

**Majorcan Catalan and corpora analysis:
a window to analyse past participle agreement as an epiphenomenon**

SEBASTIÀ SALVÀ I PUIG

Centre de Lingüística Teòrica (Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona)

The main goal of this presentation is to present the analysis of 4 diachronically successive corpora, with Majorcan Catalan data on past participle agreement (PPA), and to provide a formal analysis for PPA, flexible enough to explain these and other data from other Romance varieties.

These corpora show that, in Majorcan Catalan, the use of PPA has been decreasing over the last hundred years, but it keeps stronger in some contexts (object preposing) than in other ones.

As for PPA with the object *in situ* (PPA_{OIS}), I develop the concept of *conditioned PPA*, distinguishing two types of constraints: information structure and aspect. I start from DE CIA's (in press) observation that, in Friulian, PPA_{OIS} is not optional (*pace* LOPORCARO 1998), but conditioned by the topicality of the object: PPA_{OIS} is only licensed if the direct object can be interpreted as a *given topic* (G-topic) or as an *aboutness-shift topic* (A-topic), in the sense of FRASCARELLI & HINTERHÖLZL (2007), but PPA_{OIS} is ungrammatical if the object is under *narrow focus* (either informative or contrastive). Strikingly, a similar constraint applies to Majorcan Catalan — examples (1)a and (1)b display PPA_{OIS} with a G-topic and with an A-topic, respectively; while (1)c shows that PPA_{OIS} is ungrammatical under narrow focus —, although with some differences: (i) in Friulian, PPA_{OIS} with G-topics or A-topics is *mandatory*; conversely, in current Majorcan Catalan PPA_{OIS} is conditioned but *optional*; and (ii) Majorcan Catalan can display PPA even with fronted objects with contrastive focus or with any kind of *wh*-object [(2)]; so, in this variety, the topicality condition only applies to PPA_{OIS}.

- (1) a. —Els heu vist(s) sempre, an es cossiers?
 CL.ACC.MAS.PL have.you seen(.PL) always DOM the “cossiers”.MAS.PL
 —Sempre... Sempre **he** **vists** **es cossiers i es dimoni.**
 always always have.I seen.MAS.PL the “cossiers” and the devil
 ‘Have you always seen the “cossiers”’ ‘Always, I have always seen the “cossiers” and the devil’
- b. I llavò **he** **vists** **«hombres licenciados en carrera» de Montuiri:**
 and then have.I seen.MAS.PL men graduated in degree from Montuiri
 Cases de senyors: [...]. Frares: [...]. Metges: [...]. Notaris: [...]. Apotecaris: [...]. Missers: [...].
 houses of lords friars doctors notaries pharmacists lawyers
- c. —Què has rebut? —**He {rebut/*rebudes} dues multes.**
 what have.you received have.I received.{MAS.SG/*FEM.PL} two fines.FEM.PL
 ‘What have you received?’ ‘I have received two fines’
- (2) NA MARIA, he vista, i no en Joan.
 ART.PERS.FEM Maria have.I seen.FEM.SG and not ART.PERS.MAS Joan
 ‘It is Maria who I have seen, not Joan’

A similar phenomenon can be found in Sanvalentinense and Ripano (D’ALESSANDRO 2017) and in some Bantu varieties like Manyika (BAX & DIERCKX 2012) and Swahili (MURSELL 2018). DE CIA, following MURSELL and D’ALESSANDRO, claims that *v/v** in Friulian enters the derivation with [*uφ*:_] features and with an extra [*uδ*:_] feature, which looks (through the operation *Agree*) inside its c-command domain for the nearest DP/NP with a [Givenness] or [Aboutness] interpretable *δ* (discourse) feature. By contrast, BAX & DIERCKX prefer an analysis based on the incorporation of a pronominal clitic (which doubles the object) into the verb, which resembles the kind of analysis that I assume to explain optional PPA_{OIS}, PPA with clitics and PPA with *wh*-movement in current Majorcan Catalan, following the analysis proposed by GEORGI & STARK (2020) for French. In long-distance movement, both in French and in current Maj. Catalan, PPA with a *whP* is just possible with the most embedded participle, but not with the highest participle:

- (3) [Quines cadires has {dit/*dites} [que ha {repintades/repintat}]]?
 which chairs.FEM.PL have.you said.{MAS.SG/*FEM.PL} that has repainted.{FEM.PL/MAS.SG}
 ‘Which chairs have you said that (s)he has repainted?’

According to GEORGI & STARK, the syntactic mechanism that explains *optional PPA* with *wh*-Ps or with clitics in French is not *Agree* (unlike unaccusative constructions, auxiliated robustly with *être* and with *mandatory PPA*), but *resumption by sub-extraction, stranding and incorporation* of an H functional head (from the highest DP layer) into the participle. Crucially, this mechanism cannot be applied to already moved constituents, which are “islands for sub-extraction”: Freezing Principle and Condition on Extraction Domains.

The main conclusion is that PPA is not a unified phenomenon, but an *epiphenomenon*, which can be regarded as the by-product of several syntactic mechanisms. One of these mechanisms is *Agree* (CHOMSKY 2000, 2001; LONGENBAUGH 2019), which explains mandatory PPA within unaccusative constructions in French and Italian (*Sono {arrivate/*arrivato} le ragazze*), and even those cases of systematic or categorical PPA_{OIS} (like in Old stages of Maj. Catalan); but PPA could also be the result of *Concord* (GIUSTI 2008) or ZEIJLSTRA’s (2012) *Reverse Agree* — as in passive constructions, where PPA is mandatory even in current Spanish (*La ciudad fue destruida*), as in any other case of Concord between a noun and an adjective (*La ciudad es bonita*). Moreover, optional PPA could come from *resumption by extraction, stranding and incorporation* of an H functional head, as a strategy for marking information structure.

Finally, for some speakers of current Majorcan Catalan, PPA_{OIS} can only be used for marking those internal arguments that, besides being topics, are also affected by a dynamic event with [+bounded] or [resultative] Asp [(4)a and (4)b]; by contrast, PPA_{OIS} is excluded with states and dynamic events with [–bounded] aspect [(5)a and (5)b]. So PPA_{OIS} is also conditioned by aspect.

- (4) a. Hem {cantada/cantat} aquesta cançó {en dos minuts / tres vegades}.
 have.we sung.{FEM.SG/MAS.SG} this song.FEM.SG in two minutes three times
 ‘We have sung this song {in two minutes / three times}’
 b. Ja hem {untades/untat} ses persianes.
 already have.we spread.{FEM.PL/MAS.SG} the blinds.FEM.PL
 ‘We have already spread the blinds (with oil)’
 (5) a. Na Teresa sempre ha {temut/*temudes} ses bubotes.
 ART.PERS.FEM Teresa always has feared.{MAS.SG/*FEM.PL} the ghosts.FEM.PL
 ‘Teresa has always been afraid of ghosts’
 b. He {menat/*menada} sa furgoneta tot s’ horabaixa.
 have.I driven.{MAS.SG/*FEM.SG} the van all the afternoon
 ‘I have been driving the van all afternoon’

SELECTED REFERENCES:

- BAX, ANNA, & MICHAEL DIERCKS (2012): «Information structure constraints on object marking in Manyika», *Southern African linguistics and applied language studies*, 30(2).
- CHOMSKY, NOAM (2000): «Minimalist inquiries: the framework», in R. MARTIN *et al.* (eds.): *Step by step: Essays on minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*, Cambridge (MA): MIT Press.
- CHOMSKY, NOAM (2001): «Derivation by phase», in M. KENSTOWICZ (ed.): *Ken Hale: a life in language*, Cambridge (MA): MIT Press.
- D’ALESSANDRO, ROBERTA (2017): «When you have too many features: Auxiliaries, agreement and clitics in Italian varieties», *Glossa*, 2(1).
- DE CIA, SIMONE (in press): «Topicality and object-past participle agreement in Friulan», in A. NEVINS, A. PETI-STANTIĆ, M. DE VOS & J. WILLER-GOLD (eds.): *Angles of object agreement*, Oxford University Press.
- FRASCARELLI, MARA, & ROLAND HINTERHÖLZL (2007): «Types of topics in German and Italian», in S. WINKLER & K. SCHWABE (eds.): *On information structure, meaning and form*, Amst./Philadelphia: J. Benjamins.
- GEORGI, DOREEN, & ELISABETH STARK (2020): *Past participle agreement in French – One or two rules?*, in M. O. HINZELIN, N. POMINO & E. M. REMBERGER (eds.): Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter.
- GIUSTI, GIULIANA (2008): «Agreement and Concord in Nominal Expressions», dins Cécile De Cat i Katherine

Demuth (eds.): *The Bantu-Romance Connection. A Comparative Investigation of Verbal Agreement, DPs, and Information Structure*, pp. 201-237.

- LONGENBAUGH, NICHOLAS (2019): *On expletives and the agreement-movement correlation*, Cambridge MIT, PhD D.
- LOPORCARO, MICHELE (1998): *Sintassi comparata dell'accordo participiale romanzo*, Torino: Rosenberg & Sellier.
- MURSELL, JOHANNES (2018): «Object marking in Swahili is topic agreement», *Jezikoslovlje*, 19(3).
- ROSSELLÓ, JOANA (2003): «Ressenya de LOPORCARO (1998)», *Estudis romànics*, 25.
- ZEIJLSTRA, HEDDE (2012): «There is Only One Way to Agree», *The Linguistic Review*, n. 29, pp. 491-539.