

The Typology of NP vs. DP Languages

Nathaniel Torres

Nathaniel.jacob20@gmail.com

November 27, 2023

I. Introduction

- Classifying the world's languages as either DP or NP is a controversial topic.
- The fundamental debate is whether or not we have to classify **all** languages as either one, or whether it is simply the case that languages may differ on this point.
- There is a long and storied history with a great deal of research and debate over the years.
- One obvious issue is that this poses problems for a theory of UG.
- This lecture will take a look at prototypical examples of each kind of language, and look at the properties that are theoretically used to distinguish both kinds of language.
- The basic underlying idea in this case is that each kind of language exhibits different processes and differing nominal behavior.
- As an intuitive first pass, languages that have **articles** can be taken to be DP languages. This is because the article constitutes a D head that always takes an NP complement. The primary point of diversion is what to do with languages that do NOT have articles. (Note: this does not mean that the language does not have **determiners**.)
- What follows is examples of each kind of language, and then a discussion of some theoretical evidence that is used to make a distinction between both kinds of language.

II. DP Languages

- Not every language has over articles which give us a definite DP.
- Many (but not all) Indo-European languages, Semitic languages (like Hebrew and Arabic), Polynesian languages, some Uralic languages (most famously, Hungarian), Turkic¹, languages in the Caucasus (e.g., Abkhaz), the Basque language in Spain, inter alia.

¹ These are interesting as there seems to be an instance of an indefinite article that is phonologically synchronous with the numeral for *one*. Some Turkic languages also show what is called Differential Object Marking (DOM), in which a "definite" direct object takes a morphological suffix indicating the case-marked noun is considered definite. This does not, however, necessitate the projection of a DP. There are a number of languages that can express definiteness without the need of any kind of morphological marking.

- It is important to remember that, although these languages are conventionally considered to be DP languages, the articles in these languages do **not** necessarily have the same distribution.
- It is also important to remember that there are languages that are in the process of grammaticalizing definite articles (e.g., Finnish). When this occurs, it almost always develops from a demonstrative.
- Let's take a look at a few representatives of this type that will suffice to showcase general typological properties of these languages.
- In general, languages that have articles tend to be prone to similar syntactic processes.
- A very well-documented and well-studied DP language obviously comes in the form of English, which is a DP language with overt articles that act as D heads.

(1) **The** dog bit **a** man.

- The definite article *the* and the indefinite article *a* sit in the D head, and take NPs as their complements.
- The syntax of these elements is extremely rigid in that they do NOT show flexibility with respect to movement or order.

(2) *Dog **the** bit **a** man.

- The phrase can be expanded, and again, the order of elements is extremely rigid in that the article must appear at the left periphery of the phrase. Any nominal modifiers will appear to the right of the article.

(3) a. [_{DP} **The** [_{NP} rather tall and overly dressed red-headed woman]] walked into the room.

b. *Rather tall and overly dressed red-headed **the** woman walked into the room.

- This shows that D's are always at the left edge of a phrase, and this phrase is DP. This is not, however, the only strategy.
- There are a number of languages whose articles attach to the noun as a suffix.
- More accurately, there is a process of head movement in which the noun merges with the D head.
- In Europe, the Scandinavian languages, Romanian, Bulgarian and Macedonian all do this.
- Consider the following data:

- (4) a. Mann-**en** blev bitit av hund-**en**.
 Man-the was bitten by dog-the
 ‘The man was bitten by the dog.’ [Swedish]
- b. Sveta vidi kola-**ta**.
 Sveta see.NPST.3SG car-the
 ‘Sveta sees the car.’ [Bulgarian]
- c. Raluka vede băiat-**ul**.
 Raluka see.NPST.3SG boy-the
 ‘Raluka sees the boy.’ [Romanian]

- As the data in (4) show, all of the nouns appear with the definite article as a suffix.
- If we contrast this with the indefinite article, we can see that the paradigm is like in English:

- (5) a. **En** mann står framför **ett** hus.
 a man stand.NPST.3SG in front of a house
 ‘A man is standing in front of a house.’ [Swedish]
- b. **O** femeie vede **un** motan pe stradă.
 A woman see.NPST.3SG a tomcat on street
 ‘A woman sees a tomcat on the street.’

- Obviously, the indefinite article comes before the head noun as in English despite the fact that the definite article appears *after* the noun.
- We can conceptualize this as an instance of head movement as the positing that the noun moves into spec, DP would necessitate an interpretation where the noun alone is phrasal.
- This cannot be the case as it would permit structures like the following, which are ungrammatical:

- (6) *Mann-en ser **bil den röda en**.
 man-the see.NPST.3SG car that red the
 ‘The man sees the red car.’ [Swedish]

Compare:

(7) Mann-en ser **den röda bil-en**.
 man-the see.NPST.3SG that red car-the
 'The man sees the red car.'

- Languages like Swedish (and the other Scandinavian languages) show us definitively that the noun cannot possibly move into spec, DP, because as we can see in (7), spec, DP is optionally filled with a demonstrative whenever the head noun is modified by an adjective.
- What about when the demonstrative is not present? If, the head noun could move into spec, DP then the following would be grammatical:

(8) ***Bil**i ser mann-en **en** t_i.
 car see.NPST man/the the
 'The car is what the man sees.'

- Under these kinds of topic constructions where objects can be moved ahead of the subject and cause the V2 word order, the entire DP complement must be moved. If just the noun is moved, under an analysis where it adjoins to D in spec, DP, (8) would be possible. As it is not, we are able to determine that the noun and the article form a complex head (N+D).
- So, we have determined consequently that the article constitutes a D head, and that the noun is intrinsically a part of its domain and cannot be moved without the D in any language that has an article. (That is, there is **never** article stranding in the style of, for example, English dangling prepositions.)
- To model this we can reconsider English which allows for dangling prepositions:

(9) a. [What city]_i did John go to t_i?
 b. #[The city] is where John went to.

- As can be seen in (9) it is not solely the noun that is being extracted from the domain of P, but rather the entire DP.
- The point of this is do underscore the following: if the noun moves, so too does the article (and anything else embedded within the DP).

III. NP Languages

- In contrast to DP languages, we have the so-called NP languages which are argued to have properties that fundamentally distinguish them from DP languages (see below).
- This section is meant to showcase some conventional NP languages typologically.
- An immediate differentiation between NP and DP languages is the immediate lack of articles.
- NP languages lack overt articles, but again, this does not mean that they lack determiners.
- In NP languages, the noun is said to (appear to) be bare when it is not qualified by something like an adjective or a quantifier.
- Languages like these occur in abundance around the world.
- Some examples of languages that are argued to be NP are: the Slavic languages, Uralic languages, Japanese, Korean, Turkic languages (under an analysis where the “indefinite” is really just a numeral), among a number of others.
- Consider the following languages which are argued to be NP:

- (10) a. Ja som videl ptáčku na strome.
 I AUX.1SG see.PST.PTCP.M little bird.ACC on tree.LOC
 ‘I saw a/the little bird in the tree.’ [Slovak]
- b. þiudans waih wiþra fijand ana akra.
 king.NOM fight.PST.3SG against enemy.ACC on field.DAT
 ‘The king fought against the enemy in the field.’² [Gothic]
- c. Mizukami-san-wa mainichi gohan-o tabemasu.
 Mizukami-Mr.-TOP every day rice-ACC eat.NPST
 ‘Mr. Mizukami eats rice every day.’ [Japanese]

- As can be seen in (10) none of these languages have an element that is expressed that is equivalent to the article in English.
- Whether or not to interpret the noun as definite or indefinite relies on the context in which it appears, among a number of other factors.
- What is of immediate importance to this study is the question of whether or not languages of this type have a DP layer or not.
- The answer to the question is divided.
- There are those who claim that all languages have a DP layer and that the ones that do not have an overt article simply have a silent D head.
- On the other hand, there are those who say that languages like the ones in (10) do NOT have a DP layer at all, and that they only ever project NP.
- We can now take a look at a theoretical basis for the latter point.

² Gothic technically has an “article-like” element in the demonstrative *sa, so, þata* ‘that.’ Its function is specified and although it had uses that are reminiscent of the Germanic definite article, it was not fully grammaticalized as such in Gothic, and served a function similar to modern Slavic *to* ‘that,’ that is, as a discourse determiner marking an already introduced NP.

IV. NP vs. DP Languages

i. Left-Branch Extraction and Adjunct Extraction

- There is a great deal of research into the existence of purely NP languages in contrast to DP languages.
- One of the most prominent voices in favor of categorizing the two types of languages separately is Bošković (2005, 2007).
- Bošković uses a battery of different syntactic tests in order to argue against treating languages as all DP.
- One of the tests that Bošković uses is the test for Left-Branch Extraction (LBE).
- Left-Branch Extraction is a phenomenon in which nominal modifiers can seemingly be moved away from the noun that it modifies.
- Even in doing so, it is clear that, for example, the adjective is referring to the noun because it agrees with the noun entirely in its phi-features.
- The underlying principle here is that NP languages may (but do not have to) exhibit LBE, whereas DP languages will **never** exhibit this phenomenon.
- Consider the following from Bošković (2007):

(11) Skupa/Ta_i je vidio [t_i kola].
Expensive/that AUX seen car
'He/She saw (the/an) expensive/that car.' [Serbo-Croatian]

- In (11) we can see that the modifying words, in this case *skupa* 'expensive' and *ta* 'that' are not next to the head noun, and have been 'extracted' from the nominal domain, that is, NP.
- This is a property that is fairly ubiquitous throughout the Slavic languages (but not all, as we will see).

(12) a. Dobrú pripravuje kávu.
good.ACC:F prepare.NPST.3SG coffee.ACC.F
'She (usually) prepares (i.e., makes) good coffee.' [Slovak]
b. Dobrego życzę ci dnia.
good.GEN wish.NPST.1SG you.DAT day.GEN
'I wish you a good day!' (i.e., I hope you have a good day) [Polish]

- As you can see between the different Slavic languages, it is possible to move the modifying adjective outside of the NP it is supposed to be modifying.
- If we try this in English, we obviously get poor results:

- (13) a. *The/a expensive/that she/he sees car.
 b. *Good she makes coffee.
 c. *Good I wish you day!

- As (13) sufficiently showcases, English does not allow for LBE like Slavic languages do.
- If we try to extend this to other languages with articles, including the Slavic languages with articles, we find that they are all equally incapable of LBE.

- (14) a. *Röda jag har sett den bilen.
 red I have seen that car.the
 ‘I saw the red car.’ [Swedish]
- b. *červena vidja kolata.
 red.FEM saw car.the
 ‘S/he saw the red car.’ [Bulgarian]

- That we cannot do this gives some evidence that there is indeed some fundamental difference in the syntax between languages that have D heads and languages that (seemingly) do not.
- There are a number of analyses one could take to compose an argument as to why this is not possible to do in languages with articles, as opposed to languages without. (For example, phase impenetrability due to the D head in the form of an article).
- That LBE is possible in Slavic languages would seem to indicate that there is nothing blocking the movement of modifiers from outside of NP. This stands in contrast to DP languages where Bošković argues that the article is responsible for blocking the movement outside of the NP.
- This process can also be seen in Adjunct Extraction (AE) which is similar to LBE. The following example from Bošković (2007) illustrates the point:

- (15) Iz kojeg grada_i je Ivan sreo [djevojke t_i]?
 From which city AUX.3SG Ivan see girls
 ‘Which city did Ivan see girls from?’ [Serbo-Croatian]

- In (15) we have an entire adjunct, a PP in this case, that has been extracted from the nominal domain and fronted to the left edge of the clause.
- Again, if we try to reproduce this process in English, we observe the following:

- (16) *From which city_i did Ivan see [girls t_i]?

- Attempting to extract the entire PP from the domain of *girls* is ungrammatical in English.
- Again, the argument for this ungrammaticality is that the presence of D blocks movements of this type from outside of the NP domain.
- Slavic languages like Bosnian, Serbian, and Croatian are argued by Bošković not to have a DP, and so like the LBE case AE is possible because there is nothing to block the movement of the PP outside of NP.
- This again, is not observed across all of the Slavic languages because Bulgarian and Macedonian do not allow this.

(17) *Ot koj grad_i Ivan sreštna [momičeta t_i]?
 From which city Ivan saw girls
 ‘Which city did Ivan see girls from?’ [Bulgarian]

- Again, the presence of the article, even if it is suffixed, will prevent movement outside of the NP.

ii. Negative Raising

- Another phenomenon that Bošković argues differentiates NP and DP languages is negative raising.
- The main argument here is that only languages with articles allow for negative raising.
- Negative raising is a process by which a negative adverb or particle originating in an embedded clause is raised into the matrix clause.
- We can clearly see this process in English, which allows for negative raising with certain verbs.

(18) a. John didn’t believe [that Mary would leave [_{NPI} until tomorrow.]]
 b. John doesn’t believe [that Mary has visited her [_{NPI} in at least two years.]]

- There are a few things going on in (18) that we can break down.
- An NPI (Negative Polarity Item) is an element in the clause that is “attracted to” (that is, can only occur) in a negative context.
- If we look closely at the clauses in (18), we see that the negation in both clauses is in the matrix clause and that the verbs in the embedded clauses seem to be positive.

- This is, however, a problem because the embedded clauses both have NPIs which would seem to indicate that the embedded clauses are negative. On the surface this is not the case, but we can (and indeed must) argue that movement has occurred.
- In this case, the negation word *not* has been raised into the matrix clause. Since *not* originates in the embedded clause, the use of the NPIs in both (a) and (b) is warranted.
- What occurs in English is that the verb *believe* is said to be a negative raising verb, which targets negation in embedded clauses and pulls it up into the main clause.
- Not all verbs, however, can do this. If we compare what we see in (18) with a scenario like we see in the following, there appear to be instances where negative raising does not occur.

- (19) a. *John didn't claim [that Mary would leave [NPI until tomorrow.]]
 b. *John didn't claim [that Mary has visited her [NPI in at least two years.]]

- In these cases, there is no movement of the negative word *not* into the main clause. The *not* that you see there is generated in the matrix clause, not in the embedded clause. If we generate the *not* in the embedded clause, however, then we regain grammaticality.

- (20) a. John claimed [that Mary would not leave [NPI until tomorrow.]]
 b. John claimed [that Mary hasn't visited her [NPI in at least two years.]]

- Underlyingly, the structure in (18) looks just like the structure in (20). It is the case that certain verbs like *believe* require that the negation be moved into the matrix clause.
- To reiterate, the main argument in these cases is that since English is a DP language, it has instances like those in (18), and allows for the negative to be raised. How does this compare to NP languages?
- Bošković argues that NP languages are incapable of doing this entirely, and that when a negative appears in the matrix clause, it is because that is where it is generated, not because it is the result of some kind of movement.
- Consider the following Serbo-Croatian data from Bošković (2007).

- (21) a. Ivan ne vjeruje da bog postoji.
 Ivan not believe that god exist
 'Ivan doesn't believe in God.' (that God exists)
 b. Ivan vjeruje da bog ne postoji.
 Ivan believe that god not exist
 'Ivan believes that god doesn't exist.' (i.e., he could one day change his mind)

- In (21), we can see that the negation may appear in either the matrix or the embedded clause.
- Depending on where it appears, the interpretation of the clause is different. Essentially, when the negation appears in the main clause as in (21a), the act of believing is negated and therefore entirely negates the proposition in the embedded clause, namely, that God exists.
- In the second sentence, (21b), the act of existing is negated, and not the act of believing, which means that it is still possible that Ivan might believe otherwise. The negation in this sentence is not as strong as the negation in the main clause.
- What we see for the proposed NP language Serbo-Croatian, then, is that it does not allow for negative raising in a manner similar to DP languages like English.

iii. Wh-Fronting

- Another process that could possibly be used to identify an NP language is a phenomenon called multiple wh-fronting.
- In multiple wh-fronting, all of the interrogative words in a sentence are stacked at the left-periphery of the clause in no particular order.
- Where this is possible, we are dealing with an NP language.
- This test is not entirely foolproof, however, because there are instances of DP languages which seem to exhibit this property, but in more restricted contexts.
- Languages like Bulgarian do exhibit this phenomenon, but not quite to the extent or with the same flexibility that is observed in NP languages.
- Let us consider once again Serbo-Croatian, a proposed NP language:

(22) Ko koga vidi?/ Koga ko vidi?
 who whom see whom who see
 ‘Who sees whom?’ [Serbo-Croatian]

- As can be seen in (22), it is possible to front all of the wh-words and stick them at the left periphery of the clause.
- This is argued to be expected because a language like Serbo-Croatian is an NP language.
- As aforementioned, this test for NP-hood is rather weak in comparison to the other tests because we do have an example of a clear DP language that may do this, but with a more restricted word order.

(23) Koj kogo vižda?/*Kogo koj vižda?
 who whom see whom who see
 ‘Who sees whom?’ [Bulgarian]

- We know for a fact that Bulgarian is a DP language, however it seemingly also demonstrates multiple wh-fronting.
- If we compare this to another DP language, like any Germanic language, we find that it is either starkly ungrammatical to do this, or a degraded form at best:

(24) a. *Who whom sees?
 b. *Whom who sees?
 c. *Vem vem ser?
 Who who sees
 ‘Who sees whom?’ [Swedish]
 d. #Wer wen sieht?/Wen wer sieht?
 Who whom sees whom who sees
 ‘Who sees whom?’ [German]

- We can see, then, that this particular process produces mixed results cross-linguistically, which calls into question the legitimacy of using such a test in the first place.
- The argument that you could make for both German and Bulgarian is simply that because these languages show a difference in case between the different forms, they are clearly distinguished.
- This tends to be true cross linguistically as languages with more robust case morphology typically allow for nominal constituents to be ordered a bit more flexibly in comparison to languages that lack morphological diversity.

iv. Short Summary

- In short, we have the following tests for determining whether a language is an NP language or not:
 - Left Branch Extraction:** NP languages may, but not always, allow for LBE from within the noun phrase.
 - Adjunct Extraction:** NP languages, may, but not always, allow for adjuncts to be extracted from the domain of N.
 - Negative Raising:** NP languages do not allow for NPI raising.

- d. **Multiple Wh-Fronting:** NP languages not only allow for multiple wh-fronting, but they also allow the elements to be scrambled in any order.

V. Some Interesting Cases

- As you may imagine, these tests are not the end all, be all of determining whether or not a language is a DP or an NP language.
- There are cases where a language seemingly has both possible paradigms. One such language is Hungarian, which allows for bare nouns in places where English does not allow a “bare” noun to appear. Consider:

- (25) a. János könyvet olvas.
John book.ACC read.NPST.3SG
'John is reading a book/some books.'
- b. Anikó moziba ment.
Anikó theater.ILLAT go.PST.3SG
'Anikó went to the theater.'

- These examples show a rather stark deviation from what is observed in English because if we try to emulate these sentences, which are grammatical in Hungarian, in English, we find that it is impossible to do.

- (26) a. *John read book.
b. *Anne went to movies.

- In order to fix these sentences, English obviously needs to put the article, which for these constructions in Hungarian is optional. (It is possible to put the article in (25a-b) but the meaning would be different.)
- English may occur with nouns that are seemingly bare:

- (27) a. Lions roam the Serengeti.
b. Life can be difficult.
c. He loves to drink coffee.

- All of the examples in (27) obviously showcase nouns without the use of the article, making it appear that English does permit bare NPs, like Hungarian. The analysis behind these constructions is long and detailed, but in short, languages like English do have a D present, but the heads are silent. (For more on this, see Longobardi, 1994).
- In Hungarian, however, this same analysis is not needed. One of the ways in which we can determine that the bare noun does indeed constitute an NP in its own right, is that it

can be topicalized (which in Hungarian, moves a constituent to the left edge of the clause.)

- Topicalization in Hungarian involves a process of moving nouns that have already been introduced in the discourse to the left of the clause.
- Consider the following instance of nominal topicalization:

(28) Biciklit sok lány látott.
bicycle.ACC many girl see.PST.3SG
'Many girls saw a bicycle/bicycles.'

- Topicalization in Hungarian targets functional categories, therefore, because the bare noun can be topicalized, the NP at minimum exists in Hungarian without there necessarily being a DP.
- There are also different semantic properties between the two kinds of phrase which very clearly distinguish the two phrasal categories.
- Obviously Hungarian also has a definite article, in which case it will obviously project a DP, as functional D heads take nouns as their arguments.

(29) Mari meghívta a barátokat a bulira.
Mari invite.PST.3SG ART friend.PL.ACC ART party.SUBL
'Mari invited her (the) friends to the party.'

- The Hungarian definite article takes the form of *a(z)* and largely functions as the English article does, largely appearing in many of the same contexts, but not all of them.
- This is not an issue because not all articles are entirely the same with respect to use and distribution.
- What is of importance in this case is that Hungarian very clearly has both kinds of paradigms: it has both bare NPs and full DPs.
- How then can one classify Hungarian as either one? With the tests that we have looked at so far, it would appear that it is not entirely possible to classify Hungarian as either one or the other, but rather that it has properties of both NP and DP languages.
- Hungarian is not the only language that would appear to have this issue.
- Another Finno-Ugric language, Finnish, also seems to have properties of both.
- Finnish is a language that is conventionally analyzed as being an NP language due to the fact that it lacks articles.
- This particular point, however, is changing and it is argued that Finnish is developing a definite article (see Laury, 1997).
- However, let's assume for the moment that Finnish is as advertised and is indeed an NP language.
- Let's take the full range of tests we identified in the last section and apply them to Finnish.
- Beginning with LBE we find the following:

(30) a. ***Kalliin/Sen** on nähnyt auton.

expensive.ACC/that/ACC AUX seen car.ACC
 'He/she has seen the expensive/that car.'

b. ***Kauniita** minä katsoin lintuja.
 beautiful.PART.PL I.NOM watch.PST.1SG bird.PART.PL
 'I was watching the beautiful birds.'

[Finnish]

- Finnish very clearly disallows LBE under any circumstance. Given the criteria of the LBE test, this may not seem like a big deal because an NP language need not to express LBE. That being said, because Finnish does not have LBE, it would be argued to pattern more with DP languages.
- If we try to apply adjunct extraction to Finnish, on the other hand, we find the following:

(31) a. **Mistä kaupungista** Pekka tuntee tytöt [_{t_i}?
 what.ELAT city.ELAT Pekka know.NPST.3SG girl.ACC.PL
 'From which city is it that Pekka knows girls?'
 b. **Mistä maasta** Pekka tuntee sen pääministerin [_{t_i}?
 what.ELAT country.ELAT Pekka know.NPST.3SG SE.ACC prime minister.ACC
 'From which country is it that Pekka knows the prime minister?'

- The examples in (31) show us that, despite the fact that Finnish does not have LBE, it does have AE.
- This is interesting because one would expect that if you have one, then it's more than likely that you have the other; however, Finnish obviously does not do this.
- It would appear that there is a contradiction because Finnish now expresses a property that patterns more with NP languages in that there seems to be nothing blocking the movement of adjuncts out of the NP, but there seems to be in the case of adjectives and demonstratives.
- Further application of these tests does not help to clarify the problem. Consider the following application of the negative raising test:

(32) a. Pekka **ei** uskonut että Sanni lähtee vasta huomenna.
 Pekka not believed that Sanni go.NPST.3SG until tomorrow
 'Pekka didn't believe that Sanni would leave until tomorrow.'
 b. Pekka **ei** usko että Sanni on käynyt hänen luona
 Pekka not believe that Sanni AUX.3SG went her.GEN to
 ainakin kahteen vuoteen.
 at least two.ILLAT year.ILLAT
 'Pekka doesn't believe that Sanni has visited her in at least two years.'

- At first glance, it seems that Finnish patterns with English in that it allows for negative raising. Consider now the examples with *claim*:

- (33) a. Pekka väitti että Sanni ei lähde vasta huomenna.
 Pekka claim.PST.3SG that Sanni not go until tomorrow
 ‘Pekka claimed that Sanni wouldn’t leave until tomorrow.’
 b. Pekka väittää että Sanni ei ole käynyt hänen luona
 Pekka claim.NPST.3SG that Sanni not AUX gone her.GEN to
 ainakin kahteen vuoteen.
 at least two.ILLAT year.ILLAT
 ‘Pekka claims that Sanni hadn’t visited her in at least two years.’

- (34) a. *Pekka ei väittänyt että Sanni lähtee vasta huomenna.
 Pekka not claimed that Sanni go.NPST.3SG until tomorrow
 ‘Pekka didn’t claim that Sanni would leave until tomorrow.’
 b. *Pekka ei väitä että Sanni on käynyt hänen luona
 Pekka not claim that Sanni AUX gone her.GEN to
 ainakin kahteen vuoteen.
 at least two.ILLAT year.ILLAT
 ‘Pekka doesn’t claim that Sanni has visited her in at least two years.’

- If we follow an analysis of Finnish in which it is an NP language, we run into a problem because again we have a supposed NP language patterning with a language that is definitively a DP language.
- If Finnish were to be analyzed as an NP language with these examples, then (34) would be possible. That it is not possible would seem to indicate that Finnish is a DP language here.
- Finally, we can take a look at the test involving wh-fronting, which we predict is allowed if Finnish is to be considered an NP language, as is conventionally thought.

- (35) a. **Kuka** katsoo **mitä?**
 who.NOM watch.NPST.3SG what.PART
 ‘Who is watching what?’
 b. **Mitä** katsoo **kuka?**
 what.PART watch.NPST.3SG who.NOM
 ‘Who is watching what?’
 c. #**Kuka** **mitä** katsoo?
 who.NOM what.PART watch.NPST.3SG
 ‘Who is watching what?’

d.#**Mitä** **kuka** katsoo?
what.PART who.NOM watch.NPST.3SG
'Who is watching what?'

- These data are interesting for a few reasons, but what is immediately important to recognize is that there is some cautious flexibility in this.
- Native speakers are not wont to use the structures in (35c-d) unless there is some kind of emphasis or interlocutory force that establishes that there is some kind of contrast going on.
- Upon looking at these data only one real conclusion can be drawn: wh-fronting cannot be used to categorize Finnish as an NP language either.
- What we have for Finnish is that, similar to Hungarian, it would appear that Finnish exhibits properties of both NP and DP languages.

VI. Conclusions

- There is no clear-cut method that a syntactician can use to definitely categorize a language as either an NP or a DP language.
- There seem to exist languages which fall perfectly into line as one or the other.
- There are also languages that fall somewhere in the middle and seem to exhibit properties of both categories.
- The debate is ongoing.