

Prenominal genitives: Locality, theta-roles, and quantifiers

Antonio Machicao y Priemer & Stefan Müller

Humboldt-University of Berlin

mapriema@hu-berlin.de, St.Mueller@hu-berlin.de

Some of the arguments pro DP-analysis are based on the configurational analogies between sentences (as IP-structures) and NPs (as DP-structures). However, this proposal has been challenged since the IP-analysis for German sentences has been denied by many (Haider 1993, a.o.) making the fundament for the parallelism void. A further syntactic problem of the DP-analysis concerns the realization of arguments of relational nouns. While postnominal arguments can get case and theta-role locally, i.e. inside the NP, prenominal arguments are normally assumed either in D or in SpecDP position presenting difficulties for theta-role and case assignment (e.g. Olsen 1991). We are proposing an NP-analysis in accordance with Strict Locality (Sag 2012) in the framework of HPSG. Therefore, prenominal genitives are realised in SpecNP, showing its dependency from the head noun and getting theta-role and case assigned by the noun.

W.r.t. quantified prenominal genitives further problems of compositional nature arise (Machicao y Priemer 2017). It has been assumed that prenominal genitives are allowed only with proper names, that they are not recursive, and always interpreted as definites (Hartmann & Zimmermann 2003). These assumptions can be challenged, e.g. by (1) & (2). (1) shows the possibility of recursive prenominal genitives, not only with proper names but also with common nouns. (2) exemplifies that quantified prenominal genitives show the same interpretational scope ambiguities as other quantifiers, and not only the definite interpretation.

- (1) *Peters Bruders Harley wurde schnell repariert.*

'Peter's brother's Harley was quickly repaired.'

- (2) *Jeder Gauner raubte {die/Rothschilds/eines Bankiers} Tochter aus.*

'Every trickster has mugged {the/Rothschild's/a banker's} daughter.'

We present a semantic analysis licensing structures such as (1) & (2) accounting correctly for the scope ambiguities presented by prenominal quantified genitives. Thus, in our analysis, determiners, possessives, and genitive NPs can be treated in a uniform way.

References: • Haider, H. 1993. *Deutsche Syntax – generativ*. Tübingen: Narr. • Hartmann, K. & M. Zimmermann. 2003. Syntactic and semantic adnominal genitive. In C. Maienborn (ed.), (A-)symmetrien – (A-)symmetries, 171–202. Tübingen: Stauffenbrüg. • Machicao y Priemer, A. 2017. *NP-arguments in NPs: An analysis of German and Spanish noun phrases in Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*. Berlin: Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin • Olsen, S. 1991. Die deutsche Nominalphrase als 'Determinansphrase'. In S. Olsen & G. Fanselow (eds.), *Det, Comp und Infl*, 35–56. Tübingen: Niemeyer. • Sag, I. 2012. Sign-Based Construction Grammar: An informal synopsis. In H. Boas & I. Sag (eds.), *Sign-Based Construction Grammar*, 69–202. Stanford: CSLI.