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## Three unexpected patterns

- PL marker linear ordering - Lunigiana varieties
- Partial and optional PL concord - Lunigiana varieties
- Expressive NP concord transparency and rigidity - Italian


## PL marker linear ordering

merəl<br>blackbird.m<br>pegr-a<br>sheep-F
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## PL marker linear ordering

| merəl | merl-i |
| :--- | :--- |
| blackbird.m | blackbird-PL |
| pegr-a | pegər-j-a |
| sheep-F | sheep-PL-F |

pegr-a
sheep-F

```
blackbird-PL
```

pegər-j-a
sheep-PL-F

- DP lowest functional structure
- $\sqrt{ }+n /$ GEN + NUM (Lowenstamm 2008, Picallo 2008, Kramer 2015, Caha 2022, Baggio sub a.o.)
- Mirror principle
- The linear order of morphological markers mirrors the syntactic structure (Baker 1995)
- $\sqrt{ }$-GEN-NUM $\rightarrow$ Sp. $\sqrt{O V E J}-a_{\mathrm{F}}-\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{PL}}$ 'sheep.PL'
$-{ }^{-}$- -NUM-GEN $\rightarrow$ Col. $\sqrt{\text { PEGR- }} \mathrm{j}_{\mathrm{PL}}-\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{F}}$


## PL partial concord

|  | NP | Art-NP |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Colonnata old | pegər-j-a | I-j-a pegər-j-a |
| Colonnata | pegər-j-a | I-j-a pegər -a |
| Bagnone | pegər-j-a | I -a pegər-j-a |
| Filattiera | pegər -a | j-a pegər -a |
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## PL partial concord

|  | NP | Art-NP |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Colonnata old | pegər-j-a | I-j-a pegər-j-a |
| Colonnata | pegər-j-a | I-j-a pegər -a |
| Bagnone | pegər-j-a | I -a pegər-j-a |
| Filattiera | pegər $-a$ | j-a pegər $-a$ |

- The PL marker does not surface on all DP constituents
- The more complex the DP structure, the higher the microvariation degree

|  | Art-AP-NP |
| :---: | :---: |
| Colonnata old | I-j-a bel-j-a pegər-j-a |
| Caprio | l-j-a bel-j-a pegər -a |
| Colonnata | l-j-a bel -a pegər -a |
| Treschietto | । -a bel-j-a pegər-j-a |
| Bagnone | । -a bel-j-a pegər -a |

## PL partial concord

(1) l-a bel-j-a skarp-a

ART-F beautiful-PL-F shoe-F
'The beautiful shoes'

## PL partial concord

(1) l-a bel-j-a skarp-a

ART-F beautiful-PL-F shoe-F
'The beautiful shoes'
(2) l-a skarp-j-a nov-a

ART-F shoe-PL-F new-F
'The new shoes'

## PL partial concord

(1) l-a bel-j-a skarp-a

ART-F beautiful-PL-F shoe-F
'The beautiful shoes'
(2) l-a skarp-j-a nov-a

ART-F shoe-PL-F new-F
'The new shoes'

- The distribution of the PL marking depends on a constituent's position $\rightarrow$ conditioned by syntax


## PL partial concord
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## PL partial concord

(3) st-j-a pegr-a l $\varepsilon$ y $\quad$-a nostr-a
this-PL-F sheep-F SCL be.3pl the-F our-F
'these sheep are ours'
(4) kl-a pegr-a l $\quad$ y $\quad$ l-a vostr-a that-F sheep-F SCL be.3PL the-F your-F 'those sheep are yours'

- In some cases, the presence of the PL marker is optional
- In such cases, who controls agreement?
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- In Romance, concord tends to be complete, but partial concord is not unheard of (cfr. Ampezzano, Mesolcinese, Ladin, Occitan varieties, Walloon, North-Eastern central Catalan, Non-standard Brazilian Portuguese a.o.)
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## PL partial concord

- In Romance, concord tends to be complete, but partial concord is not unheard of (cfr. Ampezzano, Mesolcinese, Ladin, Occitan varieties, Walloon, North-Eastern central Catalan, Non-standard Brazilian Portuguese a.o.)
- Limited set of varieties and DP structures
- Some questions
- Where exactly is NUM (low, high, both ...) ?
- What is its formal status (head, adjunct ...)?
- What is concord domain?
- How to formalize partial concord/PL unpronunciation?
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## Expressive NP concord transparency

(5) un-a merd-a di pecoron-e a-F.SG shit-F.SG of ram-M.SG 'a shitty ram'
(6) *un- $\varnothing$ merd-a di pecoron-e a-M.SG shit-F.SG of ram-M.SG

## Expressive NP concord transparency

(5) un-a merd-a di pecoron-e a-F.SG shit-F.SG of ram-M.SG 'a shitty ram'
(6) *un- $\varnothing$ merd-a di pecoron-e a-M.SG shit-F.SG of ram-M.SG
(7) un- $\varnothing$ cazz-o di pecor-a
a-M.SG dick-M.SG of sheep-F.SG
'a fucking sheep'
(8) un-a cazz-o di pecor-a a-F.SG dick-M.SG of sheep-F.SG
'a fucking sheep'

## Expressive NP concord transparency

(5) un-a merd-a di pecoron-e a-F.SG shit-F.SG of ram-M.SG 'a shitty ram'
(6) *un- $\varnothing$ merd-a di pecoron-e a-M.SG shit-F.SG of ram-M.SG
(7) un- $\varnothing$ cazz-o di pecor-a a-M.SG dick-M.SG of sheep-F.SG
'a fucking sheep'
(8) un-a cazz-o di pecor-a a-F.SG dick-M.SG of sheep-F.SG 'a fucking sheep'

- Why can cazzo-type ExprNPs be bypassed?


## Expressive NP rigidity

(9) dell-e merd-e di pecor-e
a-F.PL shit-F.PL of sheep-F.PL
'some shitty sheep'
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## Expressive NP rigidity

(9) dell-e merd-e di pecor-e a-F.PL shit-F.PL of sheep-F.PL 'some shitty sheep'
(10) *dell-a merd-a di pecor-e a-F.SG shit-F.SG of sheep-F.PL
(11) *de-i cazz-i di pecoron-i
a-M.PL dick-M.PL of ram-M.PL
(12) de-i cazz-o di pecoron-i
a-M.PL dick-M.SG of ram-M.PL
'some fucking rams'

- Why can cazzo-type ExprNs never change NUM?


## Expressive NP fixed ordering
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## What these unexpected patterns might suggest

- Phonology can impose unexpected linear orderings
- Mirror Principle violations do not imply postsyntactic morphological operations and ad hoc syntactic derivations
- $[[[\sqrt{ }] F] P L]$ pronounced as $\sqrt{ }$-PL-F
- Silence can be representationally rich
- The unpronunciation of a marker does not imply its absence from the morphosyntactic representation
- PL triggers agreement even if not (independently) pronounced
- Phonetic substance can be representationally poor
- What sounds like a morpheme is possibly not a morpheme
- cazz-o $\mathrm{O}_{\mathrm{M}}$ as cazzo
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## Lunigiana



- Western endpoint of La Spezia Rimini bundle of isoglossses
- High degree of microvariation
- Phonological
- Morphosyntactic


## Mirror principle violation

- The linear order of morphological markers mirrors the syntactic structure (Baker 1995)
- Predicted
$\rightarrow$ *lup-a-j
$>* \sqrt{L U P}-\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{F}}-\mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{PL}}$
- $* \sqrt{ }$-GEN-NUM

Sp. lob-a-s 'wolves'
$\sqrt{\mathrm{LOB}}-\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{F}}-\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{PL}}$
$\sqrt{ }$-GEN-NUM

## Mirror principle violation

- The linear order of morphological markers mirrors the syntactic structure (Baker 1995)
- Predicted
- *lup-a-j

Sp. lob-a-s 'wolves'
$>* \sqrt{\mathrm{LUP}}-\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{F}}-\mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{PL}}$
$\rightarrow * \sqrt{ }$-GEN-NUM
$\sqrt{\mathrm{LOB}}-\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{F}}-\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{PL}}$
$\sqrt{ }$-GEN-NUM

- Observed
- lup-j-a 'wolves'
- $\sqrt{\text { LUP }}-i_{\text {PL }}-\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{F}}$
- $* \sqrt{ }$-NUM-GEN
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- Several num heads/categories (\#, Cl; e.g. Borer 2005)
- Several adjoining position of num (Wiltschko 2021)
- Several GEN/F heads (e.g. Steripolo and Wiltschko 2010, Pesetsky 2013, Fassi-Fehri 2018)


## NUM position

- PL is higher than F
- Or maybe not
- Several num heads/categories (\#, Cl; e.g. Borer 2005)
- Several adjoining position of num (Wiltschko 2021)
- Several GEN/F heads (e.g. Steripolo and Wiltschko 2010, Pesetsky 2013, Fassi-Fehri 2018)
- No independent reasons supporting a departure from $\sqrt{ }$-GEN-NUM hypothesis for Lunigiana dialects
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- All the categories involved in concord project one and the same functional projections hierarchy (Caha 2022)


## NUM is higher than GEN

- All the categories involved in concord project one and the same functional projections hierarchy (Caha 2022)
- If ...
- Phi-markers on NP realise functional projections
- The same markers occur on modifiers
- ... then
- The same functional projections of NP should be found on modifiers too


## NUM is higher than GEN

- Constraints on concord variation (Bayırlı 2017, Norris 2019)
- If concord in K, then concord in NUM and GEN
- If concord in NUM, then concord in GEN


## NUM is higher than GEN

- Constraints on concord variation (Bayırlı 2017, Norris 2019)
- If concord in K, then concord in NUM and GEN
- If concord in NUM, then concord in GEN
- K is higher than NUM, which is higher than GEN
- Both if GEN $=n$ or GEN $=$ independent head



## NUM is higher than GEN

- Reduced concord targets the highest head
- "different types of concord as [...] different structures that are trimmed top down"
- "categories can be missing from the top of that hierarchy, but not in the middle" (Caha 2022)



## NUM is higher than GEN

- Reduced concord targets the highest head
- "different types of concord as [...] different structures that are trimmed top down"
- "categories can be missing from the top of that hierarchy, but not in the middle" (Caha 2022)

- Lunigiana partial concord works the same way


## NUM is higher than GEN

- Bagnonese
(17) l-a lup-j-a ner-a
the-F wolf-PL-F black-F
(18) l-a bel-j-a lup-a the-F beautiful-PL-F wolf-F


## NUM is higher than GEN

- Linear ordering $=$ hierarchical structure
- Low NUM and/or high GEN
l-a lup-j-a ner-a



## NUM is higher than GEN

- Linear ordering $=$ hierarchical structure
- Low NUM and/or high GEN

- Removal of an intermediate head, contra Bayırlı (2017)
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## NUM is higher than GEN

- Linear ordering $=$ hierarchical structure (several GEN/NUM heads)
- No semantic/morphophonological support
- Incompatible with partial concord typology tendencies
- Linear ordering $\neq$ hierarchical structure
- Partial concord in line with typological tendencies
- Why linear order $\neq$ hierarchical structure?
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- NP movement with whose picture-type pied-piping
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## Morphosyntax-based accounts

- Distributed Morphology
- NP movement with whose picture-type pied-piping
- Morphological merger
- nanosyntax (Taraldsen 2009; Kloudová 2020)
- Cyclic NP movement without pied-piping
- No post-syntactic operations


## Distributed Morphology

- Sp. lob- $\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{F}}-\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{PL}}$ 'wolves'
- GEN/F as a feature on $n$ (Ferrari-Bridgers 2008, Lowenstamm 2008, Acquaviva 2009, Kučerova 2019, Baggio 2022 a.o.)
- NP movement with whose picture-type pied-piping
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## Distributed Morphology

- lup- $\mathrm{j}_{\mathrm{PL}}-\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{F}}$ 'wolves'
- NP movement with whose picture-type pied-piping
- Morphological merger: [F] [PL] $\rightarrow$ [PL]-[F]



## Distributed Morphology

- Why should morphological merger apply?
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- Why should morphological merger apply?
- These varieties have unstressed vowel reduction
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- No falling diphthongs
- *Vi


## Distributed Morphology

- Why should morphological merger apply?
- These varieties have unstressed vowel reduction
- No unstressed mid vowels
- */o/, */e/
- No falling diphthongs
- *Vi
- Morphological merger as a repair for $* a_{\mathrm{F}}-\mathrm{i}_{\Gamma \mathrm{PL}}$ ?
- Modularity offender


## nanosyntax (Taraldsen 2009)

- lup- $\mathrm{j}_{\mathrm{PL}}-\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{F}}$ 'wolves'
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- lup- $\mathrm{j}_{\mathrm{PL}}-\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{F}}$ 'wolves'
- Cyclic NP movement without pied-piping
- No post-syntactic operations
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## nanosyntax (Taraldsen 2009)

- Why should these varieties have movement without pied-piping?
- Can we independently show that this is the case?
- In all Romance varieties where GEN and NUM are realized by two independent markers, they linearize as $\sqrt{ }$-GEN-NUM
- Null hypothesis: they have the same syntax, i.e. pied-piping


## Phonology

- What we know independently about these varieties
- PL $\Leftrightarrow \mathrm{i}$ (cfr. lup 'wolf' vs lup-i)
- $\mathrm{F} \Leftrightarrow \mathrm{a}$ (cfr. lup 'wolf' vs lup-a)


## Phonology

- What we know independently about these varieties
- $\mathrm{PL} \Leftrightarrow \mathrm{i}$ (cfr. lup 'wolf' vs lup-i)
- $\mathrm{F} \Leftrightarrow$ a (cfr. lup 'wolf' vs lup-a)
- No unstressed mid vowels
- */o/, */e/
- No falling diphthongs
- *Vi
- Typologically, falling diphthongs are more marked than rising diphthongs/onset clusters


## Phonology

- What we 'know independently' about phonology
- Vowels as (combination of) elements (Backley 2012 a.o.)
- $/ \mathrm{a} /=\mathrm{A}, / \mathrm{i} /=\mathrm{I}, / \mathrm{u} /=\mathrm{U}, / \mathrm{e} /=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{I}, / \mathrm{o} /=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{U}$
- */o/, */e/ as *A.U, *A.I (*V $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{X} . \mathrm{Y}}$ )


## Phonology

- What we 'know independently' about phonology
- Vowels as (combination of) elements (Backley 2012 a.o.)
$\rightarrow / \mathrm{a} /=\mathrm{A}, / \mathrm{i} /=\mathrm{I}, / \mathrm{u} /=\mathrm{U}, / \mathrm{e} /=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{I}, / \mathrm{o} /=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{U}$
- */o/, */e/ as *A.U, *A.I (*V $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{X}, \mathrm{Y}}$ )
- Phonological strings $=$ CV strings (a.; Lowenstamm 1996)
- Phonological exponents can have different shapes
- Full segments ( $C_{1}, \mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{u}}, \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{p}}$ in a.)
- Empty positions (C, V in b.)
- Floating elements (i in c.)
a. $\begin{array}{ccc}C & V & C \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & u & p\end{array}$
b. C V
c.
i


## Phonology

lup $-j_{\mathrm{PL}}-\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{F}}$
'wolves'

- $\left[\left[[\sqrt{\text { LUP }}]_{F}\right]\right.$ PL $]$
- $\mathrm{F} \Leftrightarrow \mathrm{CV}_{\mathrm{A}}{ }^{*}$
$\rightarrow \mathrm{PL} \Leftrightarrow$ ।
-     * $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{X}, \mathrm{Y}}, * \mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{I}}$
* Contra Lowenstamm (2008)'s $\mathrm{CV}_{a} \Leftrightarrow\left[n_{\mathrm{F}}\right]$


## Phonology



## Phonology

- Compatible with PC typology tendencies
- [num[Gen[ $\sqrt{ }]]]$
- Unmarked morphosyntactic derivation
- NP movement with whose picture-type pied-piping
- No postsyntactic morphological operation
- Independently motivated
- ${ }^{*} \mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{X}, \mathrm{Y},}{ }^{*} \mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{i}}$
- Available $\bar{C}$ landing site for
- Cf. St. Italian: no ${ }^{*} V_{X . Y} \rightarrow$ I $+\mathrm{CV}_{\mathrm{A}}=/ \mathrm{e} /$ (Passino 2009, Lampitelli 2010)
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## PL partial concord

- The PL marker does not surface on all DP constituents
- The more complex the DP structure, the higher the microvariation degree
- The distribution of the PL marking depends on a constituent's position $\rightarrow$ conditioned by syntax


## PL partial concord

- Partial concord in Villafranca (from the literature)
(19) $\mathrm{l}-\mathrm{a} \quad \mathrm{b}$ l-j-j $\quad$ skarp-a

ART-F beautiful-PL-F shoe-F
'The beautiful shoes'
(20) l-a skarp-j-a nov-a

ART-F shoe-PL-F new-F
'The new shoes'
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ART-F beautiful-PL-F shoe-F
'The beautiful shoes'
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## PL partial concord

- Partial concord in Villafranca (from the literature)
(19) $\mathrm{l}-\mathrm{a} \quad \mathrm{b}$ l-j-j $\quad$ skarp-a

ART-F beautiful-PL-F shoe-F
'The beautiful shoes'
(20) l-a skarp-j-a nov-a

ART-F shoe-PL-F new-F
'The new shoes'
(21) tant-j-a koz-a bel-a
$\mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{IND}}$-PL-F thing-F beautiful-F
'Many beautiful things'
(22) l-a nostr-j-a kכz-j-a l en

Art-F poss.1pl-Pl-F thing-Pl-F SCL.F be.3PL.PRS
tut-j-a ki
Quniv-PL-F here
'All we have is here'

## Problems with previous accounts

- Bottiglioni (1911), Bonin (1952), Rohlfs (1966), Luciani (1974), Giannelli (1976), Loporcaro (1994), Cuneo (2001)
- Manzini (1997), Manzini and Savoia (2005), Cavirani (2018), Cyrino and Espinal (2020), Pescarini (2021)
- Limited set of DP structures and varieties
- Incomplete set of comparable subsystems


## Fieldwork

Questionnaire

- Exhaustive set of possible DP structures (cartography)
- Quniv $_{\text {-D-Poss- }}^{\text {card }}$ - $A_{\text {bell }}-N-A_{\text {nuov }}$
- $\mathrm{D}=$ Dem, Art, $\mathrm{Q}_{\text {ind }}$
- Pre- and post-VP
- 42 total sentences (plus 21 fillers)
- 1-to-5 speakers per variety ( F and M )
- 22 varieties


## PL partial concord - fieldwork

| 9 Bedizzano |
| :---: |
| (9) Bergiola |
| 9 Colonnata |
| $\bigcirc$ Ameglia |
| 9 Arcola |
| 9 Santo Stefano di Magra |
| 9 Bolano |
| 9 Villafranca in Lunigiana |
| 9 Treschietto |
| 9 lera |
| 9 Groppo |
| $\bigcirc$ Nezzana |
| 9 Pieve |
| $\bigcirc$ Filetto |
| $\bigcirc$ Filattiera |
| $\bigcirc$ Caprio |
| $\bigcirc$ Gigliana |
| $\bigcirc$ Lusignana |
| $\bigcirc$ Rocca Sigillina |
| $\bigcirc$ Via Ponticello |
| 9 Tresana |
| $\bigcirc$ Mulazzo |



## PL partial concord - analysis

- Collaboration with Laurence Madonna
- Analysed varieties: Arcola, Bedizzano, Bergiola, Bolano, Colonnata, Filattiera, Groppo, Iera, Nezzana, Pieve, Treschietto (11/22) + literature review
- Acoustic (Prat)
- Presence of $i$ formants
- Distributional
- Distribution of $i$ across DP-types


## PL partial concord - preliminary results

- Pre-VP not necessarily similar to post-VP, in post-VP...
- ...there is less microvariation
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- Pre-VP not necessarily similar to post-VP, in post-VP...
- ...there is less microvariation
- ... $Q_{\text {ind }}$, Dem, Poss and A tend to show the PL marker
- ... Quniv tend to show the PL marker
- D constituents don't behave homogeneously
- In each variety, there are constituents that never get the PL marker, and others that can get it
- Intra- and inter-speaker variation
- Concord can skip constituents $\rightarrow$ distributional 'holes'
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Quniv Art, Dem, Qind -Poss- Abell -N- $\mathrm{A}_{\text {nuov }}(\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{I}, \mathrm{T}, \mathrm{G}, \mathrm{P})$

## PL partial concord - preliminary results

- Red: (optional) presence of the PL marker - fieldwork
- Brown: presence of the PL marker - literature
- Orange: marginal presence of the PL marker
- Violet: absence of data

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Quniv } \text { Art, Dem, } Q_{\text {ind }}-\text { Poss- }-A_{\text {bell }}-N-A_{\text {nuov }}(N, I, T, G, P) \\
& Q_{\text {univ }}-\text { Art, Dem, } Q_{\text {ind }}-\text { Poss- } A_{\text {bell }}-N-A_{\text {nuov }}(C) \\
& Q_{\text {univ }}-A r t, D e m, Q_{\text {ind }}-\text { Poss- }-A_{\text {bell }}-N-A_{\text {nuov }}(B r, B d)
\end{aligned}
$$

## PL partial concord - preliminary results

- Red: (optional) presence of the PL marker - fieldwork
- Brown: presence of the PL marker - literature
- Orange: marginal presence of the PL marker
- Violet: absence of data

Quniv-Art, $^{\text {Dem, }}$ Qind -Poss- $\mathrm{A}_{\text {bell }}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{A}_{\text {nuov }}(\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{I}, \mathrm{T}, \mathrm{G}, \mathrm{P})$
$Q_{\text {univ-Art, }}$ Dem, Qind -Poss- $A_{\text {bell }}-N-A_{\text {nuov }}$ (C)
$Q_{\text {univ-Art, }}$ Dem, Qind $^{\text {-Poss- }}$ - bell $-N-A_{\text {nuov }}(\mathrm{Br}, \mathrm{Bd})$
$Q_{\text {univ }}-$ Art, Dem, Qind -Poss- $A_{\text {bell }}-N-A_{\text {nuov }}$ (F)
$Q_{\text {univ }}-$ Art, Dem, Qind -Poss- $A_{\text {bell }}-N-A_{\text {nuov }}$ (A)

## PL partial concord - preliminary results

- Red: (optional) presence of the PL marker - fieldwork
- Brown: presence of the PL marker - literature
- Orange: marginal presence of the PL marker
- Violet: absence of data


$Q_{\text {univ- }}$ Art, Dem, Qind -Poss- $A_{\text {bell }}-N-A_{\text {nuov }}(\mathrm{Br}, \mathrm{Bd})$
$Q_{\text {univ }}-$ Art, Dem, Qind -Poss- $A_{\text {bell }}-N-A_{\text {nuov }}(F)$
$Q_{\text {univ }}-$ Art, Dem, Qind -Poss- $A_{\text {bell }}-N-A_{\text {nuov }}(A)$
$Q_{\text {univ }}$-Art, Dem, $\mathrm{Q}_{\text {ind }}-$ Poss- $\mathrm{A}_{\text {bell }}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{A}_{\text {nuov }}$ (BI)


## PL partial concord

- In some cases, the presence of the PL marker is optional
- When absent, the VP agrees with PL anyway
(23) st-j-a pegr-a l 1 y $\quad$ l-a nostr-a this-PL-F sheep-F SCL be.3pl the-F our-F 'these sheep are ours'
(24) kl-a pegr-a l $\quad \mathrm{l}$ y l-a vostr-a that-F sheep-F SCL be.3pl the-F your-F 'those sheep are yours'
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## PL partial concord

- The same questions, again
- Where exactly is num (low, high, both ...) ?
- What is its formal status (head, adjunct ...)?
- What is concord domain?
- ... and a few more
- How to make sense of 'holes'?
- Why there is no partial concord with m?
- How to formalize cases of PL marker complete absence?
- Who controls agreement when the PL marker is not realized?
- No clear answers, just some vague ideas and remarks
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- Where exactly is NUM (low, high, both ...) ?
- Partial concord and Caha (2022) suggest [PL[F]]
- But it depends on our view on concord (see below)
- In a more 'traditional' approach, PL looks quite high in the DP

```
Quniv-Art, Dem, Qind-Poss-A Aell-N-A Auov (N,I, T, G, P)
Quniv}-Art, Dem, Qind-Poss-A Aell -N-A Auov (C)
Quniv-Art, Dem, Qind
Quniv}-Art, Dem, Qind-Poss-A Aell - N-A Auov (F
Quniv}-Art,Dem, Qind-Poss-A Aell-N-A Auov (A)
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## PL partial concord

- Where exactly is NUM (low, high, both ...) ?
- Partial concord and Caha (2022) suggest [PL[F]]
- But it depends on our view on concord (see below)
- In a more 'traditional' approach, PL looks quite high in the DP

$$
\begin{aligned}
& Q_{\text {univ }} \text {-Art, Dem, } Q_{\text {ind }}-\text { Poss- } A_{\text {bell }}-N-A_{\text {nuov }} \text { (C) } \\
& Q_{u n i v}-A r t, D e m, Q_{\text {ind }}-\text { Poss- } A_{\text {bell }}-N-A_{\text {nuov }}(\mathrm{Br}, \mathrm{Bd}) \\
& Q_{\text {univ }}-\text { Art, Dem, } Q_{\text {ind }}-\text { Poss- } A_{\text {bell }}-N-A_{\text {nuov }} \text { (F) } \\
& \text { Quniv-Art, Dem, } Q_{\text {ind }}-\text { Poss- } A_{\text {bell }}-N-A_{\text {nuov }} \text { (A) } \\
& Q_{\text {univ }}-\text { Art, Dem, } \mathrm{Q}_{\text {ind }}-\text { Poss- }-\mathrm{A}_{\text {bell }}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{A}_{\text {nuov }} \text { (BI) }
\end{aligned}
$$

- However, see data from Bolano
(25) kl-j-a bel-j-a albikok-a this-PL-F beautiful-PL-F apricot-F
'these beautiful apricots'
(26) l-a bel-j-a don-j-a
the-F beautiful-PL-F woman-PL-F
'the beautiful women'
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## PL partial concord

- What is PL formal status (head, adjunct ...)?
- Optionality suggests an adjunct/modifier status (Wiltschko 2008, 2021)
- Agreement suggests a head status (Wiltschko 2008, 2021, Caha 2022)
- Distinction between pluralization and plural marking (Cyrino and Espinal 2020, Pescarini 2021)
- "derivational rather than inflectional [number] fits with other facts: people have to think what the plurals are; there are competing forms and speakers will disagree on whether a particular noun has a plural or not" (Corbett 2000)
- What is concord domain?
- No idea, but we must allow for microvariation (of phase boundaries? Cyrino and Espinal 2020)
- Plural-marking-on-D constraint (Cyrino and Espinal 2020): If $X$ (that is, a pluralized $D$ ) c-commands $Y$ (that is, $N$ or $A$ ), which in its turn c-commands $Z$ ( $N$ or $A$ ), plural marking may be overt on X alone, on $\mathrm{X}-\mathrm{Y}$, on $\mathrm{X}-\mathrm{Y}-\mathrm{Z}$, but not on $\mathrm{X}-\mathrm{Z}$.
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- How to make sense of 'holes'?
(27) tut-j-a l-a bel-j-a storj-a ...
all-PL-F the-F beautiful-PL-F tale-F
'All the beautiful tales'
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## PL partial concord

- How to make sense of 'holes'?
(27) tut-j-a l-a bel-j-a storj-a ...
all-PL-F the-F beautiful-PL-F tale-F
'All the beautiful tales'
(28) tut-j-a l-a nostr-j-a nvod-a ...
all-PL-F the-F our-PL-F niece-F
'All our nieces'
(29) tut-j-a kl-j-a patat-a
all-PL-F that-PL-F potato-F
'All those potatoes'
(30) tut-j-a kl-j-a bel-j-a sosen-a
all-PL-F that-PL-F beautiful-PL-F plum-F
'All those beautiful plums'
- No (space for) PL marking on specific categories?
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## PL partial concord

- Why is partial concord limited to F constituents?
- Markedness-like morphosyntactic principle ruled out by e.g. Br.

Port. os $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{M} . \mathrm{PL}}$ livro $_{\mathrm{M} . \mathrm{SG}}$

- Phonology could provide an answer, but only if
- $\mathrm{F} \Leftrightarrow \mathrm{A}$ (rather than $\mathrm{CV}_{\mathrm{A}}$ )
- A links to a CV that represents some (optional) domain-boundary marker, rather than $n$ (Lowenstamm 2008)
- PC as (optional) absence of this 'extra' CV
${ }^{-} \mathrm{FA}_{\mathrm{A}}$ links to the $\sqrt{ }$-final empty $\mathrm{V} \rightarrow \mathrm{PL}$, has no place to link to
-m has no (audible) exponence $\rightarrow$ PL, links to the $\sqrt{ }$-final empty V
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- FC - novi 'new.(m.)PL'
a. $\begin{array}{llllll}C & V & C & V & -C V \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & & \end{array}$
b. $\begin{array}{lllllll}C & V & C & V-C V \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & \\ n & 0 & V & & \\ & & \\ I\end{array}$
- PC - nova 'new.F'
a. $\begin{array}{llllllll}C & V & C & V & \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & & \\ n & 0 & V & & & \\ \text { A }\end{array}$
b. $\begin{array}{llllll}C & V & C & V & \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & \\ n & o & V & A & I\end{array}$


## Phonology

- FC - novja 'new.F.PL'
a. $\begin{array}{lllllll}C & V & C & V & -C V \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & \\ n & 0 & V & & \\ \text { A }\end{array}$

- FC - novi 'new.(M.)PL'
a. $\begin{array}{llllll}C & V & C & V & C & C \\ 1 & \vdots & \vdots & & \end{array}$
b. $\begin{array}{llllll}C & V & C & V-C V \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & \\ n & 0 & V & & \\ & \end{array}$
- PC - nova 'new.F'
a. $\begin{array}{lllllll}C & V & C & V & \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & \\ n & 0 & V & & & \\ \text { A }\end{array}$
b. $\begin{array}{llllll}C & V & C & V & \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & \\ n & o & V & A & I\end{array}$
- 'PC' - novi 'new.(M.) PL'
a. $\begin{array}{llll}C & V & C & V \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & \\ n & o & V & \end{array}$
b. $\begin{array}{llllll}C & V & C & V \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & \\ n & 0 & V & & & \\ & \end{array}$
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## PL partial concord

- How to formalize cases of PL marker complete absence?
- No Animacy Hierarchy constraints (Corbett 2000)
- All NPs behave alike
- No category distinction
- PL marker's presence depends on the syntactic structure
- No COnstructed number value
- No DUAL < SBJ.PL + V.SG (Hopi, Corbett 2000)
- No semantic agreement (Krifka 2008)
- No reason to interpret dona as intrinsically PL/COLLECTIVE
- No GENERAL/COMMON NUMBER
- No morphological difference between PL and other NUM values
- No interaction with definiteness/specificity
- Why only with F nouns?
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## PL partial concord

- How to formalize cases of PL marker complete absence?
- Given agreement, we want PL in the syntactic structure
- $\mathrm{PL}_{\mid}$is there, but silent (Turbidity Theory, Cavirani 2022)
- Competition between VIs with different structure (nanosyntax)
$-[\mathrm{F}] \Leftrightarrow \mathrm{CV}_{\mathrm{A}},[\mathrm{PL}] \Leftrightarrow$ । (old generation Colonnatese)
- $[\mathrm{PL}[\mathrm{F}]] \Leftrightarrow \mathrm{CV}_{\mathrm{A}}$ (new generation Colonnatese)
- Who controls agreement when the PL marker is not realized?
- The silent PL head
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## Expressive NP concord transparency

- Ongoing work with Guido Vanden Wyngaerd
- Cazzo-type ExprNPs can be transparent for concord
(31) un-a merd-a di pecoron-e a-F.SG shit-F.SG of ram-M.SG
'a shitty ram'
(32) *un- $\varnothing$ merd-a di pecoron-e a-M.SG shit-F.SG of ram-M.SG
(33) un- $\varnothing$ cazz-o di pecor-a a-M.SG dick-M.SG of sheep-F.SG
'a fucking sheep'
(34) un-a cazz-o di pecor-a
a-F.SG dick-M.SG of sheep-F.SG
'a fucking sheep'


## Expressive NP rigidity

- Cazzo-type Expr-NPs never changes NUM value
(35) dell-e merd-e di pecor-e
a-F.PL shit-F.PL of sheep-F.PL
'some shitty sheep'
(36) *dell-e/a merd-a di pecor-e
a-F.PL/SG shit-F.SG of sheep-F.PL
(37) *de-i cazz-i di pecoron-i
a-M.PL dick-M.PL of sheep-M.PL
(38) de-i cazz-o di pecoron-i
a-M.PL dick-M.SG of sheep-M.PL
'some fucking sheep'
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## Previous accounts - concord transparency

- Doliana (2016)
- Cazzo is structurally deficient (Cardinaletti and Starke 1999) and get incorporated before D probing
- Cazzo merges with an Expr head (Potts 2007), and get too deeply embedded to be seen by D
- Giorgi and Poletto (2021)
- Cazzo-type ExprNPs in Spec,EvalP $\rightarrow$ no concord
- Merda-type ExprNPs in Eval ${ }^{0} \rightarrow$ concord
- Saab (2022)
- ExprNPs are expletives sitting in Spec,NumP
- Phi-features are there, but cannot be seen by D
- Not a lot on rigidity
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## An alternative

- Cazzo-type ExprNPs have no phi-feature
- They are not morphologically complex
- cazz- $\mathrm{O}_{\mathrm{M}}$ as cazzo
- Cfr. caspita
- $* \sqrt{\text { caspit }}$
- $*_{u n-a_{\mathrm{F}}}$ caspit-a $\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{F}}$ di articol-o $\mathrm{o}_{\mathrm{M}}$ $u n-\varnothing_{\mathrm{M}}$ caspit- $a_{\mathrm{F}}$ di articol-o $o_{\mathrm{M}}$ 'a fucking article'
- No phi-feature to be seen $\rightarrow$ transparency
- No phi-feature to be changed $\rightarrow$ rigidity
- Cazzo as either (i) semilexical or (ii) functional (Klochmann 2017; Cavirani-Pots 2020)
- caspita as functional, merda as semilexical
- cazzo cannot occur in predicative position *X è un cazzo ' X is a fucking'
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## Conclusions

- Phonology can impose unexpected linear orderings
- Mirror Principle violations do not imply postsyntactic morphological operations and ad hoc syntactic derivations
- $[[[\sqrt{ }] F] P L]$ pronounced as $\sqrt{ }$-PL-F
- Silence can be representationally rich
- The unpronunciation of a marker does not imply its absence from the morphosyntactic representation
- PL triggers agreement even if not (independently) pronounced
- We still know too little about partial (NUM) concord
- Phonetic substance can be representationally poor
- What sounds like a morpheme is possibly not a morpheme
- cazz- $o_{\mathrm{M}}$ as cazzo
- cazzo-type ExpNP behavior can be explained away by referring to grammaticalization degreees
to be continued

