

## The DP Hypothesis and Its Theoretical Implications

Yuji Takano

The following contrast discussed by Stowell (1987) seems to support the view that there are two types of "subject" of noun phrases:

- (1) a. Who did you sell a picture of?
- b. ??Who did you sell Mary's picture of? (Agent)
- c. \*Who did you sell Mary's picture of? (Possessor)

Thus extraction out of a noun phrase with an Agent phrase results in marginality, whereas a noun phrase with a Possessor phrase resists extraction. In Takano (1988) I provide an account for the lessened acceptability of sentences like (1b) within the framework of barriers and the "revised DP hypothesis" presented there. Here I will address the nature of such sentences as (1c), assuming that there do exist Agent/Poss asymmetries.

First consider the following contrast cited from Anderson (1978):

- (2) a. [Yesterday's lecture] will be given tomorrow
- b. \*[The lecture yesterday] will be given tomorrow

This suggests that the temporal noun acquires an additional meaning in (2a), which makes the whole sentence coherent. This extra meaning phenomenon recalls the assertion that a Poss phrase can have any relation to the head. One way to substantiate this claim is to suppose that a Poss phrase is contained in another category along the spirit of Anderson (1983). More specifically, a Poss phrase is a PP whose head assigns a Poss role to a noun, as shown in (3), the "PP Possessor hypothesis" as I shall call it:

- (3) [[PP e yesterday] lecture]

The PP Possessor hypothesis seems to be confirmed by the facts concerning anaphor binding and rationale clause licensing:

- (4) a. \*John<sub>i</sub> saw [Mary's picture of himself<sub>i</sub>] (Agent)  
       b. John<sub>i</sub> saw [Mary's picture of himself<sub>i</sub>] (Poss)  
 (5) a. John<sub>i</sub>'s thesis [PRO<sub>i</sub> to get his degree] (Agent)  
       b. \*John<sub>i</sub>'s book by Chomsky [PRO<sub>i</sub> to prove a point]

If a Poss noun is contained in PP, as I claim, it follows that the PP node defines the c-command domain of the Poss noun. Hence the Poss phrase does not count as a possible binder of the anaphor in (4b) and cannot control PRO in (5b).

Now the PP possessor hypothesis, the "revised DP hypothesis" and Case theory conspire to give a desired result concerning extraction. According to Stowell (1981) and Oka (1986), CP and PP cannot appear in a Case-marked position as a consequence of Case theory. Thus Stowell argues that sentential subjects undergo string-vacuous topicalization. It seems fairly natural to consider that the same holds in the case of Poss phrases, which are now claimed to be PPs. Then, on the basis of the revised DP hypothesis, the relevant part of the structure of (1c) is as follows:

- (6) [DP [IP [PP e Mary]<sub>j</sub> [IP t<sub>j</sub> [NP picture of t<sub>i</sub>]]]]

Under the assumption that DP is a barrier because of its SPEC-less nature (Takano (1988)) and that adjunction structure creates a barrier (Lasnik and Saito (forthcoming)), it follows that (1c) is a strong violation of the Subjacency Condition since in (6) extraction out of DP crosses two barriers, the upper IP and DP.