

## On Indefinite Pronoun Structures with APs: Reply to Kishimoto

Richard K. Larson

Franc Marušič

A number of authors have claimed that indefinite pronoun constructions like *everything red* are formed by raising a noun (*thing*) over a higher pronominal adjective (*red*). We examine phenomena in English and other languages which appear to show that adjectives participating in the indefinite pronoun construction do not correspond to pronominal forms, but to postnominal ones. We evaluate the challenges these results present for the N-raising account, showing that while some can be met, others apparently cannot. This outcome calls for a reexamination of postnominal position with indefinite pronouns.

*Keywords:* indefinite pronouns, adjectives, N-raising, DP syntax, nominal modification, attributives

The paradigms in (1) and (2) present an interesting contrast. Attributive adjectives modifying garden-variety common nouns like *man*, *book*, and *rooms* typically occur in pronominal position (1a–c). However, the same adjectives modifying indefinite pronouns like *everything*, *something*, and *someplace* must occur postnominally (2a–c).

- |  |                                    |
|--|------------------------------------|
| (1) a. i. every interesting <i>book</i>  | ii. *every <i>book</i> interesting |
| b. i. a delicious <i>dish</i>            | ii. *a <i>dish</i> delicious       |
| c. i. cold <i>rooms</i>                  | ii. * <i>rooms</i> cold            |
| (2) a. i. *interesting <i>everything</i> | ii. <i>everything</i> interesting  |
| b. i. *delicious <i>something</i>        | ii. <i>something</i> delicious     |
| c. i. *cold <i>someplace</i>             | ii. <i>someplace</i> cold          |

A number of authors have appealed to N-movement to explain this contrast. Abney (1987) suggests that indefinite pronouns are formed by incorporating nouns like *body*, *thing*, and *place* into a higher determiner (3a). Kishimoto (2000) proposes that these nouns raise from their base position to a higher projection, Num(ber)P(hrase), following Ritter (1991) and Cinque (1995) (3b).

- (3) a. *Abney's (1987) analysis*  
 [DP every -thing [NP \_\_\_\_\_]]
- b. *Kishimoto's (2000) analysis*  
 [DP every [NumP thing [NP \_\_\_\_\_]]]

We are grateful to Dan Finer, the ŠUSS group, and two *LI* reviewers for helpful comments and suggestions. We also thank our audience at the 2003 Linguistic Society of America annual meeting (Atlanta, Georgia), where an earlier version of this material was presented.

In cases where the indefinite pronoun cooccurs with an adjective, the noun is taken to raise around an underlyingly prenominal adjective (4a). Kishimoto suggests that this derivation parallels the raising of ‘light’ verbs around a preverbal adverb (4b); hence, he categorizes *body*, *thing*, and *place* as ‘light nouns.’

- (4) a. [<sub>DP</sub> every ... *thing* [<sub>NP</sub> interesting [<sub>NP</sub> \_\_\_\_ ]]]  
 b. [<sub>TP</sub> John [<sub>T'</sub> *has* [<sub>VP</sub> often [<sub>VP</sub> \_\_\_\_ eaten bureks]]]]

The general N-movement analysis establishes an attractive connection between the special D + N form of indefinite pronouns and the obligatory postnominal position of adjectives occurring with them. It does so by claiming that the latter is actually an illusion: postnominal adjectives with indefinite pronouns are actually prenominal adjectives that have been stranded by N-movement. In this article, however, we show that this basic claim of the N-movement analysis is problematic.<sup>1</sup> There are a variety of phenomena in English (and other languages) that distinguish prenominal from postnominal adjectives. Using these as diagnostics, we show that adjectives in the indefinite pronoun construction pattern uniformly like underlying postnominal adjectives, and not like prenominal adjectives. This result casts serious doubt on derivations like (4a) and on the general analogy to verb raising (4b). It also re-poses the question of the basic contrast in (1) and (2).

## 1 Postnominal Adjectives

We begin by noting that although we might ascribe the postnominal position of the adjective to N-raising in the (ii) examples of (2a–c), this cannot be done in all cases. Postnominal adjectives do not occur only with indefinite pronouns in English, but in other contexts as well. For example, participial adjectives, and adjectives formed with the modal suffix *-able/-ible*, typically can appear in *both* pre- and postnominal position with garden-variety common nouns. (Examples (5a–d) are due to Bolinger (1967).)

- (5) a. the *visible* stars (include Capella, Betelgeuse, and Sirius)  
 the stars *visible*  
 b. the *navigable* rivers (include the Nile and the Amazon)  
 the rivers *navigable*  
 c. the *responsible* individuals (were contacted)  
 the individuals *responsible*  
 d. the *stolen* jewels (were on the table)  
 the jewels *stolen*
- (6) a. We interviewed every *possible candidate/candidate possible*.  
 b. Lanko eats the strangest *imaginable foods/foods imaginable*.  
 c. No *named individual/individual named* was asked to sign a statement.

<sup>1</sup> We restrict ourselves to a critique of the N-raising analysis of indefinite pronouns. We say nothing about other N-movement analyses (e.g., Cardinaletti 1994 for personal pronouns, Cinque 1994 for Italian postnominal adjectives).

Furthermore, adjectives like *present* (in its spatial sense), and adjectives formed with the aspectual prefix *a-* (*abeam, ablaze, abloom, abroach, abroad, adrift, afire, aflame, afraid, agape, agleam, aglitter, aglow, aground, ajar, akimbo, akin, alight, alive, amiss, amok, amuck, apart, around, ashamed, ashore, askew, aslant, asleep, astern, astir, asunder, atilt, averse, awake, awirl, and awry*) occur *only* in postnominal position.<sup>2</sup>

- (7) a. every woman *present*  
 b. \*every *present* woman (spatial sense)
- (8) a. the children *asleepabroadlastir*  
 b. ??the *asleepabroadlastir* children

Under N-movement analyses, common nouns like those in (5)–(8) do not raise. It follows that the adjectives in these examples must occupy a postnominal position in base structure.

- (9) a. [<sub>DP</sub> the [<sub>NP</sub> individuals [<sub>AP</sub> *responsible*]]]  
 b. [<sub>DP</sub> every [<sub>NP</sub> woman [<sub>AP</sub> *present*]]]

This in turn implies that some adjectives in indefinite pronoun constructions should originate postnominally. For example, since *responsible* can occur both pre- and postnominally (see (5c)), (10a) should have a derivation in which N raises over A (10b), and one in which it does not (10c).

- (10) a. everybody *responsible*  
 b. [<sub>DP</sub> every *body* [<sub>NP</sub>[<sub>AP</sub> *responsible*] \_\_\_\_\_]]  
 c. [<sub>DP</sub> every *body* [<sub>NP</sub>\_\_\_\_\_ [<sub>AP</sub> *responsible*]]]

Likewise, since *present* occurs only postnominally (see (7)), (11a) should have only the derivation in which N does not cross over A (11b).

- (11) a. everybody *present*  
 b. [<sub>DP</sub> every *body* [<sub>NP</sub>\_\_\_\_\_ [<sub>AP</sub> *present*]]]

<sup>2</sup> The unavailability of prenominal adjectives prefixed with *a-* appears to be an instance of the general English Right-hand Head Rule proposed by Williams (1981). The head of *a-sleep* is presumably the prefix *a-*, which derives an adjective from an underlying verb (ia). Contrast this with *sleep-ing*, whose head is a suffix (*-ing*) with the same function.

- (i) a. [<sub>A</sub> a- [<sub>V</sub> sleep]]  
 b. [<sub>A</sub>[<sub>V</sub> sleep] -ing]

Under Williams's rule, the difference in head position permits the latter form to occur prenominal (*sleeping child*), but not the former (*\*asleep child*). We should note that there are many unclaritys in this domain, such as why the headedness of the lexical item should be visible with forms like *asleep*, but not with lexicalized PPs, like those in (ii).

- (ii) a. an [over-the-counter] prescription  
 b. that [under-the-table] deal  
 c. his [off-the-cuff] remarks

We have nothing to offer on this point at present. The answers evidently require a deeper understanding of the Right-hand Head Rule itself.

These points yield a simple, general prediction. Pre- and postnominal adjectives are known to behave differently with respect to a variety of syntactic and semantic phenomena. As we have just shown, N-raising with indefinite pronouns is compatible with both pre- and postnominal sources for adjectives. The N-raising analysis, proposed for example by Kishimoto (1999), therefore leads us to expect that adjectives will show both pre- and postnominal behavior in relevant cases. Interestingly, however, this prediction is not borne out. Below, we survey a range of cases in which pre- and postnominal adjectives pattern differently. In each instance, the adjectives occurring with indefinite pronouns pattern like postnominal adjectives, and *not* like prenominal forms.

## 2 Postnominal Behavior of Adjectives with Indefinite Pronouns

### 2.1 Recursion

Postnominal adjectives with common nouns do not generally permit recursion (12a–b). Two or more APs are allowed only when the right-hand members are sufficiently “heavy” (12c–d). This constraint does not hold of prenominal adjectives, however, which stack much more freely on the left (13a–b).

- (12) a. \*the rivers explored navigable  
 b. \*the jewels visible stolen  
 c. The rivers [explored] [navigable in the summer] were surveyed.  
 d. He wanted to identify a man [present] [capable of lifting a horse].
- (13) a. The explored navigable rivers have been photographed by satellite.  
 b. All the tiny shiny visible stolen jewels were lying on the table.

Given that verbs can raise across multiple adverbs (14a), the N-raising analogy leads us to expect indefinite pronoun constructions in which a noun raises across multiple adjectives. This expectation is not met, however, as the ungrammaticality of (14b) shows.<sup>3</sup>

- (14) a. [TP John [T' has [VP obviously [VP completely [VP \_\_\_ lost his mind]]]]]  
 b. \*[DP every thing [NP large [NP heavy [NP \_\_\_]]]]  
 (cf. *every large heavy thing*)

In general, multiple postnominal adjectives seem to be available with indefinite pronouns in the same circumstances where they are available with all nouns—namely, where the right-hand adjective is sufficiently “heavy” (15a–d).<sup>4</sup>

- (15) a. everyone [present] [capable of lifting a horse]  
 b. anyplace [available] [accessible by bike]

<sup>3</sup> This point is observed by Svenonius (1994).

<sup>4</sup> See section 3.2 for refinements.

- c. someone [*eligible*] [*born before World War II*]
- d. everything [*frozen*] [*older than fourteen weeks*]

Hence, adjective recursion with indefinite pronouns appears to follow the pattern of postnominal forms, not that of prenominal forms. These facts are mysterious under an N-raising + stranding account.

## 2.2 Inflection

Sadler and Arnold (1994) point out that in many dialects of American English, measure adjective modifiers show a different inflectional pattern in pre- and postnominal position. As the pairs in (16) and (17) show, prenominal measure forms are inflectionless, whereas postnominal measure forms are marked plural.

- (16) a. a [*23-inch-long*] rope
- b. a rope [*23 inches* long]
- (17) a. a [*2-mile-wide*] river
- b. a river [*2 miles* wide]

If postnominal measure adjectives with light nouns could be underlyingly prenominal, we might expect the bare, inflectionless form to be possible under a derivation like (18). However, this is not correct for most speakers (19).<sup>5</sup>

- (18) [<sub>DP</sub> any *thing* [<sub>NP</sub> 23 inch long [<sub>NP</sub> \_\_\_\_\_ ]]]

- (19) a. anything \**23 inch/23 inches* long
- b. everything \**2 mile/2 miles* wide

The inflectional pattern that we see with indefinite pronouns is the one normally associated with postnominal adjectives, not the one associated with prenominal adjectives.

## 2.3 Attributive-Only Adjectives

Bolinger (1967) notes that certain English adjectives can only appear attributively and are unavailable in predicative constructions. Thus, the adjective *live*, meaning 'living', occurs prenominally (20a), but can appear neither as a simple predicate (20b) nor as a postnominal adjective (20c).<sup>6</sup> Expressing the relevant meaning requires the alternative form *alive*, which shows essentially the

<sup>5</sup> Some speakers of American English permit the bare, inflectionless form in postnominal position in certain cases. For these speakers, this test is inconclusive.

<sup>6</sup> There is apparently a second adjective *live* used to describe public performances and electrical circuits.

- (i) a. This broadcast is *live*.
- b. This circuit is *live*.

This meaning cannot be paraphrased by *alive* and is set aside here as irrelevant.

inverse distribution: *alive* cannot occur prenominally, but appears smoothly in predicate and postnominal position (21a–c).

- (20) a. some *live* thing  
 b. \*This thing is *live*.  
 c. \*a thing *live*
- (21) a. \*some *alive* thing  
 b. This thing is *alive*.  
 c. a thing *alive*

Consider now the equivalent forms with indefinite pronouns. Under the N-raising analysis, we might expect *live* postnominally (22a). But this is not what we find: the form licensed in postnominal position is *alive* (22b).<sup>7</sup>

- (22) a. \*something *live*  
 b. something *alive*

A similar restriction can be observed in other languages. Attributive adjectives in Slovenian, as in English, appear in prenominal positions, while postnominally under neutral intonation adjectives appear only if they are sufficiently heavy. As in English, a single attributive adjective can appear with an indefinite pronoun regardless of its heaviness.<sup>8</sup> Some restrictions nevertheless apply: the so-called type adjectives are allowed only in attributive use (23a–b) and cannot be used in predicative constructions (23c–d) (Muha 1995).<sup>9</sup> Importantly, they are also unavailable in indefinite pronoun constructions (24).

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| (23) a. šolski učitelj<br>school teacher | c. *Ta učitelj je šolski.<br>this teacher is school    |
| b. javni uslužbenec<br>public employee   | d. *Ta uslužbenec je javni.<br>this employee is public |
- (24) a. \*nekdo šolski  
someone school  
 b. \*nekdo javni  
someone public

These results are unexpected under the view that indefinite pronoun constructions involve N-

<sup>7</sup> An anonymous reviewer finds (22a) acceptable and reports consulting several other speakers, who also found it acceptable. The reviewer states that examples like it can be found in corpora. We find (22) ungrammatical, but predict that whoever finds it acceptable will also accept examples where *live* is used predicatively (*This thing is live*). The results of a Google search confirm our prediction. The large majority of pages where examples with *something live* occur appear to involve fishing. Here we also found predicative examples: for instance, ‘‘All this means is, if the pike are eating roach then use roach as bait, if the pike are eating perch then use perch as bait whether it is live or dead or it is . . .’’; ‘‘Since we love to fish with live bait, we have found that sometimes ‘live’ doesn’t matter. They still might not take something that is live.’’

<sup>8</sup> For more information on Slovenian, see Herrity 2000.

<sup>9</sup> Thanks to Rok Žaucer for bringing this reference to our attention.

raising over an underlying prenominal adjective. This view would appear to predict intrinsically prenominal adjectives occurring postnominally in this construction.

(25) \*<sub>[DP some thing [NP live [NP — ]]] ]]</sub>

#### 2.4 Stage-Level/Individual-Level Interpretation

Bolinger (1967) notes an important semantic difference in prenominal/postnominal pairs like those in (5) (repeated in (26)). The prenominal adjectives are ambiguous: they can be understood as attributing their property *intrinsically/inherently*, or they can be understood as attributing their property *temporarily/episodically*. By contrast, the postnominal adjectives are unambiguous, having only the temporary/episodic reading.

- (26) a. the *visible* stars (include Capella, Betelgeuse, and Sirius)  
       the stars *visible*  
       b. the *navigable* rivers (include the Nile and the Amazon)  
       the rivers *navigable*  
       c. the *responsible* individuals (were contacted)  
       the individuals *responsible*  
       d. the *stolen* jewels (were on the table)  
       the jewels *stolen*

Thus, *the visible stars* can refer to stars that, in virtue of their intrinsic magnitude, are perceptible to the naked eye (the inherent reading). Alternatively, *the visible stars* can refer to stars that are visible now, or on some particular occasion (the episodic reading). By contrast, *the stars visible* has only the latter, episodic reading. Similarly, *the responsible individuals* can refer to people who, in virtue of their character, are reliable and trustworthy (the inherent reading). Alternatively, it can refer to those people who are accountable or answerable for some particular event (the episodic reading). But *the individuals responsible* has only the latter reading.

The difference Bolinger observes is further brought out by the pairs in (27) and (28).

- (27) a. List all the visible stars, whether we can see them or not.  
       b. ??List all the stars visible, whether we can see them or not.  
       (28) a. List all the responsible individuals, whether they were involved or not.  
       b. ??List all the individuals responsible, whether they were involved or not.

(27a) is coherent; it can be understood as an instruction to list all stars of magnitude 1–5, whether or not they happen to be in view. By contrast, (27b) is incoherent; it requires us to list all stars currently visible whether or not they are currently visible. Similarly for the pair in (28). As noted by Svenonius (1994), Bolinger's distinction between intrinsic and temporary attribution appears to coincide with the *stage-level/individual-level distinction* identified by Carlson (1977).

Consider now indefinite pronoun cases like (29) and (30). If the derivation for (29a) were as in (29b), then (*ceteris paribus*) we might expect the example to be ambiguous between an individual-level and a stage-level reading, just like its putative prenominal source (*cf. every visible*

*thing*). But this does not appear correct. To our ears, (29c) is incoherent in just the same way as (27b). Similarly, (30c) is incoherent in the same way as (28b).

- (29) a. everything visible  
 b.  $[_{DP} \text{ every } \underline{\text{thing}} [_{NP} \text{ visible } [_{NP} \text{ — } ]]]$   
 c. ?? List everything visible, whether we can see it or not.
- (30) a. everyone responsible  
 b.  $[_{DP} \text{ every } \underline{\text{one}} [_{NP} \text{ responsible } [_{NP} \text{ — } ]]]$   
 c. ?? List everyone responsible, whether they were involved or not.

Postnominal adjectives with indefinite pronouns thus have only the interpretation open to postnominal adjectives generally. Specifically, they do *not* have the individual-level interpretation available to prenominal adjectives. This is unexplained under the N-raising analysis, which derives postnominal adjectives with indefinite pronouns from a prenominal source.

### 2.5 Restrictive/Nonrestrictive Interpretation

Bolinger (1967) notes that prenominal and postnominal adjectives in English differ in another semantic respect. Prenominal adjectives can be ambiguous between a restrictive and a nonrestrictive interpretation, whereas postnominal adjectives can only be understood restrictively. For example, (31a), with a prenominal adjective, can mean that (all) the words were deleted and they were unsuitable (nonrestrictive), or it can mean that of the words, the ones that were deleted were the unsuitable ones (restrictive). By contrast, the postnominal adjective in (31b) appears to have only the restrictive interpretation. Similar points apply to (32a–b), where the prenominal adjective can have a parenthetical character, but the postnominal adjective cannot.

- (31) a. Every *unsuitable* word was deleted.  
 ‘Every word was deleted; they were unsuitable.’  
 ‘Every word that was unsuitable was deleted.’  
 b. Every word *unsuitable* was deleted.  
 #‘Every word was deleted; they were unsuitable.’  
 ‘Every word that was unsuitable was deleted.’
- (32) a. Every *blessed* person was healed.  
 ‘All the people were healed.’  
 ‘All the people that were blessed were healed.’  
 b. Every person *blessed* was healed.  
 #‘All the people were healed.’  
 ‘All the people that were blessed were healed.’

Consider now indefinite pronoun cases like (33) and (34). If (33a) had a derivation like the one in (33b), then (*ceteris paribus*) we might expect it to be ambiguous between a restrictive and a nonrestrictive interpretation, just like its assumed prenominal source (cf. *every unsuitable thing*).



But this seems incorrect. (33a) has only a restrictive meaning. Similarly for (34a), which has only the restrictive meaning and lacks the nonrestrictive reading of its proposed prenominal source.

- (33) a. Everything *unsuitable* was deleted.  
 b.  $[_{DP} \text{ every } \textit{thing} \underbrace{[_{NP} \text{ unsuitable } [_{NP} \text{ \_\_\_\_\_\_ } ]]} ]]$
- (34) a. Everyone *blessed* was healed.  
 b.  $[_{DP} \text{ every } \textit{one} \underbrace{[_{NP} \text{ blessed } [_{NP} \text{ \_\_\_\_\_\_ } ]]} ]]$

Once again, postnominal adjectives with indefinite pronouns have only the interpretation open to postnominal adjectives generally, contra what we expect on the N-raising analysis.

### 2.6 *Comparative Adjectives with Complements*

Bresnan (1973) and Sadler and Arnold (1994) note an interesting semantic asymmetry in English comparative adjectives that modify a noun and select a comparative complement. When the comparative adjective occurs prenominally, as shown schematically in (35a), then the noun must be true of the object providing the standard of comparison in the comparative complement. Thus, in (35b) the noun *person* must be true of the individual Max, who provides the standard of comparison: Max must be a person, and not, for example, a dog. This restriction accounts for the oddness of (35c), which (intuitively) requires that the bookshelf in question be a person (that *person* be true of the bookshelf).

- (35) a. [ . . . A N CC . . . ]  
 b. a *taller* person *than* Max  
 c. #a *taller* person *than* *this* bookshelf

Interestingly, this semantic restriction is lifted when the comparative adjective occurs postnominally, with the comparative complement trailing it (36a). Here there is no requirement that the noun be true of the object giving the standard of comparison. Hence, both (36b) and (36c) are natural.

- (36) a. [ . . . N A CC . . . ]  
 b. a person *taller* *than* Max  
 c. a person *taller* *than* *this* bookshelf

One way of putting the relevant difference is that construction (35a) compares heights of Ns whereas (36a) simply compares heights. Hence, the former but not the latter requires the standard of comparison to be an N itself.

Consider now indefinite pronoun constructions like (37a). *Ceteris paribus*, under the N-raising analysis we would expect two distinct derivations for this example: one like (37b), where the adjective is underlyingly prenominal, corresponding to structure (35a), and one like (37c), where the adjective is underlyingly postnominal, corresponding to structure (36a).

- (37) a. someone taller than this bookshelf  
 b. some one taller \_\_\_\_\_ than this bookshelf [... A N CC ...]  
 c. some one \_\_\_\_\_ taller than this bookshelf [... N A CC ...]

This in turn predicts that (37a) should have two distinct readings. It should have an anomalous reading, under which it is entailed that the bookshelf in question is a person. This corresponds to derivation (37b) (cf. (35c)). (37a) should also have a natural reading, under which there is no entailment that the bookshelf in question is a person. This corresponds to derivation (37c) (cf. (36c)).

In our judgment, (37a) is not ambiguous. In particular, it has only the natural reading corresponding to the derivation in which the adjective originates postnominally. It does not have the expected anomalous reading equivalent to (35c) in which the adjective originates prenominally.<sup>10</sup> Again, this result is mysterious under an N-raising analysis.

### 2.7 Slovenian Complex Adjectives

Data from languages other than English appear to support the generalization noted here, that postnominal adjectives with indefinite pronouns behave like postnominal adjectives generally. As discussed by Orešnik (1996) and Marušič (2001), when transitive, equative, and comparative APs appear prenominally in Slovenian, the argument (38a) or equative (38b) and comparative complements (the *as*-phrase and *than*-phrase, respectively) must precede the adjective.

- (38) a. i. [<sub>AP</sub> *Maradoni podoben*] napadalec  
           Maradona similar forward  
           ‘a forward similar to Maradona’  
       ii. \* [<sub>AP</sub> *podoben Maradoni*] napadalec  
 b. i. [<sub>AP</sub> *kot Cefizelj pameten*] poba  
       as Cefizelj clever boy  
       ‘a boy (as) clever as Cefizelj’  
       ii. \* [<sub>AP</sub> *pameten kot Cefizelj*] poba

<sup>10</sup> Note that the absence of the predicted anomalous reading in (37a) cannot plausibly be ascribed to pragmatics, since anomalous readings in ambiguous structures are quite generally available. Consider cases of the form in (ia) due originally to Bertrand Russell.

- (i) a. Max thinks your yacht is longer than it is.  
       b. Max thinks your dead uncle is alive.

As Russell observes, (ia) is ambiguous between a natural reading where Max is simply mistaken about your yacht’s length, and a second, bizarre reading where Max has a thought that he might express this way: ‘‘Your yacht is longer than it is.’’ Russell analyzes this ambiguity as scopal, with two different LF structures corresponding to the two readings, one of which is anomalous. Example (ib) is analogous. Evidently, anomalous readings of ambiguous sentences remain available. Hence, there is no reason not to expect an anomalous reading of (37a), if it had the derivation in (37b).

By contrast, when Slovenian transitive, equative, and comparative APs appear postnominally, the pattern is reversed; the complement must *follow* the adjective.

- (39) a. i. napadalec [<sub>AP</sub> *podoben Maradoni*]  
           forward       similar Maradona  
           ‘a forward similar to Maradona’  
       ii. \*napadalec [<sub>AP</sub> *Maradoni podoben*]  
   b. i. poba [<sub>AP</sub> *pameten kot Cefizelj*]  
           boy       clever as Cefizelj  
           ‘a boy (as) clever as Cefizelj’  
       ii. \*poba [<sub>AP</sub> *kot Cefizelj pameten*]

Revealingly, in Slovenian indefinite pronoun constructions, transitive, equative, and comparative APs exhibit the postnominal pattern. Complements must follow the adjective; they cannot precede it.<sup>11</sup>

- (40) a. i. nekdo [<sub>AP</sub> *podoben Maradoni*]  
           someone   similar Maradona  
           ‘someone similar to Maradona’  
       ii. \*nekdo [<sub>AP</sub> *Maradoni podoben*]  
   b. i. nekdo [<sub>AP</sub> *pameten kot Cefizelj*]  
           someone   clever as Cefizelj  
           ‘someone (as) clever as Cefizelj’  
       ii. \*nekdo [<sub>AP</sub> *kot Cefizelj pameten*]

Again, this suggests that Slovenian postnominal adjectives occurring with indefinite pronouns do not derive from an underlying prenominal source.

### 3 Assessing the Challenges

The distributional, interpretive, and crosslinguistic data surveyed above display the same basic pattern. In each case, APs cooccurring with indefinite pronouns behave, not like prenominal adjectives, but like postnominal forms. This result poses a clear challenge to analyses of indefinite pronouns that assume N-raising over prenominal APs, such as those of Abney (1987) and Kishimoto (2000). It is therefore interesting to consider whether the N-raising analysis could be refined to take the new data into account. In fact, some refinements do seem possible, although important problems remain.

<sup>11</sup> The judgments recorded here assume neutral intonation and neutral interpretation. Slovenian permits scrambling so that, with appropriate intonation, focus, and emphasis, nearly any order is acceptable.

### 3.1 More on AP Complementation

We believe an independent account might be possible for the AP complementation facts introduced earlier. Recall that, under the N-raising analysis, examples like (41a) are predicted to have two derivations: one in which the noun crosses a prenominal AP (41b), and one in which it does not (41c). The two structures receive two different interpretations: (41b) yields an anomalous reading since it compares bookshelves and persons (*-one*), whereas (41c) yields a coherent reading since it merely compares heights.

- (41) a. someone taller than this bookshelf  
 b. some one taller \_\_\_\_\_ than this bookshelf  
 (cf. #*a taller person than this bookshelf*)  
 c. some one \_\_\_\_\_ taller than this bookshelf  
 (cf. *a person taller than this bookshelf*)

We observed that (41a) has only the coherent reading associated with (41c), arguing that the noun does not cross AP.

Constructions like (42a–d), the presumed source of (41a), have been a persistent topic of grammatical investigation and are known to diverge from the superficially similar constructions (43a–c) in important respects (see, e.g., Campbell and Wales 1969, Stanley 1969, Berman 1974).

- (42) a. He is *a taller man than my father*.  
 b. He is *as tall a man as my father*.  
 c. He is *less happy a man than my father*.  
 d. He is *a less happy man than my father*.  
 e. The kitchen is *as big a mess as the bathroom is*.
- (43) a. He is *a man taller than my father*.  
 b. He is *a man as tall as my father*.  
 c. He is *a man less happy than my father*.

For example, whereas the constructions in (43) can appear as arguments (44a–c), those in (42) are largely confined to predicate positions (44d–f).

- (44) a.  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} ??A \text{ taller man than my father} \\ A \text{ man taller than my father} \end{array} \right\}$  walked in.  
 b. Alice met  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} ??a \text{ taller man than my father} \\ a \text{ man taller than my father} \end{array} \right\}$ .  
 c. Max talked to  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} ??as \text{ tall a man as my father} \\ a \text{ man as tall as my father} \end{array} \right\}$ .  
 d. We consider him  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} as \text{ tall a man as my father} \\ a \text{ man as tall as my father} \end{array} \right\}$ .  
 e. Jim returned home  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} as \text{ tall a man as my father} \\ a \text{ man as tall as my father} \end{array} \right\}$ .

- f. Several sessions on the rack made Felix  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \textit{as tall a man as my father} \\ \textit{a man as tall as my father} \end{array} \right\}$ .

More to the point, the constructions in (43) readily accept determiners other than indefinite *a*, whereas those in (42) do not.

- (45) a. Alice met *every/no/each/some/the man taller than my father*.  
 b. \*Rose saw *every/no/each/some/the taller man than my father*.

These results can be brought to bear on our current concerns. English indefinite pronouns are, as we know, constructed from one of the four determiners *some*, *every*, *no*, and *any*. In particular, they are not formed from either the definite or the indefinite article (*the/a*). Presumably, then, whatever factors exclude (45b) might also be appealed to in order to exclude a source structure for (46a) (= (41a)) as in (46b).

- (46) a. some *-one* taller than this bookshelf  
 b. \*some/every/no/any taller *-one* than this bookshelf

Hence, the anomalous reading for (46a) would, correctly, be predicted to be absent.

### 3.2 More on Adjective Position

Larson (1998, 2001) has proposed that attributive APs arrange themselves into two broad domains, according to whether they modify NP or DP.<sup>12</sup>

- (47)  $[_{DP} D \alpha [_{NP} \beta N] \alpha]$   
 ( $\alpha$  = DP modifier;  $\beta$  = NP modifier)

NP modifiers are typically nonintersective and generic in semantics and occur prenominally. By contrast, DP modifiers are intersective, are equivalent to relative clauses, and occur both pre- and postnominally.<sup>13</sup> To see the difference, recall the pair in (48a–b) due to Bolinger (1967).

- (48) a. the stars *visible* (include Capella, Betelgeuse, and Sirius)  
 b. the *visible* stars

As noted earlier, (48a) has a single, stage-level reading equivalent to what would be expressed by the relative clause construction *the stars that are visible (now)*. By contrast, (48b) is ambiguous, having either the stage-level reading, or an individual-level reading where it refers to stars that, in virtue of their intrinsic magnitude, are perceptible to the naked eye. Larson (1998, 2000)

<sup>12</sup> See Bernstein 1993 for a “two-position” theory in which certain adjectives are analyzed as heads ( $A^0$ ) selecting an NP complement and others are analyzed as phrases (AP) adjoining to NP. Bernstein’s distinction is not equivalent to the one proposed here; specifically, her  $A^0$ /AP does not map to the individual-level/stage-level, generic/deictic, nonintersective/intersective, direct modifier/implicit relative clause semantic distinctions that are mapped by the NP modifier/DP modifier discussed in Larson 1998, 2001.

<sup>13</sup> More precisely, postnominal APs that follow normal common nouns in cases like *every man responsible* are analyzed as occurring within reduced relative clauses.



(53) [DP D -N  $\alpha$  [<sub>NP</sub>  $\beta$  t]  $\alpha$ ]

This proposal would immediately account for the facts in section 2.4, where we observed that indefinite pronouns cannot be followed by adjectives like *visible* on their inherent reading. Assuming the latter are NP modifiers, these forms will simply be unavailable. The proposal might also be extended to the facts discussed in section 2.3, assuming that attributive-only adjectives are also generated in NP modifier position (54). This seems a plausible position for *live* since it is found internal to the intersective adjectives available with indefinite pronouns.

(54) a. [DP[<sub>NP</sub>[<sub>AP</sub> *live*] bait]]  
 b. small stinky *live* bait

Here again, such forms would not be produced with indefinite pronouns simply because the light noun could not host the NP modifier position.

But the same analysis does not seem possible for the facts discussed in sections 2.2 and 2.7. Neither uninflected measure forms (55) nor Slovenian prenominal complex adjectives (56) appear to be located inside the NP since both can be followed by an intersective adjective that is also available with indefinite pronouns, and therefore a DP modifier.

(55) a 6-foot-long *heavy* canoe

(56) denarju podoben *star* papir  
 money similar *old* paper  
 ‘old paper similar to money’

To explain these facts, the N-raising analysis apparently requires principles for inflection emergence and adjective complement reversal that are somehow activated by the light noun raising over the adjective. Such principles seem to us unlikely, regardless of the general correctness of the assumed three adjectival positions.

### 3.3 More on Recursion

The results so far leave two further challenges to the N-raising analysis of postnominal adjective position with indefinite pronouns: absence of recursion (section 2.1), and absence of nonrestrictive readings (section 2.5). Regarding the second, we will have nothing further to say. We simply see no reason why, if N-raising is correct, nonrestrictive postnominal adjectives should fail to occur with indefinite pronouns, particularly given that indefinite pronouns of the form *some*-N license nonrestrictive relatives (*Someone, who must have had a key, broke into my apartment last night*). Absence of postnominal recursion also seems to us a serious misprediction of the N-raising analysis. Given the availability of (57a), there is no clear reason why (57b) should be absent.

(57) a. every big black bellicose [<sub>NP</sub> bug]  
 b. \*every -thing big black bellicose [<sub>NP</sub> t]

We would like to make a further observation, however. We noted earlier that multiple post-

nominal adjectives are available with indefinite pronouns in the same general circumstances where they are available with all common nouns, namely, when the right-hand adjective is sufficiently ‘heavy’ (58a–d) (= (15a–d)).

- (58) a. everyone [*present*] [*capable of lifting a horse*]  
 b. anyplace [*available*] [*accessible by bike*]  
 c. someone [*eligible*] [*born before World War II*]  
 d. everything [*frozen*] [*older than fourteen weeks*]

There is, however, one interesting departure from the common noun pattern. A sequence of two seemingly light adjectives is possible in certain cases where the first adjective is one that occurs prenominally with common nouns, and the second is one that can occur postnominally. For example, the adjective *tall* occurs prenominally with common nouns (e.g., *a tall person* vs. *\*a person tall*), whereas the adjective *present* (in its spatial sense) occurs postnominally (e.g., *a person present* vs. *\*a present person*). Observe now that the two adjectives can occur in that order following an indefinite pronoun, despite their lightness (59ai), but their order cannot be inverted (59aii). The addition of further adjectives reintroduces the heaviness requirement (59aiii). The examples in (59b–d) illustrate the same point.<sup>15</sup>

- (59) a. i. everyone [*TALL*] [*present*]  
 ii. \*everyone [*present*] [*tall*]  
 iii. everyone [*TALL*] [*present*] [*capable of lifting a horse*]  
 b. i. nothing [*METALLIC*] [*found*]  
 ii. \*nothing [*found*] [*metallic*]  
 iii. nothing [*METALLIC*] [*found*] [*similar to a wing tip*]  
 c. i. something [*LARGE*] [*detected*]  
 ii. \*something [*detected*] [*large*]  
 iii. something [*LARGE*] [*detected*] [*stationary in the upper atmosphere*]

<sup>15</sup> The (iii) examples require a special intonation, in which the first adjective bears contrastive stress (indicated by capitals), and there is a break after the second adjective equivalent to that found between postnominal adjectives (*every man present | capable of lifting a horse*). Acceptability also seems to vary with the specific quantifier in the indefinite pronoun, the position of the larger DP in the clause, and the specific choice of adjective. Compare the following pairs (where the (b) examples are due to an anonymous reviewer, whose judgments we record but do not entirely agree with in all cases).

- (i) a. We found that *nothing LARGE packed* got through security.  
 b. ??We didn’t have to show security *anything LARGE packed*.  
 (ii) a. Please enlist *anyone STRONG available*.  
 b. \**Everybody STRONG available* was assembled.  
 (iii) a. ?*No one TALENTED hired* has been invited to the meeting.  
 b. \**Somebody TALENTED hired* started working.  
 (iv) a. *Everything GOOD imaginable* has already happened.  
 b. \**Let’s buy everything CHEAP microwavable*.

Finally, we should note that the normally prenominal adjective appearing after the indefinite pronoun must be a DP modifier, not an NP modifier; prenominal NP modifiers like *live* remain unavailable.



- d. i. everything [VALUABLE] [stolen]  
 ii. \*everything [stolen] [valuable]  
 iii. everything [VALUABLE] [stolen] [recovered on the black market]

The generalization is thus the following: with normal common nouns, postnominal adjectives show the pattern in (60a); the noun is followed by a series of forms (AP<sub>POST\*</sub>) falling under the heaviness constraint. But with indefinite pronouns, the pattern is potentially as in (60b); the noun is trailed by a single adjective of the kind that precedes a common noun (AP<sub>PRE</sub>), followed by a series of postnominal adjectives (AP<sub>POST\*</sub>), again respecting heaviness. Since multiple prenominal APs are possible, the only way N-raising analyses could account for this pattern would be to somehow restrict N-raising to the crossing of a single prenominal AP (60c). We do not find this view attractive.

- (60) a. N AP<sub>POST\*</sub> (common nouns)  
 b. N AP<sub>PRE</sub> AP<sub>POST\*</sub> (indefinite pronouns)  
 c. N AP<sub>PRE</sub> \_\_\_\_\_ AP<sub>POST\*</sub>

#### 4 Summary and Prospects

The N-raising analysis begins with the basic contrast in (61), where an adjective that appears prenominally, but not postnominally, with common nouns (61a–b), nonetheless occurs postnominally with indefinite pronouns (61c).

- (61) a. [Some *white* cat] was on the porch.  
 b. \*[Some cat *white*] was on the porch.  
 c. [Something *white*] was on the porch.

The common noun construction is analyzed as displaying the basic order (62a), so that the adjective is underlyingly prenominal. The indefinite pronoun construction then represents a derived order in which the noun head has raised leftward.

- (62) a. [<sub>DP</sub> D AP NP] basic order (prenominal APs)  
 b. [<sub>DP</sub> D -N AP [<sub>NP</sub> \_\_\_\_\_]] derived order (indefinite pronouns)

In section 2, we showed that in a variety of contexts adjectives following indefinite pronouns do not exhibit the properties of their putative prenominal sources, but, on the other hand, pattern quite clearly with postnominal adjectives. They have the form (sections 2.2, 2.7) and the meaning (sections 2.4–2.6) of postnominal adjectives. And indeed, they never occur where only strictly attributive adjectives may be found (section 2.3). The fact that adjective recursion is impossible after indefinite pronouns (section 2.1) expands the observed asymmetry of pre- and postnominal adjectives to all adjectives. Even adjectives that otherwise do not appear postnominally exhibit the ban on recursion typical of postnominal adjectives.

In section 3, we showed that two of these objections can plausibly be met. The unavailability of the anomalous readings expected with AP complementation might be attributed to the fact that

indefinite pronouns reject articles, which seem to be crucial for such readings. And the unavailability of expected individual-level readings might be ascribed to the fact that indefinite pronouns have a defective N projection, using the analysis of modifier attachment in Larson 1998, 2001, which takes individual-level adjectives to require this site. The N-raising analysis does not provide adequate answers to our other objections, however. It suggests no ready answers to the problems of adjectival inflection, complex adjective form, or (crucially) recursion. We believe these arguments cast serious doubt on the N-raising analysis of indefinite pronouns.<sup>16</sup>

Given our results, it is natural to inquire what alternatives are available. Broadly speaking, two alternative approaches suggest themselves. Instead of taking the A-N order found with common nouns as basic and the N-A order found with indefinite pronouns as derived, one might adopt the opposite view. On this idea, indefinite pronoun constructions would display the underlying order (63a); the prenominal position of AP would be derived, presumably by a rule of AP-raising (63b).

- (63) a. [<sub>DP</sub> D -N AP]            basic order (indefinite pronouns)  
       b. [<sub>DP</sub> D AP NP \_\_\_\_\_]    derived order (prenominal APs)

Interestingly, although AP-raising is not widely entertained at present, it was in fact a standard analysis in early transformational studies (Smith 1964, Ross 1967, 1981, Jacobs and Rosenbaum 1968; see also McCawley 1988, Kayne 1994, Larson 2000, 2001). A typical idea at the time was to derive intersective prenominal adjectives by reduction from a postnominal relative clause source. On this approach, adjectives that can (or must) appear postnominally are simply ones that need not (or cannot) undergo the adjective-fronting operation.

This analysis leads us to ask why APs must typically raise from postnominal position, and why this raising is either optional or blocked in certain cases, such as the indefinite pronoun construction. Larson (1991, 1999, in preparation), in an updated version of the AP-raising analysis, answers these two questions by appeal to Case-checking requirements on adjectives.

<sup>16</sup> While this article was being prepared for publication, we became aware of the work of Leu (2002), who shows that English indefinite pronouns are unique (and hence rather deceptive) in the apparent transparency of their morphology. Leu shows that indefinite pronouns in French, Swiss German, and other languages are not clearly decomposable into a determiner and a nominal part. This situation also holds with Slovenian indefinite pronouns, especially the Ljubljana colloquial forms.

- (i) nekaj                      colloq. neki              colloq. kva/ka/kuga  
     *ne* + 'what'              *ki* ≠ 'what'              'what'  
     'some' or 'something'

Leu concludes that indefinite pronouns are never morphologically complex and thus never the product of movement. It follows, then, that postnominal adjective position can never be the result of prenominal adjective stranding.

We accept Leu's argument that in the languages he surveys, a raising analysis of indefinite pronouns is implausible. We do not agree, however, that this implies that no language possesses syntactically derived indefinite pronouns. Indefinite pronouns may well be similar to causatives in this respect, some being derived lexically and others being produced in the syntax. And indeed a single language may well possess both.

A second possibility is to take both adjectival positions as basic, so that neither is derived from the other (64).<sup>17</sup> Indefinite pronouns would then constitute morphologically complex Ds, with either a null or a missing noun (64c).

- (64) a. [<sub>DP</sub> D NP AP] (postnominal AP)  
 b. [<sub>DP</sub> D AP NP] (prenominal AP)  
 c. [<sub>DP</sub> D (\*AP) [<sub>NP</sub> Ø] AP] (indefinite pronouns)

This analysis must answer the two questions discussed in section 3: what property of the indefinite pronouns prevents them from appearing with prenominal adjectives, and what property of intersective adjectives like *white* makes them ungrammatical in postnominal position in constructions with common nouns as in (61b).

Assuming that indefinite pronouns constitute a single syntactic head, we might answer the first question along the lines suggested earlier: by claiming prenominal adjectives are available only in the presence of a full NP projection inside the DP. But the answer to the second question is much less clear. Cinque (1994), for example, suggests that intersective adjectives are allowed in postnominal, predicative position in English only if they are heavy, but he leaves unanswered the question of what exactly ‘heavy’ means.

In view of these points, the issue of adjective position in DP/NP appears to us very much an open area, with considerable room for clarification and advance.

## References

- Abney, Stephen. 1987. The English noun phrase in its sentential aspect. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Berman, Arlene. 1974. Adjective and adjective complement constructions in English. Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
- Bernstein, Judy. 1993. Topics in the syntax of nominal structure across Romance. Doctoral dissertation, City University of New York.
- Bolinger, Dwight. 1967. Adjectives in English: Attribution and predication. *Lingua* 18:1–34.
- Bresnan, Joan. 1973. Syntax of the comparative clause construction in English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 4:275–343.
- Campbell, Russell N., and R. J. Wales. 1969. Comparative structures in English. *Journal of Linguistics* 5: 215–251.
- Cardinaletti, Anna. 1994. On the internal structure of pronominal NPs. *The Linguistic Review* 11:195–219.
- Carlson, Greg. 1977. A unified analysis of the English bare plural. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 1:413–456.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1994. Evidence for partial N-movement in the Romance DP. In *Paths towards Universal Grammar*, ed. by Guglielmo Cinque, Jan Koster, Jean-Yves Pollock, Luigi Rizzi, and Rafaella Zanuttini, 85–110. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1995. *Italian syntax and Universal Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Herrity, Peter. 2000. *Slovene, a comprehensive grammar*. London: Routledge.
- Jacobs, Roderick, and Peter Rosenbaum. 1968. *English transformational grammar*. Waltham, Mass.: Ginn.

<sup>17</sup> On this view, we would actually have to distinguish two classes of prenominal positions, one inner and one outer, to accommodate the NP/DP modifier facts discussed above.

- Kayne, Richard. 1994. *The antisymmetry of syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Kishimoto, Hideki. 2000. Indefinite pronouns and overt N-raising. *Linguistic Inquiry* 31:557–566.
- Larson, Richard K. 1991. The projection of DP (and DegP). To appear in Richard K. Larson, *Essays on shell structure*. New York: Routledge.
- Larson, Richard K. 1998. Events and modification in nominals. In *Semantics and Linguistic Theory VIII (SALT8)*, ed. by Devon Strolovitch and Aaron Lawson, 145–168. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University, CLC Publications. Also available at <http://semlab5.sbs.sunysb.edu/~rlarson/>.
- Larson, Richard K. 1999. Semantics of adjectival modification. Lectures presented at the LOT Winter School. Amsterdam: LOT (Landelijke Onderzoekschool Taalwetenschap). Also available at <http://semlab5.sbs.sunysb.edu/~rlarson/>.
- Larson, Richard K. 2000. ACD in AP? Paper presented at the 19th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics, Los Angeles, Calif. Also available at <http://semlab5.sbs.sunysb.edu/~rlarson/>.
- Larson, Richard K. 2001. Temporal modification in nominals. Paper presented at the International Roundtable on the Syntax of Tense and Aspect, Paris, France. Also available at <http://semlab5.sbs.sunysb.edu/~rlarson/>.
- Larson, Richard. In preparation. Adjectival modifiers.
- Leu, Thomas. 2002. Something strange: Indefinite pronouns and their “postnominal” modifiers. Paper presented at University of Texas–Arlington Student Conference in Linguistics (UTASCIL) 2002, Arlington, Tex.
- Marušič, Franc. 2001. Pre- and post-nominal adjectives in Slovenian. Ms., Stony Brook University, Stony Brook, N.Y.
- McCawley, James D. 1988. *The syntactic phenomena of English*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Muha, Ada Vidovič. 1995. Class lecture notes. University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana.
- Orešnik, Janez. 1996. Nauk novejšje slovenistike o povedkovem prilastku (Depictive secondary predication in recent Slovenian linguistics). *Razprave II. razreda-Dissertationes Classis II* 15:255–267.
- Ritter, Elizabeth. 1991. Two functional categories in noun phrases: Evidence from Modern Hebrew. In *Perspectives on phrase structure: Heads and licensing*, ed. by Susan Rothstein, 37–62. Syntax and Semantics 25. San Diego, Calif.: Academic Press.
- Ross, John Robert. 1967. Constraints on variables in syntax. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Ross, John Robert. 1981. *Infinite syntax*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.
- Sadler, Louisa, and Douglas J. Arnold. 1994. Prenominal adjectives and the phrasal/lexical distinction. *Journal of Linguistics* 30:187–226.
- Smith, Carlota. 1964. Determiners and relative clauses in generative grammar. *Language* 40:37–52.
- Stanley, R. 1969. The English comparative adjective construction. In *Papers from the Fifth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, ed. by Robert I. Binnick, Alice Davison, Georgia M. Green, and Jerry L. Morgan, 287–292. Chicago: University of Chicago, Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Svenonius, Peter. 1994. On the structural location of the attributive adjective. In *Proceedings of the 12th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. by Erin Duncan, Donka Farkas, and Philip Spaelti, 439–454. Stanford, Calif.: CSLI Publications.
- Williams, Edwin. 1981. On the notions “lexically related” and “head of a word.” *Linguistic Inquiry* 12: 245–274.

*Department of Linguistics*  
*Stony Brook University*  
*Stony Brook, New York 11794-4376*  
*rlarson@semlab5.sbs.sunysb.edu*  
*lanko.marusic@guest.arnes.si*