

“at” vs. *in* (It.) /*chez* (Fr.) “at”/“in” with locative nouns, e.g. *stare in casa/rester chez soi* “stay at home”, in terms of differences in the internal feature structure of locative prepositions and locative nouns.

Independent evidence for our analysis comes from the derivation of deictic pronouns *here* and *there* in Fallesse. The preposition AT/TO is silent in Italian, *qui/li* “here”/“there”, as a consequence of the movement of the pronoun to the Specifier position (see also Van Riemsdijk 1978, McCawley 1988, Kayne 2005, Collins 2007 for languages such as English). The preposition however can be pronounced in Fallesse, *(a)ecche/(a)locche* (at here/at there), from Latin *ad hic/ad locum* “at here/at there”, when the Specifier of the higher PP phase has no phonetic content. We discuss limits of alternative accounts not relying on displacement and principles of efficient computation including Barrie and Yoo (2017).

2. Extension. In Italian the coordinate conjunction in coordinate nouns, can be silent in some cases, e.g. *mela pesca* (Lit. apple peach) “peach apple”, and pronounced in other cases, e.g. *ago e filo* “needle and thread”. The nouns in these expressions also qualify as bare nouns. They cannot be preceded by an article, allow adjectival modification, or be pluralized, without consequences on acceptability and semantic interpretation. Furthermore, when the coordinator is silent, the coordinate structure has an intersective reading; when the coordinator is pronounced, it has a group reading. According to Winter (1995, 1998), Zhang (2010) and Szabolcsi (2015) set intersection and group forming are not performed by the coordinating conjunction itself. We discuss the hypothesis that higher functional projections in the nominal spine bare group and intersection features, which active features further support the displacement of the coordinating conjunction or the lack thereof.

Focussing on the derivation of the pronunciation/silence of the coordinator, we assume that the internal structure of coordinate is asymmetrical and derived by phases (Munn 1993; Kayne 1994; Goodall 2017, a.o.). Feature valuation proceeds as in (4). In (4a), the [N] feature of *mela* values the [*u*N] feature of the conjunction. Given Collin’s (2007) Spell-Out Condition, the conjunction is not pronounced <>. In (4b), *ago* is displaced to the higher Specifier position and values the [*u*N] feature of the conjunction. Given Collin’s (2008) Condition on Spell-Out the conjunction in the lower phase is pronounced.



Independent evidence that Internal Merge applies in coordinate structures comes from Latin additive cardinal numerals. Near the 10th, the digit can be reordered to the left of the base, e.g. *viginti unus* (Lit. twenty one), *unus et viginti* (Lit. one and twenty). Further independent evidence for our analysis comes from multiple coordinate DPs where the conjunction is pronounced in the last conjunct, e.g. *Gianni Paulo e Maria* vs. **Gianni e Paulo, Maria*. We point to limits of alternative accounts with respect to the Transparency thesis (Chierchia 2013, Jacobson 2009) and syntax-semantic interface legibility.

3. Consequences. A phase based feature driven analysis of locative and coordinate nouns in Romance brings support to the relation between movement and silence, as well as a unified explanation for apparently unrelated facts. It also brings further support to the role of principles of efficient computation, maximizing asymmetry and minimizing externalization, in the derivation of linguistic expressions.

Selected references

- Barrie, M. and Yoo, I. W. 2017. Bare Nominal Adjuncts. *Linguistic Inquiry*: 48(3): 449-512.
- * Chomsky, N., A. Gallego and D. Ott. 2019. Generative Grammar and the Faculty of Language: Insights, Questions, and Challenges. *Lingbuzz*.
- * Chomsky, N. 2008. On Phases. In *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory. Essays in Honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*, eds. R. Freidin, C. P. Otero and M. L. Zubizarreta, 133–166, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- * Chierchia, G. *Logic in Grammar*. 2013. Oxford: OUP.
- * Collins, C. 2007. Home sweet home. *NYU Working Papers in Linguistics* 1: 1-27.
- * Drummond, A., N. Hornstein, and H. Lasnik. 2010. A puzzle about P-stranding and a possible solution. *Linguistic Inquiry* 41: 689-692.
- * Goodall, G. 2017. Coordination in Syntax. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics*, M. Aronoff (ed.). Oxford University Press.
- * Jacobson, P. 2009. The Syntax/Semantic Interface: Compositionality Issues. In Bezhanishvili, N. Lobner, S. Schwabe, K, and Spada, L. *Logic, Language and Computation*: 249-270. Dordrecht: Springer.
- * Kayne, R. 2005. *Movement and Silence*. Oxford: OUP.
- * Kayne, Richard. 1994. *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press.
- * Longobardi, G. 2001. Formal syntax, Diachronic Minimalism, and Etymology: The history of French *Chez*. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32(2): 275-302.
- * Pesetsky, D. and E. Torrego 2007. The Syntax of Valuation and the Interpretability of Features. In S. Karimi, V., Samiiian and W. K. Wilkins (eds.) *Phrasal and Clausal Architecture*, 262-294, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- * Rizzi, L. and G. Cinque (2016) Functional Categories and Syntactic Theory. *Annual Review of Linguistics*.
- * Zhang, L. 2015. Decomposing English particle *and* and *or*. *NELS* 45: 261-270.