

Thus, we will suggest that an analysis like Postal's, under which the noun is the head and the pronoun a determiner, is correct.

Having established that the nouns are not appositive modifiers in these phrases, we will argue that we do not have to accept, as a consequence, Postal's proposal that the pronominal determiners are base-generated like other determiners, because the analysis does not offer an account for the singular and plural asymmetry. Indeed, under minimalism, we assume that the pronoun and the noun form a small clause (SC) with DP, following den Dikken (1998):

(8) [DP D [NumP [SC pronoun [Pred noun]]]

We propose that the NumP head moves to D (like T to C in a sentence), whose amalgamated head Agrees with the pronoun in subject position in (8). Taking our cue from the fact that English singular count nouns require an overt determiner (*(a/the) *linguist*) while plurals do not ((*the*) *linguists*), we submit that the singular Num-head possesses an EPP property while the plural Num-head lacks this property. This EPP property will force overt lexicalization of Num in singular noun phrases. In the structure in (8), lexicalization of Num via raising of the pronoun in SC-subject position to Num is blocked, however, by a familiar condition on Move – the Left Branch Condition (LBC). Raising of the predicative noun to SC-external Num is likewise impossible, Num and this N being separated by a phase boundary (SC is propositional, hence a phase). Nothing may raise to Num in (8) to satisfy Num's EPP property in singular pronoun-noun constructions, therefore – which explains the ungrammaticality of the right-hand examples in (1) as violations of the EPP. (In the corresponding plural examples in the left-hand column, Num straightforwardly checks its features under Agree against the SC-subject, which is on the edge of the SC-phase, and no EPP issue arises: plural Num lacks the EPP property by hypothesis.) Insertion of a lexical definite determiner under D+Num does not help satisfy Num's EPP property either: the determiner *the* is assumed to be an expletive, hence needs to be replaced via covert *movement* of its associate (the pronoun); but movement of the pronoun (whether overt or covert) is blocked by the LBC. The ungrammaticality of **the he linguist* and of **the them linguists* is thereby ensured; that of **a/another you linguist* (cf. *There will never be another you*) can be made to follow from the mismatch of formal features borne by the indefinite determiner *a* and the pronoun.

To summarize, although Postal's determiner analysis is overall correct, the analysis calls for some modification. We recaptured the data within a minimalist approach incorporating both Agree and Move, and argued that an Agree relation is not sufficient. In particular, we proposed that move is a necessary syntactic operation. If this analysis is on the right track, the parallel (un)grammaticality of pronoun-noun same constructions in Japanese and English then leads to the conclusion that Japanese pronoun-noun structures are similar to those of English, and that, hence, Japanese noun phrases structurally project a DP (even though Japanese lacks articles; cf. Cheng & Sybesma 1999 for Chinese).

Selected Reference

- Delorme, Evelyne & Dougherty, Ray. (1972). An appositive NP constructions. In *Foundations of language* 8:2-29
- Den Dikken, Marcel. (1998). Predicate inversion in DP. In Artemis Alexiadou & Chris Wilder (eds), *Possessors, predicates, and movement in the DP*, 177-214. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Pesetsky, David. (1978). Category switching and so-called pronouns. In *Chicago Linguistic Society* 14, 350-61.
- Postal, Paul. (1969). On so-called 'pronouns in English. In *Modern studies in English*, ed. by Reibel, D. and Schane, S.A. 201-24. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.