The Internal and External Syntax of Nominal Expressions from Latin to Romance (poster)

Rossella Iovino, University Ca'Foscari of Venice, rossella.iovino@unive.it

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:

  A. The diachronic evolution of the nominal left-periphery (cf. Giusti 1996).
  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 demostratives 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$_{dir.}$ > A$_{indir.}$ and A$_{indir.}$ > N > A$_{dir.}$ (Cinque 2010) (ex.3).

- 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 [$_{DP}$ que [$_{D'}$ [$_{D°}$ -l/la/i/le]]]. As for the proximal demonstrative, given that *hic* is monosyllabic, it is replaced by a new proximal demonstrative *eccu-iste*, parallel to *eccu-ille*. Therefore, it might be a case of grammaticalization.

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 subcostituents 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).

(1) a. [$_{SpecDP}$ hic/ille [$_{NP}$ homo]] vs [$_{LPP}$ actor [$_{SpecDP}$ hic/ille [$_{NP}$ actor]] "this man" "man this"
     b. [**questo/quel/l'**[uomo]] vs *[uomo[**questo/quel/il**]]"this/that/the man""man this/that/the"
     c. [**ce/le** [homme]] vs *[homme [**ce/le**]] (Fr.)

(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 les 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 [proeliis]]] *[piccole$_{ind.}$ [equestri$_{dir.}$ battaglie]] *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[ornatos[~~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]] [enormi$_{indir.}$] *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 Roman nearby (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

    <u>*denique*</u> **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.

    pascunt 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 time by time, while due to illness they graze refusing spontaneously the grass"

(6) *****Tutta** <u>*perciò*</u> **la famiglia** *(piangeva)*… vs **tutta la famiglia** *perciò (piangeva)* (so all the family (cried)…)

(7) …[$_{DP}$ [$_{D'}$ **D** [$_{NP}$ [XP] N]]]

References Cardinaletti, A./G. **Giusti**, 2009, "Casi di accordo facoltativo nei sintagmi nominali" *XXXV Incontro di Grammatica Generativa, Università di Siena.* **Cinque**, G.. 2010. *The Syntax of Adjectives. A Comparative Study.* The Mit Press. **Giusti**, G. 1993. *La sintassi dei determinanti. Unipress.* **Giusti**, G 1996. "Is there a FocusP and a TopicP in the noun Phrase structure?", *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics 6.2: 105-128.* **Giusti**, G. 1997. "The Categorial Status of Determiners". In Liliane Haegeman (a cura di) *The New Comparative Syntax.* Longman, pp. 95-123. **Giusti**, G. 2001. "The Birth of a Functional Category: from Latin ILLE to the Romance article and personal pronoun". In G. Cinque and G. Salvi (eds) *Current Studies in Italian Syntax. Essays offered to Lorenzo Renzi.* North Holland, pp. 155-171. **Harris**, M. 1978. "The marking of definiteness in Romance". In J. Fisiak (ed) *Historical Morphology.* Mouton, pp. 141-156. **Iovino**, R-. 2012, *La sintassi dei modificatori nominali in latino.* Lincom. **Iovino**, R. **in press**. *Osservazioni diacroniche sulle espressioni nominali discontinue.* **Ledgeway**, A 2012. *From Latin to Romance. Morphosyntactic Typology and Change.* OUP. **Renzi**, L./G. **Salvi**. 2010. *Grammatica dell'italiano antico.* il Mulino. **Roberts**, I./A. **Roussou**. 2003. *Syntactic Change: A Minimalist Approach to Grammaticalization.* CUP. **Spevak**, O. 2010. *Constituent Order in Classical Latin Prose.* Benjamins.