Introduction

MICHAEL BARRIE

Sogang University, Seoul, South Korea

mikebarrie@sogang.ac.kr

SIHUN JUNG

University of California, San Diego, CA, USA

sihunjung@ucsd.edu

and

MOONHYUN SUNG

Korea Army Academy, Yeongcheon, South Korea

mhsung93@gmail.com

1. NOMINALS AT THE INTERFACES

Since the appearance of Abney's (1987) seminal dissertation, the study of nominals has expanded dramatically (Ritter 1991, 1992, 1993; Valois 1991; Li 1999; Ghomeshi 2003; Bošković 2005; Cheng and Sybesma 2012; Piriyawiboon 2011). The extended nominal projection has been compared with the extended verbal projection, with suggestions of strict parallelism between the two (Ogawa 2001, Megerdoomian 2008), along with a proliferation of functional projections (nP, NumP, ClP, PossP, DP, KP, among others). The study of nominal structure impinges on our understanding of noun incorporation (Baker 1988, van Geenhoven 1998, Massam 2001), semantics (Chierchia 1998), phases (Newell 2008), and prosody (Clemens 2014). The study of how nominals fit into the clausal spine impacts our understanding of case (Massam 2005, Diercks 2012) and argument structure (Rosen 1989, Mithun and Corbett 1999, Chung and Ladusaw 2004). The questions this special issue addresses include but are not limited to the following:

- What functional projections are found in the extended nominal projection? Is the functional hierarchy universal (Cinque 2010), language-specific, or is its variation constrained in some way (Wiltschko 2014)?

- What kinds of reduced nominal expressions are found in natural language? Bare NPs? Bare NumPs? Cl+N expressions without numerals? Caseless nouns? How does this inventory of reduced nominals inform us about, and relate to noun incorporation and pseudo noun incorporation?

- What is the phase structure of nominals? What is the evidence for DP phases (Svenonius 2004)? Is there an internal *n*P phase corresponding to *v*P (Marantz 2001, Newell 2008)?
- What are the prosodic properties of nominals and reduced nominals (Dyck 2009, Clemens 2014, Richards 2017)?
- What are the semantic properties of nominals and reduced nominals? Is there a strict correlation between the size of the nominal and its semantic properties (Dayal 2011, 2015)? Do incorporated nouns and pseudo incorporated nouns have a uniform semantics (van Geenhoven 1998) or not (Dayal 2015)?

2. ARTICLE SUMMARIES

The four papers contained in this volume address these and other questions related to nominals and the behaviour of nominals at the interfaces. These papers are a sample of presentations from the *Nominals at the Interfaces* workshop at Sogang University in November of 2018.

2.1 Deriving four generalizations about nominals in three classifier languages

Phan, Trinh, and Phan's paper examines the syntactic and semantic properties of number and nouns in three East Asian classifier languages: Mandarin, Vietnamese, and Bahnar (bdq), the latter being an Austroasiatic language.

They discuss a number of micro-parametric studies of number-marking languages and further note that micro-parametric variation among classifier languages is comparatively under-represented. It is with this background in mind that they present their observations. They note that:

- DEM can combine directly with CL + N (without a numeral) in Mandarin and Vietnamese, but not in Bahnar.
- A bare CL + N can be an argument in Vietnamese, but not in Mandarin and Bahnar.
- A bare NUM + CL + N can be definite in Bahnar and Vietnamese, but not in Mandarin.
- A bare NP can be definite in Bahnar and Mandarin, but not in Vietnamese.

Their analysis is very much along the lines of Chierchia (1998), taking the following lexical entries as a departure, where 'dog' represents the phonological form for dog in Bahnar, Vietnamese, or Mandarin:

(1)   a. $[\![\text{dog}]\!]^w = \lambda x.$ x is a singular dog = {a, b, c}

      b. $[\![\text{dog'}]\!]^w = \lambda x.$ x is a singular dog or a plurality of dogs = {a, b, c, a⊕b, a⊕c, b⊕c, a⊕b⊕c}

Phan *et al.* then lead us through an array of sophisticated semantic definitions for numerals and classifiers. They capture the differences among the three languages above by positing that numerals and classifiers can combine differently in different languages. In some languages, the classifier combines with the noun, and then this complex combines with the numeral. In other languages the numeral and the classifier combine first, and then this complex combines

with the noun.[1] The other ingredients in their analysis are a null THE (similar to English *the*, and reminiscent of Paul's 2016 analysis of Malagasy) and a null KIND. The authors then account for the four observations above on these three languages with the machinery in (1).

2.2 Oblique differential object marking, nominal structure and licensing strategies

Irimia examines differential object marking (DOM) in Spanish, Romanian, Gujarati and Mandarin Chinese. Her study investigates the difference between DOM and pseudo-incorporation and the different licensing conditions for nominals of different sizes. The key finding of her work is that DOM requires a licensing condition in addition to Case. Specifically, DOM interacts with a sentience feature on K.

She first investigates Spanish, a language with a wealth of studies on DOM and challenges the notion that DOM-less nominals are necessarily pseudo-incorporated (Ormazabal and Romero 2013). Instead, she shows that López (2012)'s Case-licensing proposal is more promising. The two approaches are summarized below.

(2) a. A nominal that lacks DOM necessarily undergoes PNI.

  b. A nominal that lacks DOM is still Case-licensed, but in a different way from DOM nominals.

She presents data from Romanian that show a clear contrast between PNI nominals and DOM-less nominals. Unlike the PNI nominals, the DOM-less nominals act as though they require Case-licensing. Her key analysis, then, rests on the following proposals.

(3) a. DOM-less nominals are DPs. D requires Case.

  b. DOM nominals are KPs. K is licensed by a sentience requirement (discussed below).

  c. PNI nominals are either bare NPs or bare NumPs.

Since D is the locus of Case assignment, both DOM-less and DOM nominals require Case. DOM nominals are further licensed by a sentience requirement on K. K, as a funtional projection high in the extended nominal projection, is responsible for sentience, perspective, interaction between speech act participants and the like, along the lines of Speas and Tenny (2003) and Ritter and Wiltschko (2019). The sentience feature on K is checked by a functional projection in the *v*P layer. PNI nominals, lacking a D head, do not receive Case and are licensed in a different way. There are many proposals on the table for how they are licensed, but these are not explored in detail, as PNI is not the object of Irimia's analysis. She then goes on to apply her analysis to Gujarati and to Mandarin Chinese.

The core contribution of Irimia's article is twofold. First, she shows that PNI is distinct from differential object splits. Second, she shows that both DOM and DOM-less nominals are Case marked. DOM nominals, in addition, require "something else" (in Irimia's words) – namely DOM nominals are licensed by a sentience feature.

---

[1]This proposal reminds us of Bale and Coon (2014). How these two works might be brought together invites several intriguing questions.

2.3   Displaced sentential complements to nouns in German

Blümel analyzes a hitherto undocumented construction in German in which clausal complements to a noun can appear in a displaced position external to the DP. Here is the example that he gives to illustrate this phenomenon.

(4) Dass   er   inkompetent   sei,   hat   sie   [die   Behauptung *e*]   gemacht.
      that   he   incompetent   be   had   she   the   claim   made
      'She made the claim that he is incompetent.'

He compares displaced noun complement clauses (NCC) to extraposed PPs, pointing out several similarities between the two constructions. He notes, however, some curious properties of extracted NCCs. In particular, they contravene the Specificity Condition, as they are extracted out of definite DPs. Blümel argues that a more nuanced view of extraction from DPs must be undertaken in light of data such as example (4).

After a discussion of previous work on extraction from nominals, notably Chomsky (1977) and Davies and Dubinsky (2003), Blümel discusses how the German NCC extraction structure fits with (or doesn't fit with) proposals therein. As stated above, he shows that NCC extraction obeys many of the standard constraints on movement, but extraction out of a definite DP is permitted.

Blümel does note that the lack of robust judgments on the data indicate that more delicate methods must be used to investigate this phenomenon further. As such, he states that the preliminary analysis he gives should be taken as tentative. He suggests that the displaced NCC raises to SpecCP by A-bar movement. One line of support for this is that the displaced NCC can undergo long-distance movement in those varieties of German that otherwise allow long-distance A-bar movement. He ends with some suggestive remarks for future research on this topic.

The core contribution of Blümel's article is that it is the first description of the phenomenon of NCC extraction in German, along with a tentative analysis. The broader impact of his contribution is that the properties of extraction from DPs cross-linguistically are more nuanced than previously thought and thus further investigation is required.

2.4   Definiteness in Laki: Its interaction with demonstratives and number

In this article, Taghipour describes double definiteness marking in Laki (lki), an under-described Kurdish language.

(5) māl-a   kalen-a
      house-DEF big-DEF
      'the big house'

Taghipour offers several diagnostics showing that the two definiteness markers in Laki have different properties, concluding that they are not the same morpheme. She compares the Laki facts with similar, well-known facts in Scandinavian, but concludes that the Scandinavian facts are different from those of Laki. Thus, the analysis used to account for Scandinavian cannot be carried over to Laki.

She proposes an elegant analysis in which the observed forms fall out from agreement (or lack thereof) with two distinct features: [*u*N] and [*u*DEF]. She argues that the DP-internal definiteness marker is a reflex of agreement with [*u*DEF] on N, which is triggered by the [*u*N] feature on D. In indefinite DP, this feature remains unvalued and is deleted, following Preminger's (2014) theory of failed agreement.

A discussion of number marking and demonstratives is then undertaken, including a cross-dialectal and cross-linguistic discussion of the intriguing properties of number marking in Indo-Iranian and its interaction with definiteness and anaphoricity. The following paradigm illustrates the pattern in Laki for the reader's reference.

(6) a. sif-al   širin-i
         apple-DEF sweet-INDEF
         'some sweet apples'

     b. sif-a   širin-el-a
         apple-DEF sweet-PL-DEF
         'the sweet apples'

     c. a   māl-a   kalen-ela
         that house-DEF big-PL.DEF
         'those big houses'

Taghipour adopts Ritter's (1992) NumP projection and proposes that Num and D fuse in some environments, ultimately leading to the pattern above. In the final part of her analysis, she proposes that agreement facts between D and N can also account for the facts with anaphoric and deictic determiners.

3. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The four articles contained in this issue cover a tremendous amount of linguistic diversity, including data from Mandarin Chinese, Vietnamese, Bahnar (Austroasiatic), Spanish, Romanian, Gujarati, German, and Laki (Indo-Aryan) along with other Kurdish varieties. In addition, these articles touch on a number of areas in which the study of nominals informs our understanding of the interfaces in linguistics, such as the ever-popular line of inquiry regarding how nominals of different sizes inform our understanding of the syntax-semantics interface. Phan et al. and Irimia address this topic and open further avenues for research in both classifier and DOM/PNI languages. Blümel's article addresses how DP structure interfaces with clausal structure and the lexical semantics of embedding verbs. Finally, Taghipour's article addresses the syntax-semantics interface with regard to Laki number and definiteness marking. It is hoped that the articles in this issue stimulate further exciting research on these and other related topics.

REFERENCES

Abney, Stephen. 1987. The English noun phrase and its sentential aspect. Doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Baker, Mark C. 1988. *Incorporation: A theory of grammatical function changing.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Bale, Alan, and Jessica Coon. 2014. Classifiers are for numerals, not for nouns: Consequences for the mass/count distinction. *Linguistic Inquiry* 45(4): 695–707.

Bošković, Željko. 2005. On the locality of left branch extraction and the structure of NP. *Studia Linguistica* 59(1): 1–45.

Cheng, Lisa Lai-Shen, and Rint Sybesma. 2012. Classifiers and DP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 43(4): 634–650.

Chierchia, Gennaro. 1998. Reference to kinds across languages. *Natural Language Semantics* 6: 339–405.

Chomsky, Noam. 1977. On wh-movement. In *Formal Syntax,* ed. Peter W. Culicover, Thomas Wasow, and Adrian Akmajian, 71–132. New York, NY: Academic Press, Inc.

Chung, Sandra, and William Ladusaw. 2004. *Restriction and saturation.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 2010. *The syntax of adjectives: A comparative study.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Clemens, Lauren Eby. 2014. Prosodic noun incorporation and verb-initial syntax. Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University.

Davies, William D., and Stanley Dubinsky. 2003. On extraction from NPs. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 21(1): 1–37.

Dayal, Veneeta. 2011. Hindi pseudo-incorporation. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 29(1): 123–167.

Dayal, Veneeta. 2015. Incorporation: Morpho-syntactic vs. semantic considerations. *Syntax and Semantics* 40: 47–87.

Diercks, Michael. 2012. Parameterizing case: Evidence from Bantu. *Syntax* 15(3): 253–286.

Dyck, Carrie. 2009. Defining the word in Cayuga (Iroquoian). *International Journal of American Linguistics* 75(4): 571–605.

van Geenhoven, Veerle. 1998. *Semantic incorporation and indefinite descriptions: Semantic and syntactic aspects of noun incorporation in West Greenlandic.* Dissertations in Linguistics. (DiLi). Stanford, CA: Center for the Study of Language and Information.

Ghomeshi, Jila. 2003. Plural marking, indefiniteness, and the noun phrase. *Studia Linguistica* 57(2): 47–74.

Li, Yen-Hui Audrey. 1999. Plurality in a classifier language. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 8(1): 75–99.

López, Luis. 2012. *Indefinite objects: Scrambling, choice functions, and differential marking.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Marantz, Alec. 2001. Words. Paper presented at the 20th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics, University of Southern California.

Massam, Diane. 2001. Pseudo noun incorporation in Niuean. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 19(1): 153–197.

Massam, Diane. 2005. Neither absolutive nor ergative is nominative or accusative: Arguments from Niuean. In *Ergativity: Emerging Issues*, ed. Alana Johns, Diane Massam, and Juvenal Ndayiragije. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Megerdoomian, Karine. 2008. Parallel nominal and verbal projections. In *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory: Essays in Honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud,* ed. Robert Freidin, Carlos P. Otero, and Maria Luisa Zubizarreta, 73–103. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Mithun, Marianne, and Greville G. Corbett. 1999. The effect of noun incorporation on argument structure. In *Boundaries of Morphology and Syntax,* ed. Lunella Mereu, 49–71. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Newell, Heather. 2008. Aspects of the morphology and phonology of phases. Doctoral dissertation, McGill University.

Ogawa, Yoshiki. 2001. *A unified theory of verbal and nominal projections*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ormazabal, Javier, and Juan Romero. 2013. Non accusative objects. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 12: 155–173.

Paul, Ileana. 2016. When bare nouns scope wide: The case of Malagasy. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 34(1): 271–305.

Piriyawiboon, Nattaya. 2011. Classifiers and determiner-less languages: The case of Thai. Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto.

Preminger, Omer. 2014. *Agreement and its failures*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Richards, Norvin. 2017. Some notes on Tagalog prosody and scrambling. *Glossa: a Journal of General Linguistics* 2(1): 21.

Ritter, Elizabeth. 1991. Two functional categories in noun phrases: Evidence from Modern Hebrew. In *Syntax and semantics, Volume 25: Perspective on phrase structure,* ed. Susan Rothstein, 37–62. New York: Academic Press.

Ritter, Elizabeth. 1992. Cross-linguistic evidence for number phrase. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 37(2): 197–218.

Ritter, Elizabeth. 1993. Where's gender? *Linguistic Inquiry* 24(4): 795–803.

Ritter, Elizabeth, and Martina Wiltschko. 2019. Nominal speech act structure: Evidence from the structural deficiency of impersonal pronouns. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics/Revue canadienne de linguistique* 64(4): 709–729.

Rosen, Sara Thomas. 1989. Two types of noun incorporation: A lexical analysis. *Language* 65 (2): 294–317.

Speas, Peggy, and Carol Tenny. 2003. Configurational properties of point of view roles. In *Asymmetry in Grammar, Volume 1: Syntax and Semantics,* ed. Anna-Maria Di Sciullo, Linguistik Aktuell. (LAkt), 315–345. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Svenonius, Peter. 2004. On the edge. In *Peripheries: Syntactic edges and their effects,* ed. David Adger, Cécile De Cat, and George Tsoulas, 259–287. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Valois, Daniel. 1991. *The internal syntax of DP*. Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

Wiltschko, Martina. 2014. *The universal structure of categories: Towards a formal typology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.