

# Anti-Locality in the Nominal Domain

Grohmann, K. K.

University of Cyprus  
kleanthi@ucy.ac.cy

Department of English Studies, P.O. Box 20537, 1678 Nicosia, Cyprus

Panagiotidis, P.

Cyprus College  
panagiotidis@cycollege.ac.cy

Department of Humanities, P.O. Box 22006, 1516 Nicosia, Cyprus

## Abstract

The structure of demonstrative expressions in Modern Greek serves as our looking glass into the broader structure of the nominal domain. Concentrating on the different positions of demonstratives and the obligatory co-occurrence of the definite article (“demonstrative doubling”), the proposal integrates issues of anti-locality into the nominal domain, where apparent articles doubling the demonstrative are analyzed as the spelled out copy of an otherwise illicitly moved demonstrative.

## 1 Introduction

Many languages show a great deal of variation in their nominal system regarding ordering relations among nouns, adjectives, determiners, and so on. We focus on the Modern Greek (henceforth, Greek) DP and examine in particular the different positions demonstratives can occupy. The basic contrast under investigation will be the one exemplified by the a- and b-example in (1), where the demonstrative *afta* ‘these’ (which can fully agree for number, gender, and Case) may occur DP-initially (preceding everything else) or -medially (between adjective and noun), in each case “doubled” by an apparent determiner in the guise of the definite article (abbreviated as *ART* for reasons that will become apparent):

- (1) a.    afta                    ta                    nea                    fenomena  
      b.    ta                    nea                    afta                    fenomena  
          *ART.NOM.PL.NEUT new.NOM.PL.NEUT this.NOM.PL.NEUT phenomenon.NOM.PL.NEUT*  
          ‘these new phenomena’

The main issues of interest for our study are the following:

- (I1)    the connection between demonstratives and articles (within the Greek DP)  
(I2)    (anti-)locality restrictions on their positions and/or DP-internal operations

We will construe a novel connection between demonstrative elements (both overt demonstrative pronoun and covert/phonetically empty demonstrative operator) and apparent definite articles (which we will refer to as doubling the demonstrative). This connection is established from the mechanisms and operations involved in the derivation of complex nominal expressions (DPs). Our language of investigation will be Greek, but the proposal can, and possibly must, be extended to other languages — at least those that also exhibit such doubling strategies. We will sketch the beginnings of a cross-linguistic investigation towards the end of the paper. In a nutshell, the novel connection concerns a derivational insertion of the determiner (apparent article) as the result of an anti-local configuration of the demonstrative (operator) in the course of the derivation and is couched within the *Anti-Locality Hypothesis* developed recently by Grohmann (2003). As such, this study constitutes a further application of the model originally proposed for clausal syntax to the nominal domain and by so doing (i) corroborates the claim that the Anti-Locality Hypothesis is a more general condition on the computational system of human language ( $C_{HL}$ ) and (ii) further supports the *Clausal DP-Hypothesis* (since Abney, 1987) that considers the structure and derivation of DP as the nominal equivalent of the structures and derivations found within clausal syntax.

## 2 Demonstrative Doubling

Nominal expressions in Greek have the general surface structure  $[_{DP} D > A > N > DP_{GEN}]$ . All nominal elements agree for  $[-]$ -features (gender, number) and Case (cf. (1)). We argue that the Greek DP makes heavy use of nominal positions to the left of the noun. The co-occurrence of demonstrative, whether DP-initial or post-adjectival, and article is initially explained along the lines of Panagiotidis (2000).

First, it has to be noted that in Greek, the doubling of the demonstrative through the apparent article is obligatory, as (2a) shows. Here we find some variation among languages, with the two main patterns illustrated in (3) and (4). Second, the demonstrative element obligatorily precedes the article when the two are adjacent, as shown for Greek in (2b).

- (2) a. \* afta (nea) fenomena  
*these new phenomena*  
 b. \* ta afta (nea) fenomena  
*ART these new phenomena*  
 ‘these new phenomena’
- (3) a. ce (\*le) phénomène *French*  
 b. dieses (\*das) Phänomen *German*  
 c. this (\*the) phenomenon *English*
- (4) a. ovoj moj-ov ostrov *Macedonian*  
*this my-ART island*  
 ‘this island of mine’  
 b. teatru-l acesta frumos *Romanian*  
*theater-ART this nice*  
 ‘this nice theater’  
 c. an fear so *Irish Gaelic*  
*ART man this*  
 ‘this man’

As Panagiotidis shows, the structure in (1a) above is the result of the demonstrative raising to the nominal left periphery in order to give the DP a deictic interpretation (5); when failing to do so, a locally generated covert operator *OP* takes its place (6), resulting in an anaphoric reading for the DP.

- (5) afta ta nea ~~afta~~ fenomena  
*these ART new phenomena*
- (6) *OP* ta nea afta fenomena  
*ART new these phenomena*

Panagiotidis adopts the basic analysis of two demonstrative positions related through movement (high occurrence as the result of moving from a lower position), but throws up the question why the demonstrative *may* move. For starters, call the two observed occurrences of the demonstrative as exemplified by (1a) and (1b)  $DEM_{HI}$  and  $DEM_{LO}$ , respectively. His answer is that  $DEM_{HI}$  receives a *deictic interpretation* (which we take to be encoded in the nominal left periphery, as one would expect if the Clausal DP-Hypothesis, presented in section 3.2, holds).  $DEM_{LO}$ , on the other hand, is restricted to a *discourse-anaphoric function* (where *OP* is hence an anaphoric demonstrative operator).

However, Panagiotidis’ analysis invokes two additional ingredients, a “Demonstrative-Criterion” and a “demonstrative article.” The Demonstrative-Criterion as formulated by Panagiotidis (cf. Campbell, 1996) requires a Spec-head relation between two demonstrative features: a demonstrative head (determiner) must correspond to a demonstrative specifier (operator). Regarding the demonstrative article, it would then constitute a third type of determiner next to the regular definite article and an expletive use of the article (originally proposed in Roussou and Tsimpli, 1994). We will argue against both additional ingredients on principled grounds, which will perspire directly from our presentation of the Anti-Locality Hypothesis in section 3 and our (proposal and) discussion of the nature of the article in section 4.

### 3 The Framework

The Anti-Locality Hypothesis is an attempt to capture the intuition that licit movement must not only be restricted in terms of an upper bound, but also of a lower bound: movement must cross a minimum distance in order to be well formed. The relevant metric for measuring distance is expressed in terms of derivational sub-components, so-called Prolific Domains, which span information-relevant related projections. Grohmann (2003) identifies the classic tripartition of clause structure, [Comp [Infl [VP ]]] of Chomsky (1986) and much subsequent work, as the three Prolific Domains at the clausal level:

- (□□) the *Thematic or □-Domain* (basically VP-shells expressed in terms of  $vP$  and VP);
- (□□) the *Agreement- or □-Domain* (split Infl: hosting IP/TP, various types of AgrP etc.);
- (□□) the *Discourse- or □-Domain* (split Comp: topics, foci, operators, and other elements).

The “information-relevant related projections” follow from contextual information (as relevant for anti-locality) encoded in all lexical and functional heads that build up a derivation. In order to capture this in structural terms, we introduce the notion of a *Prolific Domain* (simplified from Grohmann 2003):

- (7) *Prolific Domain*  
A Prolific Domain is a contextually defined part of the computational system, which (i) provides the interfaces with the information relevant to the context and (ii) consists of internal structure.

Following earlier conceptions of the clause (Chomsky 1986) and current research on the finer structure of these projections (Cinque 1999), a natural implementation of contextual information would be a clausal tripartition, a formal split of the clause into three Prolific Domains as sketched above (cf. Platzack 2001 for a related proposal). We adopt a dynamic approach to  $C_{HL}$ , which allows Spell Out to apply more than once (Uriagereka, 1999; Chomsky, 2000). Each Prolific Domain forms a part of the derivation where Spell Out applies and the information gets shipped to the PF- and LF-interfaces. One minimalist criterion that all conditions, operations, and principles must abide by is that they follow from Bare Output Conditions (Chomsky 1995). With the abolishment of the GB-levels of D- and S-structure, many of the standard conditions do not follow from bare output conditions. The single condition in (8) does, and consequences of this condition will be relevant for our proposal (see Grohmann, this volume for more):

- (8) *Condition on Domain Exclusivity (Grohmann 2003: 78)*  
For a given Prolific Domain □□, an object O in the phrase-marker must receive an exclusive interpretation at the interfaces, unless duplicity of O yields a drastic effect on the output of □□.

One important prediction of the CDE is that if a dependency between two XPs within a given Prolific Domain involves two different PF-matrices (the phonological shape of a linguistic expression), the dependency should be well-formed. An interesting and reasonably clear-cut instance of this is left dislocation, where the left-dislocated constituent and the resumptive pronoun are in the same Prolific Domain, the □-Domain (Grohmann, 2003, this volume). The obvious analysis made possible by the Anti-Locality Hypothesis and the CDE is to derive contrastive left dislocation in terms of a (movement) dependency between the left-dislocated phrase and the resumptive: this movement can be understood as the result of Copy Spell Out, changing the PF-matrix of the lower of the two copies that are in the same Prolific Domain. We will illustrate and apply this approach to demonstrative doubling in the next section.

Since Abney (1987), the *Clausal DP-Hypothesis* (in a nutshell, the hypothesis that the nominal layer displays the same structure as the clausal layer) has received considerable attention. Adopting standard assumptions, if  $vP/VP$  and its nominal counterpart  $nP/NP$  denote the domain of thematic relations, AgrP/NumP of agreement properties, and CP/DP of discourse information (all as understood throughout), a first approximation would thus be to assign the same Prolific Domains to clausal and nominal layers. Such a tripartite composition of DP (the nominal layer) is in principle widely employed, and as such suggests that we would find the same Prolific Domains listed above here as well, just as with the tripartite composition of CP (the clausal layer). And just as these functional projections have been finer articulated in the clausal layer, so have they in the nominal layer (Bernstein 2001). Now that we can conceptually motivate Prolific Domains in the nominal layer, let us see whether we can empirically support them the same way we’ve done with the clause, i.e. in terms of the CDE applied to Greek demonstrative DPs.





