Introduction

This talk will explore the relationship between general properties of a language’s noun phrases and the syntactic category of its pronouns.

First: Cross-linguistic variation in pronominal syntax can be explained in terms of the syntactic category differences.

Next: Bošković (2008) suggests that pronominal category depends solely on the presence or absence of articles in the language.

Then: There is counterevidence to this claim; Chierchia’s (1998) Nominal Mapping Parameter (NMP) provides a better summary of the situation.

Finally: Unanswered questions remain.

Modification of Pronouns I

- In some languages, pronouns can be modified by attributive adjectives, genitive noun phrases, demonstratives, etc., while in others they cannot.

- **Japanese** pronouns can be modified:

  (1) a. ookii **kare**
      big he
      ‘big he (or, he who is big)’
  b. **kyou-no kare-no hou-ga kinou-no today-GEN he-GEN way-NOM yesterdayGEN**
     **kare** yori atamagaii desu.
     **he** than smart is
     ‘Today’s he is smarter than yesterday’s him (or, he is smarter today than yesterday).’

Modification of Pronouns II

- **English** pronouns cannot be modified:

  (2) a. *Big **he** bought pizza.*
  b. *Today’s **he** is smarter than yesterday’s **him**.*
Modification of Pronouns Explained

- These DP-internal modifiers can only attach to units smaller than the full DP.
- Bošković (2008) takes this analysis further to predict that pronouns are NPs in all article-less languages, and DPs in all languages with articles.

Bošković’s (2008) Prediction I

- At first glance, this prediction holds.
- **Mandarin** has no articles, and pro-NP:
  \(\text{(3)}\) Nian qing de wo bu hui kai che. young PRT 1SG not.know how drive ‘(lit.) Young me didn’t know how to drive.’
- Same with **Korean**:
  \(\text{(4)}\) Onul-uy ku-ka ecey-uy ku-pota te today-GEN he-NOM yesterday-GEN he-than more hyenmyengha-ta. smart-DECL ‘Today’s he is smarter than yesterday’s him.’

Bošković’s (2008) Prediction II

- It even explains contrasts within the South Slavic language family.
- **Serbo-Croatian** has no articles, and pro-NP (Runić 2011, p. 39):
  \(\text{(5)}\) Jesi li ga vidio juče? Jesam, ali je are Q him.Cl.Acc seen yesterday Am but is jučerašnji on baš nekako bio čudan. yesterday’s he really somehow been strange ‘Did you see him yesterday? I did, but yesterday’s he was really somehow strange.’

Bošković’s (2008) Prediction III

- **Bulgarian** has articles, and pro-DP (Runić 2011, p. 40):
  \(\text{(6)}\) *Toj je interesen vseki den, no včerašnijat toj he is interesting every day but yesterday’s he beše mnogo po-interesen nego was much more-interesting than onjadenšnijat toj. the.day.before.yesterday’s he ‘He is interesting every day but yesterday’s he was much more interesting than the day before yesterday’s he.’
Breaking the Prediction I

- However, contrary to Bošković’s (2008) prediction, there are article-less languages which have pro-DP, rather than pro-NP.
- **Polish** is an example:

(7) Ola dała zabawki (*malutkiem)
    Ola.NOM gave.FEM toy.ACC (little.DAT.MASC)
    jemu.
    him.DAT
    ‘Ola gave (*little) him a toy.’

Breaking the Prediction II

- **Turkish** is another example:

(8) *Küçük o pizza yedi.
    small 3SG pizza eat-PAST
    ‘(intended lit.) Young he ate pizza.’

- **Finnish** is as well:

(9) *Hän on viisas joka päivä mutta eilen
    he is smart every day but yesterday.GEN
    hän oli viisaampi kuin tänänpäivän hän.
    s/he was smarter than today.GEN s/he
    ‘He is smart every day but yesterday’s s/he was smarter than today’s s/he.’

Summary

- Some languages have pro-NP, some have pro-DP.
- There is a correlation between the presence/absence of articles and the category of pronouns, but it is not a perfect correlation:
  - All languages with articles have pro-DP (to the best of my knowledge);
  - Many article-less languages have pro-NP (Japanese, Mandarin, Korean, Serbo-Croatian);
  - However, there are article-less languages that also have pro-DP, not pro-NP (Polish, Turkish, Finnish).
- The last class of languages form a natural class in terms of Chierchia’s (1998) Nominal Mapping Parameter.

The Nominal Mapping Parameter

- Chierchia (1998): In terms of the interpretation of NPs, languages fall into three classes:
  1. All NPs need some determiner to be an argument;
  2. No NPs need a determiner to be an argument;
  3. Certain NPs need a determiner, but not all.
- NPs which require a determiner are mapped onto predicates.
- NPs which require no determiner are mapped onto arguments.
- The mapping of NPs in a particular language is determined by the Nominal Mapping Parameter (NMP), a macroparameter.
The Nominal Mapping Parameter: Features

- This parameter is a combination of two features, [+arg] and [-pred].
- In [+arg] languages, NPs may be mapped onto arguments. In the lexicon, the operator “∪” must apply, turning them from properties into kinds.
  - Since kinds have a mass (not count) denotation, they may not be pluralized.
- In [-pred] languages, NPs may be mapped onto predicates. They require an article in order to appear as arguments in a sentence. (Articles may be covert.)
  - Since predicates/properties may have either a mass or count denotation, depending on the noun, many predicative NPs may be pluralized.

Typology of Parameter Settings

- [+arg,–pred]: All NPs appear as an argument without a determiner. All nouns are mass nouns, requiring a classifier to be counted.
  - Bare arguments (no articles), no plural morpheme.
  - Ex. Chinese, Japanese
- [–arg,+pred]: All argument NPs must have determiners. Mass and count nouns are permitted.
  - No bare arguments (except in very restricted cases), plural morpheme present.
  - Ex. French, Italian
- [+arg,+pred]: These languages require determiners for all singular NPs, but allow bare plural and mass NPs.
  - Bare plurals and mass nouns, plural morphemes.
  - Ex. English, Russian, Turkish (the latter two languages lack the definite article)

Type-shifting as Last Resort

- Chierchia only allows type-shifting as a last resort: A type-shifter (like the $\iota$-operator) may apply only if the equivalent determiner is absent.
- There could be [+arg,+pred] languages (like English) which happen to lack articles.
  - Slavic article-less languages are an example
  - As are Turkish and Finnish.
  - Any article-less languages with plural marking and no classifiers are as well.
- In these languages, mass nouns and plurals work the same way as in English, but singular bare count nouns may be either definite (due to $\iota$) or indefinite (due to $\exists$).

Back to Pronouns

- Combining the NMP typology with the presence/absence of articles gives four different categories into which languages can fall:
  1. [+arg,–pred], no articles: pro-NP (East Asian languages)
  2. [–arg,+pred], articles: pro-DP (Romance languages)
  3. [+arg,+pred], articles: pro-DP (Germanic languages incl. English, and Slavic DP languages, incl. Bulgarian)
  4. [+arg,+pred], no articles: pro-NP (Serbo-Croatian) OR pro-DP (Polish, Turkish, Finnish)
- The fact that the correlation holds without exception for the first three categories suggests that pronominal category is intimately tied to these other properties of the noun phrase.
- However, the fourth category is problematic: What distinguishes Serbo-Croatian from these other languages that accounts for this difference in pronominal category?
Possibilities I

▶ Finnish and Turkish both have article-like elements used for specificity (rather than definiteness); perhaps the presence of specificity markers is another factor correlated with pro-DP. However, I have not yet looked for such markers in the other [+arg,+pred] languages.
▶ Many creoles also have such specificity-marking “articles” (Holm and Patrick 2007); I intend to find out whether they also have DP pronouns.

Possibilities II

▶ Since Serbo-Croatian (pro-NP) is so closely related to Polish (pro-DP) and Russian (also pro-DP; Andrew McKishnie, p.c.), any differences between the former and the latter two are potentially the crucial distinguishing factors.
▶ Franks (1995) notes differences in case assignment into quantified NPs, with Russian and Polish showing one pattern and Serbo-Croatian showing another.
▶ However, I have not yet determined whether this difference is due to some relevant property, or if it is an unrelated phenomenon.
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