A Split-DP hypothesis for Latin and Italo-Romance

Giuliana Giusti & Rossella Iovino

University Ca'Foscari Venice

giusti@unive.it rossella.iovino@unive.it

Lack of articles, free word order and discontinuous noun phrases in Latin are often taken as evidence for non-configurationality. In this vein, the main innovation in Romance would be the development of configurational structure (Lyons 1999, Ledgeway 2012).

The aim of this paper is to provide a formal analysis showing that the possible orders in Latin are not just dependent on pragmatics but are strictly controlled by syntax. **The diachronic change into old and modern Italian is to be derived by a single parameter that regards the different bundling of the features constituent of D, namely Case and Number.**

Our proposal is based on Giusti's (1996, 2010, 2012) hypothesis that the nominal expression (NE) has a Left Periphery, parallel to the clause (Cinque 1990, Rizzi 1997):

(1) a. CaseP >   LPP >   NumberP   Giusti (2012)
     b. ForceP > TopP* > FocP > TopP* > FinP   Rizzi (1997)

Rizzi proposes that Force and Fin are often realized in a single bundle (C). Giusti proposes that Case and Num can be bundled in a single head D.

In Latin (2a), Case and Num are bundled with N, which can be realized in any position of the extended projection, including the low D. In old and modern Italian (2b-c), Case is not bundled with N, and for this reason it is realized in the higher D. Number is redundant on Case and N. In old Italian (2b), interpretable Num is still on N, thus the low DP is projected and can attract N; in modern Italian (2c), interpretable Num is bundled with Case in the higher DP, the low DP does not project, and N remains lower:

(2) a.   [LPP   [$_{DP}$ [Case+Num] [...]]]   (Latin)
     b. [$_{DP}$ [Case(+Num)]   [LPP   [$_{DP}$ [Num]   [...]]]   (old Italian)
     c. [$_{DP}$ [Case+Num]   [LPP   [...]]]   (modern Italian)

This proposal can account for the following facts:

I. In Latin **the demonstrative** can precede or follow a noun (3a). But in complex NEs only an adjective or a genitive complement can precede Dem (3b-c). The orders in (3d) are unattested, thereby excluding movement of a remnant (Cinque 2010, Abels and Neeleman 2012):

(3) a. [$_{DP}$ ille [$_{NP}$ homo]] vs [$_{LP}$ homo [$_{DP}$ ille [$_{NP}$ ~~homo~~]]] 'that man/man that'
     b. ex [$_{LP}$ vetere [$_{DP}$ illa [$_{FP}$ [$_{AP}$ ~~vetere~~] [$_{NP}$ disciplina]]]] (Cic. *Cluent*. 76)
         from old that discipline
     c. [$_{LP}$ [$_{DP}$ Caesaris] [$_{DP}$ hic [$_{DP}$ ~~Caesaris~~] [[$_{PP}$ per Apuliam et Brundisium] cursus]]]]
         Caesar's this through Apulia and Brundisium race   (Cic. *att*. 8,11,7)
     d. *NDemA, *NADem, *ANDem

In old and modern Italian, Dem is always the first element in the NE. Being in complementary distribution with the article, we take it to be in the higher DP.

II. In Latin, **the position of adjectives** complies with the hierarchy of modification (Cinque 1994, Crisma 1996); N(P)-movement is optional (4a-c), as is roll-up movement (4d-e):

(4) a. [parvulis [equestribus [proeliis]]] (Caes. *Gall*. 5,50,1)   no movement
         small   horse   battles
     b. [veteres [cives [Romanos [~~cives~~]]]] (Liv. 8,11,14)   partial N(P)-movement
         old   citizens Roman
     c. [asinos [ornatos [~~asinos~~ [clitellarios [~~asinos~~]]]]] (Cato *agr*. 10,1)   total N-movement
         donkeys decorated   for-transport

    d. [patriis [fortunis]] amplissimis] (Cic. *Cluent*. 31)   partial roll-up
       of-father richness very-large
    e. [[[equite] Romano] propinquo] (Cic. *Quinct*. 87)   total roll-up
       horse-man Roman nearby

The modification hierarchy can be violated by movement of only one constituent to LPP (5):

(5) **[LPP Plautina** [DP [longa [~~Plautina~~ [fabula]]]]] (Plaut. *Pseud*. 2)   relational> size
   by-Plautus   long   fable

Although in old Italian N(P)-movement across relational adjectives and roll-up movement across indirect modification is established (Giusti 2010, Giorgi 2010), the position of N is still free, and can be found above a possessive (6a) or below the relational adjective (6b):

(6) a. [DP uno [DP chavallo [AgrP suo ~~chavallo~~ [FP morello [NP ~~chavallo~~]]] (*Libro giallo* 308, l4)
     a   horse   his   brown
    b. [DP la [FP cittadina [NP maniera di dire]]] (*Tesoro volg.* vol4, book8, chap39, p134)
     the   city-like   way of saying

Neither of these possibilities is admitted in modern Italian, where N is established in an intermediate position in the modification hierarchy.

III. The **left periphery** in old Italian is below the high DP. Taking the order in (7a) to be the unmarked order, we observe the possibility of contrasting a adjective, moving it to the left of the possessive, which is the highest in the adjectival hierarchy:

(7) a. [PP *co*[DP -l   [DP *corno*   [AgrP *tuo* ~~corno~~   [FP *sinistro* [NP ~~corno~~]]]]]
     with-the   wing   your   left
    b. [PP *co*[DP -l [LPP *diritto* [AgrP *suo corno* [FP ~~diritto~~ [NP ~~corno~~]]]
     with-the   right   his   wing (Bono Giamboni, *Vegezio*, book3, chap20, p128)

This is still the case in high registers of Italian.

IV. The existence of **discontinuous nominals**, in which a subconstituent is raised to the LP of the NE or further moved to the CP of the clause, or the middle field of the vP:

(8)   ... [LPP ___ [DP ... [NP N [LPP ___ [DPGen ... [NP [XP] N]]]

This possibility is lost in old Italian for adjectives, but preserved for possessors as also is in modern Italian. This will be related to the position of LPP w.r.t. DP in Latin vs old and modern Italian, and to the phasal nature of (possessive) DPs vs. the non-phasal nature of APs.

Abels, K. and Neeleman, A. 2012. "Linear Asymmetries and the LCA". *Syntax* 15.1:25-74.
Cinque, G. 1990. *Types of A' Dependencies*. Cambridge (Mass.): The MIT Press.
Cinque, G. 1994. "On the Evidence for Partial N-Movement in the Romance DP."In *Paths Towards Universal Grammar* edited by G. Cinque et. al., 85-110. Georgetown UP.
Cinque, G. 2010. *The Syntax of Adjective*. Cambridge (Mass.): The MIT Press.
Crisma, P. 1996. "On the configurational nature of adjectival modification." *LSRL* 25:59-71.
Giorgi, A. 2010. "La struttura del sintagma nominale." In *Grammatica dell'italiano antico* edited by L. Renzi and G. Salvi, 275-294. Bologna: il Mulino.
Giusti, G. 1996. "Is there a FocusP and a TopicP in the noun phrase?" *UVWPL* 6.2.
Giusti, G., 2010. "Il sintagma aggettivale." In *Grammatica dell'italiano antico* edited by L. Renzi and G. Salvi, 593-616- Bologna: il Mulino.
Giusti, G. 2012. "On Force and Fin, Case and Num."In *Enjoy Linguistics!* Edited by V. Bianchi and C. Chesi, 205-217. Siena: CISCL.
Lyons, C. 1999. *Definiteness*. CUP.
Ledgeway, A. 2012. *From Latin to Romance. Morphosyntactic Typology and Change*. OUP.
Rizzi, L. 1997. "The fine structure of the left periphery." In *Elements of Grammar* edited by L. Haegeman, 281-337. London: Longman.