

This paper investigates the noun phrase of an understudied Northwestern Iranian language, Laki, with a focus on double definite marking (see Embick and Noyer (2001) and references therein for this pattern in Scandinavian). I propose that double definiteness in Laki is the result of the Agreement of D and N (Chomsky 1995, 2000, 2001). I will also explore plural marking. I propose that Num(ber) undergoes head movement to D and it fuses with definiteness after syntax.

In Laki, nouns inflect for definiteness by the affix *-a* (1). When a definite noun is modified, the definite marker gets doubled (2-3).

- (1). *māl-a* (2). *māl-a* *kalen-a* (3). *māl-a* *kalen sefid-a*
house-DEF house-DEF big-DEF house-DEF big white-DEF
‘the house’ ‘the big house’ ‘the big white house’

Despite their phonological form, these two affixes display differences. **a).** *stress*: the affix on N (henceforth DP internal definite marker) is unstressed, while the other one on the (last) modifier, or on the bare N (henceforth DP final definite marker) is stressed (bold in (1-5)). **b).** *Syllable sensitivity*: The DP internal definite marker is sensitive to the number of the syllables of its nominal host, such that it doesn’t appear on a multisyllabic N. In contrast, the DP final definite marker does not show this sensitivity. (4) shows that the DP internal definite marker cannot appear on the two-syllable N *ketew*. (4) also shows that the DP final definite marker is obligatory. (5) shows that the DP final definite marker is not sensitive to the number of syllables of its host.

- (4). *ketew(*-a) zwānšenāsiy-*(a)* (5). *zwānšenās-a*
book linguistics-DEF linguist-DEF
‘the linguistics book’ ‘the linguist’

Double definiteness has been observed in Scandinavian; *mus-en* ‘the mouse’ – *den lilla mus-en* ‘the old mouse’ (Swedish). Different proposals have tried to account for this pattern; e.g. triggered by selectional requirement (Svenonius 1992), the definite suffix on N as ArtP licensing the weak inflection of definiteness on adjective (Santelmann 1993), the definite suffix on N as a concord and a dissociated morpheme inserted after syntax (Embick and Noyer 2001), two syntactic positions for definiteness (Julien 2003), etc. To account for double definite marking in Laki, I propose that double definiteness in Laki is triggered by the Agreement between D and N. I assume that D has an uninterpretable [uN] feature licensing it as the probe. N on the other hand, is assumed to have an uninterpretable [uDEF] feature. The [uDEF] feature on N is valued as a reflex of the probe by D (*free rider principle* (Chomsky 1995)). The definite expression is inserted on N, as a result of this feature checking. The null expression of the definite agreement on the multisyllabic noun (4) follows from the fact that the vocabulary insertion proceeds bottom up. Given this assumption, the syllable structure of the root must be visible to the insertion of the definite Agreement, requiring a null insertion for definite agreement on a multisyllabic noun.

The contribution of definiteness to the realization of [PL]: The form and the distribution of plurality is sensitive to the definiteness. (6) shows that in a modified indefinite DP, the plural marker appears on the noun with the form *-al*. (7) shows that in a modified definite DP, the plural marker is expressed on the (last) modifier, with the form *-el*.

- (6). *det-al bālābarz lak-i* (7). *det-a bālābarz lak-el-a*
girl-PL tall Lak-INDEF girl-DEF tall Lak-PL-DEF
‘some tall Lak girls’ ‘the tall Lak girls’

As for (7), I propose that number undergoes head movement to D due to the strong [*PL] feature in D. I further propose that the Num(ber) fuses with definiteness postsyntactically. The distribution of the plural marker in a sister Kurdish variety, *Kermānshāhi*, provides evidence for this claim. In

this dialect, [PL] is marked with the suffix *-eyl*, and [DEF] is marked with the suffix *-aga*. In a modified definite DP, [DEF] and [PL] are realized simultaneously with one lexical item *-agān* on the (last) modifier in the DP.

The Agreement of D and N along with the fusion of the plural and definite markers being realized as one lexical item, demonstrate the contribution of the definiteness to the structure of DP, which can be extended to sister Kurdish varieties that display the same DP pattern.

References:

- Chomsky, Noam. 1995. Categories and transformations. In *The Minimalist Program*, 219–394. Cambridge, Mass. MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. (2000). Minimalist inquiries. In Martin, D. M. and R, J. U., editors, *Step by step: Essays on minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*, pages 89–156. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. (2001). Derivation by phase. In M. Kenstowicz, K. H., editor, *A life in language*, 1–52. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Embick, D. and Noyer, R. (2001). Movement operations after syntax. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 32:555–595.
- Julien, M. (2003). Double definiteness in scandinavian. *Proceedings of the 19th Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics*, 31(1):230–244.
- Noyer, R. (1992). Features, positions and affixes in autonomous morphological structure. PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Santelmann, L. (1993). The distribution of double determiners in swedish. *Studia Linguistica*, 47:154–176.
- Svenonius, P. (1992). The extended projection of n: Identifying the head of the noun phrase. In *Working Papers in Scandinvian Syntax*, volume 49, pages 95–121. Dpt. Of Scandinavian lnnguages, Lund.