

Some Preliminary Comparative Remarks on French and Italian Definite Articles

Richard S. Kayne
New York University
October 2004

1. Interrogatives.

English has both:

- (1) Which student did you just see?

and:

- (2) What student did you just see?

In (2) the *wh*-word is the same as the one in:

- (3) What have you done?

The French counterpart of bare interrogative *what* is either *que/qu'* or *quoi*:

- (4) Qu'as-tu fait? ('what have you done')

- (5) Tu as fait quoi? ('you have done what')

depending on various factors. However, neither *que/qu'* nor *quoi* can mimic *what* in (2):

- (6) *Qu'étudiant as-tu vu? ('what student have you seen')

- (7) *Quoi étudiant as-tu vu?

French does have:

- (8) Quel étudiant as-tu vu? ('which student have you seen')

with a *wh*-word *quel* that seems to be a relatively close counterpart of English *which* as in (1).¹

Of central interest to this paper is the fact that French does not allow the lexical noun to be unpronounced in sentences that are otherwise exactly like (8):²

- (9) *Quel as-tu vu?

Similarly in the plural:

- (10) Quels étudiants as-tu vus? ('which students have you seen')

- (11) *Quels as-tu vus?

The lexical noun can remain unpronounced in French only if *quel(s)* is preceded by the definite article (written as one word with *quel*³):

- (12) Lequel as-tu vu? ('the which have you seen')

- (13) Lesquels as-tu vus?

The Italian counterparts of (8) and (10) are the following:

- (14) Quale studente hai visto? ('which student have-you seen')

- (15) Quali studenti hai visto? ('which students...')

in which Italian *quale/quali* is parallel to French *quel/quels*. Yet Italian differs from French in that Italian allows the lexical noun to be unexpressed without a definite article appearing, in contrast to (9) and (11):

- (16) Quale/quali hai visto?

Moreover, Italian does not allow the definite article to appear in (16), as opposed to French (12) and (13):

- (17) *Il quale hai visto? ('the which...')

- (18) *I quali hai visto? ('the which (plural)...')

We can note in passing that English is more like Italian here:

- (19) Which would you prefer?

- (20) *The which would you prefer?

On the other hand, English differs from Italian in relative clauses with *quale* or *which*:

- (21) the reason for (*the) which John...

- (22) la ragione per *(la) quale Gianni...

English relative *which* is incompatible with *the*, while Italian relative *quale* must be preceded by the definite article, here *la*.⁴ In relatives, French *quel* is like Italian *quale*, despite differing from it in interrogatives in the way just discussed. In relatives, French *quel* requires the definite article, as in Italian:

- (23) la raison pour laquelle Jean...

- (24) *la raison pour quelle Jean...

The question why English differs in relatives in this way from both French and Italian will not be pursued in this paper.⁵ (Nor will I pursue here the Italian-internal contrast between (17)/(18) and (22).⁶)

Returning to the central theme of French vs. Italian, we can ask whether the contrast discussed in (9)-(18) between French *quel* and Italian *quale* in interrogatives without a pronounced lexical N (whereby *quel* requires and

quale disallows a preceding definite article) correlates or clusters with any other difference between the two languages.

2. Superlatives.

Cross-Romance comparative evidence suggests a link to postnominal superlatives. English superlatives have the superlative adjective prenominal:

- (25) You should give the smartest student an A.
 (26) *You should give the student smartest an A.

This is also true with *most*:

- (27) You should give the most intelligent student an A.
 (28) *You should give the student most intelligent an A.

Plausibly, this falls under the generalization that English adjectives are (almost) always prenominal.⁷

French and Italian share the property that their adjectives can readily be postnominal, in contrast to English:

- (29) *John has read a book interesting.
 (30) Jean a lu un livre intéressant. (French)
 (31) Gianni ha letto un libro interessante. (Italian)

Similarly with superlatives:

- (32) L'étudiant le plus intelligent est Jean. (French 'the student the most intelligent is J')
 (33) Lo studente più intelligente è Gianni. (Italian)

French and Italian also share the property of lacking a morphological distinction corresponding to *most* vs. *more*. French *plus* and Italian *più* appear both in the superlatives of (32)/(33) and in comparatives:

- (34) Marie est plus intelligente que Jean. (French 'M is *plus* intelligent than J')
 (35) Maria è più intelligente di Gianni. (Italian 'M is *più* intelligent than G')

However, French and Italian differ sharply in that French (32) contains a definite article *le* immediately before *plus*, whereas Italian *più* in (33) is not preceded by a definite article. In French, this definite article is obligatory with postnominal superlatives:

- (36) *L'étudiant plus intelligent est Jean.

In Italian it is impossible:

- (37) *Lo studente il più intelligente è Gianni.

The fact that French has, in postnominal superlatives, an obligatory definite article that Italian cannot have is reminiscent of the fact discussed earlier that French has, with interrogative bare *quel*, an obligatory definite article (v. (9)-(13)) that Italian *quale* cannot have (v. (16)-(18)).

That there is a significant linkage here is supported by the fact that the following cross-Romance generalization appears to hold:

(38) If a Romance language obligatorily has an overt definite article preceding (its equivalent of) bare interrogative *quel*, then it obligatorily has a definite article preceding (its equivalent of) postnominal superlative *plus*.

3. Greek.

We can (and must) now ask why this linkage should hold and how best to express it. (A specific answer will be proposed beginning in section 6.) As a first step, note that the pre-*plus* definite article in (32) is less exotic than it looks. Although in French it does not appear with non-superlative postnominal adjectives:

- (39) *l'étudiant l'intelligent ('the student the intelligent')

DPs that look like (39) are possible in Greek,⁸ as discussed by Alexiadou and Wilder (1998). I will attempt to adapt their analysis to French.

Alexiadou and Wilder look at the (grammatical) Greek counterpart of (39) in the following way. From the observation that Greek allows a postnominal adjective to be preceded by an 'extra' definite article only if that adjective can occur in predicate position (as opposed to adjectives like *former*), Alexiadou and Wilder conclude that the postnominal adjectives in question should in fact be analyzed as predicative, originating within a small clause, in effect a kind of reduced relative clause.

Their proposal adopts a raising approach to (these) relatives, approximately along the lines of Kayne (1994, §8.4), in which the relative clause is a complement of D. But Alexiadou and Wilder diverge from that analysis in one crucial way.⁹ Whereas I had assumed that the phrase that was raised/promoted in relative clauses (to a position just below D) could never itself be a DP, they argue that it can be, and that that is precisely what underlies Greek having two Ds in cases like (39).

For reduced relatives, I (p.98) had a derivation (for English cases like *the recently arrived letter*) essentially as follows (abstracting away from the head of the small clause). The small clause, which was taken to have a subject NP (or QP, but not DP), is merged with (an unpronounced) C, yielding:

(40) C [_{SC} letter [recently arrived]]

Preposing of the predicate phrase to Spec,CP yielded:

(41) [recently arrived]_i C [_{SC} letter t_i]

followed by merger of D:

(42) the [[recently arrived]_i C [_{SC} letter t_i]]

This derivation produces an output in which the predicate phrase (whether participial or adjectival¹⁰) precedes the noun.

Alexiadou and Wilder argue that the small clause subject in this kind of derivation must be allowed to be a DP. Continuing for convenience with English morphemes (and using a simple adjective), their proposal leads to derivations (in Greek) like the following, in which the subject of the small clause is the DP ‘the student’:

(43) C [_{SC} [the student] [intelligent]] --> preposing of predicate
[intelligent]_i C [_{SC} [the student] t_i] --> merger of D
the [[intelligent]_i C [_{SC} [the student] t_i]]

Alexiadou and Wilder then propose that the derivation shown in (43) can be extended,¹¹ in the sense that the DP subject of the small clause can itself be preposed to the specifier of the higher D. Starting from and repeating the last line of (43), we have:

(44) the [[intelligent]_i C [_{SC} [the student] t_i]] --> DP-preposing
[the student]_j the [[intelligent]_i C [_{SC} t_j t_i]]

The result is of course ungrammatical in English (and French, as in (39), and Italian):

(45) *the student the intelligent

but is grammatical in Greek.

A (remnant movement) variant of the partial derivation in (44) would have the whole small clause containing ‘the student’ preposed to Spec,D (rather than just ‘the student’):

(46) the [[intelligent]_i C [_{SC} [the student] t_i]] --> small clause preposing
[_{SC} [the student] t_i]_j the [[intelligent]_i C t_j]

in which case there is significant parallelism with the derivation of prenominal relatives of the Japanese and Amharic type proposed in Kayne (1994, 93).

Both (44) and (46) attribute to (45) an initially non-obvious property, namely that it is the second definite article that is hierarchically the higher one (the one merged later) - since the first definite article is embedded within the preposed phrase containing ‘student’.

As far as the choice between (46) and (44) is concerned, the link to Japanese and Amharic favors (46). In addition, (46) has movement to Spec,D of a constituent (the small clause) that is hierarchically closer to D than what is moved in (44) (the subject of that small clause).¹² This, too, favors (46), which I will from now on take to be the correct choice for the derivation of (45) in Greek.

4. French postnominal superlatives.

Since the ‘extra’ definite article seen with French postnominal superlatives as in (32) recalls the Greek pattern of (45), let me in fact propose that French postnominal superlatives have a derivation similar to (43)+(46). Thus a French example such as:

(47) le livre le plus court (‘the book the most short’)

will have a derivation containing the following steps, starting from a small clause with a full DP subject:

(48) C [_{SC} [le livre] [plus court]] --> preposing of predicate
[plus court]_i C [_{SC} [le livre] t_i] --> merger of higher D
le [[plus court]_i C [_{SC} [le livre] t_i]] --> small clause preposing
[_{SC} [le livre] t_i]_j le [[plus court]_i C t_j]

Again, it is the *le* immediately preceding *plus* that is the hierarchically higher D (the one merged later).¹³

Any analysis of (47) must account for the fact that French does not allow this higher D to appear with postnominal non-superlative adjectives (as we had previously seen in (39)):

(49) *le livre le court (‘the book the short’)

(50) le livre court

What I would like to propose is that in French (and also Italian) the predicate preposing step in (48) is limited to superlatives. In effect, this amounts to saying that in French (and Italian), when the subject of the small clause in

(48) has a definite article, predicate preposing is not available at all, in any general sense. The correct way to think of the first step in (48) is rather as:

- (51) C [_{SC} [le livre] [plus court]] --> superlative preposing
 [plus court]_i C [_{SC} [le livre] t_i]

That French can have superlative preposing here in the absence of any more general predicate preposing should be interpreted in terms of (obligatory) pied-piping. The superlative *plus* in (51) raises across DP to Spec,C and in so doing pied-pipes the adjective. Unlike Greek in its counterpart of (43), French does not allow adjective phrases per se to raise to Spec,C in such structures - in French they only raise as a side effect of the raising of superlative *plus*.¹⁴ The idea that superlatives in French (and Italian) can raise in a way that ordinary APs cannot of course recalls the fact that interrogative *wh*-phrases (in English, for example) raise in a way that ordinary DPs do not; similarly, negative phrases in some languages (very visibly in Icelandic, for example¹⁵) raise in a way that ordinary DPs do not. Pied-piping of the AP by *plus* is to be considered parallel to the pied-piping of NP (or QP or NumP) by the *wh*-morpheme or by the negative morpheme.¹⁶

I note in passing that there is evidence that, even in English, superlatives raise in a way that ordinary APs do not. This is not apparent in *the most interesting book*, which appears to be parallel to *the interesting book*, but it is seen, I think, in the sharp contrast between the following:

- (52) That's not the shortest/most interesting of books.
 (53) *That's not the short/interesting of books.

and also in:

- (54) (?)Of all the students, John's the one who's written the fewest number of papers this year.
 (55) John is the author of the few (*number of) papers that are good.

The adjective *few*, as seen in (55), normally cannot directly modify the overt noun *number*, but it can (to varying extents) if *few* is raised - as shown, I would claim, in (54). This raising is seen more transparently in:

- (56) ?(?)John has written too few a number of papers to qualify for a grant.

in which *too few* has been raised past *a*, just as *fewest* has been raised (I claim) in (54).¹⁷ In (56) *few* has clearly been pied-piped by *too*:

- (57) *John has written few a number of papers.

and in (54), by extension, by *-est*. (Similarly, in (52) *short/interesting* has plausibly been pied-piped by *-est/most*.¹⁸)

Let me repeat the contrast that holds within French:

- (58) le livre le plus court ('the book the most short')
 (59) *le livre le court

The proposal is that this contrast is due to French having raising of *plus* (similarly to raising of *wh*) that pied-pipes the adjective *court*. This leads to the intermediate stage:

- (60) [plus court]_i C [_{SC} [le livre] t_i]

seen in (51), which in turn leads to (58) via the merger of the higher D *le* and the preposing of (the small clause containing) *le livre* to Spec,*le*:

- (61) [plus court]_i C [_{SC} [le livre] t_i] --> merger of *le*
 le [[plus court]_i C [_{SC} [le livre] t_i]] --> small clause preposing
 [_{SC} [le livre] t_i]_j le [[plus court]_i C t_j]

A parallel derivation for (59) is not available in French (as opposed to Greek) because, by hypothesis, the 'bare' adjective *court* cannot be raised in French in the same way that *plus court* has been in (60).

This picture of French takes *plus court* in (58) to be a constituent that excludes the definite article *le*, as shown in (61). Put another way, (58) contains no constituent of the form 'le plus'. That the definite article and the superlative morpheme do not form a constituent is supported to a certain indirect extent by English:

- (62) That is a most interesting book.

which at the very least shows that *most* need not occur with *the* at all.¹⁹

Closer to present concerns, there is evidence within French itself that superlative *plus* and preceding definite article need not form a constituent.²⁰

- (63) les quatre plus belles femmes ('the four most beautiful women')
 (64) la quatrième plus belle femme ('the fourth most beautiful woman')

In these examples *plus* is not immediately preceded by a definite article. I conclude that the dissociation of *le* and *plus* shown in (61) is plausible and I take it to be correct.

In (63) and (64) the superlative is prenominal rather than postnominal. In such prenominal cases in French there cannot be a definite article directly preceding *plus* at all:

- (65) *les quatre les plus belles femmes

(66) *la quatrième la plus belle femme

The contrast between these and (58), with a well-formed postnominal superlative and two definite articles, can be understood as follows. As we have seen, in (58) the first definite article originates as part of the subject of the small clause; the second corresponds to the higher definite article of a relative clause-like structure. At the point in the derivation of (58) (given in (48)) just after the merger of the higher definite article we have:

(67) le [[plus court]_i C [_{SC} [le livre] t_i]]

If we were to have a numeral (cardinal or ordinal) within the small clause subject, we would have (adjusting to plural in the first of these):

(68) les [[plus courts]_i C [_{SC} [les quatre livres] t_i]]

(69) le [[plus court]_i C [_{SC} [le quatrième livre] t_i]]

Small clause preposing would then yield:

(70) [_{SC} [les quatre livres] t_i]_j les [[plus courts]_i C t_j]

(71) [_{SC} [le quatrième livre] t_i]_j le [[plus court]_i C t_j]

corresponding to:

(72) les quatre livres les plus courts ('the four books the most short')

(73) le quatrième livre le plus court ('the fourth book the...')

These are well-formed, but they still have the superlatives postnominal.

Put another way, the type of derivation proposed earlier for the well-formed (58) has the (welcome) property that it does not lead us to expect (65)/(66) to be available. If it were possible in French to stop the derivation at the point shown in (67), we would get, switching back to *belle*:

(74) *la plus belle la femme

which is ill-formed in French (even with an adjective like *belle* that lends itself to being prenominal). I conclude that when the derivation reaches (67) (or (68) or (69)) it must continue on, with the small clause obligatorily moving to Spec,D, yielding (58) (or (72) or (73)).²¹

There remains the question of how to allow for the well-formed prenominal superlatives of (63) and (64), as well as for the corresponding case with no numeral:

(75) les plus belles femmes ('the most beautiful women')

in all three of which there is only one definite article. A possible answer is that French, in addition to (67), also allows the small clause subject to contain no overt article:

(76) la [[plus belle]_i C [_{SC} [femme] t_i]]

yielding (75) or its singular counterpart directly. If a numeral can be merged above CP but below D in this kind of derivation, we can derive (63) and (64), for example for (63):²²

(77) les [quatre [[plus belles]_i C [_{SC} [femmes] t_i]]]

A question that arises is why small clause preposing applied to (76) yields a deviant result:

(78) *femme la plus belle

Adapting an idea of Alexiadou and Wilder's (1998, 327), let me say that (small clause) movement to Spec,*la*, i.e. to the Spec of the higher D in (76), is subject to a strong agreement effect, namely that the subject of the small clause must itself be preceded by (overt) definite D, as in:

(79) la femme la plus belle

with the representation:

(80) [_{SC} [la femme] t_i]_j la [[plus belle]_i C t_j]

in which the preposed small clause matches the higher D *la* in definiteness.²³

Note that this matching requirement cannot be met in French by an unpronounced definite article that would precede *femme* in (76), otherwise (78) could incorrectly be generated. Nor, not unexpectedly, by an indefinite article.²⁴

(81) *une femme la plus belle ('a woman the most beautiful')

On the other hand, one sees no definite article per se in the well-formed:

(82) ton livre le plus court ('your book the most short')

Either the possessive must itself count as fulfilling the matching requirement imposed by *le*, or there must be an unpronounced *le* specifically licensed by that possessive.

Although French does not permit (81), it does have:

(83) une femme des plus jolies ('a woman of-the most pretty')

with an interpretation akin to that of *a most beautiful woman*. In French this is not possible with a non-superlative:

(84) *une femme des jolies

suggesting that superlative raising plays a role in (83) (though I won't pursue the analysis of (83) here).

5. French superlatives vs. Italian superlatives.

The central contrast is (cf. the discussion of (36) and (37) earlier):

(85) le livre le plus court (French ‘the book the most short’)

(86) il libro più corto (Italian)

With a postnominal superlative, French must have a definite article preceding *plus*, while Italian cannot have one preceding *più*. To exclude the word-for-word French counterpart of (86):

(87) *le livre plus court

as a superlative in French,²⁵ we need to ensure that the higher definite article in:

(88) [_{SC} [le livre] t_i]_j le [[plus court]_i C t_j]

is overt, i.e. French must not allow the equivalent of (88) with an unpronounced definite D.

We can now ask in what way Italian is different. Let me propose that Italian is only minimally different from French, in that (86) has a structure identical to (85)/(88), except that Italian leaves its definite D there unpronounced:

(89) [_{SC} [il libro] t_i]_j D [[più corto]_i C t_j]

The unpronounced definite D of (89) is not allowed in French.

Before going on to make this proposal more precise, let me note that the unpronounced (definite) D that Italian has in (89) shares with the pronounced definite D of French (88) the property that the (specifier of the) small clause that it attracts to its Spec must match in definiteness (in the superlative interpretation - see note 25). Italian (90) is parallel to French (78), and Italian (91) (as a superlative) is parallel to French (81):

(90) *libro più corto

(91) *un libro più corto

Italian (89) and French (88) are thus strongly parallel, yet with a sharp difference concerning whether the higher D is pronounced or not.

6. French vs. Italian bare arguments.

Distinguishing French (85) from Italian (86) (with the corresponding representations (88) and (89)) in terms of the pronounced vs. unpronounced character of the higher D (rather than via recourse to an ad-hoc distinction between French *plus* and Italian *più*) makes it possible, I think, to relate these superlative facts to another difference between French and Italian (in a way that an ad-hoc distinction between *plus* and *più* would not have).

Let us ask, then, why French and Italian should differ here at all, and secondly, why it is French whose higher D must be pronounced in (85) and Italian whose higher D must not be pronounced in (86), rather than the other way around. The answer that I will now propose will rest in part on the fact that this French/Italian difference is one that is in essence already familiar from work on bare plurals and bare mass nouns.²⁶

Italian allows bare plurals, but French does not:

(92) *Jean achetait livres. (French ‘J bought (was buying) books’)

(93) Gianni comprava libri. (Italian - same)

Bare mass nouns/NPs show a parallel difference:

(94) *Jean buvait bière. (French ‘J drank beer’)

(95) Gianni beveva birra. (Italian - same)

To express (92) and (94) French has what I will, partly following the French grammatical tradition, call the ‘partitive’:

(96) Jean achetait des livres.

(97) Jean buvait de la bière.

in which the direct object is preceded by the preposition *de* (‘of’) and the definite article. (This is clearly so in (97), with definite article *la*; in (96) the expected **de les* is reduced to *des*, in a way that is fully general in French and not limited to these partitives.²⁷)

The presence of *de* in these partitives is related to the presence of an unpronounced noun akin to overt nouns like *number*, *amount* and *quantity*, i.e. we should think of (96) and (97) as:²⁸

(98) ...NUMBER de les livres

(99) ...AMOUNT de la bière

with capitals indicating non-pronunciation, and *de* akin to the *de* and *of*:

(100) un certain nombre de livres

(101) a certain number of books

It is important to see that the syntax of this *de* and the syntax of the definite article that follows it in (96)-(99) are at least partially independent. A simple indication in this direction comes from Piedmontese, which is like French

in rejecting exact counterparts of (93) and (95), and like French in having a partitive preposition akin to *de*. However Piedmontese lacks the definite article that French partitives have, for example:²⁹

(102) Maria a-l'a cata' d' sucher. ('M she has bought of sugar')

(103) *Maria a-l'a cata' d'l sucher. ('...of the sugar')

(In what follows, I will use the term 'bare plural/mass' in such a way as to cover (102), as well as (93) and (95), i.e. 'bareness' will pick out absence of overt determiner and will be indifferent to the presence of a preposition. The French (96)/(97) are not 'bare', since they contain a (reduced) definite article following the preposition.)

Within French itself, one sees this independence of *de* and the definite article in at least two ways. First, the definite article can fail to appear in cases like (96) where the plural noun is preceded by an adjective:

(104) Jean achetait de bons livres. ('J was-buying of good books')

Yet the *de* continues to be present. Second, there is an alternation concerning quantity elements like *beaucoup* ('a lot'), which in simple cases corresponding to *a lot of friends* are followed by *de*-NP, with no definite article:

(105) Jean a beaucoup d'amis. ('J has a lot of friends')

Yet under right-dislocation *beaucoup* can for many speakers cooccur either with or without the definite article:

(106) Jean en a beaucoup, d'amis. ('J of-them has a lot, of friends')

(107) Jean en a beaucoup, des amis. (same, with the definite article)

Granting, then, that *de* and the definite article of partitives are independent of one another (even if they interact in important ways), we can return to (92)-(95) and conclude that French and Italian actually differ there in two separate ways. French (like Piedmontese) must have *de* where Italian does not have to have it. And, second, French has a definite article (in (96)/(97)) where Italian does not have to have one (in (93)/(95)). (On Italian partitives, see the discussion of (122) later.)

This second conclusion is very similar to what we have seen in the syntax of superlatives. More specifically, assume that I have been correct in arguing that the superlative difference has to do, not directly with the superlative morphemes *plus* and *più*, but rather with French necessarily having an overt higher definite article in certain DPs (containing postnominal superlatives), as opposed to Italian necessarily having an unpronounced higher definite article in the same (superlative) context.

Then both differences now under consideration (superlatives on the one hand, bare plurals/mass on the other) have something to do with the pronunciation (in French) vs. the non-pronunciation (in Italian) of the definite article in certain contexts.

The structures given for the two French cases now under discussion are:

(108) [_{SC} [le livre] t_i]_j le [[plus court]_i C t_j] (=88)

(109) AMOUNT de la bière (=99)

Their Italian counterparts are, in the superlative case, with unpronounced D:

(110) [_{SC} [il libro] t_i]_j D [[più corto]_i C t_j]

and in the bare mass noun case (95):

(111) AMOUNT D birra

In (111) I have attributed to Italian the same structure (but with D unpronounced) that we have in (109), less the *de*.³⁰

Assume that AMOUNT in (111) is in Spec,D (in all likelihood having gotten there by movement - and similarly for (109), with respect to Spec,P). Then we can formulate two generalizations:

(112) In Italian, a definite D with a filled Spec can and must be unpronounced.

(113) In French, a filled Spec does not license non-pronunciation for a definite D.

The formulation in (112) allows both (110) and (111), while prohibiting (cf. (37)):

(114) *il libro il più corto (Italian 'the book the most short')

It also allows (111)/(95), while prohibiting:

(115) *AMOUNT la birra

with a pronounced D. That (115) is impossible translates into the fact that the interpretation of (95) is distinct from that of:

(116) Gianni beveva la birra. ('G drank the beer')

As far as French is concerned, (113) excludes the counterpart of (88) in which D would be unpronounced, thereby correctly excluding as a superlative (cf. (87)):

(117) *le livre plus court

In the case of partitives, (113) is compatible with the well-formedness of (109)/(97), but excludes (the Italian-like):³¹

(118) *AMOUNT D bière

with an unpronounced D, and thereby prohibits French from having (the Italian-like) (94), repeated here:³²

(119) *Jean buvait bière. ('J drank beer')

The pair of generalizations (112)/(113) thus allows bringing together the difference between French and Italian superlatives with the difference between French and Italian bare plurals/mass nouns. (From the present perspective, bare plurals and bare mass nouns/NPs (at least those with an indefinite interpretation³³) must contain NUMBER/AMOUNT, and are therefore less 'bare', strictly speaking, than has been thought.)

Taking singular count nouns not to be compatible either with NUMBER or with AMOUNT, this gives us a way of understanding the asymmetry within Italian between the widespread character of bare plurals and bare mass nouns, and the much more limited character of bare singulars:

(120) *Gianni comprava libro. ('G bought book')

The status of (120) follows from the impossibility of having an argument be a simple NP,³⁴ combined (since (120) has neither NUMBER nor AMOUNT in Spec,D) with the limited possibilities for licensing a null D. (In Italian, a null D can perhaps only be licensed via (112).³⁵)

Of interest is the fact that (112) does not exclude an Italian counterpart of (109) (since in (109) AMOUNT is, given the presence of the (overt) preposition,³⁶ not in Spec,D), i.e. Italian is not prohibited from having:

(121) AMOUNT de la birra

which arguably corresponds to the well-formed *della birra* in sentences like:³⁷ (122) Gianni beveva della birra. ('G drank of-the beer')

Somewhat similarly (112) does not prevent Italian from having a counterpart to French (83):³⁸

(123) Ho parlato con un impiegato dei più gentili. (Italian 'I-have spoken with an employee of-the most nice')

since the definite article *-i* is 'protected' by the preposition from having a filled Spec. The same holds for:

(124) due dei ragazzi (Italian 'two of-the boys')

A question concerning (112) is, what exactly is meant by filled Spec, in particular in cases in which some phrase might have moved through Spec,D, landing in some still higher position. Passage through Spec,D has been proposed in at least two kinds of cases. One involves extractions from NP/DP of the sort discussed by Giorgi and Longobardi (1991, chap.2); the other involves extraction of a dative possessor in Hungarian (Szabolcsi (1983)), which can plausibly be transposed to Italian (and French) sentences with dative inalienable possessors, for example, in Italian.³⁹

(125) Gli hanno rotto la gamba. ('to-him they-have broken the leg')

If there is in fact movement through Spec,D, then, given the pronunciation of the definite article in many such cases (e.g. *la* in (125)), movement through Spec,D must not count as producing a filled Spec in the sense of (112).

7. Back to *lequel* and *quale*.

Consider again (38), repeated here:

(126) If a Romance language obligatorily has an overt definite article preceding (its equivalent of) bare interrogative *quel*, then it obligatorily has a definite article preceding (its equivalent of) postnominal superlative *plus*.

The relevant interrogative sentences are:

(127) Lequel as-tu vu? (French 'the which have you seen')

(128) *Quel as-tu vu?

and:

(129) *Il quale hai visto? (Italian 'the which have-you seen')

(130) Quale hai visto?

Why should the correlation stated in (126) hold?

The correlation expressed in (126) brings together interrogative *lequel/quale* and superlatives. The discussion of section 6 brought together superlatives and bare plurals/mass nouns. It is therefore of interest that the following seems to hold:

(131) If a Romance language has an obligatory overt definite article preceding bare interrogative *quel*, then it does not allow bare plurals/bare mass nouns any more than French does.

The fact that the *lequel* vs. *quale* difference between French and Italian correlates both with a difference having to do with bare plurals/mass nouns and with a difference having to do with (postnominal) superlatives suggests folding *lequel/quale* into the perspective of (112)/(113). What we want to say, then, is that interrogative *quel/quale*, in the absence of an overt noun, enters into structures that are in fact similar to those proposed for postnominal superlatives, repeated here for French and Italian, respectively:

(132) [_{SC} [le livre] t_i]_i le [[plus court]_i C t_j]

(133) [_{SC} [il libro] t_i]_j D [[più corto]_i C t_j]

as well as to those proposed for bare plurals/mass nouns (possible only in Italian):

(134) NUMBER D libri

(135) AMOUNT D birra

The key question then is, where is the missing noun in (127)-(130)? Although its presence in the structure is virtually certain, its exact position is less immediate. Let me propose that the unpronounced noun (or NP) in such interrogatives precedes, rather than follows, *lequel/quale*. In all likelihood, it does so as the result of movement. The structures corresponding to the grammatical sentences (127) and (130) are thus:⁴⁰

(136) N_i le quel t_i...

(137) N_i D quale t_i...

where N is unpronounced in both languages, and D is unpronounced in Italian.⁴¹

Taking N (or NP) in Italian to be in Spec,D makes (137) immediately compatible with (112). In the same way, taking N (or NP) in French to be in Spec,D makes (136) immediately compatible with (113). We consequently have a way of understanding the triple linkage across superlatives, bare plural/mass nouns and *lequel/quale*.

8. A digression to English possessors.

A question that arises is, why does N(P) here move to Spec,D? There would appear to be a link to Rizzi's (2000, 316) discussion of null topics in German and to Chomsky's (2001, 13) Phase Impenetrability Condition. An unpronounced category (here N⁴²) that is not locally licensed by another category must arguably move up to the Spec of an appropriate phase (here perhaps DP), presumably to the nearest such Spec (thinking of the discussion of (125)). (This would not apply to the unpronounced D itself of (135), which is locally licensed by the phrase in its Spec.)

There is a curious set of English facts that bears on the principles regulating the syntax of unpronounced categories. These facts concern possessives with unpronounced nouns (or NPs), as in:

(138) John's car is bigger than Bill's.

The possessor of the unpronounced noun can be pronominal:

(139) John's car is bigger than yours.

In these examples, the unpronounced noun clearly has an antecedent *car*. Somewhat different is:

(140) Why don't we go over to Bill's tonight?

which is perfectly natural in an out-of-the-blue context, with no feeling of an antecedent in the sense of (138)/(139). The interpretation of (140) in an out-of-the-blue context is very close, if not identical, to that of:

(141) Why don't we go over to Bill's place tonight?

a fact that (among others) led me to propose (see Kayne (2004)):

(142) ...Bill's PLACE...

as (part of) the structure of (141). In (142), PLACE is an unpronounced noun that differs from the ones in (138) and (139) in not (necessarily) having an antecedent.

Trudgill and Hannah (1994, 76) have noted in effect that in American English (and this is certainly true for mine) the possessor in (140) cannot be pronominal:⁴³

(143) *Why don't we go over to yours tonight?

To me, this sentence is clearly impossible in an out-of-the-blue context, contrary to (140). Similarly, in a contrastive context, I have a clear difference between non-pronominal and pronominal possessors, with unantedeceded PLACE:

(144) Why should we go over to Bill's tonight? We should all go over to John's/*yours, instead.

Why should this be? The answer depends in part, I think, on the fact that in a sense, (138) and (139) are misleading - the parallel behavior of pronominal and non-pronominal possessors that those two examples display breaks down if we reinstate the lexical noun and simultaneously keep the -s:

(145) Bill's house

(146) *yours house

and similarly for **hers house*, **theirs house*, **ours house* (and for the less regular possessive of **mine house*).⁴⁴

A natural hypothesis is that (143) is out for the same reason as (144). But if that's true, how can we distinguish these two from (139)? Assume that, parallel to (142), we have, for (143):

(147) *...yours PLACE

but that for (139) we have, rather:

(148) ...N_i yours t_i

with N-raising approximately as in (136) and (137). Let me, more specifically, adopt the approach to (145) vs.

(146) put forth by Bernstein and Tortora (2004), who have pronominal possessors lower in the DP structure than

lexical ones.⁴⁵ In particular, pronominal possessors are lower than the position in which 's is found, so that *your* in the simple case cannot precede 's, as seen in (146). To allow for:

(149) a friend of yours

they propose that when a *friend* raises to Spec,*of*⁴⁶ *your* in fact can raise to the position normally reserved for lexical possessors. In their footnote 30, they suggest looking at predicative:

(150) This book is yours.

in the same way, with raising of an unpronounced (pronominal) counterpart of *book* licensing the raising of *your* past 's.

If we generalize further to all argument positions, we in effect reach (148) as part of the analysis of (139). If the raising of *your* (and other pronominal possessors) to Spec, 's is dependent on such N-raising,⁴⁷ and if no such raising takes place with PLACE in (143)/(144)/(147), then we can draw the desired distinction.

This leads in turn to the question why unpronounced PLACE would fail to raise in (147) while unpronounced N does raise in (148), which corresponds to (139) and (150). A likely initial answer is that N raises in (148) precisely because it has an antecedent, which PLACE in (147) does not have.⁴⁸

This might then be related to the proposal in Kayne (2002a, §9), to the effect that every antecedent-pronoun pair originates in a doubling constituent that subsequently raises (a movement induced by a property of the pronominal subpart).

9. Conclusion.

Examples (127)-(130), with *lequel* and *quale*, have in common with (150) and (139) that there is an unpronounced noun understood to have an antecedent. Therefore, the suggestion just made as to why there should be N-raising carries over, and provides an account of why (136) and (137) are the correct structures.⁴⁹ Those structures in turn allow linking *lequel/quale* to the question of postnominal superlatives (and via (131) to the question of bare plurals).

That these three phenomena are each to be seen as reflecting a (differential) property of definite D is not self-evident. To look at *lequel* vs. *quale* in that way is straightforward, less so no doubt are the other two. For postnominal superlatives, one might have thought that what was at issue was some property of the superlative morpheme itself. For bare plurals, one might have thought that the absence of any definite D in bare plurals in Italian would make the approach argued for here unlikely to be on the right track. But that consideration is overridden if it is correct to take French partitives (which do contain a definite article) to be a true French counterpart of Italian bare plurals.⁵⁰

Moreover, the fact that within Romance there is a partial correlation/clustering across these three properties (as stated in (131) and (126)) constitutes additional evidence (especially in the case of (131)) that the syntax of definite D is central to an understanding of indefinite bare plurals/bare mass nouns across Romance.

This is of course not entirely a surprise, since we can readily see through French partitives that phrases that are globally interpreted as indefinites (similarly to bare plurals in Italian) can and do contain a definite D. The comparative evidence discussed here suggests (in a way that recalls Cheng and Sybesma (1999, 529; 2005) on Chinese) that the same holds for Italian (cf. Chomsky's (2001, 2) uniformity principle), even though Italian bare plurals do not give their definite D any pronunciation.⁵¹

It goes without saying that additional Romance languages need to be examined to test the validity of the cross-Romance correlations that I have suggested, and that additional morphosyntactic properties of French and Italian (and other Romance languages) need to be looked into with an eye to seeing how widespread (and how consistent) the ramifications are of (112)/(113).⁵²

The present conclusion shares with Longobardi (1994, 618) and Chierchia (1998, 386) the idea that Italian bare plurals/mass nouns⁵³ contain an unpronounced determiner. But I have been led to think that that determiner is an unpronounced counterpart of the definite article (see note 33), with the indefinite reading (again recalling Cheng and Sybesma (1999; 2005)) depending rather on the additional presence of an unpronounced NUMBER/AMOUNT.

For helpful comments on an earlier draft of this paper, I am indebted to Guglielmo Cinque and to Jean-Yves Pollock.

References:

- Alexiadou, A. (2003) "On Double Definiteness," in L.-O. Delsing, C. Falk, G. Josefsson and H.A. Sigurdhsson (eds.) *Grammar in Focus. Volume II. Festschrift for Christer Platzack*, Department of Scandinavian Languages, Lund University, Sweden, 9-16.

- Alexiadou, A. and C. Wilder (1998) "Adjectival Modification and Multiple Determiners," in A. Alexiadou and C. Wilder (eds.) *Possessors, Predicates and Movement in the Determiner Phrase*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 305-332.
- Anagnostopoulou, E. (1994) *Clitic Dependencies in Modern Greek*, Doctoral dissertation, Salzburg University, Austria.
- Benincà, P. (1980) "Nomi senza articolo," *Rivista di grammatica generativa*, 5, 51-63.
- Benincà, P. and C. Poletto (2004) "Topic, Focus, and V2. Defining the CP Sublayers," in L. Rizzi (ed.) *The Structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Volume 2*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Bernstein, J.B. (2004) "English *th-* Forms," handout of paper presented at the Copenhagen Symposium on Determination, 26-28 August.
- Bernstein, J.B. and C. Tortora (2004) "Two Types of Possessive Forms in English," *Lingua*,
- Bianchi, V. (1993) "An empirical contribution to the study of idiomatic expressions," *Rivista di Linguistica*, 5, 349-385.
- Bianchi, V. (1999) *Consequences of Antisymmetry. Headed Relative Clauses*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Bouchard, D. (2003) "Les SN sans déterminant en français et en anglais," in P. Miller and A. Zribi-Hertz (eds.) *Essais sur la grammaire comparée du français et de l'anglais*, Presses Universitaires de Vincennes, Saint-Denis, 55-95.
- Cardinaletti, A. (1997) "Subjects and Clause Structure," in L. Haegeman (ed.) *The New Comparative Syntax*, Longman, London, 33-63.
- Chenal, A. (1986) *Le franco-provençal valdôtain*, Musumeci, Aoste.
- Cheng, L.L.-S. and R. Sybesma (1999) "Bare and Not-So-Bare Nouns and the Structure of NP," *Linguistic Inquiry*, 30, 509-542.
- Cheng, L.L.-S. and R. Sybesma (2005) "Classifiers in Four Varieties of Chinese," in G. Cinque and R. Kayne (eds.) *Handbook of Comparative Syntax*, Oxford University Press, New York,
- Chierchia, G. (1998) "Reference to Kinds across Languages," *Natural Language Semantics*, 6, 339-405.
- Chomsky, N. (2000) "Minimalist Inquiries: The Framework," in R. Martin, D. Michaels and J. Uriagereka (eds.) *Step by Step: Essays in Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 89-155.
- Chomsky, N. (2001) "Derivation by Phase," in M. Kenstowicz (ed.) *Ken Hale. A Life in Language*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1-52.
- Cinque, G. (1977) "The Movement Nature of Left Dislocation," *Linguistic Inquiry*, 8, 397-412.
- Cinque, G. (1995) *Italian Syntax and Universal Grammar*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England.
- Cinque, G. (to appear) "Deriving Greenberg's Universal 20 and Its Exceptions,"
- Delfitto, D. and J. Schrotten (1991) "Bare Plurals and the Number Affix in DP," *Probus*, 3, 155-185.
- Déprez, V. (to appear) "Morphological Number, Semantic Number and Bare Nouns," *Lingua*,
- Giorgi, A. and G. Longobardi (1991) *The Syntax of Noun Phrases. Configuration, Parameters and Empty Categories*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Grevisse, M. (1993) *Le bon usage* (thirteenth edition, by André Goosse), Duculot, Paris.
- Gross, M. (1968) *Grammaire transformationnelle du français. Syntaxe du verbe*, Larousse, Paris.
- Guéron, J. (1983) "L'emploi 'possessif' de l'article défini en français," *Langue Française*, 58, 23-35.
- Harrell, R.S. (1962) *A Short Reference Grammar of Moroccan Arabic*, Georgetown University Press, Washington, D.C.
- Hendrick, R. (1990) "Operator Binding in NP," in A. Halperin (ed.) *Proceedings of the Ninth West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Julien, M. (2002) *Syntactic Heads and Word Formation*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Kayne, R.S. (1975) *French Syntax. The Transformational Cycle*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Kayne, R.S. (1994) *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Kayne, R.S. (1998) "Overt vs. Covert Movement," *Syntax*, 1, 128-191 (reprinted in Kayne (2000)).
- Kayne, R.S. (1999) "Prepositional Complementizers as Attractors", *Probus*, 11, 39-73 (reprinted in Kayne (2000)).
- Kayne, R.S. (2000) *Parameters and Universals*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Kayne, R.S. (2002a) "Pronouns and Their Antecedents" in S. Epstein and D. Seely (eds.), *Derivation and Explanation in the Minimalist Program*, Blackwell, Malden, Mass., 133-166 (reprinted in Kayne (2005c)).
- Kayne (2002b) "On Some Prepositions That Look DP-internal: English *of* and French *de*", *Catalan Journal of Linguistics*, 1, 71-115 (reprinted in Kayne (2005c)).

- Kayne, R.S. (2003) "Antisymmetry and Japanese", *English Linguistics*, 20, 1-40 (reprinted in Kayne (2005c)).
- Kayne, R.S. (2004) "Here and There" in C. Leclère, E. Laporte, M. Piot & M. Silberstein (eds.) *Syntax, Lexis & Lexicon-Grammar. Papers in Honour of Maurice Gross*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 253-273 (reprinted in Kayne (2005c)).
- Kayne, R.S. (2005a) "Some Notes on Comparative Syntax, with Special Reference to English and French" in G. Cinque and R. Kayne (eds.) *Handbook of Comparative Syntax*, Oxford University Press, New York (reprinted in Kayne (2005c)).
- Kayne, R.S. (2005b) "On the Syntax of Quantity in English", in Kayne, R.S. (2005c).
- Kayne, R.S. (2005c) *Movement and Silence*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Koopman, H. and A. Szabolcsi (2000) *Verbal Complexes*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Kornfilt, J. (1997) *Turkish*, Routledge, London.
- Kuroda, S.-Y. (1968) "English Relativization and Certain Related Problems," *Language*, 44, 244-266 (reprinted in Reibel, D.A. and S.A. Schane, eds., *Modern Studies in English* (1969), Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey).
- Landau, I. (1999) "Possessor Raising and the Structure of VP," *Lingua*, 107, 1-37.
- Longobardi, G. (1996) "The Syntax of N-Raising: A Minimalist Theory," *OTS Working Papers*, Utrecht University.
- Longobardi, G. (1994) "Reference and proper names," *Linguistic Inquiry* 25, 609-665.
- Martinon, P. (1927) *Comment on parole en français*, Larousse, Paris.
- Matushansky, O. (2003) "Is 'The Best' Like 'Good Enough'?", handout of paper presented at the Journée syntaxe-acquisition, École Normale Supérieure, Paris, 21 May.
- Moshiri, L. (1988) *Colloquial Persian*, Routledge, London.
- Nilsen, Ö. (2003) *Eliminating Positions: The Syntax and Semantics of Sentence Modification*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Utrecht.
- Pollock, J.-Y. (1998) "On the Syntax of Subnominal Clitics: Cliticization and Ellipsis," *Syntax*, 1, 300-330.
- Perlmutter, D.M. (1972) "Evidence for Shadow Pronouns in French Relativization," in P.M. Peranteau et al. (eds.) *The Chicago Which Hunt. Papers from the Relative Clause Festival*, Chicago Linguistic Society, Chicago, Illinois, 73-105.
- Rizzi, L. (2000) *Comparative Syntax and Language Acquisition*, Routledge, London.
- Roodenburg, J. (2004) "French Bare Arguments Are Not Extinct: The Case of Coordinated Bare Nouns," *Linguistic Inquiry*, 35, 301-313.
- Roodenburg, J. (2003) "Nouvelles remarques sur *de+s*," ms., University of Amsterdam and University of Paris 8.
- Schmitt, C. and A. Munn (2002) "The Syntax and Semantics of Bare Arguments in Brazilian Portuguese," in P. Pica and J. Rooryck (eds.) *Linguistic Variation Yearbook. Volume 2*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 185-216.
- Spector, B. (2001) "Plural Indefinite DPs as PLURAL-polarity Items," abstract of paper presented at the Workshop on Determiners (Going Romance 2001), University of Amsterdam.
- Sportiche, D. (1995) "Sketch of a reductionist approach to syntactic variation and dependencies," in H. Campos & P. Kempchinsky (eds.) *Evolution and revolution in linguistic theory*, Georgetown University Press, Washington, D.C., 356-398 (reprinted in Sportiche, D. (1998) *Partitions and Atoms of Clause Structure. Subjects, agreement, case and clitics*, Routledge, London)..
- Sportiche, D. (2002) "Movement Types and Triggers," *GLOW Newsletter*, 48, 116-117.
- Storto, G. (2001) "On the Status of the 'Partitive Determiner' in Italian," abstract of paper presented at the Workshop on Determiners (Going Romance 2001), University of Amsterdam.
- Svenonius, P. (2000) "Quantifier Movement in Icelandic," in P. Svenonius (ed.) *The Derivation of VO and OV*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 255-292.
- Szabolcsi, A. (1983) "The Possessor that Ran Away from Home," *The Linguistic Review*, 3, 89-102.
- Toso, F. (1997) *Grammatica del genovese - varietà urbana e di koinè*, Le Mani, Genoa.
- Trudgill, P. and J. Hannah (1994) *International English. A Guide to Varieties of Standard English*, third edition, Edward Arnold, London.
- Vergnaud, J.-R. and M.L. Zubizarreta (1992) "The Definite Determiner and the Inalienable Constructions in French and in English," *Linguistic Inquiry*, 23, 595-652.
- Zribi-Hertz, A. (2003) "La syntaxe de l'article défini: De la structure à l'interprétation," to appear in *Actes du colloque Modèles syntaxiques*, De Boeck/Duculot, Louvain.
- Zribi-Hertz, A. and H. Glaude (2003) "Bare NPs and Deficient DPs in Haitian and French: from Morphosyntax to Referent Construal," to appear in M. Baptista and J. Guéron (eds.) *Bare nouns in Creole languages*, J. Benjamins,

Zwart, J.-W. (2000) "A Head Raising Analysis of Relative Clauses in Dutch," in A. Alexiadou, P. Law, A. Meinunger and C. Wilder (eds.) *The Syntax of Relative Clauses*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

¹ Although the interpretation of (9) may cover that of (3), too.

² (9) differs from:

(i) *Quelle est-elle?* ('which is it(fem.)')

in which we have a (non-subject) predicative *quelle*. (9) is representative of all cases in which *quel* is part of an argument. In (i), *quelle* is arguably not be part of a DP.

The contrast:

(ii) **Quel de ces livres est le plus intéressant?* ('which of those books is the most interesting')

(iii) *Lequel de ces livres est le plus intéressant?*

suggests that (iii) contains an unpronounced noun in addition to overt *livres*, as in the Turkish construction mentioned by Kornfilt (1997, 237) in which the 'extra' (pronounced) noun corresponds to a classifier-like *item* (or *person*).

³ As far as I can tell, this orthographic convention is not of importance to the syntax - cf. Julien (2002).

⁴ Except, as brought to my attention by Guglielmo Cinque, when predicative:

i) *Da gentiluomo quale era...* ('from gentleman which he-was..')

recalling note 2.

⁵ Possibly, (21) can be linked to the fact that *the* is incompatible with plural generics in cases like (cf. Longobardi (1994, 631)):

i) Cats are smart.

and/or to the fact that *the* is incompatible with possessives, as in:

ii) *(*the) your books*

and/or to *the* being incompatible with inalienable possession in cases like (cf. Guéron (1983) and Vergnaud and Zubizarreta (1992)):

iii) John raised the arm.

and/or to *the* being incompatible with sentential complements as in:

iv) John erred in *(*the) telling us a lie.*

and/or to the fact that *the* is morphologically related to demonstratives (cf. Bernstein (2004)), and/or to Sportiche's (1995, §4.2) suggestion that *the* might be a specifier.

⁶ Which recalls Kuroda (1968). The obligatoriness of the definite article with Italian relative *quale* may suggest an analysis in which *quale*+NP is the double of an unpronounced resumptive (cf. Perlmutter (1972)), yet in which NP is raised much as in Kayne (1994, 89). (The raising of a double would be similar to Kayne (2002a).)

Indirectly relevant is the fact that Italian CLLD is possible with idiom chunks - v. Cinque (1977, 402) and Bianchi (1993).

⁷ Both with superlatives and with ordinary adjectives there are exceptions when the adjective is accompanied by a complement as in:

i) The student most capable of solving that problem is Mary.

ii) any student capable of solving that problem

Similarly, although for me a bit less easily, with *-est*:

iii) (?)The student strongest in mathematics is Mary.

It may be that the preposition (*of, in* in these examples) is playing a crucial role, in a way related to Cinque's (to appear, note 34) and perhaps to the facts mentioned in Kayne (1975, chap.3, note 82).

⁸ And in Hebrew - see Alexiadou (2003) for discussion of differences between Greek and Hebrew (and Scandinavian).

⁹ Cf. in part Bianchi (1999, 49); also Zwart (2000), Zribi-Hertz (2003, note 16) and Zribi-Hertz and Glaude (2003, (32)).

¹⁰ It might be that adjectives have two possible sources, one within a relative clause and one not - see Alexiadou and Wilder (1998, 313) and Cinque (to appear, note 2).

¹¹ For them (p.322), the derivation can alternatively stop at that point, yielding:

i) *the intelligent the student

the equivalent of which is possible in Greek, though not in English or French, or in Italian (unless prenominal *begli* ('beautiful - m.pl.') is 'be+gli', with *gli* a (second) definite article).

¹² For a notion of 'closeness' that does not depend on feature-checking, see Kayne (2005a, §5.6); also Cinque (to appear).

¹³ This conclusion and derivation differ from Matushansky (2003), whose general hypothesis that all superlatives are associated with a noun (sometimes unpronounced - cf. also Martinon (1927, 103)) looks correct.

In (48) (and similarly for (44) or (45), in Greek) the Spec of overt *le* is itself overt, in a way incompatible with Koopman and Szabolcsi's (2000, 40) formulation of their Generalized Doubly Filled Comp Filter.

¹⁴ As for the question why Greek allows the equivalent of (49), with a non-superlative adjective, as opposed to French and Italian, I don't have a clear proposal to make. Alexiadou and Wilder (1998, 330), citing Anagnostopoulou (1994), note that (49) in Greek has something in common with clitic doubling. That may well be a promising linkage, in particular thinking of the fact that Greek has clitic doubling with non-prepositional accusatives in a way that even Spanish (which lacks (49)) does not.

For example, it might be that in order for an ordinary AP to be able to cross 'D NP' in (43) on its way to Spec,C, the D in question (the one within the small clause subject) must have some property that accusative clitics have when they are compatible with doubling of a non-prepositional object, especially if the relevant D c-commanded the initial position of the AP (allowing D in Greek, but not in French, to act as a successful probe for AP), thinking of Sportiche (2002). (If the (adjectival) predicate in the first line of (51) is a non-superlative, the derivation will not converge.) Pursuing the implications here of Sportiche's approach to D is beyond the scope of this paper.

¹⁵ Cf. Kayne (1998); on Icelandic, see also Svenonius (2000). Probably also related is the raising in French and Italian of *tout/tutto* ('everything') - Kayne (1975, chap. 1), Cinque (1995, chap. 9).

¹⁶ Cf. Hendrick (1990).

¹⁷ For relevant discussion, see Hendrick (1990) and Kayne (2005b).

The fact that *a* cannot appear in (54):

i) *...the fewest a number of papers...

is perhaps related to the presence of *the*, in a way that would need to be clarified. Possibly, (i) is related to:

ii) *That's not the shortest of a book (that I've ever seen).

iii) *?That's not the most interesting of a book.

Degree modifiers other than superlatives are not compatible with an 'extra' definite article in French:

iv) *les hommes les trop/si riches ('the men the too/so rich')

recalling the contrast between (52) and:

v) *the too/so/more interesting of books

Cf. also, to a lesser extent:

vi) the most/*too/*so intelligent of the students

Possibly, in (61) *le* can be merged with a CP containing a degree phrase in its Spec only if the degree element is superlative *plus*; and similarly for English *the*.

¹⁸ Cf. also the fact that in Persian (cf. Moshiri (1988, 24)) superlatives end up prenominal, while ordinary adjectives and even comparatives are generally postnominal; also the contrast within Italian:

i) una bellissima/*bellina donna ('a most-beautiful/a-little-beautiful woman')

Plausibly parallel to (52) vs. (53) is:

ii) That's not the shortest/most interesting of his books.

iii) *That's not the short/interesting of his books.

More similar, still, to the Persian facts is the contrast:

- iv) the blackest two dogs that I've ever seen
- v) *the black two dogs that I saw yesterday

¹⁹ French lacks an exact counterpart of (62), for reasons that remain to be elucidated. As is well-known, English does not allow this with *-est*:

- i) *That is a shortest book.

In addition, there is for me a clear contrast between (62) and:

- ii) *?That is a most short book.

Similarly:

- iii) She is a most intelligent woman.
- iv) *?She is a most smart woman.

suggesting that the almost certainly related:

- v) *?She is a more smart linguist than he is.

is not simply due to 'competition' from *smarter*.

The interpretation of (62) is close to that of:

- vi) That is a very interesting book.

but the two differ sharply in various ways:

- vii) a very very/*most most interesting book
- viii) a not very/*not most interesting book
- ix) very/*most few books
- x) so very/*most interesting; such a very/*most interesting book

suggesting that (62) might be related to:

- xi) That is a book of the most interesting sort/kind.

with *most* a true superlative.

²⁰ From Sportiche's (2002) perspective, they would not be expected to.

Left open is how to integrate Genoese *a ciù cōsa bella* ('the most thing beautiful') - Toso (1997, 76).

If definite article and *plus* formed a constituent, the obligatory agreement shown by the second *la* in:

- i) *la fille la plus intelligente* ('the girl the most intelligent')

would not be expected.

For some cases of non-agreement with adverbial superlatives (which fall outside the scope of this paper), see Martinon (1927, 104).

²¹ Whether this obligatory continuation is due more to a property of the higher *le* or more to a property of the small clause is left an open question here.

²² The presence of a numeral between CP and D appears to interfere with small clause preposing, however, if we return to (67). Adding a numeral above CP to (67) gives us (with a plural):

- i) *les* [quatre [[plus courts]_i C [_{SC} [les livres] t_i]]]

Doing nothing further is not possible (just as we saw with (74)):

- ii) **les quatre plus courts les livres*

But in this case, as opposed to (58), small clause preposing is not possible, either:

- iii) **les livres les quatre plus courts*

²³ If Sportiche (2002) is on the right track, the *la* preceding *femme* might be the head of the small clause, rather than the head of the specifier of the small clause.

²⁴ Sentences corresponding to (81) are found, however (perhaps they are akin to (83), or, thinking of Martinon's (1927, 101) discussion, to a reduced relative - see also Chenal (1986, 415, 417) and Grevisse (1993, §950)).

Martinon also mentions as a (probable) superlative:

- i) *ce qu'il y a de plus beau* ('that which there is of most beautiful')

which needs to be looked into.

²⁵ Possible as a comparative is:

- i) *le seul livre plus court que...* ('the only book more short than...')

²⁶ See, for example, Delfitto and Schrotten (1991), Longobardi (1994) and Chierchia (1998).

²⁷ Roodenburg (2003) suggests that with *des* the *l-* is not syntactically present at all. On bare nominals with coordination, see Longobardi (1994, 619n) and Roodenburg (2004). Cf. also Bouchard (2003).

²⁸ Cf. the (undeveloped) suggestion in Kayne (1975, §2.9) in terms of the noun ‘part’; on NUMBER/AMOUNT, cf. Kayne (2002b; 2005a; 2005b).

The unpronounced NUMBER/AMOUNT of these partitives is not subject to the restriction concerning Italian bare plurals/mass nouns as subjects discussed by Longobardi (1994, 616). Why Italian hanging topics (cf. Cinque (1977, 406) and Benincà and Poletto (2004, 64)) are (contrary to French) not subject to that restriction remains to be understood.

²⁹ Examples provided by Luigi Burzio.

³⁰ It might be that an unpronounced preposition could not be licensed by unpronounced AMOUNT.

³¹ The fact that no language has (as far as I know):

(i) *Jean a les amis. (‘J has the friends’)

with a partitive/indefinite interpretation means that the presence of an overt definite article induces for some reason to be determined the need for an overt preposition.

³² As for (104), it might be that the plural morpheme following the pronominal adjective counts as a pronounced definite D - see Pollock (1998, note 24).

³³ The definite article *la* in (109)/(97) (and its unpronounced counterpart in (111)/(95)) may have something significant in common with the definite article found in generic sentences, as noted by Gross (1968, 30). The global indefinite interpretation of (111) and (109) is comparable to that of:

i) a certain amount of beer

ii) a number of people

The presence of an overt preposition (like) *of* is not essential:

iii) a hundred people

iv) ein Liter Wein (German ‘a liter wine’)

Left aside here is any discussion of French negative sentences like:

v) Jean n’a pas d’amis. (‘J neg has not of friends’)

with no definite article. It may be that Italian bare plurals match both (v) and French partitives; see note 35.

Like (ii), French partitives seem to be positive polarity items.

³⁴ Cf. the discussion in Longobardi (1994, 620). The possible counterexample having to do with (Italian and French) infinitives mentioned in Kayne (1999, §4) might dissolve if, as suggested to me by Viviane Déprez, their prepositional complementizer (*di/de*) reflects the presence of an unpronounced head noun - cf. Kayne (2003, §4.6).

³⁵ Which would amount to saying that there are no null indefinite determiners per se in Italian. On Brazilian Portuguese, which differs from Italian in productively allowing bare singulars, see Schmitt and Munn (2002); on the relevance of French-based creoles, see Déprez (to appear).

Italian allows bare singulars in negative contexts like:

i) Non ho mai visto gatto che fosse... (‘neg I-have never seen cat that was...’)

as discussed by Benincà (1980).

³⁶ See note 30. It remains to be understood why Italian partitives with *di* require an overt definite article - as opposed to Piedmontese (102) and also (in the special case of pronominal adjectives) as opposed to French (104):

i) *Gianni comprava di buoni libri. (‘G bought of good books’)

³⁷ There are differences in behavior between Italian partitives as in (122) and French partitives as in (97) that fall outside the scope of this paper.

³⁸ Example provided by Paola Benincà, who notes that the construction is literary in Italian, and who finds the exact counterpart of (83) less than perfectly natural.

³⁹ See Landau (1999). Similarly, perhaps, for clitic doubling and for antecedent-pronoun relations - see Kayne (2002a).

⁴⁰ If the agreement requirement discussed at (78) holds with *quel/quale*, too, then the unpronounced phrase in Spec,D in (136)/(137) should be taken to be DP.

The text proposal means that (i) (cf. note 2):

i) *Lequel de ces livres...?* ('the which of these books...')

must be:

ii) N_i *le quel t_i de ces livres...*

⁴¹ Left open here is the contrast within Italian between (137) and possessive *il mio* ('the my') (also *l'altro* ('the other') and relative *il quale* - (22)), which has an unpronounced noun together with a pronounced D. One possibility is further movement of the unpronounced noun (cf. Bianchi (1999, 79) on relatives), with a link to (125); another is that the unpronounced noun in *il mio*, etc. need raise no higher than just past *mio* itself.

With an overt noun, French and Italian do not differ, in cases like:

(i) *Marie a gagné le concours.* (French - 'M has won the competition')

(ii) *Maria ha vinto il concorso.* (Italian - same)

Given (112), (ii) must not have a filled Spec.

⁴² See note 40.

⁴³ I have come across one speaker of American English who accepts (143). Although this leads to interesting questions, it does not bear on the text discussion.

⁴⁴ Possible is *his house*, because *his* is (irregularly) the form that occurs both with and without an overt lexical noun.

⁴⁵ Cf. Nilsen (2003) on object shift and Cardinaletti (1997).

⁴⁶ Cf. Kayne (1994, 86)

⁴⁷ In a way that recalls Chomsky (1995, 185) on equidistance.

⁴⁸ This approach to (147) differs from the suggestion made in Kayne (2004, §1.1).

Trudgill and Hannah (1994, 76) state that, in English English, sentences like (143) are possible, contrary to (most - see note 43) American English. (Possibly there is a link to *The soup has carrots in*, which they (p.81) also give as possible in English English.) The implication here is that for such speakers, either PLACE is being taken to have an antecedent, or else PLACE is raising for a distinct reason - cf. Longobardi (1996, §1.4) on Italian *casa* ('home').

⁴⁹ If the antecedent relation underlies raising in the case of *lequel/quale*, then the motivation for raising (to Spec,D) is distinct from the case of postnominal superlatives.

⁵⁰ See Spector (2001) and references cited there, emphasizing the parallelism. Possibly, French partitives can in addition have an analysis corresponding to that of Italian partitives (on which, see Storto (2001)).

⁵¹ Cf. also the fact that, according to Harrell (1962, 206), Moroccan Arabic, with the numerals between 2 and 10 inclusive, has the possibility of a definite article within what corresponds to indefinite *two books*, etc.

⁵² For example, Delfitto and Schrotten (1991) suggest a link between bare plurals and postnominal number morphology, though as noted by Chierchia (1998, note 32) their proposal doesn't extend to mass nouns. Nor can the presence of (pronounced) suffixal number morphology be a sufficient condition for licensing bare plurals, given the apparent absence of bare plurals in Genoese (Toso (1997, 66)) and Pavese (Andrea Moro - p.c.). Déprez (to

appear) argues that it is not a necessary condition for bare nominals, on the basis of various creole languages. Ultimately many other language families will need to be brought into the discussion in a systematic way.

⁵³ And by plausible extension English indefinite bare plurals. Chomsky (2000, 139) argues against bare plurals having a semantically null D; that would lead to the (plausible) conclusion that the unpronounced definite D proposed here (like the one visible in French partitives) is not semantically null.

