

# Is there a FocusP and a TopicP in the Noun Phrase structure? <sup>1</sup>

Giuliana Giusti  
University of Venice

## 0. *The "defective" character of Noun Phrase structure*

In studying the parallelisms between clausal and nominal structure, researchers have often noticed the "defective" character of the latter both in their argument structure and in their functional structure.

With reference to the functional structure of the noun phrase, the Determiner Projection has been compared sometimes to IP (Abney (1987)), sometimes to CP (Szabolcsi (1994)). A Tense Projection in the Noun Phrase has been argued for in Somali (Lecarme (1996)) but very few other languages display it. In his work on adjectives and adverbs Cinque (1995a and 1995b respectively) makes the hypothesis that they have a strict order and that this order is in many respects parallel. But these parallelisms are not as systematic as one would like them to be.

In the view of the recent work by Rizzi (1995) on the fine structure of the left periphery of the clause, it would be interesting to wonder whether the DP also has a finer structure than is generally assumed. This will be the focus of the present paper. I will claim that there is some fine structure in DP but this is, once again, "defective"

---

<sup>1</sup>. This paper was read at the "Inside DP" Conference at D.I.P.S.C.O., Milan, June 27-28, 1996. The Albanian data and their analysis in section 2. was presented in a paper read at the XIX Incontro di Grammatica Generativa, Bergamo, February 22-24, 1996. The Bulgarian data and their analysis in section 5 is part of joint work with Mila Dimitrova-Vulchanova and was presented in a seminar at the University of Trondheim on January 10, 1996. I wish to thank all the participants of those meetings for helpful comments.

both from the crosslinguistic and from the language internal points of view. In other words, not all languages have a fine DP-structure and, furthermore, each single position is not found in all languages. This is actually expected considering that even for clauses we find a high degree of cross-linguistic variation in the syntactic representation of Focus/Topic constructions.

The structure of the paper is as follows: Section 1 offers a brief review of the defective character of noun phrases with respect to A and A-bar movement and clitic movement. There, I will point out some problems for current theories on the parallel structure of noun phrases and clauses, but I will not attempt a solution. In the rest of the paper I will discuss some data that show that it is reasonable to assume a FocP and a TopP inside the noun phrase structure, parallel to Rizzi's proposal for clausal structure. In particular, in section 2 we will see the case of prenominal adjectives and possessives in Albanian which supports the assumption of a FocP immediately lower than DP. The same position will be proposed for Serbo-Croatian in section 3, to host adjectives with the so-called "indefinite morphology". In section 4, I will suggest that some apparently unexpected order among prenominal adjectives in Italian can be analysed as derived by movement to a SpecTopP immediately lower than DP, exactly as the one mentioned for Albanian and Serbo-Croatian. In section 5 we will go back to the Balkans and observe the behaviour of preposed possessors in Bulgarian. We will follow the proposal formulated in joint work with Mila Dimitrova-Vulchanova that the Bulgarian noun phrase has a TopP which is the highest projection in the nominal structure.

### ***1. Landing sites inside the noun phrase***

One important difference between sentential and nominal structure is the presence in the former of landing sites (or triggers) for A and A-bar movements, while in the latter little material is usually taken to be moved and there is a more restricted number of positions available as landing sites (or as triggers) for movement.

With respect to landing sites for A and A-bar movement, the noun phrase structure is highly "defective". A noun phrase cannot check a wh-feature in SpecDP, only some languages have NP-movement, and we see very restricted instances of Clitic movement in some languages.

### 1.1. *A-bar movement*

SpecDP can only be an escape hatch for a wh-element:

- (1) a. *Conosco il presidente di questa associazione.*  
I-know the president of this association.  
b. *Di che associazione conosci il presidente?*  
Of which association do-you-know the president?  
c. *\*Di che associazione conosci questo presidente?*  
Of which association do-you-know this president?

(1a) gives the basic structure, (1b) show that a wh-element can move out of a DP. This is presumably done in two steps, for various reasons. An intermediate landing site must be in DP. In independent research Campbel (1991) for English and Giusti (1993) for Italian have proposed that the escape hatch in the DP is SpecDP, parallel to SpecCP. When this position is filled by a demonstrative, as in (1c), extraction is blocked.

Despite the fact that there is a landing site for wh-elements, a wh-feature cannot be checked inside DP. Let us consider (2). In (2a) we see that the predicates *non sapere / non conoscere* can take a clausal wh-complement. In (2b) it is shown that the same predicates can take a nominal complement. (2c) shows that the nominal complement cannot check a wh-feature in its SpecDP:

- (2) a. *Non so/?conosco di che associazione Gianni sia il presidente*  
I don't know of which association G. is the president  
b. *Non ?so/conosco l'associazione/il presidente*  
I don't know the association/the president  
c. *\*Non so di quale associazione il presidente*  
I don't know of which association the president

**1.2. A-movement**

Let us now consider a case parallel to A-movement to check nominative case for the subject of a clause. Case checking inside DP is very rare in Italian. Let us start from a basic word order such as that in (3a) where the genitive is realized by a PP. In (3b) we see the case of the genitive relative pronoun *cui*. Cinque (1988) observes that it can only appear immediately right adjacent to an article. This suggests that it must check its morphological case into a position governed by a filled D. The same is possibly the case of the pronoun embedded into a PP in (4a). Notice that this position is the same as the position of possessive adjectives in Italian (4b).

- (3) a. il famoso ritratto di Aristotele  
       the famous portrait of Aristotel  
       b. Aristotele, [<sub>DP</sub> il [<sub>XP</sub> cui<sub>i</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> famoso [ritratto t<sub>i</sub>]]]] ...  
       Aristotel, the whose famous portrait ...
- (4) a. il di lei consorte  
       the of her husband  
       b. il suo ritratto  
       the his/her portrait

Italian also has a very restricted instance of construct state with the noun *casa* "home", as argued by Longobardi (1991) and following work. In (5a) the noun *casa* has moved to D and the genitive has moved to the immediately lower specifier. In all other cases, however, the construct state is not allowed (5b):

- (5) a. casa Rossi  
       house Rossi  
       b. \*\*il (di) Maria figlio  
       the of Mary son

Semitic languages allow the construct state very generally. Let us take the seminal work by Ritter (1988) as an example:

- (6) Hebrew, Ritter (1988):
- |    |                                  |                     |
|----|----------------------------------|---------------------|
| a. | ha-bayit ha-gadol shel ha-mora   | Art-N > Adj > genPP |
|    | the-house the-big of the-teacher | ("free" state)      |
| b. | *ha-bayit shel ha-mora ha-gadol  |                     |
|    | the-house of the-teacher the-big |                     |
- 
- |        |                           |                   |
|--------|---------------------------|-------------------|
| (7) a. | *beyt ha-gadol ha-mora    | N > GenDP > Adj   |
|        | house the-big the-teacher | (construct state) |
| b.     | beyt ha-mora ha-gadol     |                   |
|        | house the-teacher the-big |                   |

(6) shows the basic word order, the "free" state. The genitive PP is after the adjective. The noun has not moved as high as D. In (7) the noun is in D, since no article can appear, the possessor is a DP (not a PP), and checks its genitive case by moving in the Spec immediately lower than the D filled by the lexical N.

The construct state reminds us of the V/2 in Germanic: V-to-C is parallel to N-to-D. Nominative case is checked in the Spec immediately lower than C (as suggested by Tomaselli (1990), for instance, parallel to genitive case in the construct state.

In English, however, DP is more parallel to IP than to CP, if we look at the position where case is checked. In (8) we see the case of an inanimate possessor, which we could take as the basic position, while in (9) we see the case of a Saxon genitive, possibly a derived position. Abney (1987) suggests that genitive is assigned in SpecDP:

(8) [DP [D the] [ ... leg [PP of the table]]

(9) [DP John's [D] [ ... leg]] (Abney (1987))

Notice that in the clause the subject never A-moves to SpecCP.

### 1.3. *Clitic-movement*

In Italian there is no landing site for clitics inside the noun phrase even if genitive third person clitics can be extracted out of noun phrases and land onto the verb:

*Is there a FocusP and a TopicP in the Noun Phrase structure?*

- (10) a. l'autore del libro  
the author of the book  
b. \*\*\*l'autore ne  
the author CL-gen  
c. \*\*\* il ne autore  
the CL-gen author
- (11) a. conosco l'autore del libro  
I-know the author of the book  
b. ne conosco l'autore  
CL-gen I-know the author

Another question is why no other clitic can be extracted:

- (12) a. ho visto la tua lettera a Gianni (sul tavolo)  
I-have seen the your letter to Gianni (on the table)  
b. \*\* $t_i$  ho visto [la  $t_i$  lettera a Gianni] (sul tavolo)  
CL-2nd.s. I-have seen the letter to G. (on the table)  
c. \*\* $gli_i$  ho visto [la tua lettera  $t_i$ ] (sul tavolo)  
CL-3rd.s.-dat I-have seen the your letter to G. (on the table)

A possible answer is that the escape hatch for the clitic is an XP where only genitive pronouns (or better possessive adjectives) can land. This is on line with Cinque's (1980) generalization that the possessivization hierarchy is the same as the extractability hierarchy and with Longobardi's (1990) analysis in terms of NP structure. But this analysis does not take into account the impossibility of (12b) where a second person possessor is extracted.<sup>2</sup>

In some Balkan languages it is possible to have a dative possessive clitic inside the noun phrase. The position of this clitic is second immediately after the definite article

---

<sup>2</sup>. As far as I know, the contrast between (12a) and (12b) has neither been adequately explored nor explained. Since it is not the topic of the present paper I will not attempt here to make up for this gap in the understanding of extraction phenomena from DPs.

in Rumanian (13a) and in Bulgarian (13b). In modern Greek the dative possessive clitic can be after any lexical head (13c):

- (13) a. *carte+a-i nouà*  
           book+the-his/her new  
       b. *nova+ta mu kniga*  
           new+the his book  
       c. *to oreo mou to vivlio, to oreo to vivlio mou, etc.*  
           the good my the book, the good the book my,

Up to now, I have reviewed the defective character of the clause-like functional structure of noun phrases. I have also pointed out that even some actual parallelisms between clauses and noun phrases are not complete. I have limited the discussion to some empirical problems without giving any new proposal to solve them. This short discussion should serve as the background of what follows, in which Topic ad Focus positions inside the noun phrase are dealt with.

## 2. *FocP inside the noun phrase: The case of Albanian*

In Albanian the relative order of postnominal adjectives is fixed, as expected under Cinque's (1995) hypothesis. For example, *tjetër* "other" precedes *i bukur* "beautiful" both in indefinite noun phrases (14) and in definite noun phrases (15). The only difference between Italian and Albanian is the position of the head noun which is higher in Albanian. However, not so high as D, since the indefinite article which is not enclitic must precede N and, as we will see in a moment, there is no difference in the word order of definite and indefinite noun phrases:

- (14) a. *një grua tjetër e bukur* (Alb.)  
           a woman other the nice  
       b. *un'altra donna bella* (Ital.)  
           another woman nice  
           "another nice woman"

*Is there a FocusP and a TopicP in the Noun Phrase structure?*

- (15) a. gruaja tjetër e bukur (Alb.)  
 woman-the other the nice  
 b. l'altra donna bella (Ital.)  
 the other woman nice  
 "the other nice woman"

(16) shows that the inverted order of the adjectives is excluded both in Albanian and in Italian, confirming Cinque's hypothesis:

- (16) a. \*një grua e bukur tjetër (Alb.)  
 b. \*una bella donna altra (Ital.)
- (17) a. \*gruaja e bukur tjetër (Alb.)  
 b. \*la bella donna altra (Ital.)

In (18)-(19) we see the case of an event nominal. The thematic adjective must be lower than the descriptive adjective. Once again, in Albanian the noun precedes both adjectives, while in Italian the noun is between the high adjective and the low one:

- (18) a. pushtimi i vetëm italian i Shqipërisë  
 invasion-the terrible Italian the of-Albania  
 b. la terribile invasione italiana dell'Albania  
 the terrible invasion Italian of Albania  
 "the terrible Italian invasion of Albania"
- (19) a. \*pushtimi italian i vetëm i Shqipërisë  
 invasion-the Italian the terrible the of-Albania  
 b. \*l'italiana invasione (terribile) dell'Albania  
 c. the Italian terrible invasion of Albania

It is possible in Albanian (at least for some speakers) to have a prenominal adjective. In this case the adjective is emphasised, not necessarily contrastively focused:

- (20) a. një grua e bukur  
 a woman the nice  
 "a nice woman"



- b. një e bukur grua  
a the nice woman  
"a *nice* woman"
- (21) a. një grua tjetër  
a woman other  
"another woman"  
b. një tjetër grua  
a other woman  
"*another* woman"
- (22) a. gruaja e bukur  
woman-the the nice  
"the nice woman"  
b. e bukura grua  
the nice-the woman  
"the *nice* woman"
- (23) a. gruaja tjetër  
woman-the other  
"the other woman"  
b. tjetra grua  
other-the woman  
"the *other* woman"

Notice, once again, that there is no difference in word order between indefinite noun phrases (20)-(21) and definite noun phrases (22)-(23). This clearly shows that the enclitic nature of the article is irrelevant to AP-movement: It neither triggers nor blocks it.

Interestingly, the prenominal position is available for either adjective, irrespectively of the hierarchy:

- (24) a. *tjetra* grua e bukur  
other-the woman the nice

*Is there a FocusP and a TopicP in the Noun Phrase structure?*

- b. *e bukura* grua tjetër  
the nice-the woman other

This suggests that the prenominal position is derived by movement of the AP. Furthermore this movement is a sort of A'-movement (if such a distinction should be shown to make sense for adjectives at all).

The AP-movement hypothesis is supported by the observation that thematic adjectives that are usually only postnominal in some languages such as in Italian, can also be prenominal in the emphatic position in Albanian, although marginally:

- (25) a. ?*italiani* pushtim ?(i vetëm) i Shqipërisë  
b. \**l'italiana* invazione terribile dell'Albania  
the Italian invasion terrible the of-Albania

If AP-movement is to be assumed in these cases, we must now inquire what the target position is.

The focus position follows the demonstrative which I take, for parallelisms with other languages, to be in SpecDP (cf. Giusti (1993), Brugè and Giusti (1996)). A Focused AP cannot precede the demonstrative:

- (26) a. *kjo* (shumë) *e bukur(a)* grua tjetër  
this the (very) nice woman other  
b. \**e bukur(a)* *kjo* grua  
the nice(-the) this woman  
c. \**tjetra/tjetër* *kjo* grua  
other(-the) this woman

This focus position is also available for genitive DPs:

- (27) a. *ky* libër i Benit  
this book the of-Ben  
b. *ky* i Benit libër  
this the of-Ben book  
c. \**i* Benit *ky* libër

The fact that it can host elements of various categorial nature strongly supports the proposal that it is a derived position of the A'-type.

The structure I propose for Albanian is (28):

(28) [DP D [FocP [Foc N(+Art)<sub>i</sub>] [... t<sub>i</sub> ...]]]

In definite noun phrases, the article is generated as a morpheme in Foc for reasons which I will not investigate here. The lexical head N may move to Foc and further check the article in D. It may also be the case that an AP is focused: AP moves to SpecFocP. In this case, the enclitic article in Foc is encliticized onto the adjacent adjective. The checking will be done at LF in SpecDP. If SpecDP is filled by a demonstrative, the definiteness features of DP are fulfilled. The article we find in (26a) is to be taken as a (pleonastic) agreement morpheme which is not checked in neither position in DP at LF.<sup>3</sup>

Russian, a language with no article, presents a similar phenomenon.<sup>4</sup> The order of demonstratives and adjectives is fearily fixed as shown in (29a-b). It is however possible to find a different order of adjectives, provided that the preposed adjective is emphasised (29c). The focused adjective must follow and cannot precede the demonstrative (29d):

(29) a. eta staraja amerikanskaja knjiga o lingvistike  
this old american book on linguistics

---

<sup>3</sup>. Alternatively, it is possible to believe that if no FocP is needed, no FocP is projected. In this case, the article is directly generated and checked in D triggering N-to-D movement at SPELLOUT.

Another instance of minimizing the number of the projections is when no demonstrative is inserted. In this case DP and FocP may be taken to conflate in a theory à la Haider (1988). D and Foc would be one and the same position where the article is inserted in definite noun phrases. This article would not trigger N-to-D/Foc because it can encliticize onto the AP in SpecFocP/DP. If we take movement as a last resort, the possibility for the article to encliticize onto the AP would dispense with N-movement.

<sup>4</sup>. I thank Michael Yadroff for the data and a discussion on them.

*Is there a FocusP and a TopicP in the Noun Phrase structure?*

- b. \*eta amerikanskaja staraja knjiga
- c. eta *amerikanskaja* staraja knjiga
- d. \*amerikanskaja eta staraja knjiga

### 3. *TopP inside the noun phrase. The case of Serbo-Croatian*

Serbo-Croatian provides evidence for a Topic position for adjectives following the demonstrative. Consider the examples in (30)-(34) discussed in Leko (1988):<sup>5</sup>

- |      |  |                    |
|------|--|--------------------|
| (30) | a. siromasan djecak<br>poor-indef boy<br>"a poor boy"      | (Leko (1988))      |
|      | b. siromasni djecak<br>poor-def boy<br>"the poor boy"      |                    |
| (31) | a. siromasan, bolestan djecak<br>poor-indef sick-indef boy | A-indef, A-indef N |
|      | b. bolestan, siromasan djecak                              |                    |
| (32) | a. siromasni bolesni djecak<br>poor-def sick-def boy       | A-def A-def N      |
|      | b. bolesni siromasni djecak                                |                    |
| (33) | a. siromasan, bolesni djecak                               | A-indef, A-def N   |
|      | b. bolestan, siromasni djecak                              |                    |
| (34) | a. *siromasni bolestan djecak                              | *A-def A-indef     |
|      | b. *bolesni siromasan djecak                               |                    |

---

<sup>5</sup>. I thank Nedžad Leko for discussing with me this data.

The cooccurrence of a definite and an indefinite adjective shows that the so-called definite/indefinite inflection of the adjective is not directly relevant to the interpretation of the noun as the glosses in (30) would make one believe at first sight. This observation is confirmed by the fact that a sequence such as (33) can be preceded by a demonstrative, as in (35):

- (35) a. onaj siromasan, bolesni djecak           (Leko (p.c.))  
           this poor-indef sick-def boy  
       b. onaj bolestan, siromasni djecak  
           this sick-indef, poor-def boy

Leko also observes that the "indefinite" form of the adjective is the one used as a predicate and in postnominal position (secondary predication), independently of the definiteness interpretation of the noun phrase it refers to:

- (36) a. onaj djecak je siromasan/\*siromasni  
           this boy is poor-indef/\*def  
       b. onaj djecak, siromasan i bolestan  
           this boy, poor and sick

I would like to propose that the indefinite adjective in (31), (33), is in a sort of topic position. This is why it does not agree for definiteness with the noun. In other words it is external to the functional structure which triggers agreement with the noun. The topic interpretation is confirmed by the comma intonation which is obligatory even if what follows is another indefinite adjective as in (31). This comma intonation is not found between adjectives inflected for definiteness, as in (32).

Interestingly, the topic (left dislocated position) is parallel to a "predicate" right dislocated position, much in the same way as in the Italian clause structure.

The position of this adjectival topic inside the noun phrase is lower than the demonstrative (37). Furthermore, its presence blocks the presence of a fronted focused adjective:

- (37) a. onaj siromasan, bolesni djecak  
           this poor-indef, sick-def boy

*Is there a FocusP and a TopicP in the Noun Phrase structure?*

- b. \*siromasan, onaj bolesni djecak (Leko (p.c.))  
 poor-indef this sick-def boy

- (38) a. \*SIROMASAN, onaj bolesni djecak  
 b. \*BOLESNI onaj siromasan djecak  
 c. onaj siromasan, BOLESNI djecak

I tentatively propose the structure in (39) for Serbo-Croatian:<sup>6</sup>

- (39)  $[_{DP} \text{ (dem) D } [_{TopP} \text{ Top } [_{FocP} \text{ Foc } [_{AgrP} \dots \text{ N}]]]]$

#### 4. Italian AP Topicalisation

Consider now the Italian examples in (40):

- (40) a. i suoi capelli bianchi  
 the his/her hair white  
 b. i suoi bianchi capelli  
 the his/her white hair  
 c. i bianchi, suoi capelli  
 the white his/her hair  
 "his white hair"

(40a) can either mean that all his hair is white or that he has some white hair. With a prenominal AP as in (40b-c), the only interpretation we have is that all his hair is white. (40c) is acceptable only with some kind of pause between *bianchi* and the possessive adjective. In (40c) the whiteness of his hair must already be given in the discourse or as shared information.

---

<sup>6</sup>. The head N does not move, or moves to a very low Agr position. This alleged movement is irrelevant to our topic.

This correlates to what is noted by Zamparelli (1993). According to him, prenominal adjectives are best i) if they express a prototypical property of the noun (41), ii) if the noun itself is maximally specified (42)-(43):

- (41) a. la bianca neve / le verdi colline  
the white snow / the green hills  
b. ??la nera neve / ??le azzurre colline  
the black snow / the blue hills
- (42) a. il prode Garibaldi  
the brave Garibaldi  
b. queste pigre giornate  
these lazy days
- (43) a. la nera bandiera che penzolava dalla sua finestra  
the black flag that hung from his/her window  
b. \*voglio una nera badiera  
I-whant a black flag

I would like to suggest that in all these cases the prenominal adjective refers to shared knowledge in the discourse. In fact, (41b) become acceptable if we have already introduced the hearer in a world where, say, snow is black and hills are blue. In (42a) it is certainly shared knowledge that Garibaldi was brave. In (42b) the presence of the demonstrative gives us a maximally specified referent whose character (of being lazy) is already given. In (43a) the relative clause specifies the referent, and once again my intuition is that the modifier "black" is already given in the discourse. This would be impossible in (43b), where the noun phrase is new information.

Considering the relative order of adjectives in Italian, we see that descriptive adjectives are rather low in the structure, immediately higher than thematic adjectives (as in 44b) or even in complementary distribution with them (as in 44c):<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup>. In (44) I depict a well known fact about Italian adjectives recently discussed at length by Cinque (1995). Only one can follow the noun, if there is a thematic adjective like *Martian* in (44b,c) this must follow the noun. I admit, however, that when things get complicated, even (44c) does not sound as bad as to assign it a star. The contrast with (44b), however, is clear. It is also clear to my

*Is there a FocusP and a TopicP in the Noun Phrase structure?*

- (44) a. La loro ultima vera aggressione brutale al pianeta sarà nel prossimo secolo.  
 (The) their possible last real aggression brutal to the planet will be in next century.
- b. La ultima vera brutale aggressione marziana al pianeta sarà nel prossimo secolo.  
 The probable last real brutal aggression Martian to the plane will be in next century.
- c. ??La ultima vera aggressione brutale marziana al pianeta sarà nel prossimo secolo.

Let us now provide a context in which we all know that last Martian invasion of the planet was brutal. We could either have (44b) above, in which we see *brutale* in the basic position, or (45a), in which *brutale* has been moved to a higher position, immediately lower than the DP:

- (45) a. Sappiamo tutti che la brutale ultima vera aggressione marziana al pianeta è la causa della distruzione dei dinosauri.  
 We all know that the brutal last real aggression martian to the planet is the cause of the destruction of the dinosaurs.
- b. Sappiamo tutti che la brutale loro ultima vera aggressione al pianeta .....  
 We all know that the brutal their last real aggression to the planet ...
- c. ... ?\*la loro brutale ultima vera aggressione ...
- d. ... \*la loro ultima brutale vera aggressione ...

---

intuition that the interpretation of *brutal* is not necessarily topical in this case.

It is not clear to me whether *brutale* is in the same position (44a,c) If this is the case, it is necessary to explain why the noun can move across it in (44a) but not in (44c). In other words it is unclear why (44b) is excluded. A possible solution is to relate N-movement to the presence of an adjective, no matter what class of adjective this is. The limitation of one postnominal adjective could then be related to the possibility for the lexical N in the immediately higher Agr to licence it, and the impossibility for a trace of a further moved N to have the same effect. Nothing of this kind has been proposed in the literature as far as I know. Unfortunately this topic is only tangential to ours and cannot be developed here.



e. ... \*l'ultima brutale vera aggressione marziana ...

(45) shows that the TopP in the Italian DP is the highest position in the nominal functional structure below DP, exactly like what has turned out for Albanian and Serbo-Croatian in the preceding sections. In fact, nothing except the article can precede the topicalized adjective, as shown by the impossibility of (45c-e).

Italian does not have a FocP:

- (46) a. \*i BIANCHI suoi capelli, non (quell)i neri  
           the white his/her hair, (not the black ones)  
       b. \*i suoi BIANCHI capelli, non (quell)i neri  
       c. i suoi capelli BIANCHI, non quelli neri

The impossibility of (46b) supports the hypothesis that prenominal adjectives in general are topics, since they cannot be focused even in situ.

To summarize: In Italian prenominal descriptive adjectives are always topic, shared knowledge, given, etc. Their given nature can be emphasised by fronting into a position immediately lower than DP. No FocP is present in the Italian noun phrase:

- (47) [DP Art [TopP AP<sub>j</sub> Top [AgrP POSS [AgrP .....t<sub>j</sub> ...[AgrP N<sub>i</sub> [...t<sub>i</sub> ]]]]]]

## 5. *Bulgarian*

For Albanian we have shortly seen that the genitive DP can also be fronted to TopP. I will now present the case of Bulgarian, studied in joint work with Mila Dimitrova-Vulchanova (cf. Dimitrova-Vulchanova and Giusti 1996, from now on DV&G) which clearly shows the possibility of fronting a dative possessor PP, with some interesting restrictions.

Bulgarian has a unique preposition: *na* (glossed as "to") which expresses both dative and genitive case. The *na*-DP can either follow the head noun or be first in the sequence:

*Is there a FocusP and a TopicP in the Noun Phrase structure?*

- (48) a. vsicki tezi novi knigi na Ivan  
 all these new books to Ivan  
 b. ?na Ivan vsicki tezi novi knigi

D-V&G propose to take (48a) as the basic structure and (48b) as derived via movement not only on general theory internal and cross-linguistic considerations but also on the language internal fact that the structure with the preposed possessor is better, as a matter of fact perfect, if the possessor is doubled by a clitic. Notice that doubling is also possible although not perfect, when the possessor is in place.

- (49) a. na Ivan vsickite mu tezi novi knigi  
 to Ivan all-the CL-dat.3.s. these new books  
 b. ?visckite mu tezi knigi na Ivan  
 all-the CL-Dat.3.s. these new books to Ivan

The clitic is only present in definite noun phrases and follows the element with the definite article (which is the head of the first constituent in the sequence, disregarding the preposed possessor) or the demonstrative:

- (50) a. tezi mu novi knigi  
 these CL-dat.3.s. new books  
 b. novite mu knigi  
 new-the CL-dat.3.s. books  
 c. knigite mu  
 books-the CL-dat.3.s.

It cannot be present if a definite article or a demonstrative is missing:

- (51) a. edna (\*mu) nova kniga  
 a/one (CL-Dat.3.s.) new book  
 b. \*vsicki (\*mu) novi knigi  
 all (CL-dat.3.s.) new books  
 c. nova (\*mu) kniga  
 [a] new (CL) book  
 d. kniga (\*mu)  
 [a] book (CL)

Fronting of the possessor is allowed in indefinite noun phrases. In this case it is not doubled by the clitic:

- (52) a. na Ivan edna nova kniga  
           "a new book of Ivan's"  
       b. na Ivan mnogo knigi  
           "many new books of Ivan's"

Notice that the fact that the preposed possessor does not count as the first element of the noun phrase w.r.t. the article and the possessive encliticization confirms our hypothesis that the preposed position of the possessor is derived.

Given the relatively free word order in the Bulgarian clause, it is very difficult to establish whether the preposed possessor is really in a position inside the DP or "scrambled" out of the DP. However, the following considerations may suggest a DP-internal hypothesis.

The fronted possessor can appear string adjacent to the DP from which it originates in object position (53a), in the Clause front position (53b) and in predicate position (53c):

- (53) a. Ceta na Ivan knigata na studentite  
           I read to Ivan book-the to students-the  
       b. Na Ivan kniga vcera ja procetox na studentite  
           To Ivan book yesterday I read to students-the  
           "Yesterday I read a book of Ivan's to the students"  
       c. Tova e na Ivan kniga  
           This is to Ivan book  
           "This is a book of Ivan's"

(53c) is the most stringent data in favour of the hypothesis that there is a landing site inside the DP for the fronted element.

Of course the *na*-DP can be further moved to the Clause front position (54a) or as a wh-element (54b):

*Is there a FocusP and a TopicP in the Noun Phrase structure?*

- (54) a. Na Ivan ja procetox kniga(ta mu) na studentite  
 To Ivan I read book(the his) to students-the  
 b. Na koj izvesten gruzki filisof kupi portet(ut) (\*mu)?  
 "Of which famous Greek philosopher did you buy [a]/the portrait?"  
 c. Na IVAN kupi portret(ut) (\*mu)!  
 "Of IVAN I bought the/a portrait!"

If it is fronted as a wh-element, or focalized, the clitic cannot appear.

Only possessors can be fronted (55). For this reason event nominals do not allow fronting (56):

- (55) a. na Aristotel portret (mu) (\*theme)  
 to A. portret-the (CL)  
 b. na Rembrandt potretut (mu) (\*agent)  
 c. na Ivan potretut (mu) (possessor)

- (56) a. unistozavaneto na grada  
 destruction-the to the city  
 "the destruction of the city"  
 b. unistozavaneto mu  
 destruction-the CL  
 "its destruction"  
 c. \*na grada unistozavaneto (mu)

This restriction to possessors, once again suggests a parallelism with the predication construction:

- (57) a. portretut bese na Ivan  
 "the portret was of Ivan"  
 b. \*unistozavaneto bese na grada  
 "the destruction was of the city"

The restriction to possessors does not hold for wh-movement and parallel focus movement outside the DP. In this case the clitic cannot appear:

- (58) a. na koj grad opisa unistozavaneto (\*mu)?  
of which city did you describe the destruction?  
b. na RIM opisax unistozavaneto (\*mu)!  
of ROME I described the destruction!

I propose, slightly reformulating the proposal of D&G (1996) that the Bulgarian noun phrase structure is as in (59):

- (59) [TopP Top [CIP CL [DP ..... ]]]

That Spec of TopP is different from SpecCIP is shown by the following examples:

- (60) a. na Ivan novata mu kniga  
of Ivan new-the his.CL book  
b. na Ivan tazi mu (nova) kniga  
of Ivan this his.CL (new) book  
c. na Ivan negovata si (nova) kniga  
of Ivan his-the self.CL (new) book

On independent grounds, I have proposed in Giusti (1993) for other Balkan languages and in joint work with Mila Dimitrova-Vulchanova (cf. Giusti and Dimitrova-Vulchanova 1994) that adjectives that host the clitic are neither in D nor in their basic position, but in SpecDP. In order to host the clitic in cases such as (60a) D-V&G. (1996) proposed that they move to SpecCIP. In independent work on demonstratives, I have claimed that they are in SpecDP, so they must be in SpecCIP in (60b). Finally notice that in (60c) there is a further element which part of the CHAIN constituted by the preposed possessor and the Clitic, namely the possessive pronoun *negov*, which certainly is a maximal projection.

Bulgarian clearly shows a parallelism between clause and sentence as pointed out by DV&G (1996). The Bulgarian sentence structure allows multiple fronting with clitic doubling. The noun phrase turns out to be "defective" once again, since the fronting is much more restricted and cannot be multiple at all.

The analysis given to Bulgarian, opens up the possibility of analysing parallel structures as instances of movement of possessive DPs to SpecTopP, thereby explaining the doubling effect which does not seem to violate the projection principle:

*Is there a FocusP and a TopicP in the Noun Phrase structure?*

- (61) German: a. das Buch von Johann  
the book of J.  
b. dem Johann sein Buch  
the.dat J. his Buch
- (62) West Flemish: a. de boek van Valere (Haegeman (p.c.))  
the book of V.  
b. Valere zen boek  
Valere his book
- (63) Norwegian: a. bilen til Per (Fiva (1987))  
car-the of P.  
b. Per sin bil  
P. his car
- (64) Hungarian: a. a Mari kalapja (Szabolcsi (1994))  
the M.nom. hat.poss.3.s.  
b. Marinak a kalapja  
Mari.dat. the hat.poss.3.s.

Notice that in the two languages where morphological Case is present, the possessor is in dative, parallel to the Bulgarian case discussed above. But I will leave this for future research.

## 6. *Conclusions*

In this paper, I have tried to draw a further parallelism between Noun Phrases and clauses, in view of other well-known ones. In particular, I have argued that in Noun Phrases a FocP and/or a TopP are to be assumed at least for some languages.

Considering that in a very general sense, Noun Phrases are "defective" with respect to the functional properties found in clauses, we are not surprised to find out that also the FocP and the TopP are not necessarily present in Noun Phrases in all languages.

These two functional projections represent the "fine" structure of the DP, in the sense that Rizzi (1995) proposes for CPs. And, as a matter of fact, they are situated either immediately below or immediately above it.

The assumption of these two new functional projections in the Noun Phrase structure not only does not complicate the general approach, since they have been proposed for clauses, but also can explain a certain number of otherwise unexpected word orders. Every section has motivated the assumption of these projections independently of theory-internal questions.

GIUSTI@UNIVE.IT

### *References*

- Abney, S. P. (1987), *The English Noun Phrase in Its Sentential Aspect*, PhD Diss. MIT.
- Brugè, L. and G. Giusti (1996) "On demonstratives", GLOW talk, Athens.
- Campbell, R. (1993) "The Occupants of SpecDP", GLOW Newsletter, 30.
- Cinque, G. (1980) "On Extraction from NP in Italian", *Journal of Italian Linguistics* 5, 47-99.
- Cinque, G. (1988) "La frase relativa", in Renzi, L. (ed.) *Grande Grammatica Italiana di Consultazione*, Il Mulino, Bologna, 443-503.
- Cinque, G. (1995a), "On the Evidence for Partial N-movement in the Romance DP", Cinque et al. (eds.) *Paths to Universal Grammar. Studies in Honor of R. Kayne*, Georgetown University Press.
- Cinque, G. (1995b) "Adverbs and the Universal Hierarchy of Functional Projections", ms. Univ. of Venice.
- Dimitrova-Vulchanova, M. and G. Giusti (1996) "Possessors in the Bulgarian DP", *Trondheim Working Papers in Linguistics* [to appear].

- Fiva, T. (1987) *Possessor Chains in Norwegian*, Tromsø Studier i sprakvitenskap IX, Novus.
- Giusti, G. (1993) *La sintassi dei determinanti*, Unipress, Padova.
- Giusti G. and M. Dimitrova-Vulchanova (1994) "Quantified Noun Phrase Structure in Bulgarian", *[Formal] Approaches to [Slavic] Linguistics*. The College Park Meeting 1994. Michigan Slavic Publications. 1996, 123-144.
- Haider, H. (1988) "Matching Projections", in Cardinaletti, A. G. Cinque, G. Giusti (eds.) *Constituent Structure. Papers from the 1987 GLOW Conference*, Foris, Dordrecht, 101-121.
- Leko, N. (1988) "X-Bar Theory and Internal Structure of NPs", *Lingua* 75, 135-169.
- Lecarme, J. (1994) "Tense in the Nominal System: The Somali DP", *Studies in Afroasiatic Grammar*, Sophia Antipolis, France.
- Longobardi, G. (1991) "Extraction from NP and the proper notion of c-command", in Giorgi, A. and G. Longobardi *The Syntax of Noun Phrases*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, G.B.
- Longobardi, G. (1994) "Reference and Proper Names: A Theory of N-Movement in Syntax and Logical Form", *Linguistic Inquiry* 25, 609-665.
- Rizzi, L. (1995) "The fine structure of the left periphery", ms. Univ. of Genenva.
- Szabolcsi, A. (1994), "The Noun Phrase", *Syntax and Semantics* 27. *The Syntactic Structure of Hungarian*, Academic Press, 179-274.
- Tomaselli, A. (1991) *La sintassi del verbo finito nelle lingue germaniche*, Unipress, Padova.
- Zamparelli, R. (1993) "Prenominal Modifiers, Degree Phrases and the Structure of AP", *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics* 3.1, 138-163.