

Italian reinforcers: DP-internal and left-peripheral

The Issue: Italian Demonstratives can co-occur with an adverbial locative reinforcer, which can be either [proximate] (e.g. *questo libro qui* ‘this book here’) or [distal] (e.g. *quel libro lì* ‘that book there’), “agreeing” with the Demonstrative used. Standard analyses of the construction (e.g. Bernstein (1997), Brugè (2002), among others), while vastly differing in implementation, all assume that Dem and Reinf. are generated together in a local configuration (typically Spec,Head) inside the DP. The Dem is then moved up stranding the Reinf. behind, yielding the order Dem>Num>A>N>Reinf. (*quei tre bei libri lì* ‘those three beautiful books there’). Brugè (2002) further observes that the reinforcer cannot follow the object PP of a N, as shown in (1). However, Brugè (2002) fails to acknowledge that (1a) becomes perfectly grammatical if the distal reinforcer “*lì*” is used (1b). Moreover, an interpretive difference also emerges: the pre-PP reinforcer is more naturally interpreted as a purely locative/deictic marker, while the post-PP reinforcer yields a topical interpretation of the DP. In contexts where a topical interpretation is forced (2), only the [distal] reinforcer *lì* can be used.

Analysis: Cinque (2005) shows that the merge order of DP internal elements is universally Dem>Num>A>N. Surface word order differences are essentially derived via either leftward movement of NP or via successive word order inverting roll-up movements. Cinque (2005) further argues that complements of N are always stranded at the end of the DP. In Romance leftward NP movement can raise past certain As (Cinque (1994)) but always leaves PP complements stranded. In Hebrew, the PP complements do not roll-up with the NP. These facts follow straightforwardly under a Kayneian analysis of PPs (see Kayne (2002)): the P head is merged outside the DP (*of* [*John a picture*]), P’s complement is first attracted to Spec, P (*John_i of* [*t_i a picture*]), P is raised to a higher head W (*of_j+W John_i t_j* [*t_i a picture*]), the remnant is pied-piped to [Spec, W] (*[t_i a picture]_k of_j+W John_i t_j t_k*). This analysis suggests that in (2b) the reinforcer is not generated together with the Dem, since it follows the N-complement PP. In this paper I would like to propose that the post-PP reinforcer is a specificity marker which overtly realizes one of the left peripheral heads. Notice in fact that the distal reinforcer is grammatical in *bona fide* left peripheral constructions, like CLLD (2B’), Focus (3a) and “contrastively focalized Left Dislocation Structures” (CFLD) (see Bocci (2004)) (3b). In some languages (English, Romance, etc.) nominal expressions are typically unambiguously marked DP-internally as either definite or indefinite (*the* vs. *a*), but not as ±specific. In other languages e.g. Gungbe, the mirror image obtains: nominal expressions are always unambiguously specific or non-specific but unmarked with respect to definiteness (Aboh 2004:76ff.). I propose that specificity is not overtly marked DP-internally in Italian, but it is rather parasitic on Top/Focus, due to the notional proximity of Specificity and left peripheral features (see Ishane and Puskas (2001)). Specificity in fact relates to pre-established elements in the discourse (like a Topic) and narrows down the range of things that can be felicitously referred to (like a Focus)). Left peripheral reinforcers are therefore *not per se* Top/Foc heads and they are *not* optional. They are specificity markers which associate with left peripheral heads and they only surface when a +specific interpretation is needed. Depending on which head in the left periphery they associate with, a [+Top +Spf], [+Foc +Spf] interpretation is obtained. Finally, while DP-internal pre N-complement reinforcers (1a) must always co-occur with a Dem, in certain structures the left peripheral specificity markers can surface without the co-occurrence of a Dem (4). These particular structures also show a peculiar stress pattern. While in (2B’), (3) the reinforcer *qui* is the most heavily stressed element in the DP, in (4) the main stress is on the first syllable of the N *tipo* (‘guy’).

- (1) a. *Questo libro {qui} di sintassi/ di Gianni {*qui} è molto interessante*
 This book here of syntax of Gianni here is very interesting
 `This book here on syntax / of Gianni is very interesting’
 b. *Quel libro di sintassi lì è molto interessante*
 That book of syntax there is very interesting
- (2) A: *Ho letto “La Morte a Venezia” e mi è molto piaciuto*
 `I read “Death in Venice” and I liked it a lot’
 B’: *Quel libro lì, non l’ho mai letto*
 That book there not it-have.1s never read
 `That book there, I have never read’
 B’’: *#Questo libro qui, non l’ho mai letto*
 `This book here, I have never read’
- (3) a. *Quel libro di sintassi Lì ho letto, non quell’articolo*
 That book of syntax THERE have.1s read, not that article
 b. *Quel libro di sintassi lì l’ho comprato ieri, non quel giornale*
 That book of syntax there it-have bought yesterday not that newspaper
- (4) *Il tipo lì, l’ho finalmente incontrato*
 The guy there him-have finally met
 `The specific guy (and we both know who I am referring to), I have finally met him’

References

- Aboh, E. 2004. *The Morphosyntax of Complement-Head Sequences*. Oxford University Press
- Bernstein, J. 1997. Demonstratives and reinforcers in Romance and Germanic languages. *Lingua* 102:87-113
- Bocci, G. 2004. Contrastive focalization on topics and preverbal subjects in Italian. In *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa*
- Brugè, L. 2002. The positions of Demonstratives in the Extended Nominal Projection. In Cinque, G. (ed.) *Functional Structure in DP and IP*. Oxford University Press.
- Cinque, G. 1994. “On the evidence for partial N movement in the Romance DP”. In G. Cinque, J. Koster, J.-Y. Pollock, L. Rizzi and R. Zanuttini (eds.), *Paths Toward Universal Grammar*, 85–110. Georgetown: Georgetown University Press.
- Cinque, G. 2005. Deriving Greenberg’s Univesal 20 and its Exceptions. In *Linguistic Inquiry* 36,3:315-332
- Kayne, R.S. (2002) "On Some Prepositions That Look DP-internal: English *of* and French *de*", ms., New York University.
- Ishane, T. and G. Puskas. 2001. *Specific is not Definite*. In *Generative Grammar in Geneva* 2:39-54