

In support of a DP-Analysis of Nominal Phrases in Croatian

Beginning with Abney's (1987) DP-Hypothesis, many linguists have provided empirical evidence for the presence of a DP in various languages. While the head of a DP is occupied by articles in languages that overtly employ them, the focus of recent discussions on languages without articles (such as Russian, Polish, Serbian and Croatian) is whether there is a DP on top of NP in these languages. The different proposals range from an elaborated DP structure (cf. Progovac 1998, Dimitrova-Vulchanova and Giusti 1998, Leko 1999, Rutkowski 2002, Bašić 2004, Pereltsvaig 2007) to the complete omission of the DP layer in favour of a simple NP analysis (Zlatić 1998, Trenkić 2004, Bošković 2005, 2008, 2009).

This paper argues for a DP-analysis of nominal expressions in Croatian. I will be critically reviewing the main arguments that have been brought in favour of an NP analysis (optionality of determiners, unavailability of a DP-head, adjectival nature of determiners) and will show that they are inconclusive. Instead I will show that Croatian nominal expressions do indeed host a D head. This is contrary to the NP approach in Corver (1992), Zlatić (1998) and Bošković (2005, 2008, 2009), who take determiners to appear either as specifiers of the noun or in a position adjoined to NP. It is also contrary to the DP approach in Progovac (1998) and Leko (1999), who propose that determiners appear in the specifier position of various functional categories projected above NP. Following Beavers (2003), who puts forward the hypothesis that all noun phrases have both D- and N-semantics, I will show that this claim also holds for Croatian nominal expressions in spite of the fact that nouns predominantly appear bare (articleless).

1. Optionality of determiners. Zlatić (1998) claims that the presence of a demonstrative determiner in some contexts is not evidence for the presence of a DP in Croatian, since the determiner can be omitted without influencing the grammaticality of the sentence (1a). However, the presence of the determiner in (1a) has effects on interpretation which, in contexts like (1b), lead to ungrammaticality. Assuming that demonstrative determiners in Croatian cover a subpart of the reference domain of definite articles (Mišeska-Tomić 1974, Djordjević 1989), I claim that the adverbial clause in (1b) creates a particular referential context which makes the demonstrative determiner obligatory.

(1) a. (**Onaj**) student voli Mariju.

that student loves Mary

b. *(**Onaj**) razgovor sa svećenikom, dok je još bio dijete, pretvorio se u sjećanje.

That conversation with priest, while is still been child, turned itself into memory.

“The conversation with the priest, when he was still a child, came to be a mere memory.”

To accommodate the nominal configuration in (1b), we obviously need a functional structure above the NP. In what follows I suggest that *onaj* in (1) is a D head, despite previous approaches that claim that it behaves like an adjective and therefore has no head properties.

2. Reanalysis of Zwicky's *Headedness' Tests*. Zlatić (1998) uses Zwicky's (1985) “Headedness-Tests” (morphosyntactic locus, concord determinant, obligatory constituent, distributional equivalent, semantic argument, etc.) to show that nominal expressions like (1a) are headed by a noun and not by a determiner. However, this claim is highly problematic when subjected to each of the tests mentioned above. I will here illustrate the *morphosyntactic locus* test. Zlatić claims that the noun must be the only head in (1a), since it carries the phi-features (gender, number) of the nominal. However, determiners have been shown to carry phi-features as well (Newson 2006) and this can also be illustrated for Croatian in (2), where determiners impose strict restrictions on the selected noun:

(2) a. **svi** odgovor-**i** / ***svi** odgovor

all answer-PI / *all answer

b. **svaki** recept / ***svaki** recept-**i**

each prescription / *each prescription-PI

My investigation of quantifiers and numerals will show that they display head properties and accordingly must occupy the head position of their own functional projection. For example, in

(3), the quantifier *mnogo* (*many*) assigns genitive case to the noun *knjiga* (*books*), which itself obligatorily carries a [+plural] grammatical feature:

(3) *mnogo knjiga*

many books-PL.GEN.

In order to function as a case assigner, the quantifier *mnogo* (*many*) must govern the noun *knjiga* (*books*). By definition, governors are heads within the GB framework.

3. Determiners are a non-adjectival category. Zlatić (1998) and Bošković (2005, 2008, 2009) claim that determiners in Croatian have the same category as adjectives. I will here provide a range of arguments for the view that determiners and adjectives are distinct categories with different morphological and syntactic properties (see Frleta 2005). For instance, the morphological process of derivation is not productive with determiners:

(4) a. *crven* → *crvenkast* → *zacrvenjen* b. *ovaj* / **ovajkast* / **zaovajjen*”
red → reddish → red-hot this / **thisish*

4. Functional structure above NP. NP approaches to Slavic accommodate adjectives and determiners within the NP. I will show that functional structure above the NP is needed and that Bošković’s (2005) NP-over-AdjP analysis of adjectival modifiers (where determiners occupy either a position adjoined to NP or [Spec,NP]) cannot be maintained. Linde-Usiekniewicz and Rutkowski (2007) argue that the split-reading of premodified coordinated nominals in Polish (in the sense of Heycock and Zamparelli 2005) cannot be accounted for if adjectives have an NP-internal position. The same holds for Croatian. In addition, the use of infrequency adjectives in Croatian, as compared to other DP-languages (Alexiadou & Campanini 2010), provides further arguments for the presence of an elaborated functional structure above NP.

5. Genitive constructions. In order to support the view that nominal expressions in languages with and without articles are fundamentally different, Bošković (2008, 2009) claims that the latter do not allow transitive nominals with two nominal genitive arguments. According to him, complex nominal constructions comparable to German (5a) are not possible in Croatian.

(5) a. *Hannibals Eroberung Roms* b. *Kolumbovo otkriće Amerike*
Hannibal-GEN conquest Rome-GEN *Columbus-POSS.GEN discovery America-GEN*

However, Croatian data in (5b) provide a direct counterevidence to his generalisation. Moreover, the analysis of adnominal genitive constructions and complex nominals in Croatian, as put forward by Kuna (2003), provides evidence for the existence of functional projections above NP and of the DP-internal NP-movement. In addition, following Alexiadou et al. (2007), I propose a more fine-grained structural configuration of nominal expressions in Croatian.

(Selective) References: Alexiadou, Haegeman & Stavrou. 2007. Noun phrase in the generative perspective. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. Alexiadou & Campanini. 2010. On the adverbial reading of infrequency adjectives and the structure of DP. Proceedings of CGSW 24. Beavers. 2003. More heads and less categories: a new look at noun phrase structure. Proceedings of HPSG2003. Bošković. 2005. On the locality of left branch extraction and the structure of NP. *Studia Linguistica* 59. Bošković. 2008. What will you have, DP or NP? Proceedings of NELS 37. Frleta. 2005. Razlika između determinanta i opisnog pridjeva. *Suvremena lingvistika*, Vol. 59-60. Kuna. 2003. NP-pomicanje i posvojni genitiv. In: *Jezikoslovlje* 4.2 (2003). Newson et al. (2006). *Basic English Syntax with Exercises*. Budapest: Bölcsész Konzorcium. Linde-Usiekniewicz & Rutkowski 2007. NP coordination as a new argument in the debate on the DP-analysis of Polish. LSO Working Papers in Linguistics, vol.6: Proceedings of WIGL 2006, Rodgers (ed.), University of Wisconsin-Madison. Zlatić. 1998. Slavic Noun Phrases are NPs not DPs. Workshop on Comparative Slavic Morphosyntax, Bloomington, Indiana. Zwicky. 1985. Heads. *Journal of Linguistics* 21.