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Introduction and aim - The present proposal is part of a wider research still in progress, which aims at an in-depth study of the syntactic development of Nominal Expressions both synchronically in Romance languages and diachronically from early Latin to Romance (cf. Ledgeway 2012). The analysis will deal with two main aspects:
B. The new values assumed by the distal demonstrative *ille*, which evolves into article and clitic in the passage from Latin to Romance.

For this purpose, a corpus of prose texts is considered. It includes data selected from the literary production of authors active from the end of the 3rd century BC to the end of the 4th century AD.

The Analysis - As regards point (A), the presentation will provide a general hypothesis on the basis of the following evidence from Romance languages:
- Differently from Latin, in a cross-Romance parametric perspective, the postnominal position for demonstratives is not admitted both with proximal and distal demonstrative (ex.1). Only Romanian, Spanish, Catalan and Occitan allow for (exceptional) postnominal position of demonstratives with marked readings (ex.2).
- Contrary to what is found in Latin, the position of the noun in the nominal hierarchy appears to be quite fixed in most Romance varieties. Out of the six structural orders available in Latin (Spevak 2010, Iovino 2012), only two are possible in Italian, namely N > A
- Only Latin admits discontinuous nominal structures (ex.3) (cf. Iovino in press).

Concerning point (B), it will be assumed that *ille* is the strong determiner inserted into SpecDP (cf. Giusti 1993, 1997) (ex.1). However, in late Latin (cf. Harris 1978, Giusti 2001, Ledgeway 2012) it undergoes semantic weakening (loss of the deictic value of “distality”) and becomes a discourse-anaphoric operator, also checked in the same position (ex.5).

As regards the development of the distal demonstrative, *ille* is replaced by a newly formed distal demonstrative *eccu-ille* (Renzi-Salvi 2010), analyzed by Cardinaletti-Giusti (2009) as [SpecDP [SpecDP hic/ille [NP homo]] vs [LPP actor [SpecDP hic/ille [NP actor]] “this man” “man this”]

b. [questo/quel]*[uomo] vs *[uomo[questo/quel/il]] “this/that/the man” “man this/that/the”
c. [ce/le [homme]] vs *[homme [ce/le]] (Fr.)

The Proposal - Latin has a fully fledged nominal structure (more flexible than that of Romance, maybe due to its rich morphology), including a DP and one more peripheral position. Latin allows for: extraction of Adj out of the NP to the DP Left-Periphery; extraction of nominal subconstituents to the CP Left-Periphery under topic/focus interpretations. Romance languages do not allow either of these options and, in order for an element to receive a pragmatically marked interpretation, the whole DP must be dislocated (ex.6). The diachronic analysis shows that there is a connection between the loss of the fronting and the emergence of the article. It is reasonable to suppose that the development of functional heads in Romance disallows the movement of a left-branch because it would violate anti-locality (ex.7).
(2) a. acest/acel program vs program-ul acesta/acela (Rom.) “this/that program”  
b. este/ese/aquel país vs el país este/ese/aquello (Sp.) “this/that country”  
c. aquestes/aquelles opinions vs le opinions aquestes/aquelles(Cat.) “these/those opinions”  
d. aqueste/aquel brave òme vs lo brave òme aqueste/aquel (Occ.) “this/that good man”

(3) a. [parvulis [equestribus [proelis]]] *[piccole_{ind.} [equestri_{dir. battagl}] no movement small horse battles (Caes. Gall. 5,50,1)  
b. [veteres [cives [Romanos [cives]]]] [antichi_{indir.} [cittadini [romani_{dir.}]] partial N-mov old citizens Roman (Liv. 8,11,14)  
c. [asinos[ornato]asinos[clitellarios]asinos]…*[asino[decorato_{indir} [da soma_{dir}.]]] total N-mov donkeys decorated for transport (Cato agr. 10,1)  
d. [patriis [fortunis]] amplissimis * [paterne_{dir.} [fortune]] [normi_{indir.}] partial roll-up of father richness very-large (Cic. Cluent. 31)  
e. [[[equite] Romano] resistente] [[[cavaliere Romano_{dir.}] resistente_{indir.}] total roll-up horse-man nearby Roman (Cic. Verr. II 3,36)  
f. [[LPP Plautina [DP [longa [Plautina [fabula []]]]]*[Plautina_{dir} [lunga_{ind} [NP commedia]]]]LPP by-Plautus long fable (Plaut. Pseud. 2)

(4) Flebat et Fortunata, flebat et Herinnas, tota Cry.IMPERF.3.SG. and Fortunata.NOM.F, cry also Herinnas.NOM.F, all.NOM.F.SG denique familia ... (Petr. 72) so family.NOM.F.SG “And cried Fortunata, also cried Herinnas, so all the family”

(5) Quos oportet sub divo in agro dimittere, ut solem et auram They.ACC. need.3.SG. under light.ABL. in field.ABL. leave.INF. so sun.ACC. and air.ACC patiantur et ambulando per tempore morbum digerant, take.CONJ.3.PL. and walk.ABL.GERUND. time-by-time illness.ACC disease.IND.3.PL. dum varietatem herbarum per suam voluntatem [SpecDP illi [NP morbo]] repugnantes while variety.ACC grass.GEN. spontaneously that.ABL. illness.ABL. refuse.PART.PRES. pascut graze.PRES.3.PL. (Chiron.181) “They need to be left in a field in the light so they can take the sun and the air, and, walking, they can digest the disease by time, while due to illness they grass refusing spontaneously the grass”

(6) *Tutta percìo la famiglia (piangeva)… vs tutta la famiglia percìo (piangeva) (so all the family (cried)…)

(7) …[DP [D [NP [XP] N]]]