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1. Structure

1.1 X-bar structure

In a generative analysis, syntactic constituents are all constructed according to the same pattern: The "X-bar structure" as in (1) (where the sequence of the head and the complement may vary).

(1) \[ \text{XP} \]
    \[ \text{YP} \quad \text{X}' \quad \text{X}^\circ \quad \text{ZP} \]
    \[ \text{Specifier} \quad \text{Head} \quad \text{Complement} \]

(2) \[ \text{XP} = \text{phrase} \quad - \quad \text{the maximal projection of X} \]
    \[ \text{X}' = \text{X-bar} \quad - \quad \text{the intermediary projection of X} \]
    \[ \text{X}^\circ = \text{head} \quad - \quad \text{the minimal projection of X} \]

A maximal projection may occur as specifier or as complement in another projection. A head is always a head of its own projection, and all maximal projections have a head (are endocentric). Furthermore, a maximal projection can also be adjoined to another maximal projection:

(3) \[ \text{XP} \]
    \[ \text{WP} \quad \text{XP} \quad \text{Adjoined} \]
    \[ \text{position} \quad \text{...} \]

X (and also Y, Z and W) may stand for one of the following categories:

(4) | lexical categories (word classes) | "functional" categories |
---|----------------------------------|-------------------------|
N  | (noun)                           | C ("complementiser" –   |
V  | (verb)                           | subordinating conjunction) |
P  | (preposition)                    | I ("inflection", used to be AUX) |
Adj | (adjective)                      | D (determiner/article etc.) |
Adv | (adverb)                         | etc.                     |
    |                                  | etc.                     |

Vikner, 07.02.2008, p. 3
1.2 Clause structure

In a somewhat simplified generative analysis, the structure of a sentence is as follows:

(5) A clause is a **CP**, the complement of its head (\(= C^\circ\)) is an **IP**, and the complement of the IP’s head (\(= I^\circ\)) is a **VP**.

(VP thus corresponds to Diderichsen’s 1962 “indholdsfelt”,
IP thus corresponds to BOTH Diderichsen’s 1962 “nexusfelt” AND “indholdsfelt”)

All verbs have their own VP. Adverbials (etc.) may be adjoined both on the left side and on the right side of a VP.


(6) a. 

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Spec} & C' \\
\text{C} & \text{Spec} & I' \\
\text{I} & \text{Spec} & V' \\
\text{V} & \text{Spec} & V' \\
\text{V} & \text{Spec} & V' \\
\text{V} & \text{Spec} & V' \\
\text{V} & \text{Spec} & V' \\
\text{V} & \text{Spec} & V' \\
\text{V} & \text{Spec} & V' \\
\text{V} & \text{Spec} & V' \\
\end{array}
\]

b. F

\[
\text{Nu} \quad \text{har} \quad \text{den} \quad \text{igen} \quad \text{lagt} \quad \text{æg} \quad \text{her}
\]

\[
\text{Now} \quad \text{has} \quad \text{it} \quad \text{again} \quad \text{laid} \quad \text{eggs} \quad \text{here}
\]

c. k

\[
\text{om} \quad \text{den} \quad \text{igen} \quad \text{har} \quad \text{lagt} \quad \text{æg} \quad \text{her}
\]

\[
\text{if} \quad \text{it} \quad \text{again} \quad \text{has} \quad \text{laid} \quad \text{eggs} \quad \text{here}
\]

"Nexusfelt"  
Nexus field

"Indholdsfelt"  
Content field

(This collapsing of the Diderichsen model for the main clause with the one for the embedded clause was introduced by Platzack 1985).

(On compatibilities and incompatibilities between formal and functional linguistics, see also Vikner 2004 and Bjerre, Engels, Jørgensen & Vikner 2007)

*Vikner, 07.02.2008, p. 4*
2. CP and verb Second (V2)

In all Germanic languages with the exception of Modern English, all main clauses have a special property, namely that they are "verb second" (V2), which means that the finite verb occupies the second position in the clause, irrespective of which constituent occupies the first position:

\[(7) \text{Verb second } = \text{V2:}\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{one constituent} & \text{the finite verb} & \text{the rest of the clause} \\
1 & 2 & 3
\end{array}
\]

Danish, Icelandic and German are thus V2, whereas English and French are not:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{CP-Spec} & \text{C°} & \text{IP} \\
\hline
\text{a. Da. Den her bog} & \text{har} & \text{Peter læst} \\
\text{b. Ic. Þessa bók} & \text{hefur} & \text{Pétur lesið} \\
\text{c. Ge. Dieses Buch} & \text{hat} & \text{Peter gelesen} \\
\text{d. En. *This book} & \text{has} & \text{Peter read} \\
\text{e. Fr. *Ce livre} & \text{a-t-} & \text{il lu}
\end{array}
\]

V2 is analysed as two movements: A maximal projection (e.g. PP, AdvP, DP) moves into CP-Spec (i.e. the 1st position) and the finite verb moves into C° (i.e. the 2nd position).

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{CP} & \text{C°} & \text{IP} \\
\hline
\text{XP} & \text{Subj} & \text{I°} \\
\text{Spec} & \text{V°} & \text{VP} \\
\text{V°-to-I°-to-C°} & \text{Spec} & \text{V°} \\
\text{mvt.} & \text{Obj}
\end{array}
\]

Because V2 moves the finite verb out of the clause (into the C°-position, to the left of the subject position), we have to look at sentences without V2 in order to be able to see which verb positions are possible in which languages. In English and French this is not difficult, as only main clause questions are V2, whereas in the other Germanic languages, we have to turn to embedded clauses.

\[\text{Vikner, 07.02.2008, p. 5}\]
3. IP and V°-to-I° movement

3.1 IP and V°-to-I° movement in the SVO-languages

French is a language with what is called V°-to-I° movement. This means that in French the finite verb moves from its position in V° to a functional position further left, namely I°. This movement can be detected if there is a e.g. medial adverbial present, in this case souvent:

(11)

Fr. a. Jean mange souvent des tomates
Jean eats often tomatoes
b. *Jean souvent mange des tomates
Jean often eats tomatoes

Chomsky (1995:222) says about the ability of constituents to move in the syntax: "Minimalist assumptions suggest that this property should be reduced to morphology-driven movement." This was the objective of Vikner (1997, 1998), where finite verb movement was linked to verbal inflectional morphology:

(13) An SVO-language has V°-to-I° movement if and only if person morphology is found in all tenses. (Vikner 1997:207, (23))

The generalisation in (13) accounts for the above difference in the positions of finite main verbs, assuming a clause structure as in (12) and (11) above.
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Among all the Romance and Germanic SVO-languages, the only languages where inflectional differences for person are not found in every tense are modern English and four modern Scandinavian languages: Danish, Faroese, Norwegian, and Swedish, cf. (18) and (19) below.

These five languages are also the only SVO-languages without V°-to-I° movement, cf. (14) and (15) below.

- **Which languages have V°-to-I° movement?**

Icelandic, Yiddish, and French all have V°-to-I° movement:

(14) \[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{C°} & \text{IPsp} & \text{I°} & \text{AdvP} & \text{V°} & \text{DP} \\
\text{a. En.} & \* \text{That} & \text{John} & \text{often} & \_ & \text{tomatoes} \\
\text{b. Da.} & \* \text{At} & \text{Johan} & \text{spiser} & \text{ofte} & \text{tomater} \\
\text{c. Fa.} & \* \text{At} & \text{Jón} & \text{etur} & \text{ofta} & \text{tomatir} \\
\text{d. Ic.} & \* \text{Að} & \text{Jón} & \text{borðar} & \text{oft} & \text{tómata} \\
\text{e. Yi.} & \* \text{Az} & \text{Jonas} & \text{est} & \text{oft} & \text{pomidorn} \\
\text{f. Fr.} & \* \text{Que} & \text{Jean} & \text{mange} & \text{souvent} & \text{des tomates} \\
\end{array}
\]

(15) \[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{C°} & \text{IPsp} & \text{I°} & \text{AdvP} & \text{V°} & \text{DP} \\
\text{a. En.} & \text{That} & \text{John} & \text{often} & \text{eats} & \text{tomatoes} \\
\text{b. Da.} & \text{At} & \text{Johan} & \text{spiser} & \text{oft} & \text{tomater} \\
\text{c. Fa.} & \text{At} & \text{Jón} & \text{etur} & \text{ofta} & \text{tomatir} \\
\text{d. Ic.} & \* \text{Að} & \text{Jón} & \text{borðar} & \text{oft} & \text{tómata} \\
\text{e. Yi.} & \* \text{Az} & \text{Jonas} & \text{est} & \text{oft} & \text{pomidorn} \\
\text{f. Fr.} & \* \text{Que} & \text{Jean} & \text{mange} & \text{souvent} & \text{des tomates} \\
\end{array}
\]

English, Danish, and Faroese (and also Norwegian and Swedish) all lack V°-to-I° movement:

Furthermore, the languages without V°-to-I° movement have all only recently lost V°-to-I° movement. In English and also in Danish (Vikner 2005a), this change took place in the 15th and 16th centuries, Middle English and Old Danish were like French:

(16) a. ME. He swore that he talked never t wyth no man ...  
   b. En. He swore that he never talked to anybody ...

(16a): 1460 William Paston I, Letter to John Paston I, 02.05.1460, Davis 1971:164

(17) OD. Æn beriær man threl for bondæns øghæn. tha bøtæ han  
   But hits a man a slave for peasant-the’s eyes, then pays he  
   bondæn tolf øræ foræ um threllæn takær øy atær gen  
   peasant-the twelve øre therefore if slave-the attacks not back again  
   "Men slår en mand en træl for ojenene af bonden, da skal han bode tolv øre derfor til bonden, hvis  
   trællen ikke sætter sig til modværge”  

(caps. 1300, Valdemars sjællandske lov, yngre redaktion, chap. 86, Uldaler & Wellejus 1968:54, l. 21-22)
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Which languages have person morphology in all tenses?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infinitive</th>
<th>English (20th C.)</th>
<th>Early modern English (16th C.)</th>
<th>Middle English (14/15th C.)</th>
<th>French (20th C.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Italians</td>
<td>Hear</td>
<td>Here(n)</td>
<td>J' entend</td>
<td>Entends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinitive</td>
<td>Italians</td>
<td>Hear</td>
<td>Here(n)</td>
<td>Entends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>Italians</td>
<td>Hear</td>
<td>Her(e)</td>
<td>Entendez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participle</td>
<td>Italians</td>
<td>Hearing</td>
<td>Hering</td>
<td>Entendant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td>Italians</td>
<td>Heard</td>
<td>Herd</td>
<td>Entendu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Different forms**

- English: 2
- Early modern English: 3
- Middle English: 4
- French: 4

---

**Danish, Faroese, Yiddish, Icelandic**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infinitive</th>
<th>Danish</th>
<th>Faroese</th>
<th>Yiddish</th>
<th>Icelandic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Italians</td>
<td>Høre</td>
<td>Hoyra</td>
<td>Hern</td>
<td>Heyra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>Italians</td>
<td>Hoyr</td>
<td>Heyr</td>
<td>Heyrið</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participle</td>
<td>Italians</td>
<td>Hoyrønde</td>
<td>Hoyrøndi</td>
<td>Heyrøndi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td>Hørt</td>
<td>Hoyrt</td>
<td>Gehert</td>
<td>Heyrt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Different forms**

- Danish: 1
- Faroese: 3
- Yiddish: 4
- Icelandic: 5

---

**Vikner, 07.02.2008, p. 8**
3.2 IP and V°-to-I° movement in the SOV-languages

Now what about SOV-languages like German or Dutch? As far as verbal inflection is concerned, the above suggestion would lead us to expect German (but not Dutch) to have V°-to-I° movement. Although this is what I used to think (Vikner 1995:152-157), I no longer think so, in that I now think that none of the SOV-languages have V°-to-I° movement, not even German (Vikner 2001, 2005b). Consider first the German version(s) of (14) and (15):

(20) a. *Dass Johann isst oft Tomaten überrascht die meisten Leute
    b. Dass Johann oft Tomaten isst überrascht die meisten Leute

The ill-formedness of (20a), which must have the structure (21a), could be due to I° being final (as I thought in Vikner 1995:153) and/or be due to German not having V°-to-I° movement (as argued in Vikner 2001, 2005b).

The well-formedness of (20b) may either be the result of V°-to-I° movement if I° is final, as in (21b), or of lack of V°-to-I° movement, as in either of (21a,b) WITHOUT the arrows:

(21) a. CP
    XP C'
    C° IP
    DP I'
    I° VP
    AdvP VP
    Spec V'
    DP V°

In other words, if German lacks V°-to-I° movement, we have no evidence of the position of I° in German, and thus it may be that the only difference between German clause structure and that of e.g. English and Danish is the position of V°, as in (21a) vs. (12).

(22)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V2</th>
<th>V°-to-I°</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In my view, there are at least two other things that indicate that German (etc.) does not have V°-to-I° movement:

1. **(Vikner 2005b)**

A number of complex verbs in German and Dutch have a strange distribution. The occur as non-finite verbs in both main and embedded clauses, (23a,b), but as finite verbs, they only occur in embedded clauses, (23c), NOT in main clauses, (23d,e):

   (23) Ge. a. Sie will bausparen
       She wants (to) building-save
       (She wants to save with a building society)

   b. ... weil sie bausparen will
       ... because she building-save wants
       (... because she wants to save with a building society)

   c. ... weil sie bauspart
       ... because she building-saves
       (... because he saves with a building society)

   ((23a,c) adapted from Eisenberg 1998:226, 324, (16a))

   d. * Spart sie bau  ?
   e. * Bauspart sie  ?
       (Building-)saves she (building) ?
       (Intended: Does she save with a building society?)

I think that this is best explained if we assume that what (23a-c) have in common is that the verbs here all are in V°, i.e. what these verbs are unable to do is to leave V°. The reason is that they then would have to be treated either as separable (“trennbar”) or as non-separable (“nicht-trennbar”) verbs, and this special property of these verbs is that they have to fulfill the conditions on verbs of both types.

2. **(Vikner 2001:66-99)**

There is a lot of variation in the sequence of verbs in embedded clauses like

   (24) a. Du. ... dat hij haar hoort roepen
       ('... that he her hears shout')
   b. Ge. ... dass er sie rufen hört
       ('... that he her shout hears')

both across nine different Germanic languages/dialects (Dutch, Afrikaans, West Flemish, Frisian, Standard German, Swabian German from Stuttgart, Swiss German from Sankt Gallen, Swiss German from Zürich, and Swiss German from Bern) and across six different constructions (perfect, passive, durative, causative, perception verbs, and modal verbs).

This variation in embedded clauses where one of the two verbs is finite, as in (24a,b), is almost identical to the variation in the sequence of the verbs in main clauses where none of the two verbs in question are finite, (25a,b):

   (25) a. Du. Hij zal haar horen roepen
       ('He will her hear shout')
   b. Ge. Er wird sie rufen hören
       ('He will her shout hear')

This shows that it makes no significant difference whether the higher of the two verbs concerned is finite, as *hoort/hört* in (24a,b), or non-finite, as *horen/hören* in (25a,b). This again means that in embedded clauses in the nine SOV-Germanic languages, there can be no obligatory movement that involves only finite verbs. This amounts to saying that there is no V°-to-I° movement in the Germanic SOV-languages.

Vikner, 07.02.2008, p. 10
4. VP

It is possible to refer to a preceding VP without repeating it word for word:

(26) En. a. Henry will buy presents in Paris tomorrow and Joe will do so, too
   b. Henry will buy presents in Paris tomorrow and Joe will do so next week
   c. Henry will buy presents in Paris tomorrow and Joe will do so in Bolton next week
   d. *Henry will buy presents in Paris tomorrow and Joe will do so books in Bolton next week

(27) Da. a. Henrik vil købe julegaver i Paris i morgen og det vil Joachim også
   b. Henrik vil købe julegaver i Paris i morgen og det vil Joachim i næste uge
   c. Henrik vil købe julegaver i Paris i morgen og det vil Joachim i Møgeltønder i næste uge
   d. *Henrik vil købe julegaver i Paris i morgen og det vil Joachim bøger i Møgeltønder i næste uge

*do so / det (gøre det)* can replace the following:

1. $V^o$-NP-PP-AdvP (26a): *buy presents in Paris tomorrow*
2. $V^o$-NP-PP (26b): *buy presents in Paris*
3. $V^o$-NP (26c): *buy presents*

but not just:

4. $V^o$ (26d): *buy*
4. $V^o$ (27d): *købe*

The fact that three different constituents may be replaced by one and the same element can be captured by assuming that these three constituents are of the same category, namely VP:

(28) \[
\begin{array}{c}
V^o \quad NP \\
\hline
\text{VP} \\
\hline
\quad \text{AdvP/PP} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

... that Henry will buy presents in Paris tomorrow ...
... at Henrik vil købe julegaver i Paris i morgen ...

Vikner, 07.02.2008, p. 11
5. NP

Important announcement: Articles (etc.) are not seen as part of the NP (noun phrase) here. Instead, what was earlier seen as an NP is here seen as a DP (determiner phrase). (Abney 1987, Giorgi & Longobardi 1991, Haegeman & Guéron 1999:406-422, and others).

**BEFORE:**
(29) a. [NP these green chairs]  
(30) a. [NP the chairs from France]

**HERE:**
(29) b. [DP these [NP green chairs]]  
(30) b. [DP the [NP chairs from France]]

The minimal NP thus consists of the head (N°) and its complement(s). Modifiers may be adjoined to the left or to the right.

The article is the head of its own projection (DP, i.e. determiner phrase), which dominates D° and its complement (NP), cf. the following section.

One reason to assume the existence of both NPs and DPs is NPs, (31a), (32a), (33a), & (34a), and DPs, (31b), (32b), (33b), & (34b), do not occur under the same circumstances:

(31) En. a. Nice man though he is, my uncle can be a little boring  
   b. *A nice man though he is, my uncle can be a little boring

(32) En. a. *I met nice man  
       b. I met a nice man

(33) Da. a. Stor dyreven som han var, den lille Emil, lukkede han katten ud  
       b. *En stor dyreven som han var, den lille Emil, lukkede han katten ud

(34) Da. a. *Ida kender dyreven  
       b. Ida kender en dyreven

English has an element that may be substituted for NP: one.

(35) En. a. These chairs from Germany are cheaper than the ones over there  
   b. These chairs from Germany are cheaper than the ones from France over there

The fact that two different constituents may be replaced by one and the same element can be captured by assuming that these two constituents are of the same category, namely NP:

(36)  
(37)

(38a,b) is thus accounted for by assuming that of linguistics is a complement in teacher of linguistics, whereas with an American accent is a modifier. The same assumptions will also account for the ordering restrictions in a,b):

(38) En. a. The teacher of linguistics with an American accent knows more about German than the one with a Danish accent  
       b. *The teacher of linguistics knows more about German than the one of physics

(39) En. a. A teacher of linguistics with an American accent  
       b. *A teacher with an American accent of linguistics

Vikner, 07.02.2008, p. 12
6. DP

As was said in the previous section, the article is here seen the head of its own projection (DP, i.e. determiner phrase), which dominates D° and its complement (NP). Other examples of D° are demonstratives, e.g. this, and possessives, e.g. my.

(40) DP
\[
\begin{array}{c}
D° \\
\text{the} \\
\text{AdjP} \\
\text{Adj}° \\
\text{nice} \\
\text{picture}
\end{array}
\]

ONE argument for making a distinction between DP and NP is that NPs and DPs do not occur under the same circumstances, cf. (31)-(34) above (even if it only happens very rarely that an NP is not part of a DP).

A SECOND argument for making a distinction between DP and NP is that this allows us to analyse pronouns as a kind of determiners:

(41) new DP-analysis:
\[
\begin{array}{c}
a. \\
\text{D' } \\
\text{I didn't know that}
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{c}
b. \\
\text{D' } \\
\text{I didn't know that book}
\end{array}
\]

(42) old discarded NP-analysis:
\[
\begin{array}{c}
a. \\
\text{N° det N°} \\
\text{I didn't know that}
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{c}
b. \\
\text{det N°} \\
\text{I didn't know that book}
\end{array}
\]

Taking pronouns to be D°s (with no sisters) gives a better account of a large number of elements across languages that occur both as articles/demonstratives and as pronouns: Not just English this book and this, but also e.g. Danish den bog and den, German das Buch and das, and French le livre and le.

It also allows a straight-forward analysis of cases where other pronouns seem to occur as determiners:

(43) DP
\[
\begin{array}{c}
D° \\
\text{We Danes really admire you Brits}
\end{array}
\]

Vikner, 07.02.2008, p. 13
A **THIRD** argument in favour of the DP-analysis is that it makes the following analysis of possessive constructions possible, where *the actor* is in the specifier position of DP, i.e. it is in some sense a subject.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\text{D'} \\
\text{D° NP}
\end{array}
\]

En. a. *The actor's disappearance was mysterious*  
En. b. *The actor's book was expensive*

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\text{D'} \\
\text{D° NP}
\end{array}
\]

c. *His disappearance was mysterious*  
d. *His book was expensive*

This analysis has two advantages:

1. It predicts that possessor phrases and articles do not cooccur, because both *'s* and *the* have to be in D°.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{En. a. *The actor's the disappearance was mysterious} \\
\text{En. b. *The actor's the book was expensive}
\end{array}
\]

2. And it predicts that *'s* occurs not on the noun in the possessor DP (as it would if it was a real case ending) but after the entire possessor DP:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{En. a. *The little [N° girl's] next door bicycle} \\
\text{En. b. [DP The little girl next door]'s bicycle}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{En. a. *The [N° Queen's] of England new hat} \\
\text{En. b. [DP The Queen of England]'s new hat}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{En. a. *In a [N° year's] or so time} \\
\text{En. b. In [DP a year or so]'s time}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Da. a. *[N° Deres] der ikke kom egen skyld} \\
\text{Da. b. [DP De der ikke kom] 's egen skyld}
\end{array}
\]

*Those who not arrived's own fault*
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- DPs containing proper names

Proper names like London or Louise normally occur without an article in English, Danish or French, and so one might be tempted to analyse them as NPs (as in (31a) above) rather than DPs. There are at least two reasons why we shall nevertheless take them to be DPs, with a structure as in (50a,b) where D° is empty:

(50) En. a. DP
     |  
     D'
     |  
     D° NP
     |  
     N'
     |  
     N°

b. DP
     |  
     D'
     |  
     D° NP
     |  
     N'
     |  
     N°

London Louise

The first reason is that sometimes proper names do have articles, which then fit into D°:

(51) En. a. He much preferred the London of the 1930es to the modern city
     b. You probably know this Louise much better than that Louise
     c. I much prefer your Fred to my Fred
     d. Tower Bridge is a famous bridge across the Thames
     e. The meeting took place in the Hague

There are also languages where proper names may frequently take articles:

(52) a. It. La Maria non parla danese
     b. Ge. Die Maria spricht kein Dänisch

The Maria (not) speaks (no) Danish

The second reason is that the positions and functions that proper names have can otherwise be filled with DPs, not with NPs:

(53) En. a. London is a really nice place
     b. [DP This city] is a really nice place
     c. *[NP City] is a really nice place

This also applies to what we before would have called "determinerless NPs". These are now taken to be DPs with an empty D° ("zero article"):

(54) En. a. Mobile phones should be switched off during the lecture
     b. Young Danes drink less beer than 50 years ago
     c. Theory should go hand in hand with practice
     d. He knew Danish before he learned English
7. Parallels between DP and IP/CP (and missing parallels)

Just as DP is built on top of an NP, so IP is built on top of a VP.

Notice that the subject of the DP is in DP-spec and the subject of the IP is in IP-spec. Notice further how the modifier of an NP is an AdjP which adjoins to the NP, and the modifier of the VP is an AdvP which adjoins to the VP:

(55)

(56)

En. a. (During) The careful reading of the novel
  b. (During) Fred 's careful reading of the novel

Da. c. (Under) Den omhyggelige læsning af romanen
  d. (Under) Frede -s omhyggelige læsning af romanen

En. a. (While) Fred carefully read the novel
  b. (While) Fred will carefully read the novel

Da. c. (Mens) Frede omhyggeligt læste romanen
  d. Læste Frede omhyggeligt romanen ?
We have seen examples of movement from $V^\circ$ to $I^\circ$ or from $V^\circ$ to $I^\circ$ to $C^\circ$, but we have not (yet) seen any parallel examples in the DP. Danish and the other Scandinavian languages (and also unrelated languages like Romanian) are sometimes assumed to have $N^\circ$-to-$D^\circ$ movement:

\begin{align*}
(57) & \text{Da.} & a. & \text{et stort billede} & \text{a large picture} \\
& & b. & \text{et billede} & \text{a picture} \\
& & c. & \text{det store billede} & \text{the large picture} \\
& & d. & \text{billedet} & \text{picture-the} \\
\end{align*}

Cf. that only the elements that occur between $D^\circ$ and $N^\circ$ (e.g. adjectives) may prevent this movement, not elements that occur left of $D^\circ$ (e.g. quantifiers) or right of $N^\circ$ (e.g. PPs):

\begin{align*}
(58) & \text{Da.} & a. & \text{billederne} & \text{pictures-the} \\
& & b. & \text{begge billederne} & \text{both pictures-the} \\
& & c. & \text{billederne} & \text{af huset} & \text{pictures-the of house-the} \\
& & d. & * & \text{billederne store} & \text{pictures-the large} \\
& & e. & \text{de store billeder} & \text{the large pictures} \\
\end{align*}

Across different frameworks (Dik 1997:67, Platzack 2001a,b, the wording here is from Christensen 2005:30), it is often observed that the tripartition between CP, IP and VP correspond to a tripartion between (e.g.) discourse form, grammatical form and thematic form:

\begin{align*}
(59) & \text{CP} & \text{Discourse Form} & \text{Proposition, illocutionary force, topic, focus} \\
& & \text{IP} & \text{Grammatical Form} & \text{Subject-predicate (nexus), tense, aspect, voice, polarity} \\
& & \text{VP} & \text{Thematic Form} & \text{Argument structure} \\
\end{align*}

It remains to be seen whether something parallel could hold for the DP.
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In the project application, we promised to look for similarities and differences between clauses and nominals in three different directions. From the point of view of the approach presented here, these three areas correspond to different parts of the phrase structure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Danish</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Positions ins the structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(60) a. Grammatiske relationer</td>
<td>Argument structure</td>
<td>Specifier and complement positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Beskriverled</td>
<td>Modifiers</td>
<td>Adjoined positions (or are they?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Bestemmerled</td>
<td>Determiners</td>
<td>“Functional” head positions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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