**On the Relationship between Nominal Syntax and Pronoun Type**

This presentation is aimed at determining the relationship between the nominal syntax of a language and the syntactic category of its pronouns. Cross-linguistically, pronouns may be pro-NP or pro-DP (Fukui 1988; Noguchi 1997); pro-NP may take NP-internal modifiers while pro-DP may not. For example, Japanese has pro-NP while English has pro-DP:

(1) a. kinoo-no kare ‘\*yesterday’s he’

b. tiisai kare ‘\*small he’

Bošković (2008) notes a correlation between the category of a language’s pronouns and the presence/absence of the category D in a language, a very attractive proposal. He notes that Slavic languages with articles (e.g. Macedonian, Bulgarian) tend to have DP pronouns, while those without articles tend to have pro-NP (e.g. Serbian, Slovenian). However, Turkish, an NP language, has DP pronouns, suggesting that there may be other factors constraining the category of a language’s pronouns. Chierchia’s (1998) Nominal Mapping Parameter seems to be involved as well. His NP[+arg,-pred] languages (e.g. Japanese, Chinese), in which all nouns enter the derivation as semantic ‘kinds,’ have NP pronouns without exception; in these languages NPs are already argumental so no determiners are required, and NPs have mass interpretations so they have no plural. The purpose of this study is to examine more NP languages which have plural marking, and find out if they pattern with Slavic NP languages and with Chierchia’s [+arg,-pred] languages in having pro-NP, or with DP languages and Turkish in having pro-DP.
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