hungry'
- (17) *context* o Janis taise tis mikres gates  
 the Janis fed the small cats  
 a. #i gates i mikres itan pinasmenes  
 the cats the small were hungry  
 b. #i mikres i gates itan pinasmenes  
 the small the cats were hungry  
 '[<sub>DP</sub> the small cats] were hungry'

Whenever the adjective is contrastively focused in a polydefinite construction, one has to resort instead to the 'the A the N' case of D-spread, illustrated in (16b). As a matter of fact, it seems that the 'the A the N' case of D-spread instantiated is acceptable *only* in contexts in which the adjective is contrastively focused: (15b) is awkward due to the fact that the adjective is not felicitously focusable in this particular context.<sup>9</sup> To derive this, we propose the derivation in (18a), featuring focus movement of the AP from the complement position of the Dx head (the position AP occupies in (13a)) into the specifier position of a FocP between DxP and D. With Dx raising to Foc and the Foc+Dx complex subsequently raising on to D, this derivation delivers an overt definite article in D and a copy of it under Foc; there can be no definite article spelled out in the base position of Dx, however, because that copy would end up in DP-final position, leaving it with no host to encliticise onto. The result of (18a), therefore, is the polydefinite construction in (18b) — with an overt article at the left edge and another one between the focused adjective and the noun.<sup>10</sup>

9 Alexiadou & Wilder's (1998:306) observation that, for them at least, non-intersective adjectives like *ipothimenos* 'alleged' and ethnic adjectives such as *italiki* 'Italian' are ill-formed in 'the A the N' polydefinites may be rooted in the fact that these are less likely to be focused than intersective adjectives. Leu (2006) reports that there are many speakers of MG for whom *pro-ighoumenos* 'former' and *kaimenos* 'pitiable' CAN be used in 'the A the N' polydefinites, precisely when contrastively focused.

10 If, from the DP-internal focus position in (18a), the AP can undergo further movement escaping from DP altogether, there may be a generalisation to be captured here about the cross-linguistic distribution of left-branch extraction (LBE) involving APs: if the possibility of DP-internal focus movement is a precondition on escaping from DP, then languages with LBE of adjectives from

- (18) a. [<sub>DP</sub> D [<sub>FocP</sub> [<sub>AP</sub> A] [Foc [<sub>DxP</sub> [<sub>NP</sub> N] [Dx<sup>[PERSON]</sup> t<sub>AP</sub>]]]]]  
 → Dx-to-Foc-to-D, resulting in lexicalisation of D and Foc as 'the'; Dx remains silent  
 b. to MEGALO to spiti  
 the big the house

Why is the adjective *necessarily* focused in 'the A the N' polydefinite noun phrases? Put differently, why couldn't we derive 'the A the N' from (19a), involving a base-generated A–Dx–N order in a predicate-specifier structure of the type in (9b')? The thing is that, though (19a) is indubitably grammatical, it does not deliver D-spread: with Dx raising to D, D will certainly be spelled out as the definite article; but the Dx head in (19a) takes a bare NP as its complement, and is hence prevented from being lexicalised by the definite article. In other words, (19a) delivers an output in which there is precisely one definite article, preceding the adjective — a garden-variety attributive modification construction of the type illustrated in (19b).<sup>11</sup>

- (19) a. [<sub>DP</sub> D [<sub>DxP</sub> [<sub>AP</sub> A] [Dx<sup>[PERSON]</sup> [<sub>NP</sub> N]]]]  
 → Dx-to-D, resulting in lexicalisation of D as 'the'; Dx remains silent  
 b. to megalo spiti  
 the big house

### 3.4 D-drop in P-drop contexts

So far, we only considered noun phrases that can check their Case feature in their external syntactic environment, against a matching feature of T, V or P. But in the P-drop context we discussed in section 2, the external syntactic environment does not make a Case feature available against which the noun's Case feature could be checked: the verb is unaccusative, hence Case-feature-less, and radically null P does not have a Case feature either. The noun arguably does have a Case feature, even in P-drop constructions. This is suggested by our earlier examples in (2c,c'), repeated here as (20a,b).

- (20) a. pao se ton (>ston) kinematografo  
 I-go to the-ACC cinema-ACC  
 b. pao – (\*ton) kinematografo  
 I-go the-ACC cinema-ACC

DP should all have focus movement within DP. This seems accurate for the languages of the Balkans, at least. Whether so-called LBE really involves *extraction* from DP is not entirely clear, however; see Pereltsvaig (2006), in particular, for careful discussion.

11 It is possible, in (19b), to contrastively focus the adjective: *to MEGALO spiti* 'the BIG house (as opposed to the small one)'. If the derivation involved raising of the AP into SpecFocP, then with Dx raising to Foc and Foc+Dx raising on to D we would expect polydefiniteness to result (with definite articles spelled out under D and Foc+Dx, though not in Dx) — in fact, there would appear to be no way to derive monodefiniteness *to MEGALO spiti* if the focused adjective had to raise to SpecFocP. We suggest, tentatively, that in structures in which the Foc head is adjacent, in the base, to the focused constituent, movement of the latter to SpecFocP is not forced (hence probably prohibited, on minimalist assumptions). With AP focused *in situ*, no polydefiniteness results, as desired.

Note in this context as well that Den Dikken (2006a:50) concludes (without providing an explanation for this) that predicate-specifier constructions of the type in (19a) are 'frozen' as far as the two major constituents, the subject and the predicate, are concerned — so probably AP would not even be *allowed* to focus-move to SpecFocP in (19a). For the same reason, one would expect it to be equally impossible to focus-move the NP-complement of Dx in the structure in (19a) — that is, the derivation in (i) should crash. The only way, then, in which a focus interpretation for the noun in a polydefinite noun phrase is derivable is via (13a). It may be that not all speakers allow NP in (13a) to be focused — it originates, after all, as the subject in SpecDxP, the equivalent of SpecTP in the clause, which is quintessentially a topic position. This may explain the fact that, for Campos & Stavrou (2004), focus on the noun is altogether impossible in polydefinite noun phrases. The first author of this paper does not share this judgement. It would be interesting to investigate whether this point of speaker variation correlates with variation concerning the (im)possibility of a focus interpretation for a preverbal subject in the clause. This remains to be investigated systematically.

(i) \* [<sub>DP</sub> D [<sub>FocP</sub> [<sub>NP</sub> N] [Foc [<sub>DxP</sub> [<sub>AP</sub> A] [Dx<sup>[PERSON]</sup> t<sub>NP</sub>]]]]]

Note that not just in (20a), the overt-P case, but in the P-drop example in (20b) as well, the head noun appears in the accusative form (the nominative is *kinematografos*, which is impossible in both (20a) and (20b)). If morphological case is any indication, therefore, it seems that even in P-drop constructions, the noun is equipped with a Case feature.<sup>12</sup> The question is how it manages to get it checked.

The answer we suggest is the following. We propose that, within a Case-marked noun phrase (at least in languages such as Greek, which show morphological case both on the determiner and on the head noun), both the head noun and the determiner come equipped with a structural Case feature (to be translated at spell-out into the corresponding morphological case). The noun's Case feature can in principle be checked under Agree against D's Case feature — but only if D's Case feature can be valued by a matching Case feature external to the DP; an unvalued Case feature in D cannot initiate an Agree relationship with the Case feature on N. In all contexts in which DP checks Case against a Case-feature bearing head in the external syntax, the Case checking relationship between D's Case feature and the matching DP-external Case feature ensures that the former is valued, which allows N's Case feature to be checked under Agree. But in those (few) contexts in which DP does *not* find anything in its external syntactic environment against which D could get its Case feature valued, checking N's Case feature under Agree is not an option. Precisely under these circumstances, an alternative scenario has to be pursued to get N's Case feature checked: EPP-driven movement of NP into the specifier position of DP, which creates a Spec-Head agreement configuration under which N's Case feature can be checked as a last resort.<sup>13</sup>

Let us see what this entails for the various DPs we investigated in section 3.2. We will revisit each of these DPs here, placing them in a syntactic environment in which no DP-external checker is available for D's Case feature — a P-drop context in which both P<sub>o</sub> and the unaccusative matrix verb are Case-featureless. Consider first (21), which is the equivalent of (12) in a P-drop environment. Here, because D cannot get its Case feature valued externally, NP must raise into SpecDP, with D's and N's Case features being checked off against each other under Spec-Head agreement.

$$(21) \quad P_o \text{ [DP D [D}_{\text{XP}} \text{ DX}^{\text{[PERSON]}} \text{ [NP N]]}]$$

Raising NP to SpecDP is legitimate: we have assumed all along that D in Greek comes equipped with an EPP property; checking D's EPP property via raising to SpecDP is certainly a legitimate option. But note that, with D's EPP property checked via phrasal movement to SpecDP, there remains no trigger for head movement of Dx to D — Dx-to-D movement is itself triggered by the need to eliminate D's EPP property (in line with Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 1998); it is the most economical way of satisfying the EPP on D, but in the case at hand, it must be overridden by EPP-satisfaction via phrasal movement to SpecDP because only via NP-to-SpecDP movement can the Case features of N and D be checked against each other. With the EPP satisfied by phrasal movement to SpecDP in P-drop contexts, no Dx-to-D movement may arise, which means that in (21) no definite article can surface at all: Dx does not raise to D hence D cannot be lexicalised as the definite article;<sup>14</sup> Dx itself cannot be spelled out as an article either because Dx takes a bare NP complement in (21). The result of (21) will therefore be a *bare*, article-less noun phrase in the complement of null P.

12 There is morphological case on Greek predicate nominals as well; it is not obvious that this is the translation of a structural Case feature. We assume that, 'case agreement' contexts aside, all morphological case is the reflex of a structural Case feature.

13 While drawing on Chomsky's recent work on feature valuation, this analysis has a distinctly 'global' and countercyclic ring to it: it is only after DP has become a part of a larger structure within which D's Case feature can be valued and checked under Agree that it can be determined whether N's Case feature can be checked under Agree or must instead be checked via Spec-Head agreement. The countercyclicality of the account can be circumvented straightforwardly by allowing both the Agree and the Move derivations to proceed in parallel, with the Move derivation filtered out further down the line in all cases in which it turns out to be uneconomical (i.e., in all cases in which D's Case feature is checked externally); but the globality of the present analysis makes it fit in rather poorly with current work in minimalism. We must leave this issue for further research at this time.

14 There is a direct link here to Pesetsky & Torrego's (2001) account of the absence of *do*-support and the emergence of *that*-trace effects in highest-subject *wh*-movement constructions.

The NP-to-SpecDP derivation for P-drop constructions has the desired result of deriving Longobardi's (2001) 'construct state' effect in P-drop constructions — the fact that the head noun in Romance P-drop constructions, when possessed, must precede the possessor, and is itself unadorned with a definite article, 'deriving' its definiteness from the possessor, just as in Semitic construct state constructions.

- (22) a. la mia casa è più bella della tua [Italian]  
       the my house is more beautiful of-the yours  
       (\*la) casa mia è più bella della tua  
       the house my is more beautiful of-the yours  
       c. \*mia casa è più bella della tua  
       my house is more beautiful of-the yours
- (23) a. \*vago la mia casa [Veneto]  
       I-go the my house  
       b. vago (\*la) casa mia (cf. (1a))  
       I-go the house my  
       c. \*vago mia casa  
       I-go my house

Longobardi (2001) derives the construct state via head movement of the possessed noun up to D. Such head movement is theoretically problematic, however, on the assumption (argued for extensively in Den Dikken 1995, for instance) that possessors originate as specifiers, subjects of small clauses whose predicates are dative PPs introducing the possessor as P's complement: movement of the head of a specifier up to higher heads in the structure generally seems to be impossible (cf. Hale & Keyser 1993 *et passim*). We therefore propose to replace Longobardi's head-movement account of the construct state with a phrasal-movement account — specifically, with an analysis in terms of movement of the possessed NP into SpecDP. This preserves the fact that, whenever construct state formation obtains, no outer definite article can show up: NP-to-SpecDP satisfies D's EPP property and is hence incompatible with Dx-to-D raising; with Dx-to-D raising blocked in construct state contexts, no article can be spelled out in D.

Now that we have an account of (1a,b), let us investigate whether our analysis predicts, as it should, that no modification (other than possessive modification) is possible in P-drop constructions. Let us start out by ensuring that the 'straight' predication structure in (24), the P-drop counterpart to (13), is ruled out.

$$(24) \quad *P_o \text{ [DP D [D}_{\text{XP}} \text{ [NP N] [DX}^{\text{[PERSON]}} \text{ [AP A]]}]$$

Recall that in P-drop constructions, NP must raise to SpecDP to be Case-licensed. But in the structure in (24), NP-to-SpecDP is actually illicit. In (21), NP-to-SpecDP crosses over the Dx head, which, though phonologically null, is semantically contentful: deixis is meaningful. Movement of NP to SpecDP in (21) is hence in keeping with the Vacuous Movement Hypothesis as formulated in Den Dikken (2006b):

$$(25) \quad \text{Vacuous Movement Hypothesis} \quad (\text{Den Dikken 2006b})$$

movement that does not cross phonologically or semantically visible material is prohibited

But in (24), NP-to-SpecDP movement does not cross anything phonologically or semantically contentful: D is phonologically null, and it does not inherently have any semantic features either — D, in the analysis of the noun phrase we have adopted (basically from Szabolcsi 1994), is the equivalent of C, which, in simple declarative contexts, is semantically meaningless as well. So NP-to-SpecDP movement applied to (24) would result in a violation of the VMH as stated in (25). Since NP cannot remain *in situ* either (that would leave D's and N's Case features unchecked, yielding a Full Interpretation violation), the outcome is that (25) crashes.

The derivation in (26) crashes as well. Again, NP must raise to SpecDP for Case-licensing purposes, but such movement in (26) (where AP undergoes focus movement to SpecFocP, which is on the movement path for NP-to-SpecDP movement) would be illegitimate: AP focus movement sets up a relativised minimality effect, parallel to the effect we get in English *\*I wonder what under no circumstances would he do.*<sup>15</sup>

(26) \*P<sub>o</sub> [<sub>DP</sub> D [<sub>FocP</sub> [<sub>AP</sub> A] [<sub>Foc</sub> [<sub>DxP</sub> [<sub>NP</sub> N] [<sub>Dx</sub><sup>[PERSON]</sup> t<sub>AP</sub>]]]]]

Finally, let us examine (27), a predicate-specifier structure representing simple attributive modification. As always, in P-drop contexts, NP has to make its way up into SpecDP. But in (27) this is impossible: as Den Dikken (2006a:50) points out, in predicate-specifier structures of this type, the post-relator subject is generally ‘frozen’ (recall fn. 11, above — the structure in (i), in particular).

(27) \*P<sub>o</sub> [<sub>DP</sub> D [<sub>DxP</sub> [<sub>AP</sub> A] [<sub>Dx</sub><sup>[PERSON]</sup> [<sub>NP</sub> N]]]]]

So we see that in P-drop contexts, the only derivation that actually converges is the one in (21), featuring a simple, unmodified DP. This derives the ban on adjectival modification, as well as the fact that not a single article surfaces in the complement of null P. What remains to be checked is whether our analysis leaves room for modification of the head noun by pronominal possessors in P-drop constructions — in other words, how do we accommodate (28)?

(28) pao spiti mou/sou/tou  
I-go house my/your/his/her-GEN/DAT

The base representation for (28) is (29), with the possessor base-generated inside a PP predicated of the possessum, in a ‘straight’ predicate-complement structure of the type in (9b) (cf. Den Dikken 1995).

(29) P<sub>o</sub> [<sub>DP</sub> D [<sub>DxP</sub> [<sub>NP</sub> N] [<sub>Dx</sub><sup>[PERSON]</sup> [<sub>PP</sub> mou/sou/tou]]]]]

As things stand, this structure is equivalent, for all intents and purposes, with (24), which we rejected. Recall that the reason why a derivation based on (24) crashes is that movement of NP to SpecDP violates the VMH in (25). What makes (29) different from (24) is that the possessive pronoun in (29) is arguably a *clitic* (cf. Alexiadou & Stavrou 2000, for instance). We assume that this means that *mou* attaches to D, yielding (30):

(30) P<sub>o</sub> [<sub>DP</sub> D+mou/sou/tou<sub>i</sub> [<sub>DxP</sub> [<sub>NP</sub> N] [<sub>Dx</sub><sup>[PERSON]</sup> [<sub>PP</sub> t<sub>i</sub>]]]]]

As a result of cliticisation of the possessor to D, the latter comes to be equipped with phonological and semantic content: all the semantic content of *mou*, in fact. Movement of the possessed NP to SpecDP across D is now no longer vacuous, hence perfectly licit. With NP raising to SpecDP, D’s and N’s Case features are checked off against each other, and NP comes to linearly precede the possessor, delivering the desired output: (28). The analysis thus correctly predicts that the clitic possessor must follow the possessed noun in P-drop constructions (cf. (28)).<sup>16</sup>

15 Culicover (1993) has long-distance movement cases that apparently counterexemplify the text claim for English; but see Den Dikken (2003:97, fn. 9) for discussion of how these are different from the text case.

16 English is interesting in this connection. Though it does not productively allow P-drop, directional uses of *home*, as in *I am going home*, arguably instantiate this phenomenon. In line with this, directional uses of *home*, in contradistinction to non-directional ones, do not allow adjectival modification — while Longobardi (2001:288) quotes (ia) as grammatical, (ib) is sharply ill-formed with the modifiers included. So (ib) exhibits one of the hallmarks of P-drop constructions: the ban on adjectival modification. But while Italian dialects and Modern Greek allow the noun in P-drop constructions to have a pronominal possessor (cf. (1a,b)),

It also predicts that the possessor must be a clitic. And that, too, is a correct prediction: non-clitic possessors, which surface are impossible in P-drop constructions — the sentences in (31b,b’) are ill-formed.

(31) a. pao sto spiti tis Marias  
I-go to-the house the-GEN/DAT Maria-GEN/DAT  
a’. pao stis Marias to spiti  
I-go to-the-GEN/DAT Maria-GEN/DAT the house  
both: ‘I am going to Mary’s house’  
b. \*pao spiti tis Marias  
I-go house the-GEN/DAT Maria-GEN/DAT  
b’. \*pao tis Marias spiti  
I-go the-GEN/DAT Maria-GEN/DAT house

In MG, phrasal possessors can be placed either to the right or to the left of the possessum, as illustrated in (31a,a’). The possessor’s base position, just as in (29) (and following Den Dikken 1995), is the complement position of a preposition projecting a PP predicated of the possessum. When surfacing to the right of the possessum, the possessor does not intervene between the possessum’s launch site and its landing-site, SpecDP, in P-drop constructions. (32a) thus crashes, for exactly the same reason that (24) crashes: movement of NP to SpecDP violates the VMH in (25) since it crosses neither phonologically nor semantically contentful material. Raising the possessor to the left of the possessum, as in (31a’,b’), arguably involves movement of the possessor to SpecDP — cf. Hungarian *Mari-nak a háza* ‘Mari-DAT the house-3SG’, for which Szabolcsi (1994) and subsequent work in its wake have argued in detail that the dative possessor occupies SpecDP, and gets there via movement. Assuming so, we derive the ungrammaticality of (31b’) from the fact that, with *tis Marias* raising to SpecDP, the possessum-NP is prevented from moving to this position, thereby being deprived of the possibility of getting its Case feature checked within the complex DP. This leads to a violation of the Principle of Full Interpretation, responsible for the ill-formedness of a derivation built on (32b).

(32) a. \*P<sub>o</sub> [<sub>DP</sub> D [<sub>DxP</sub> [<sub>NP</sub> N] [<sub>Dx</sub><sup>[PERSON]</sup> [<sub>PP</sub> tis Marias]]]]]  
b. \*P<sub>o</sub> [<sub>DP</sub> [<sub>PP</sub> tis Marias]<sub>i</sub>] [<sub>DxP</sub> [<sub>NP</sub> N] [<sub>Dx</sub><sup>[PERSON]</sup> t<sub>i</sub>]]]]]

Though we know from (28) that the noun phrase in P-drop constructions can be possessed, it is impossible in MG P-drop constructions to question the possessor — regardless of whether the possessed noun phrase as a whole is *ex situ* (in SpecCP) or left *in situ* (as in multiple *wh*-questions), and regardless of whether the *wh*-possessor subextracts or takes the entire possessed noun phrase along:

(33) a. se pjanou (to) spiti {pate/gyrizete/ftanete/trechete/perpatate/kolimbate/...}  
to whose the house you<sub>PL</sub>-go/return/reach/run/walk/swim  
b. \*pjanou {pate/gyrizete/ftanete/trechete/perpatate/kolimbate/...} sto spiti  
whose you<sub>PL</sub>-go/return/reach/run/walk/swim to-the house  
c. pjos {pai/gyrise/ftani/trechi/perpatai/kolimbai/...} se pjanou (to) spiti  
who goes/returns/reaches/runs/walks/swims to whose the house

English directional *home* cannot be possessed at all: (ic) is altogether impossible. On our analysis, this is a consequence of the fact that English pronominal possessors are not clitics, and can never be postnominal. The technical execution of the analysis of (ic) will be left open here; we content ourselves with pointing out that (ic) confirms the text generalisations concerning legitimate possessors in P-drop constructions.

(i) a. I miss (old sweet) home  
b. I’m going (\*old sweet) home  
c. I’m going (\*my) home (\*my)

- (34) a. \*pjanou spiti {pate/gyrizete/ftanete/trechete/perpatate/kolimbate/...}<sup>17</sup>  
       whose house you<sub>PL</sub>-go/return/reach/run/walk/swim  
       b. \*pjanou {pate/gyrizete/ftanete/trechete/perpatate/kolimbate/...} spiti  
       whose you<sub>PL</sub>-go/return/reach/run/walk/swim house  
       c. \*pjios {pai/gyrise/ftani/trechi/perpatai/kolimbai/...} pjanou spiti  
       who goes/returns/reaches/runs/walks/swims whose house

The ungrammaticality of (34b) is of course readily expected on our assumptions, in light of the corresponding ill-formedness of (33b) — stranding P under subextraction from P's complement is generally impossible, in MG as well as many other languages. And the deviance of (34a), which contrasts markedly with the grammaticality of (33a), could be derived from our account by capitalising on the presence of a null P in the syntax of P-drop constructions: this null P is neither strandable (MG does not allow P-stranding) nor pied-pipable (null P would not be licensable via incorporation into V in its derived position, SpecCP). Unfortunately, however, we cannot construe (34a) as an argument for our analysis of P-drop in terms of a null-headed PP — the fact that P-drop is disallowed even if the *wh*-phrase stays *in situ*, as in (34c), indicates that there is no source for the *wh*-movement examples in (34a,b) to begin with; so the fact that (34a,b) are ungrammatical reduces to the fact that (34c) is as well.<sup>18</sup> That (34c) is ungrammatical actually follows straightforwardly from our analysis, in precisely the same way that the ill-formedness of (31b') does: the pronominal possessor in *pjanou spiti* is not a clitic (unlike *mou/sou/tou* in (28)); it occupies SpecDP, like *tis Marias* in (31b'), and by sitting in this position it prevents the possessum-NP from raising there to check its Case feature. So even though (34) does not directly provide us with an additional argument for our null-P analysis, it does ultimately support our account — in particular, it supports the claim that, in P-drop constructions, the NP part of the complex noun phrase must raise to SpecDP for Case-licensing purposes; and the need for this movement follows from the fact that, in the external syntactic environment, the noun phrase complement of P<sub>o</sub> does not find a Case feature to check.

It is thus the absence, in P-drop contexts, of a matching Case feature that could value D's inherently unvalued Case feature that is responsible for the obligatoriness of NP-to-SpecDP movement, which derives the 'construct state' effect noted by Longobardi (2001) as well as the various restrictions on the DP-complement in MG P-drop constructions that we catalogued and explained in this section. And here we find an important argument in favour of our null-P approach to the syntax of P-drop constructions — an argument that distinguishes directly between hypotheses (c) and (d) from section 2: the PF-ellipsis and null-P approaches. After all, on a PF-ellipsis approach, the syntax of P-drop constructions should behave exactly like that of their overt-P counterparts: there is a full-fledged P present throughout the syntactic derivation, which should, like all full-blown prepositions, come lexically equipped with a Case feature; and that Case feature should be able to value the Case feature of the D head of P's DP complement, which should in turn allow the Case feature

17 There is some variation on individual examples here, which is why we have illustrated the point for a wide variety of verb choices — (34a) with *pate* is relatively good, and its version with *ftanete* is perhaps not fully ungrammatical either; but the other instances of (34a) are all irredeemable. The relative acceptability of (34a) with *pate* (and to a lesser extent with *ftanete* as well) is probably a low-level frequency effect: P-drop is most common under *pao* 'go'. We take the general pattern to show, however, that (34a) is indeed ill-formed.

18 Similarly, the fact that in P-drop constructions it is impossible to replace the entire postverbal noun phrase with a *wh*-pronoun (cf. \**paralia opia piga* 'the beach which I went') reduces to the fact that it is impossible to insert a non-*wh* pronoun in this position (\**piga afto* 'I went this'), and the impossibility of replacement of the postverbal noun phrase with a 'which'-phrase (\**pio panepistimio pas?* 'which university you-go') reduces to the impossibility of insertion of demonstratives in this noun phrase (\**pao <afto> panepistimio <afto>* 'I go this university'). The question of how to ensure that no demonstratives can surface in P-drop constructions is a difficult one that we have to leave aside for now, for lack of sufficient understanding (on our part, at least) of the syntax of demonstratives in MG. If demonstratives originate as predicates of the noun phrases they combine with, the account of the ban on demonstratives will run along the same lines as that of the ban on adjectival modification given in the main text; but if demonstratives originate in SpecDxP (or a DxP-adjoined position), it is not immediately obvious how to rule out demonstratives in P-drop constructions.

of N inside DP to be checked under Agree, without the need for NP-to-SpecDP movement ever arising.<sup>19</sup> What we have found, however, is that P-drop constructions behave markedly differently from their overt-P alternatives in ways that, as far as we can tell, can only be understood if there is a radically null, Case-feature-less P present in the syntax of P-drop constructions: the Case-feature-less P forces NP-to-SpecDP movement in the syntactic derivation of P-drop sentences, which allows us to make straightforward sense of the restrictions on the postverbal noun phrase in P-drop constructions.

So in conclusion, what we have seen in this section is that raising to the D-domain (Dx-to-D and, in P-drop/'construct state' contexts, NP-to-SpecDP) is the key to question (II) from section 1.

#### 4 Concluding remarks

In this paper, we have argued that P-drop constructions involve a syntactically projected null P subject to licensing via incorporation into V, and a full-fledged DP complement to the null P that is subject to restrictions that follow from the need to check N's Case feature via NP-to-SpecDP movement internally to the DP.<sup>20</sup> 'Construct state' formation (i.e., NP-to-SpecDP), while not a sufficient condition for licensing null P (*contra* Longobardi 2001), is required in P-drop contexts to have D's and N's Case-features checked within the DP.<sup>21</sup> Our analysis of P-drop and its interaction with D-drop/spread argues for a *copying* approach to D-spread, hence against many extant accounts that take each of the articles to have an independent structural source (including Alexiadou & Wilder 1998, Leu 2006 and references cited there): Modern Greek definite articles originate under Dx, T's counterpart in the DP (cf. Pesetsky & Torrego 2001), and raise to D to check D's EPP property, with multiple spell-outs of the definite article resulting unless independent considerations prevent lexicalisation of an article under the Dx head.

19 Recall that NP-to-SpecDP movement is less economical (because it pied-pipes more material) than the alternative route to check D's EPP property, Dx-to-D. So NP-to-SpecDP movement should apply only as a last resort.

20 That the complement of null P in P-drop constructions can be a full DP is shown by some of the observations about P-drop made at the very outset of this paper — in particular, by the fact that this noun phrase is interpreted as a definite DP, being able to pick out a definite and specific referent, to be possessed (cf. (1b)), and to serve as the antecedent for an anaphoric pronoun in subsequent discourse. Whether the syntax (of MG or, more generally, of UG) countenances the possibility of a 'bare' NP in the complement of P is a question we cannot broach in this paper. English *I am going to town* may suggest that bare NPs are legitimate under P — this noun phrase certainly lacks the earmarks of a referential DP (it will not antecede pronouns in subsequent discourse, for instance: \**I am going to town; I like it very much* is deviant). For the specific case of MG, the topic of our paper, there is one consideration that some might interpret as a potential argument in favour of a bare-NP complementation analysis: the observation, made by Baliouli & Psaltou-Joycey (1994), that the article-less noun phrase in P-drop constructions often shows what they call a 'broadening' of its 'extensivity' — thus, in *pao sxolio* 'I-go school' (in contradistinction to *pao sto sxolio* 'I-go to-the school'), the noun *sxolio* refers to the abstract idea of 'school', not (just) the physical building. In the absence of a translation of 'extensivity' and 'breadth' thereof into a syntactic structure, however, it is difficult to draw any firm conclusions from this. It is entirely possible that *some* P-drop sentences involve a structure in which null P takes a bare-NP complement — and it is likely that it is precisely those P-drop cases in which the bare noun shows a broadening of its extensivity that fail to respond positively to the diagnostics we used for establishing DP status. Indeed, in *pao vouna* 'I-go mountains' the postverbal noun phrase cannot serve as the antecedent for a pronoun in subsequent discourse; but on a par with this, non-P-drop, simple transitive *exerevno vouna* 'I-explore mountains' also fails to support anaphora. So this does not say anything about P-drop specifically; if indeed there is something to be said here about the relationship between bare NP status and broadening of extensivity, this tells us something about the distribution of bare-NP complements in MG, which is a topic beyond the scope of this paper. Suffice it to say here that we have confined our attention, throughout, to P-drop cases which do *not* show the kind of broadening of extensivity that Baliouli & Psaltou-Joycey (1994) discuss, and for which there is good evidence that we are dealing with a full-fledged DP in the complement of null P.

21 That Case checking 'from within' is possible under specific circumstances shows that the obligatoriness of *of* in *destruction* \*(*of*) DP is not Case-based: *of* is needed here independently of Case, to link *destruction* to its argument (cf. *idiot of a doctor*, and the analysis thereof developed in Den Dikken 2006a).

## References

- Alexiadou, A. & E. Anagnostopoulou. 1998. Parametrizing AGR: Word Order, Verb-movement and EPP checking. *NLLT* 16.
- Alexiadou, A. & M. Stavrou. 2000. Adjective-clitic combinations in the Greek DP. In Gerlach & Grijzenhout (eds), *Clitics in phonology, morphology, and syntax*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Alexiadou, A. & C. Wilder. 1998. Adjectival modification and multiple determiners. In A. Alexiadou & C. Wilder (eds), *Possessors, predicates and movement in the DP*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Baliouli, M. & A. Psaltou-Joycey. 1994. Pame plateia? Hrisi i apousia tou emprothetou arthrou. In *Studies in Greek Linguistics. The Proceedings of the 15<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of the Department of Linguistics*. Faculty of Philosophy, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.
- Campos, H. & M. Stavrou. 2002. Polydefinite constructions in Modern Greek and Aromanian. Ms.
- Chomsky, N. 2004. On phases. Ms., MIT.
- Culicover, P. 1993. Evidence against ECP accounts of the *that-t* effect. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24.
- Dikken, M. den. 1995. *Particles*. Oxford/New York: OUP.
- Dikken, M. den. 2003. On the morphosyntax of *wh*-movement. In C. Boeckx & K. Grohmann (eds), *Multiple wh-fronting*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Dikken, M. den. 2004. On the syntax of locative and directional adpositional phrases. Ms., CUNY Graduate Center.
- Dikken, M. den. 2006a. *Relators and Linkers: The Syntax of Predication, Predicate Inversion, and Copulas*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Dikken, M. den. 2006b. Vacuous movement in focus — On the syntax of highest-subject *wh*-questions and relative clauses. Paper presented at GLOW 29, Barcelona; ms., CUNY Graduate Center.
- Hale, K. & S.J. Keyser. 1993. On argument structure and the lexical expression of syntactic relations. In K. Hale & S.J. Keyser (eds), *The view from Building 20*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kariaeva, N. 2004. Agreement and locality. Ms., Rutgers University.
- Kayne, R. 2000. *Here and there*. In *Syntax, lexis and lexicon-grammar: Papers in honor of Maurice Gross*. Benjamins.
- Leu, T. 2006. From Greek to Germanic: The structure of adjectival modification. Paper presented at GLOW 29, Barcelona.
- Longobardi, G. 2001. Formal syntax, diachronic minimalism, and etymology: The history of French *chez*. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32:2.
- Pereltsvaig, A. 2006. LBE ≠ E: Split phrases in colloquial Russian. Paper presented at FASL 15, Toronto.
- Pesetsky, D. & E. Torrego. 2001. T-to-C movement: Causes and consequences. In M. Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: A life in language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Postal, P. 1966. On so-called 'pronouns' in English. In F. Dinneen (ed.), *19<sup>th</sup> monograph on languages and linguistics*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press; reprinted in D. Reibel & S. Schane (eds), *Modern studies in English*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1969.
- Szabolcsi, A. 1994. The noun phrase. In F. Kiefer & K. É. Kiss (eds), *The syntax of Hungarian. Syntax and Semantics* 27. New York: Academic Press.
- Triantafyllidis, M. 1991. *Neoelliniki grammatiki*. OEDB.
- Tomic, O. to appear. *Balkan Sprachbund morphosyntactic features*. Dordrecht: Springer.