

**The Locus of Person Feature, Agreement, and DP/CP Parallelism**

**Intro** This paper investigates the structure of a nominal collocation composed of a non-possessive pronoun and a noun ([PRN-N]). I propose, based on Modern Greek (MG), that the pronoun in [PRN-N] occupies SpecDP, and show that the proposal can be extended to account for English and Korean. The proposal implies that the semantic person feature is encoded on D of pronominal DP, the subject-verb agreement is mediated by D, and DP resembles CP with respect to dislocation to the left-periphery.

**Issue** Based on English [PRN-N] in (1a), it has been hypothesized that the pronoun is the head D of [PRN-N] DP, as in (1b) (Abney 1987, Longobardi 2008, Panagiotidis 2002, Postal 1969, a.o.).

(1) a. **we/the/\*we the/\*the we** linguists      b. [<sub>DP</sub> [**we/the** [<sub>AgRP</sub> [<sub>Ag</sub> [<sub>NP</sub> [linguists]]]]]]

The structure in (1b), however, fails to account for MG [PRN-N] in (2a), in which the definite article *i* ‘the’ must co-occur with the pronoun *emis* ‘we’, and the former cannot precede the latter, as in (2b).

(2) a. **emis \*(i) glossologi** nikisame to epathlo.      b. **i (\*emis) glossologi (\*emis)**  
we the linguists won.1PL the award the we linguists we  
‘We linguists won the award.’

**Proposal** I propose, contrary to (1b), that [PRN-N] pronouns must be treated on a par with demonstratives, rather than definite articles. That is, pronouns are dislocated to SpecDP from SpecAgrP between DP and NP: [<sub>DP</sub> **pronoun** [<sub>D</sub> [<sub>AgRP</sub> **t<sub>pronoun</sub>** [<sub>Ag</sub> [<sub>NP</sub> [N]]]]]], which bears an analogy to the syntax of MG demonstratives (Alexiadou et al., 2007).

**Evidence** First, demonstratives and pronouns are in complementary distribution in MG, as in (3).

Given the well-known fact that a definite article must be present in the presence of a demonstrative in MG (Alexiadou et al., 2007), the ungrammaticality of (3) is not due to something else but to the co-occurrence of a pronoun and a demonstrative, which compete for the same position.

(3) **(\*afti)emis (\*afti) i glossologi (\*afti)**  
these we these the linguists these

Second, as exemplified in (4a), the deictic property of pronouns/demonstratives—but not definite articles—can be modified/reinforced by a reinforcer, and the presence of a reinforcer is dependent on the presence of pronouns/demonstratives. Given the role of reinforcers and the dependent relationship shown in (4a), I construe the pronoun/demonstrative-reinforcer collocation to be an instance of the modifier-modifiee relationship, as in (4b). This suggests that pronouns/demonstratives and a reinforcer form a phrase; an alternative hypothesis is ruled out that the pronouns/demonstratives take a DP as a complement (e.g., [<sub>PrnP/DemP</sub> [Prn/Dem [DP]]]), even though it can capture the word order fact in (2).

(4) a. **[(\*)emis/afti edho] i glossologi**      b. einai **[poly \*(exypnos)]**  
we/these here the linguists is.M very smart  
‘we/these here linguists’      ‘He is very smart.’

Lastly, if pronouns are a sort of definite articles, pronoun spreading, like MG determiner spreading in (5a), is expected to be allowed. However, pronoun/demonstrative spreading causes ungrammaticality, as shown in (5b).

(5) a. **ta tris (ta) vivlia**      b. **emis/afti i (\*emis/\*afti) tris (\*emis/\*afti) glossologi**  
the three the books we/these the we/these three we/these linguists

**Empirical Extensions** The current analysis is empirically superior to the previous analyses like (1b). First, English [PRN-N] can still be accounted for. In non-Standard English, demonstratives/pronouns can be modified by a reinforcer, e.g., [**(we/these) here**] *linguists*. For the same reason noted for MG reinforcers, we can conclude that demonstratives/pronouns are phrasal and thus occupy SpecDP. As for Standard English, which does not allow for reinforcers, I assume SpecDP to be the position of English demonstratives (Alexiadou et al., 2007). The reason for the obligatory absence of a definite article in the presence of a pronoun/demonstrative is presumably due to the doubly-filled COMP filter.

Second, the current analysis can also capture the Korean [PRN-N] fact. Assuming Korean to be a D-final language as many others do, the previous analyses incorrectly predict [N-PRN] order in (6b) to be correct. In contrast, the correct order [PRN-N] in (6a) is derived if *wuri* ‘we’ is assumed to be in SpecDP, since the specifier position precedes the head regardless of the head-directionality.

(6) a. **wuri enehacatul**      b. \***enehacatul wuri**  
we linguists linguists we

**Implications** First, the current analysis speaks against the prevailing hypothesis about D of (non-)pronominal DP being the locus for the interpretable person feature (Panagiotidis 2002, Longobardi 2008, a.o.). Their main argument is based on the fact that the person feature of [PRN-N] is determined

