

## Two structural sources for possessives:

### Evidence from Spanish alienable possessive constructions

Sangyoon Kim (sangyoonkimm@gmail.com) *Hankuk University of Foreign Studies*

**Some data.** Spanish sentential adverbs do not modify PreN(ominal)-Poss(essives) alone in cases like (1a), but they have the whole DP in their scope. Regarding PostN-Poss as in (1b), their behavior varies: evidential adverbs (*evidently*) and evaluative adverbs (*regrettably*) can only modify them, while speech act adverbs (*honestly*) cannot. These contrasts are unexpected from the standard view that both PreN- and PostN-Poss are merged at a unique position in DPs (Cardinaletti 1998; Alexiadou *et al.* 2007). Arguably, they arise in different positions, PostN-Poss originating in a DP-internally merged sentential domain from which they modify the noun; structural implications therein result in (un)grammaticality in (1b):

- (1) a. {Evidentemente/Lamentablemente/Honestamente}, sus errores.  
evidently/regrettably/honestly his faults  
b. Errores, {evidentemente/lamentablemente/\*honestamente}, suyos.  
faults evidently/regrettably/honestly his

**Goal.** I show that Spanish PreN- and PostN-Poss are each introduced into alienable possessive constructions by different merge positions (inalienable ones need a particular study due to their nominal argument structure). The discussion is made in parallel with a new proposal on the DP structure: all determiners, including definite articles, are merged in embedded layers in DPs. I also argue that syntax-driven phonetic restrictions can avoid imposing an undesirable look-ahead requirement on the grammar in deriving DP constructions.

**DP-internally merged articles.** The definite article projects its own projection ArtP inside DPs, and hosts demonstratives in its specifier (Julien 2002; Roehrs 2006). I claim that ArtP is located between the two domains argued for as merge positions of adjectives in Cinque (2010): Dir(ect)-Mod(ification) APs occur as specifiers of dedicated functional heads of the extended projections of N. Indir(ect)-Mod APs are predicates in nonfinite reduced relative clauses, merged above the functional projections hosting Dir-Mod APs:

- (2) [DP [FP [CP [TP PRO<sub>i</sub> T [*Indir-Mod AP*]]] F [ArtP<sub>i</sub> [FP [*Dir-Mod AP*] F [NP]]]]]

D has an unspecified [DEF] feature and EPP. Hence, ArtP is attracted to SpecDP by Agree between D and Art. The subject PRO of Indir-Mod APs is coindexed with ArtP (cf. Cinque 2010). Empirical evidence in favor of this proposal is provided by the fact that direct and indirect modifiers show different modification ranges on the elements within ArtP, despite the identical position they eventually occupy:

- (3) a. esta empresa cervecera                      b. esta empresa vendida  
this company of-beer                              this company sold

Classificatory adjectives like *cervecera* are always direct modifiers, and participle adjectives such as *vendida*, as indicated by the past participle suffix *-da*, are inherently indirect modifiers (Cinque 2010). Thus, *cervecera*, merged below ArtP, only modifies the noun in (3a) (an intersective reading between the referent of *esta empresa* and the set denoted by *cervecera* cannot be processed). Meanwhile, in (3b), the entire set of demonstrative and noun remains within the scope of *vendida*, merged above ArtP, (the satisfactory paraphrase is *this company, which was sold*, not *a sold company, which is this one*)

**Duplicity in possessive merger.** I claim that, in principle, Romance PreN-Poss enter DPs as the highest Dir-Mod adjective, but immediately below ArtP (SpecXP). As a result, they are indifferent to (in-)definiteness of the DP in which they appear, and precede very high Dir-Mod adjectives like *alleged* (It. *il/questo/un (suo) sedicente (\*suo) psichiatra* ‘the/this/a (his) alleged psychiatrist’). Their rendering indefinite DPs specific, a function proper to Dir-Mod adjectives (Bosque 1996), shows that they belong to this type of adjectives (hence, not to Indir-Mod adjectives nor to pronouns). Accordingly, relative clauses with verbs in the subjunctive mood are not permitted in this kind of DPs:

- (4) \*Intento localitzar un meu amic que m'ajudi. (Catalan)  
 try.1SG locate a my friend that me help.3SG.SUBJ

(Expected meaning: 'I am trying to find any friend of mine that may help me.')

This account also holds for Old Spanish, where PreN-Poss behaved in the same way as current Italian or Catalan counterparts. Though, the standard contemporary Spanish PreN-Poss act as definite determiners after undergoing reanalysis ((*\*el/\*un*) *mi libro* '(the/a) my book'). The proposal in (2) casts light on the role of locality in this diachronic change: [+DEF] on Art spreads toward the contiguous PreN-Poss in SpecXP, which absorb it to be reestablished as SpecArtP, preserving their maximal projection status as an instance of adjectival determiners in terms of Börjars (1998). Then, I argue that PostN-Poss are Indir-Mod adjectives. This analysis explains the contrast in (1b). Evidential and evaluative adverbs modify PostN-Poss if they occur in higher positions in the same relative clause with them. However, speech act adverbs, only licensed in matrix clauses, cannot appear in this environment (Haegeman 2003). Concretely, PostN-Poss occupy the highest position among Indir-Mod adjectives, thus, below heterogeneous indirect modifiers such as participle adjectives and finite restrictive relative clauses, according to Cinque's (2010) hierarchy. Now, the description that they must follow other adjectives, but precede participle adjectives and relative clauses meets a structural reason. For example, (5a) derives from (5b), namely, ArtP moves around the nearest modifier, and then continues to move pied-piping the immediately dominating phrase around the next nearest modifier. This movement is repeated all the way up to SpecDP.

- (5) a. la casa nueva suya pinta-da de azul que vi ayer  
 the house new his paint-ed of blue REL saw.1SG yesterday  
 b. [DP [*que vi ayer* [*pintada de azul* [*suya* [*nueva* [ArtP *la* [NP *casa*]]]]]]]

**Silence of Art.** Spanish PostN (but not PreN) demonstratives can appear with definite articles. The minimal pair in (6a, b) is generally assumed to involve two different Lexical Arrays regarding the inclusion of the article (Brugè 1996). This view, though, may not be too attractive, as it implies that grammar foresees the position that demonstratives will occupy at the syntax in order to determine whether extract the article from the Lexicon.

- (6) a. ese libro b. el libro ese c. [DP ... [ArtP [*ese*] *el* [NP *libro*]]]  
 that book the book that

As an alternative, I propose that they both are derived from (6c), and that the article is not pronounced, if an element with the same [+DEF] feature c-commands it from its specifier (Leu 2008). If ArtP moves to SpecDP, we get (6a); the article, c-commanded by the demonstrative, remains silent. As for (6b), Spanish DPs with PostN demonstratives always have a referential-deictic reading (DPs with PreN demonstratives can have an unspecific/generic reading). I argue that this reading is licensed at the left periphery above DPs, slightly modifying Panagiotidis (2000). Contrastive focus reading or speaker's negative viewpoints on the referent also conveyable by these demonstratives reinforce my proposal. In (6b), the derivation continues after ArtP moves to SpecDP: C<sub>1</sub> licensing the deictic reading is merged with DP, and the demonstrative is attracted to SpecCP<sub>1</sub>; then, C<sub>2</sub> is merged and attracts the remnant to SpecCP<sub>2</sub> à la Kayne. Now that the demonstrative is not in SpecArtP, the article is pronounced.

- (7) a. ese libro suyo b. el libro suyo ese c. \*su libro ese  
 that book his the book his that his book that  
 d. [DP ... [FP [CP [TP PRO<sub>i</sub> T *suyo*]] F [ArtP<sub>i</sub> [*ese*] *el* [NP *libro*]]]]]

The more complex pair (7a, b) shares (7d) in the same manner. If ArtP moves around *suyo*, and the entire chunk moves to SpecDP, we get (7a). If a deixis-inducing C<sub>1</sub> head is subsequently merged attracting the demonstrative and a higher C<sub>2</sub> attracting the remnant, we get (7b). (7c), another minimal pair with (6b), is ruled out. The reason is that PreN-Poss and demonstratives compete for SpecArtP to be merged in. In this way, it is unnecessary to stipulate special features or operations to explain these strings, as occasionally done in the literature.