

N-to-D movement, hybrid agreement & conventionalized expressions

Benjamin Bruening
University of Delaware

bruening@udel.edu

Bruening (2009), Bruening et al. (2018) argue against the DP Hypothesis. Here I refute two recent defenses of the DP Hypothesis & extend the selection argument against it.

1. Shona. Carstens (2017) shows that the only element that can precede the N in Shona is a demonstrative. She proposes N-to-D movement to capture the fixed position of N: the only things that can precede N are ones that can occupy Spec-DP (demonstratives). However, it is equally simple to stipulate that merge places all elements to the right of N, except demonstratives. Since languages differ in linear order, such language-particular stipulations are unavoidable. Stipulating that N-to-D takes place in Shona is no more explanatory.

2. Agr. In BCS, certain Ns can have both formal & semantic gender & agreement can target either. Once agreement targets semantic gender, it cannot switch back to formal gender for agreement relations that are structurally higher. Salzmänn (2018) argues that this requires the DP Hypothesis: The D head can block agreement with N. A simple analysis is available without the DP Hypothesis: a principle requires that once agreement triggering a presupposition has taken place, all agreement has to be with the features that triggered the presupposition. Semantic agreement triggers a presupposition, formal does not.

3. Idioms. Salzmänn (2018) dismisses the selectional argument against DP in Bruening (2009), claiming there is no evidence that Vs select for Ns. Idioms show that Vs do enter into close relationships with Ns but ignore dependents of N like determiners. In contrast, functional heads like C, P, Asp cannot be skipped. There are many expressions like *light a fire under X*, where the expression has an open slot for the object of P. There are no expressions that include a V & the object of a P, leaving P unspecified. This contrasts with V-NP expressions, where D is often unspecified (e.g., *jump the/that/another gun*), & there are no expressions where V & D are fixed but N can vary. Extending Bruening et al. (2018), there are expressions where a V combines with an embedded clause, like *know which way the wind blows*. The functional material (C) is fully fixed. Contra Salzmänn (2018), V & N do enter into a close dependency, that of *I-selection* (selection for a particular lexical item). V & D never do, but V & C do, and V & P, contrary to the DP Hypothesis.

References: • Bruening, B. 2009. Selectional asymmetries between CP and DP suggest that the DP hypothesis is wrong. In L. MacKenzie (ed.), *U. Penn Working Papers in Linguistics 15.1: Proceedings of the 32nd Annual Penn Linguistics Colloquium*, 26–35. • Bruening, B., X. Dinh, & L. Kim. 2018. Selection, idioms, and the structure of nominal phrases with and without classifiers. *Glossa* 3. 1–46. • Carstens, V. 2017. Noun-to-determiner movement. In M. Everaert & H. van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to syntax*. Wiley. • Salzmänn, M. 2018. Revisiting the NP vs. DP debate. <http://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/003823>.