

**Variation and the architecture of grammar.  
Where are parameters? Where is lexicalization?**

**Data.** I base my study on Italian dialects, favored by the existence of large corpora of data collected with contemporary formal grammars in mind (Atlante Sintattico Italiano, Padua; Manzini & Savoia 2005). Among the most systematically studied phenomena are those involving person hierarchies, because of the ease of study; given six persons, at most 64 variation schemas for two-valued choices are in principle possible. Case studies include partial pro-drop (partial drop of subject clitics) in Northern Italian dialects (Manzini & Savoia 2005, Calabrese to appear for summary tables) *ó* and *have/ be* auxiliary alternations according to person in Central and Southern Italian dialects (Manzini & Savoia 2007, 2011, Legendre 2010 for summary tables). In order to be able to present some results at all, I will limit myself to 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> person, i.e. to the participant set (16 possible patterns overall for two-valued choices). Among the 187 subject clitic dialects in Manzini & Savoia (Calabreseø count), only the six patterns in (1) are instantiated. On the other hand this holds of proclitic subjects, i.e. in declaratives contexts. In enclisis, i.e. in interrogative contexts, my survey of the same corpus reveals that only two patterns are clearly not attested (namely P Ø Ø P; Ø P P Ø, roughly with the plural specular to the singular).

(1)	1sg	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø	P	P
	2sg	Ø	P	P	P	P	P
	1pl	Ø	Ø	Ø	P	Ø	P
	2pl	Ø	Ø	P	P	Ø	P

e.g. column 2: Ø *dørmo*, *ti dørmi*, Ø *dormimo*, Ø *dor<sup>l</sup>mi* ÷I sleep etcí ø *Chioggia* (Veneto)

In *have/ be* auxiliary selection in the present perfect, only the six person patterns in (2) are attested. If we line up *be* selection (*essere*, E) with P lexicalization and *have* selection (*avere*, A) with Ø lexicalization, the patterns in (2) are seen to mostly overlap with those in (1). Strikingly however the dominating A E pattern can also be reversed, as in the last column (E A). In past and modal (subjunctive) forms, practically all dialects select either *have* or *be* uniformly.

(2)	1sg	A	A	A	E	E	E
	2sg	A	E	E	E	E	A
	1pl	A	A	E	A	E	A
	2pl	A	A	E	A	E	A

e.g. column 2: *affə/ si/ əmmə/avi:tə drəmməutə* ÷I have/ etc... sleptø *Ruvo di Puglia*  
last column: *sə/ a/ əmmə/ avitə vənəutə* ÷I have/ etcí comeø *Gravina di Puglia*

**Literature.** The obvious generalization to be drawn from (1) is that if any P clitic is lexicalized, then 2<sup>nd</sup> sg is (cf. Renzi & Vanelli 1983); another generalization is that the plural can be at most as differentiated as the singular or otherwise lacks any differentiation at all. To what parametric organization do these generalizations correspond? Why do they hold only in certain contexts? There are several answers available in the literature. Cardinaletti & Repetti (2008) argue that person hierarchies in subject clitics systems are to be modelled by syntactic hierarchies; if the verb moves as high as clitic x, then x and all clitics lower than x are lexicalized *ó* while clitics higher than x are not. In enclisis the verb moves higher than in proclisis, so more clitics can be seen in proclisis than in enclisis. In the auxiliary selection domain this type of approach is best exemplified by Kayne (1993). The general problem is that these approaches consistently undergenerate. Thus if 1<sup>st</sup> singular is above 1<sup>st</sup> plural, we derive the penultimate column in (1), but not the third column *ó* and vice versa. In enclisis, given that roughly all combinations are allowed, we will inevitably find varieties that have 2<sup>nd</sup> singular lexicalized in proclisis and not in enclisis (e. g. *te dørmes* ÷you sleepø vs. (*nəwa*) *dørmes* ÷(where) do you sleep?ø *Mulegns*, Grisons), therefore disconfirming the prediction that all clitics present in proclisis are present in enclisis. Another possible approach is proposed by Calabrese (to appear) within the framework of Distributed Morphology. He argues that

(1) is governed by a morphological markedness hierarchy which governs the  $\neq$ obliteration $\emptyset$  of features bundles at Vocabulary Insertion. The more highly marked the feature bundles are, the more likely they are to be obliterated. Such a model still undergenerates; for instance Calabrese is aware of the ordering problems created by the third and fifth columns in (1) and by the proclitic  $\emptyset$  P vs. enclitic P  $\emptyset$  alternations. Undergeneration also characterizes the OT approach of Legendre (2010), cf. the discussion by Manzini & Savoia (2011).

**Analysis.** I advocate a different view of what happens in (1)-(2). The hierarchy between 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> person in (1) is best modelled as a conceptual, rather than a linguistic one; the speaker is more salient (pragmatically) than the hearer, as in (3). Thus it is possible to have subject clitic sets where speaker reference is lexicalized, while speaker reference lacks a lexicalization, being recoverable independently of context in virtue of its salience. The reverse is not possible. This split between 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> person may not be defined for plural referents, as in (4). Again there is no evidence that (4) refers to a syntactically structured content, as opposed to a purely conceptual one.

- (3) (pragmatic) salience of speaker reference
- (4) (3) not defined in the plural

In languages which differentiate non-modal subject clitic series from modal (interrogative) ones, the modal series can keep the conditions of the non-modal one (i.e.  $\emptyset$  P), or it can neutralize the split, or it can reverse it. The neutralization of the split corresponds to a simple mechanism of the type in (4) with (interrogative) modality substituted for plural. Possibly the reverse of the prominence hierarchy in (3) (i.e. hearer more salient) may hold in languages which reverse the lexicalization split in interrogative contexts. Turning to the *have/be* alternation in (2), it is tempting to read in the predominant alignment of hearer with *be* and speaker with *have* a reflex of the classical ergativity split, whereby most prominent arguments are aligned with nominative (transitive *have*), though other arguments may be aligned with absolutive (ergative *be*). In this instance, however, the reverse alignment is also possible (cf. the last column in (2)). Since the two alignments subtly differ in their consequences for the plural, possibly a markedness effect is at play, allowing for lesser variation in the marked alignment. In any event, note the substantial identity of these parameters with those defined by typological data  $\acute{o}$  despite the different grain of the variation involved (micro- vs. macro-variation).

**Discussion.** The models discussed in the literature (cartography, DM, OT) have a similar outlook on variation. DM (e.g. Calabrese) is clearest on variation being a PF interface matter, since it pairs abstract, (potentially) universal bundles of features with a PF exponent only in the postsyntactic Morphological Structure component. The Kaynian  $\neq$ silent $\emptyset$  categories approach, presupposing something like an underlying universal cartographic tree, is also compatible with a PF interface view of variation, whereby certain pieces of structure are left unpronounced, though syntactically present. The view I take is that variation is defined by lexical items carving directly the universal conceptual/ categorial space. This reflects the traditional lexicalist conception of the architecture of grammar, under which the mapping between LF content and PF content, with its potential for variation, is carried out by the lexicon. Since lexical items cut the conceptual repertory in slightly different ways, and the syntax is projected from the lexicon (Chomsky 1995), differing lexicons, though built on the basis of an identical conceptual repertory, will yield different syntaxes.

My argument here is not that an account of, say, the gaps in subject clitic paradigm in (1) along the lines in (3)-(4) cannot be executed at the PF interface  $\acute{o}$  it obviously can. The point is that the non syntactically structured interface offered by the conceptual system is sufficient to yield the desired parametrization as well. Vice versa, the extra mechanisms (rigid hierarchies) made available by a syntactically structured interface are not exploited by lexicalization/ parametrization  $\acute{o}$  certainly in the cases at hand and arguably in all (sufficiently documented) instances. This is not expected if lexicalization/ parametrization is a PF interface phenomenon, feeding on syntactic(-like) structures.