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This volume grew out of our research agenda, seeking to understand the structure and interpretation of bare nouns in three typologically and genetically unrelated articleless languages: Lithuanian, Inuktitut, and Innu-aimun. None of these languages has articles, and yet they are very different from one another with respect to the syntactic and semantic behaviour of their bare nouns (for Lithuanian, see Gillon and Armoskaite 2013, 2015; for Lithuanian and Innu-aimun, Gillon and Armoskaite 2012; for Inuktitut, Lithuanian and Innu-aimun, Gillon 2013, 2015). This variation forced us to question the universality of D, as well as the universality of the semantics of D.

Structurally, all nominals were originally conceived of as simply NPs. However, Abney (1987) argued that nominals are projections of D, rather than N. He based this on the parallelism between gerunds (derived from verbs) and nouns, as well as agreement patterns in languages such as Hungarian.

Semantically, determiners have long been argued to create arguments out of predicates (Higginbotham 1985; Szabolsci 1987, 1994; Stowell 1989; Longobardi 1994, among others). Thus, there seemed to be a tight relationship between D and argumenthood. Further, determiners are often assumed to be definite (e.g., Lyons 1999; see Matthewson 1998 and Gillon 2013 for arguments against this). Both of these ideas are questioned by authors in this volume.

Moreover, the nature of bare nouns is controversial: are they DPs (like other nominals), or are they different (in that they lack the DP layer)? There are three possible analyses: (i) bare nouns are DPs (just like all nominals) (Longobardi 1994), (ii) bare nouns are NPs (Chierchia 1998), or (iii) bare nouns can vacillate between NPs and DPs (Franks and Pereltsvaig 2004; Ajibóyè 2006). It is also possible that bare nouns vary across languages: bare nouns in a language that has articles (like English) may still be DPs, whereas bare nouns in articleless languages may not be.

The most prominent analysis of this last type comes from Bošković (2005, 2007, 2008a,b, 2009, 2012) who claims that there is a dichotomy between so-called NP languages (languages that lack articles) and so-called DP languages (languages with overt articles). Many of the papers in this volume specifically address his proposal, but only one assumes that his analysis is correct; many of the authors in
this volume found the DP/NP dichotomy proposed by Bošković (2008) to be untenable for at least some articleless languages.

It is only natural to draw on Bošković’s work: the idea of a dichotomy is a plausible null hypothesis. Whether or not the proposed dichotomy holds—or if it does, to what extent—it still fuels linguistic inquiry. We hope the discussion in this volume will lead to a more clearly fleshed out and empirically motivated theory of nominal functional superstructure, as well as a theory about which languages and environments that superstructure will appear in.

Beyond the putative NP/DP divide, there are a few other recurring themes that can be found in the studies included in this volume. Many of them are familiar problems: problems that have yet to be resolved in languages that are more commonly researched, such as Germanic or Slavic. The fact that we also find these recurring themes in the otherwise underrepresented languages of this volume, such as West Greenlandic, Mauritian Creole, Tagalog, Tatar, and Vietnamese, shows how important these questions are.

We begin with the syntactic issues that arise. In languages without overt D, the relation of N to other functional heads must be sorted out, because other functional heads may behave like D (cf. the seminal article on the relation of classifiers to D by Cheng & Sybesma 1999, and Filip’s work on aspect 1995, 1999). Case is a plausible candidate for confusion. Does K (case) cross-linguistically flag the presence or absence of D? Or can a particular case be D (cf. Pesetsky 2013 on Nominative as D)? Or are these D and K heads completely independent of one another? Many languages lack any candidates for D, but in this volume, a few potential candidates were discussed. For example, Paul et al. (this volume) argue that articles in Tagalog do not occupy D, but rather K, and that Tagalog lacks D altogether. Thus, for them, D and K are completely independent (at least in Tagalog). Manlove (this volume) argues that West Greenlandic has both K and D, which suggests that they can co-occur in some languages at least. Does this mean that all four options (only K, only D, both D and K, neither D nor K) are available?

Num is another head articles could occupy: for example, English a is often assumed to occupy Num rather than D (Epstein 1999). Further, Aboh (2004) has argued that the definiteness/number marker in Gungbe occupies Num, rather than D. Phan & Lander (this volume) argue that all potential articles in Vietnamese occupy Num (but are not associated with definiteness).

Thus, we must be careful what we assume occupies D, checking first to see if the elements can occupy some other position instead: in particular, potential candidates could occupy K or Num.

Relatedly, Guillemin (this volume) splits the DP into two: Sp(ecificity)P and Def(initeness)P. Elements we assume occupy D could thus occupy two different positions.

Agreement could also be another source of confusion. Do particular patterns of agreement entail the presence or absence of D? While the relation between possessives and definiteness varies across languages (Alexiadou 2005, Trugman 2007), possessive elements have been noted to have definiteness effects (Pakendorf 2007) or be hosted in D (den Dikken 2007). For example, Manlove (this volume) argues that possessive agreement occupies D in West Greenlandic.
Covertness remains another issue that comes up time and again (e.g., Longobardi 1994 vs. Bošković 2008a,b). The issue has remained the same for a number of years: the absence of phonological material does not necessarily entail the absence of a syntactic head. In particular, the absence of an overt D does not necessarily entail an absence of D (Lyutikova & Pereltsvaig, this volume). So what evidence can we use to show that D is, in fact, missing?

The papers in this volume also force us to question the relation between D and the ability to create arguments out of predicates. Paul et al. (this volume) argue that, in Tagalog, K performs the argument-creating function (instead of D, which is missing). If this is true, perhaps other functional heads (such as Num) could also perform this function.

The papers also ask us to question the relation between D and definiteness (cf. Lyons 1999 vs. Matthewson 1998, Gillon 2015). Guillemin (this volume) argues that D must be split between Sp(ecific) and Def(inite). She also argues that all languages must mark one or the other, but the other papers in this volume call this into question. Paul et al. (this volume) argue that definiteness arises from a conspiracy of events; no one nominal-internal position or article is associated with definiteness. Thus, definiteness can also be dissociated from the position it is most often associated with: D.

Inasmuch as structure itself is meaning (Grimshaw 2005), the position of a nominal within a clause also matters for (in)definiteness. A particular syntactic position might entail (in)definiteness (e.g., subject vs. object; see Paul et al. this volume).

Gradiencc is an issue that cuts through many debates (e.g., grammaticality judgments, famously, are often gradient cross-linguistically and within a language; Schütze 1996, Sorace & Keller 2005). Talic (this volume) expands on Boskovic’s NP/DP dichotomy arguing for “weak” vs. “strong” DP languages as well as NP languages, giving us a three-way distinction that leads to a continuum.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{strong DP} & \text{weak DP} & \text{NP} \\
\leftarrow \text{more DP-like} & \text{-} & \text{more NP-like} \rightarrow
\end{array}
\]

This raises a question: are “NP languages” allowed to vary in a similar way? Are there different kinds of NP languages? If there are, this might explain why Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian (Talic, this volume) behaves so differently from Tatar (Lyutikova and Pereltsvaig, this volume). Further, are there different kinds of D? Talic makes a distinction between affixal and non-affixal D—though she also distinguishes Ds that occupy the leftmost position within a nominal from Ds that follow some other element within the DP.

In addition to the syntactic and semantic themes discussed above, we also observe a scarcity of discussion of information structure/pragmatic effects. The only one to address it directly in this volume is Guillemin. Otherwise, information structure/pragmatics is almost entirely absent in these studies, as it is from our own work. This will require our collective attention, given that in at least some languages the (in)definiteness effects are argued to be epiphenomenal (Paul et al. this volume).

We describe each of the papers briefly below.
Guillemin investigates referentiality, specificity and definiteness in English, French and Mauritian Creole. She argues that English and French overtly mark a [±definiteness] contrast, whereas Mauritian Creole overtly marks a [±specificity] contrast. The only candidate for an article in Mauritian Creole is thus a specificity marker. She ties this to the basic denotation of nouns in each language: French has predicative nouns (of type <e,t>), whereas English and Mauritian Creole have argumental nouns (of type e).

Guillemin further argues that all three languages have both a Specificity Phrase and a Definiteness Phrase. However, in English and French, only the DefP must have an overt element while in Mauritian Creole, only the SpP must have an overt element. She claims that a language must have either an overt Def or an overt Sp; both cannot be null. She further claims that the presence of an overt element in Sp licenses the empty Def position. Thus, she splits D into two different heads for these three languages.

Lyutikova & Pereltsvaig's study has two goals: (i) to argue against the NP/DP dichotomy proposed by Bošković (2012); (ii) and to present novel arguments in favour of a D projection based on evidence from a Turkic articleless language (Tatar). The second argument is explicitly constructed as a counterexample to the conclusions of Bošković & Sener's (2014) paper on Turkish nominals.

First, Lyutikova & Pereltsvaig point out that Bošković's (2012) generalizations are problematic, even before they are applied to Turkic languages. Some generalizations do not hold at all, such as the exhaustivity presupposition for Russian, while others are inconclusive; the Lithuanian pattern straddles the fence between NP/DP (see also Gillon and Armoskaite 2015 for similar arguments).

Next, Lyutikova & Pereltsvaig note that the original arguments for a DP projection in languages with articles should hold for articleless languages, too. They build on Abney's (1987) insight that parallels between noun and gerund possessive constructions are explained if they both involve the same functional head, D. Lyutikova and Pereltsvaig assume that if a certain pattern of linguistic data is used to support a certain analysis in one type of language (with articles), the same pattern of data in a different type of language (without articles) should support the same analysis.

Lyutikova & Pereltsvaig focus on ezafe-3 and ezafe-2 possessive constructions and Differential Object Marking in Tatar. They conclude that the differences between two types of ezafe constructions and (un)marked objects are explained by the presence or absence of D. Ezafe-2 constructions and unmarked objects both pattern like Small Nominals (which are smaller than DPs): they are non-referential, take narrow scope, are not case-marked, and are not visible to probes, and are therefore frozen in their position. In contrast, ezafe-3 constructions and accusative objects both pattern like DPs: they are referential, can take wide or narrow scope, must be case-marked, and are visible to probes, which allows them to move to a higher position. Thus they tie both syntax and semantics to D: D requires case-marking and allows the nominal to move; further, D provides referentiality.

Manlove discusses definiteness (and, to a lesser extent, specificity) in another articleless language, West Greenlandic Inuit. She argues for two different sources of
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(in)definiteness: internal (possession agreement, demonstratives and quantifiers) and external (position in the clause). She argues that West Greenlandic must have a DP projection on the basis of three elements: the position of possessive morphology, (in)definiteness interpretations, and focus interpretations within the nominal domain.

Manlove argues that D is required to explain the position (and transitivity) of possession in West Greenlandic. She also argues that D is the locus of (in)definiteness, and that D hosts an unvalued feature for (in)definiteness that must be valued. This feature can be valued by possession agreement, demonstratives, quantifiers, or a functional head within the clausal domain. If the feature cannot be valued by anything within the nominal or clausal domain, it receives a default value of indefinite. Finally, in order to get the right nominal-internal word order for focus, she claims that movement to SpecDP of part of the nominal domain is required.

The only element that can occupy D is the possessive agreement. However, nothing needs to be in D. Thus, according to Manlove, West Greenlandic has a covert D.

Paul, Cortes and Milambiling investigate Tagalog morphemes ang and ng, which have been traditionally described as definite and indefinite (respectively). They show that this description is incorrect, since ng can be found in both familiar and novel contexts, and that ang can receive an indefinite interpretation when it co-occurs with a quantifier.

They make three claims: two syntactic and one semantic. Syntactically, they claim that ang and ng both occupy K, rather than D, despite the fact that they turn predicates into arguments (cf. Higginbotham 1985; Szabolsci 1987,1994; Stowell 1989; Longobardi 1994, among others). Thus, they split the function of argumenthood from the position D. They further claim that Tagalog lacks D altogether. This could mean that the function of definiteness and D are also split in Tagalog, but instead, they argue that ang and ng are not markers of (in)definiteness at all. Instead, (in)definiteness is obtained through a combination of syntactic position and the presence or absence of quantifiers. They show that while ang tends to behave like a definite, this is due to the high structural position of ang KPs. Ng tends to behave like an indefinite, due to the relatively low structural position of ng KPs. However, ng KPs can receive definite interpretations, and ang KPs can be made indefinite with a quantifier.

Phan and Lander argue that Vietnamese lacks DP structure, but they also provide evidence that Bošković’s (2005, 2008, 2012) NP/DP dichotomy does not hold exactly as he describes it. Instead, only a subset of generalizations is relevant to the dichotomy.

Phan and Lander explore how Bošković’s generalizations fare in Vietnamese, a language without overt articles. They find that the language exhibits both NP and DP properties. They observe that for four of Bošković’s generalizations, Vietnamese behaves like an NP language; for four other generalizations, it behaves like a DP language; and for two generalizations, either analysis is possible. They argue that this is evidence that there are really three parameters involved, rather than a simple NP/DP dichotomy: (i) a nominal parameter, (ii) a clausal parameter, and
(iii) a quantificational parameter. They ultimately argue that Vietnamese is an NP language, but it looks like a DP language because of the clausal and quantificational parameters.

The nominal parameter determines the presence or absence of an overt definite determiner, the (in)ability of a language to utilize left branch extraction, radical pro drop, and obligatory number morphology. With respect to these generalizations, Vietnamese patterns like an NP language.

The clausal parameter determines whether a language has a TP, whether a language has subject expletives and whether a language has a subject-object asymmetry. With respect to these properties, Vietnamese patterns like a DP language. However, they argue this has nothing to do with D.

Lastly, the quantificational parameter determines whether a language allows neg-raising, whether a focused element must be adjacent to the verb, and whether there must be focus morphology on negation. With respect to these properties, Vietnamese shows a split between characteristics associated with both NP and DP languages. This is because, according to them, these features have nothing to do with D.

Therefore Phan and Lander conclude that the difference between NP and DP languages has to do only with the features associated with the nominal parameter, not the clausal or quantificational parameters.

**Talic** investigates the phenomenon of adverb extraction from adjective phrases and ties it to the presence or absence of functional superstructure. She argues that (i) functional superstructure is parallel – if a language has functional superstructure within a nominal, it also has functional superstructure within an AP – and (ii) there are three types of languages: “strong” DP languages, “weak” DP languages, and NP languages (expanding on Bošković’s 2008 description). In “strong” DP languages, extraction from nominals and extraction from APs are equally disallowed. This is because both phrase types have functional superstructure (DP for nominals, and some kind of structure for APs). In “weak” DP languages, extraction from both nominals and APs is allowed. This is because in these languages, DP is not required (and therefore the parallel superstructure is not required within an AP). DP is only projected when the semantics requires it – or when an article is actually pronounced. In NP languages, extraction from both nominals and APs is allowed. This is because in these languages, DP is never projected (and therefore the parallel superstructure is not projected within an AP). Talic claims that “weak” DP languages are those where the article is either affixal or a clitic – and crucially, follows some element within the DP (that is, is not the first element within the DP). Thus, Bulgarian, Icelandic and Romanian are all instances of the “weak” DP type. In all three languages, the affixal/cliticized article can be dropped when the semantics allows. Unlike English (which for her always has D, even for bare nouns), these languages are not required to project a DP.
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