Which clues for which V2: a contribution to the typology of V2 on the basis of Old Italian[1]

1.   Introduction

In previous work (Poletto 2006, 2014 and in press) on Old Italian I argued on favor of the idea that all phases are built in a parallel fashion independently from the category they start with, either the verb, Tense or the noun. The parallelism manifests itself in the left periphery of Old Italian in a particularly clear way since each phase, CP, vP and DP, seem to display the same configuration and movement properties, i.e. we can identify a Focus/Operator position preceded by a set of Topics located just at the edge of each phase. This means that we can capture the V2-like property of the CP, scrambling phenomena which yield OV configurations and scrambling phenomena internal to the DP/PP phase by means of one single abstract property independently from the phase. Furthermore, I will show that scrambling phenomena similar to the ones found in the CP, vP and DP are also observed with AdjPs, which opens up the possibility that adjectival phrases (or at least some of them) can also be considered as phases. This paper is framed in a cartographic perspective and assumes, as standardly assumed in cartography, that sentence structure is universally present in the

human brain and not created each time we produce a sentence. The type of argumentation I present here is thus framed in a setting where elements move to positions that already exist and are not created by the element moving (or second merging). One might wonder in which sense it is possible to use the term 'phase' in such a framework, since phases have sense only in a derivational perspective. Notice however, that the cartographic approach is not representational in the traditional sense used in the 80ties of elements only creating chains: cartography foresees feature-driven movement. It is justified to talk about phases also in cartography, since the units investigated here are not simply extended projections of syntactic domains of some sort: the Phase Impenetrability Condition (PIC), which is one of the main properties of phases, is relevant also in the present framework. Therefore, following a tradition initiated with Belletti (2004), I will use the notion of phase even though this article´s perspective is a cartographic one.

Evidently, this view has consequences on the way we interpret the supposed V2 property of Old Italian (and probably Old Romance). On the one hand OI is not to be analyzed as a "standard" V2 language in the same sense as languages like modern German, but on the other hand, it is not identical to modern Italian either, since the CP layer is always active in OI in all main clauses, and requires that the inflected verb moves at least to the Focus/Operator layer. On the other hand, the trigger for V2 is fundamentally different in OI, because it is related to Information structure and not (or not only) to an Agreement mechanism established between C and SpecT as is

generally assumed for Germanic V2. It is probably the case that different stages of evolution of the Old Romance languages display different types of V2, the stage that we observe in OI is already an advanced system, where the V2 property is related to a lower head with respect to the system of modern Germanic. This can contribute to clear the polemic that has been going on in the literature for some time about the V2 nature of Old Romance (see Roberts 1993, for an analysis of V2 in standard terms and Kaiser 2002 and Rinke 2007 for an analysis which stresses the non V2 character of Old Romance). If we define V2 as the obligatory realization of one of the heads in the left periphery of the clause, i.e. the CP layer, then OI was indeed V2, but if we define V2 in terms of the linear restriction typical of modern Germanic, then OI was definitely not a V2 language. On the other hand, the fact that there most probably are different types of V2 systems is relevant to the discussion of what the clues for its loss might have been. In the end, we should reach a sort of typology of possible V2 systems, which can be geographically as well as diachronically represented. The various types of V2 systems might depend on the feature that triggers to obligatory movement to the CP domain. In the Germanic languages, the standard proposal is that this feature is an Agreement feature (see Platzack 1995, Tomaselli 1991). This is strongly supported by the fact that in the Germanic dialects it is possible to observe complementizer agreement, which to my knowledge is not found in Italian varieties. It might be the case that even inside Old Romance the differences between the various languages have to modeled in term of the feature and

hence the project that attracts the verb to the C domain. As for OI, I propose that it is an Operator/Focus feature located in the Focus Field, i.e. the lower part of the CP layer. Other authors have proposed that movement of the verb targets the Fin° head in Old Romance. I will not pursue this hypothesis, because, since this is the view on the Germanic type of V2, we would then expect OI to behave like German, which is not the case. Furthermore, the rise of V2 and its residual cases are both observed with wh-items and more generally operators (see Cruschina 2012 on Focus in Sicilian and Longobardi 1978on Gothic), which target Focus/Op, which indicates that this must be the layer involved. In the present work I will further elaborate on the idea that not only is the structural configuration found in the left periphery of OI always the same across phases, but also the movements to the left periphery are parallel independently of the phase. This means that if the present work is on the right track, we have to take into account also phenomena which up to now have been considered as totally unrelated to the V2 property as clues for the acquisition of the system. In other words, not only phenomena like subject inversion, asymmetry between main and embedded clauses and topicalization could be seen as clues for a V2 system, but also cases of fronting inside the DP/PP[2] and OV orders in front of the past participle can count as clues, since the setting of the property is phase independent.

---

[2] In this work, I will analyze PPs as projecting the same highest category as DPs, namely a KP., In other words, prepositions are treated here as the realization of case, and the only distinction between DPs and PPs is that PPs display an additional projection with respect to DPs, since the KP of oblique cases is more complex than the one of direct cases (see Caha 2009 on this).

In section 2 I summarize the situation of OI on the basis of Benincà (2006) and show that the inflected verb really moves to the left periphery. In section 3 I recapitulate my analysis of OI OV constructions as cases of scrambling which display the same properties found in the CP. In section 4 I argue that inside the DP there are cases of scrambling of internal PPs and adjectives modified by the adverb *molto* 'very', and in section 5 I show that the head noun can indeed raise in some constructions to the left periphery of the DP; the test I will use to show this implies the identification of a structural genitive position located immediately below the left periphery of the DP which is the nominal counterpart of SpecT.

In section 6 I show that also in the domain of AdjP we observe cases of scrambling of the internal argument of the AdjP which feeds the possibility of extraction out of the AdjP into the clausal spine both of arguments, modifiers and also of the adjectival head which can even strand its modifiers in situ.

2.   The properties of the CP in Old Italian

In this section I will briefly summarize the properties of the CP layer in OI. The following sketch is based on Benincà (2006), to whom I refer for a detailed description of related phenomena like enclisis and proclisis, sentential particles and pro drop licensing. The basic idea is that the V2 property of OI is not identical to the one of the Germanic languages for two

reasons: a) OI does not obey the V2 linear restriction typical of modern Germanic because it crucially does not only tolerate V3, which is also possible in Old High German, but V* where the verb can be preceded by several constituent. b) it also tolerates V1 in narrative structures, much as it was the case in Old High German but has come to be rather restricted in modern Germanic.

(1)   E   per volontà de le Virtudi tutta questa roba tra'   poveri dispense
        and for will   of the virtues all   this   stuff among poor dispensed
        'And according to the will of the Virtues dispensed all these goods among the poors' (VeV 99)
(2)   Avemo detto che è rettorica
        have.1pl told   what is rhetorics
        'We have told what rhetorics is' (Rettorica 5)

Since OI is a pro drop language in which pro is licensed by the I to C movement of the inflected verb, cases of subject inversion are not as widespread as they are in languages like the modern Germanic ones. Furthermore, since OI allows for postverbal subjects in the same way as modern Italian does (i.e. for new information Focus in the case of unergative verbs and in all new/broad Focus sentences in the case of unaccusatives), one has to distinguish two types of subject inversion a) the one where the subject is in SpecT and the verb has moved to the C layer (let us call it Germanic inversion) and b) one where the subject is still sitting in the vP, either in a Focus position or in its base position depending on the type of verb which is traditionally referred to as free inversion (see Belletti 1999) for an analysis of

postverbal subjects in modern Italian which carries over to Old Italian).

Hence, in order to prove that Germanic subject inversion exists in Old Italian,

we can only take compound tenses into account, where it is clear that the

subject occurs in front of the past participle. These cases exist, as shown in

(3), where the QP subject is marked in bold:

(3) a.   Eper questi intendimenti ha **catuno**   trovata sua legge
            and by these meanings   has each.one found   his law
            'Through these meanings each one has found his law'
            (VeV 75)
     b.   Adunque sanza gramatica non potrebbe   **alcuno** bene dire…
            so   without grammar not could.3sg anyone well
            speak.inf
            'Without grammar one could not speak well…'
            (Rettorica 48)

(3b) (see also (4) below) represents an even stronger argument that

shows that OI is indeed a language where the verb systematically reaches the

CP domain in main clauses because here the inverted subject also precedes

adverbs which mark the vP border, and therefore must be analyzed as sitting

in the SpecT position. As for the typical third correlate of V2, namely the

asymmetry between main and embedded clauses, Benincà notes that the only

clear asymmetry between main and embedded domains is found in the case

of embedded interrogatives where, as Benincà (2006): states: " any access to

the CP system is blocked." In all other embedded clauses, the asymmetry does

not come up quite so clear, since V2 is possible, though more restricted than

in main clauses (see Poletto 2014: 11ff.) and this is a point we will come

back at the end of the paper. Therefore, it is possible to find subject inversion also in embedded clauses:

(4)   perchè stessero i   Romani sempre poscia securi
           for   were.3pl the Romans always after   safe
           'So that the Romans could be safe for the future'
           (*Pagani* 269)

Still following Benincà (2006), I will assume that the left periphery of the clause in OI is in principle not different from the one of modern Italian, i.e. it contains a low Operator/Focus layer and several Topic projections located lower than Force, where the finite complementizer is sitting. What varies with respect to modern Italian is the accessibility of these projections: in OI the Operator Focus layer is used also for Informational Focus (see Benincà and Poletto 2004) while modern Italian only uses the lower position in the vP for informational Focus (see Belletti 1999). Furthermore, in OI the inflected verb always reaches the Operator°/Focus° position in main clauses, yielding pro drop and subject inversion, while this is not the case in modern Italian. Third, when the SpecOp/Focus position is empty, the inflected verb raises up to Topic , where it licenses a null Topic in its Spec yielding V1 structures and enclisis of the clitics. The layering proposed by Benincà (2006) is the one illustrated in (5).

(5) [Force C°[Rel*wh*C°]/{Frame [ScSett][HT]C°}{TOPIC[LD] [LI] C°}{Focus[I Focus][II Focus]/[Interr*wh*]C°}[Fin C°]}

Hence, in OI the verb must either reach one of the OP/Focus positions if aSpecFocus position is occupied, otherwise it must reach Topic. This

complex left periphery also allows us to capture phenomena like pro drop licensing, which is possible when the verb moves to the left periphery, and enclisis of object clitics, which occurs when the verb moves to Topic. Summing up, the left periphery in OI has the following properties:

(6) a. it is always occupied by the verb
     b. in front of the verb we can have Ø, a single constituent or more than one
     c. the order of the Topics is not fixed, just as in modern Italian
     d. there exist secondary effects of I to C like pro drop and enclisis if the verb   moves to Topic.

3.   The properties of the vP phase in OI

OI also allows for an unexpected amount of OV orders, and this is true even factoring out OV derived by verb second: there are a lot of cases of direct (7a), indirect objects (8a), PPs and even verbal modifiers (7b) and particles located in front of the past participle, which clearly cannot be explained in terms of V2 since they occur lower and which also give rise to multiple scrambling (cf. (8b)).

(7) a. il quale da che ebbe   tutto Egitto vinto…
         whom   since   had.3sg all   Egypt won…
         'since he submitted all Egypt…' (Pagani 83)
     b. Poi lo   fece   fuori   trarre
         that him made.3sg outside take.inf
         'then he had him taken out' (Nov. XIII, 158)
(8) a. ch'elli è a fine venuto
         that he is to end come
         'that he has died' (Tristano 397)

b. Come se ciascuno fosse   di   morte a vita suscitato
    as   if everybody was.sbj.3sg from death to life come.back
    'As if everybody had come back from death to life' (VeV 84)

These cases have been analyzed in Poletto (2014), where I argue that they are to be analyzed as scrambling, i.e. movement to the vP left periphery which also contains an Operator/Focus and Topic positions (see Belletti 2004) and not as a consequence of the fact that OI was an optional OV language due to the influence of Latin. Scrambling is the way OI authors 'mimic' the Latin OV grammar, simply because OV orders are not associated with the typical properties or real OV languages but is clearly a scrambling phenomenon as shown by cases like the following where part of the pre-posed constituent has remained in situ after the past participle, a configuration which is impossible in a real OV language:[3]

(9)   E quand'ebber **questa schiera** fatta **così grossa**
        and when had.3pl this   rank   made so big
        'And when the rank was really big' (VeV 76)
        avegna che neuno possa   buono advocato essere
        né perfetto
        happens that noone can.subj.3sg good advocate be.inf
        nor perfect
        'even if no one can be a good nor perfect lawyer'
        (*Rettorica* 147)

However "real" OV is to be analyzed, these cases show that the OI one is not an OV grammar like German or Japanese.

---

[3] More generally, OI presents lots of cases where an element has been preposed while others remains after the past participle, which is not possible in a real OV language.

The scrambling phenomenon thus displays the same properties as the V2-like in the CP: i.e.

a.   there can be either no scrambling at all, i.e. scrambling is optional
b.   it is possible to scramble one or more elements and
c.   they do not have a fixed word order inside the Topic field

Interestingly, these three properties are identical to the ones found in the CP and which constitute the V2-like property of Old Italian: we can have V1 (which corresponds to no scrambling at all in a)), it is possible to have V3 or V4, i.e. more than one Topic can be found in front of the inflected verb just like more than one scrambled element can be found in front of the past participles and the topicalized elements do not have a fixed word order just like the scrambled elements.

Since these properties are the same, I have proposed in Poletto (2014) to treat V2 and scrambling in the same way: they are both the effect of the peculiar properties that the left periphery has in Old Italian, properties that remain constant across the CP and vP phase.

If the two phases are to be completely parallel, we should also find evidence that the past participle moves in a way which is similar to the one reported for the inflected verb in the CP phase, i.e. the past participle should move to the Operator/Focus position in the left periphery and stay there, or if there is no Operator/Focus element it should be able to move to the Topic position. The proposal of a low FocusP in the vP periphery has already been made by Belletti (2004) for modern Italian: she assumes that this is not a

criterial position, and I do as well. As for possible interference between movements to the CP and movements to the vP left peripheries, under relativized minimality, this should arise in cases in which the features of the two elements that have been displaced are the same and their movement paths cross each other. This means that cases of Focus would not interfere with cases of quantifier floating, as assumed by an anonymous reviewer (see Poletto 2014 for a description of the position of universal quantifiers in the clause). Since it is not always evident whether the elements moved to the vP edge are topics or foci, i.e. whether they have the same features or not, I cannot test this prediction.

Actually, there is evidence that this happens, since there is a clear difference in the movement span of the active past participle between Old and Modern Italian. In Modern Italian the past participle moves to the aspectual projections located higher than the low phase vP, crossing adverbs and bare quantifiers which occur in a post-participial position, as extensively shown by Cinque (1999), who provides empirical arguments to show that the past participle in modern Italian raises higher than the aspectual projections where elements like *tutto,* 'all' *completamente* 'completely' *sempre* 'always' are located. This is not the case in Old Italian, where it is clear that the past participle stops lower than the position of elements like bare *tutto*, which occurs in a position similar to the one found today in French. As shown by Poletto (2014), the same distribution is found with infinitival forms under modal, causative, perception and aspectual verbs.

(10)　　　　e　come l'à tutto perduto
　　　　　　and how it has all　lost
　　　　　　'and how he lost it all' (FR 75)

(11)　　　　seguire　　Idio chi à　**tutto**　　　venduto
　　　　　　follow.inf　God who has everything sold
　　　　　　'(he can) follow God who sold all his possessions'
　　　　　　(Fiore 232)

(12)　　　　perché　non sono　**bene** tutte le cose　che nuocere
　　　　　　possono considerate
　　　　　　because not　are.3pl good all　the things that do.harm.inf
　　　　　　can.3sg considered
　　　　　　'because not all the things that can be dangerous haven been
　　　　　　well considered'
　　　　　　(VeV 59)

(13)　　　　o vuogli　　tu sempre alla　tua　vita stare　　infermo
　　　　　　or want.2sg you always to.the your life　stay.inf sick
　　　　　　'or you want to be sick during all your life' (FSI 204c)

This difference between Modern and Old Italian is straightforward if we adopt Rizzi's (2002) idea that some positions in the structure are criterial in the sense that the elements which land there are frozen in place because they enter a special relation with the head which blocks any further movement. Since Focus/Operator are criterial positions in Rizzi's view, we simply have to say that the distinction between Modern and Old Italian has to do with the span of verb movement, as generally assumed in any theory concerning the loss of the V2-like property in Old Romance, from Adams (1987) to Roberts (1993) onwards. The fact that in OI the verb has to raise to the criterial position while in Modern Italian this is not necessary blocks the past participle in the OP/Focus position in OI. This is actually the fundamental difference with respect to Modern Italian, i.e. the movement path of the past participle. This means that in modern Italian while the inflected

verb moves less with respect to OI, the past participle moves more, i.e. OI had a bigger structural span between the inflected verb and the past participle with respect to the modern variety.

Since the structure of the two phases vP and CP looks identical with respect to the elements that can enter the Specifiers and the raising path of the verbal form, we now turn to the structure of the DP and discuss the possibility to extend the parallel between the vP and the CP seen above to the DP as well.

4.   Scrambling to the DP left periphery

Suppose for a moment that the same V2-like property is replicated also in the DP phase, what type of phenomena should we expect to find in order to prove this idea? In the DP we should also find internal scrambling of the elements in the DP, both of PPs and of AdjPs and, if determiners are the nominal counterpart of complementizers, following the long tradition that the CP and the DP are parallel, we should also find cases in which the N raises

up to the D domain and no article is present, which are not possible in modern Italian.[4]

The first prediction is actually born out, as there are cases of scrambling of a PP internal to the DP to the first position of the DP, the phenomenon is also found with PP[5] (see Andreose 2010) :

(14)   Di dolor madre antica
              of sorrow mother ancient
              'The ancient mother of sorrow' (VN 30)

(15)   Ma molte genti di religione mettono a'   buoi innanzi il carro…[6]
              but many people of religion put.3pl to.the oxen before the wagon
              'Many priests put the cart before the oxen…'
              (Paternostro 101)

Notice that these cases of scrambling, which are rather infrequent in prose, more common in poetry and with PPs with respect to DPs, never display a definite article, but either no article at all or the indefinite article.

(16)   glialtri c'han d'amor neente
              the others who have.3pl of love nothing
              'The others who have nothing of love'
              (C. Davanzati XI, 229)

(17) a.   Fanno di loro gente un capitano c'ha nome Umiltà
              do.3pl of their people a captain that has name humility
              'They elect a captain of their people called Humility'
              (VeV 27)
    b.   Facestilo tu per dare   di me esemplo alle genti?

---

[4] Apart from rather special cases like those of proper nouns, as proposed by Longobardi (1991), whose movement is triggered by a different property.

[5] I assume here that DPs and PP are similar in the sense that, since the nominal phase is complete when it has a KaseP, the P represents the case of the DP and hence, the phase is only closed when the P has been merged.

[6] In this example we find a case in which a definite DP has been prosed. Notice however, that the generalization proposed for the DP, that the head noun can have no definite article is not valid for the element that is itself preposed. Since PPs have an addition case layer, the generalization does not hold for PPs.

did.2sg.it you for give.inf of me example to.the people

‘   Did you do it to make me an example for people?’ (VeV 4)

The same type of restriction is found when there is a prenominal adjective modified by *molto* ‘very’. As noted by Giusti (2010), while in modern Italian it is not possible to have a prenominal adjective modified by *molto* ‘very’, this is actually the case in Old Italian, but only if the DP has no definite article: once again we see that scrambling blocks the presence of the definite article.

(18) a.   Cornacchie sono di molto grande vita
              crows   are of very   long   life
              ‘Crows have a long lifespan’ (Tesoro b 175)
       b.   e di molto grande apparecchiamento in su le carra guerniti
              and of very big setting in on the carts provided
              ‘and provided of a very vast equipment on the carts’
              (Pagani 42)

It is well known fact that OI does not use definite determiners as regularly as modern Italian does (see Renzi 2010), as there are a lot of cases in which a definite determiner is obligatory in modern Italian while it is not in OI.[7] It clearly remains to be seen how the development of the definite article has evolved through time, and it is very probablethat not all cases are alike. However, I will propose that the scrambling of a modified adjective or

---

[7]There are also a few cases of the opposite pattern, for instance, as Renzi (2010) notes when the thematic function of the DP is the one indicating the stuff out of which money is made:

(i)   contossi il fiorino dell’oro (Libro del Guelfo 197)
         counted the florin of-the gold
         ‘counted a florin made of gold’

of a PP internal to the DP to the left periphery of the DP blocks the realization of the definite determiner sinceboth of them reach the DP, one is sitting in the head, the other in the specifier, , while this is not the case for the indefinite determiner, which remains much lower, actually in the lowest head of the left periphery.

If we want to draw a real parallel between the CP/vP phases and the DP phase, the cases of scrambling presented above should be analyzed either as Focus or as Topics: Giusti (2006) proposes for modern Italian that in the DP there exist Topic positions (including a contrastive Topic position) but no Focus. I think that if we abstract away from the contrastive/corrective value of the CP Focus in modern Italian, we can assume that in all phases there exists a lower Focus/Operator field with on top a Topic field, and that the exact value of the elements which can target the position in each field in each phase are variable both across phases and across languages: we have already seen an undebated case of this, since modern Italian only has informational Focus in the vP, while OI also uses the CP to mark this particular type of Focus. Thus, if the left periphery of the DP is similar to the one of the vP[8] and CP, we should have a Topic layer followed by a Focus/Operator layer, both of which are sandwiched between what corresponds to ForceP and what

---

[8] As for a complex left periphery of the vP, I assume here Belletti (2004), (2014) who proposes that in modern Italian there are a Focus and several Topic positions at the edge of the phase which are similar, though not identical to those of the CP. If I am correct here, OI is not different from the modern variety.

corresponds to FinP, which, following Giusti (2006), I will dub here D° and d°.[9]

(19) [DP[PP di me] [D°][TopP [OpP] [dP esemplo [FP [F°~~esemplo~~] [NP [N ~~esemplo~~ [PP ~~di me~~]]]]]]]

Here the preposed element *di me* 'of me' is located in the highest specifier of the DP. Any movement of this sort blocks the occurrence of the definite article by the well known effect of the doubly filled comp filter (DFCF), where head and specifier cannot be both lexicalized at the same time, which means that scrambling is always incompatible with definite articles.

It is to be noted, that scrambling can co-occur with indefinite articles (17a) or within articleless nominals (17b). Since indefinite articles are located in the lower d° position, there is no DFCF effect[10] with the scrambled constituent because they never occupy the head and the Spec of the same projection. This alternation between bare nominals and indefinite DPs can be captured assuming that the head noun can raise to the lowest position in the left periphery of the DP, namely d°, in which case also the indefinite article is blocked. Alternatively the head noun remains lower, in which case an indefinite article can occur.

(20)a. [DP[PP di lor gente] [D°][TopP[OpP] [dP un   [FP [F°capitano]... [NP [N ~~capitano~~ [PP ~~di lor gente~~]]]]]]]

---

[9] The fact that the left periphery of the DP is complex is widely accepted in the cartographic project (see Cinque 2002. Furthermore Giusti 2006 for Romance and, Roehrs 2006, 2009 and 2014 for Germanic have proposed that there are different positions for determiners, Roehrs (2014) explictely proposes that determiners move inside the DP.

[10] See Koopman (1997) for a restatement of the DFCF in minimalist terms.

b. [DP[PP di molto grande] [D°][TopP [OpP] [dP vita [FP~~vita~~... [NP [N ~~vita~~ [PP ~~di molto grande~~]]]]]]]

If the layering of the left periphery of the DP is the one in (19)/(20), then the fact that scrambling and the definite article are incompatible in OI does not necessarily mean that the target position of scrambling is SpecD, as I assumed in Poletto (2014). The incompatibility could also be derived simply by saying that adjectives modified by *molto* are located in the Focus/Operator position, since *molto* has a quantificational nature, and that the definite article is merged lower but cannot move through that position to reach D°, because of the DFCF, and that PPs rather target a Topic-like position, which again interferes with the movement path of the definite articles, though they are not directly located in SpecD. Crucially, in order to capture the distinction between definite and indefinite articles, it must be the case that definite articles are merged in a position higher than d°, where the indefinite article is sitting, but it could still be the case the definite articles are merged lower than D° and moved there. Hence, the effect noted concerning PP and *molto*+adjective scrambling could be derived by the particular combination of the movement path of the definite determiner with the general layering of the left periphery of each phase and not by a simple complementary distribution involving only SpecD and D°.

Up to now, the data clearly show that adopting some version of scrambling is unavoidable if we want to capture data like those in (14) to (18).

What the data clearly reveal is that the first half of the V2-like property of OI also applies to the DP, in the sense that in OI it is possible to move constituents to the left periphery of the DP that cannot be moved any longer in Modern Italian, in the same way it was possible to move to an informational Focus position in the CP which is blocked in Modern Italian. What remains to be proved is the other half of the V2-like property, namely the possibility to move the N to the left periphery, in particular to the d° position, as we have seen to be the case for the inflected verb and for the past participle in the CP and vP respectively. This is what I will show in the next section.

5.   Structural genitive and residual N to d.

In what follows I will show that N to d° is possible in OI because it can cross over a structural genitive position, GenP, located immediately below d°.

Let us first show that GenP exists: the first phenomenon that indicates the existence of this position is the fact that in OI pronouns like *costui/costei/costoro*, 'this man here/this woman here/these people here' *colui/colei/coloro* 'that man there/that woman there/those people there' can either occur after the N and are generally preceded by the preposition *di* 'of' or

a 'to', or they can occur between the definite article and the head noun.[11] The structure is very frequent with the head noun 'tempo' 'time', but is also found with all possible Ns:

(21)   a.   alla potenzia **di costui** (Bono Storie contra i pagani 93)
              to-the power of him.here
              'to the power of this person'
      b.   in casa **a costui** (Bono Fiore di rettorica 19)
              in house of him-here
              'in the house of this person'

(22)   a.   la **costui** anima (Fiori e vita di Filosafi 203b)
              the him-here soul
              'the soul of this person'
      b.   lo **costui** proponimento lodo bene e confermo
              (Cappellano 167)
              this his decision prize well and confirm
              'I prize the decision of this person and confirm it'

That the alternation between the two genitive positions is optional is attested by minimal pairs like the following one found in the same text:

(23)   a.   Al **costui** tempo (Paolino Pieri 15)
              At.the him.here time
      b.   Al tempo **di costui** (Paolino Pieri 16)
              at.the time of him.here
              'At the time of this person'

Interestingly the definite article plus the structural genitive can also be used with deletion of the head noun in a way similar to possessive pronouns like *la sua* 'his' or in a way similar to the English Saxon Genitive which can represent the whole DP in cases 'at the doctor's':

---

[11]The same is found with pronouns like 'altrui' 'of others'. See (44) below for cases like 'l'altrui miserie' 'the miseries of others'.

(24)   che lla **costui** è da laudare
         (De Amore Andrea Cappellano 25)
         that the him.here is to prize
         'that the one of this person is to be prized'

One might think that there is some restriction with respect to the head

noun, for instance that there could be an inalienable possession restriction

here, but this is clearly not the case:

(25)   a.   la costui venuta (Boccaccio Filocolo 61)
                the him.here arrival
         '   his arrival'

These data suggest that the structure of the DP is even more similar to

the one of the clause, because it also has a position for structural case for the

external argument immediately lower than the left periphery just like SpecT

is the structural subject position where nominative case is assigned: I will still

refer to this structural case assignment position as GenP, although it might be

identified with a position that has already been proposed in the literatur, for

instance NumP or PossessorP.[12]

(26) [DP[PP] [D°][TopP[OpP] [dP [GenP [Gen°]... [NP [N]]]]]]

Once we have established that such a position can be occupied by a

specifier in OI, we have to show that the head noun can cross it.

---

[12]Such a position was first proposed by Szabolcsi (1994) and then taken up by a number of
authors. What is new here is the fact that OI could use such a position with a wider range of
elements than Modern Italian, which probably only places there possessive elements, if ever.

A first argument that the noun can raise higher that GenP in OI is provided by the cases of enclitic possessives discussed in Giusti (2010), which today are rather widespread in the Southern Italian dialects, but which are only possible with intrinsically relational nouns, like kinship nouns both in OI and in the modern dialects:

(27)   egli lo torrà al figliuolto (Novellino 138)
         he it will.take at.the son.your
         'he will take it to your son'

Since in the example above, the definite article is present, this means that the head noun raises higher than GenP, but lower than D°. (see Cinque and Krapova 2013 for an analysis that shows that possessives correspond to the subject of the DP as assumed here).

Similar cases are found with a regular genitive of a proper noun:

(28)   a.   La figluola   Guidi Tinaçi d'Aliana…
              the daughter Guido T.   of A.
              'The daughter of Guido Tinazzi of Agliana…' (Streda 221)
        b.   le rede   GuiglelmoGitti…
              the heirs GuglielmoGitti
              'the heirs of G.G.' (Streda 243)

Again, here the structure must be something like (29):

(29) [$_{DP}$ [la] [$_{TopicP}$[$_{OpP}$] [$_{dP}$ figluola [$_{PossP}$ [$_{DP}$ Guidi]...[$_{Poss°}$ figluola   [$_{NP}$ [$_N$ figluola [$_{DP}$ Guidi]]]]]]]]

Another clear case that indicates movement of the head noun to the left periphery is provided by the construction analyzed as construct state by

Longobardi (1991) where nouns like *casa* 'home' clearly move higher than the structural genitive position mentioned above:

(30) a. in casa i Frescobaldi
     in home the F.
     'in Frescobaldis' home' (GVillani b77)
  b. In casa gl'Orciolini
     in home the O.
     'In Orciolinis' home' (CF 126)

Since all these cases are incompatible with the definite article, we have to assume that here the head noun raises up to the D° position.

(31) [$_{DP}$ [casa] [$_{TopicP}$.[$_{OpP}$] [$_{dP}$[$_{GenP}$ [$_{DP}$ gli Orciolini] [$_{GenP}$casa[$_{NP}$ [$_N$ casa[$_{DP}$gli Orciolini]]]]]]]

The same type of construction is also found with other head nouns which imply inalienable possession, like *mano* 'hand', where we find again the same two alternatives found with cases, where both the structural genitive and the prepositional genitive occur in postnominal position, thus showing that the head noun can target the left periphery. Interestingly, also in these cases there is no article at all, either definite or indefinite, which suggests that head noun moves through the left periphery blocking both d°, where the indefinite article originates but also D° where the definite article is merged (or moved).

(32)   per mano s(er) Ruggieri
     for hand Sir Ruggieri
     'by the hand of Sir Ruggieri)

(33)   per mano di s(er) RinieriAlbertani
            by hand of Sir RinieriAlbertani
            'by the hand of Sir RinieriAlbertani'

This alternation between a non prepositional genitive and a prepositiona genitive can be readily explained by making reference to the subject positions in the CP, once again strengthening the parallel with the DP: as a subject can be either pre or postverbal in OI (and Modern Italian), the genitive can be in a higher GenP structural position or in a lower position where it does not get any structural case assigned and needs the preposition *di* to be licensed.

On the other hand, in structures like those in (32) and (33), the head noun *mano* moves through all the heads of the left periphery to reach D° blocking all intermediate positions:

(34) [DP [mano] [TopicP.[~~mano~~] [OpP [~~mano~~]] [dP [GenP Ser Ruggieri] [~~mano~~] [NP [N ~~mano~~ [DP~~Sir Ruggieri~~]]]]]]]

Summing up, in OI there are constructions where we can clearly see movement to the head noun to the left periphery of the DP. However, it is not clear yet whether the parallel with the other two phases is really complete, since in the CP and vP phase the verb moves at least up to the Focus/OP head, while this is not clearly shown by the data I have discussed. All I could prove is that head nouns indeed move to the left periphery, but the exact

position(s)of the scrambled elements and of the different classes of head nouns still remains to be pinned down.[13]

6. Scrambling in the AdjP

Still following the view that all phases are parallel, I will now show that a scrambling phenomenon similar to the ones described above for the vP and the DP is also found within complex AdjPs, which might be an indication that at least some complex AdjPs are phases on a par with the vP and the DP. The following examples illustrate the case in point:

(35)   sono ne la fronte allegri e tristi nel cuore (FF 145)
             are in the front merry and sad in in-the heart
             'who look happy but are sad in their hearts'
(36)   a.   uomo di cupidità pieno da non potersi saziare
             (Bono Giamboni delle Storie contro i pagani 382)
             man of greed full to not can.himself satiate
             'a man so full of greed that he cannot be glad with anything'
       b.   uomo di fede e di sapienzia pieno,
             (Bono Giamboni delle Storie contro i pagani457)
             man of faith and of knowledge full
             ' a very knowledgeable andfaithful man'
       c.   e di vanagloria pieno
             (Bono Giamboni delle Storie contro i pagani80)
             and of boastfulness full
             'and full of boastfulness'
       d.   Questo luogo era di cotali felloníe pieno
             (Lancia A.Eneide volgarizzata 304)
             This place was of such crimes full
             'This place was full of such crimes'

---

[13]SeePoletto (in press) for an analysis of cases of preverbal restrictive adjectives in terms of movement to the left periphery.

e. ch'io rimasi di paura pieno (Dante, Rime 65)
    that I remained of fear full
    'that I was full of fear'

(37) a. ed è d' animo semplice, e di vile cibo contento
        (Bono Giamboni, Vegezio Arte della guerra 9)
         and is of soul simple and of plainfood happy
        'and he is a simple person happy with plain food'

    b. Rimase Pandar di Troiol contento (Boccaccio Filostrato 87)
        remained Pandar of Troiol happy
        'Pandar was happy about Troiol'

    c. e il nostro Giove è di tutte queste cose contento
        (Boccaccio Filocolo 62)
        and the our Giove is of all these things happy'
        'and our Jove is happy about all these things'

The examples above all display the complement of the adjective in

pre-adjectival position, an order which is impossible in modern Italian[14]

It is clear that all these cases are the result of a scrambling

phenomenon, as they alternate with cases in which the complement is in post-

adjectival position as it is obligatorily the case also in Modern Italian:

(38) a. ma non era pieno di grande senno
        (Brunetto Latini, Rettorica 94)
        but not was full of great intelligence
        'but he was not very intelligent'

    b. essendo ivi il re pieno di libidine,
        (Bono Giamboni, Delle Storie contra i pagani 71)
        being there the king full of lust
        'being the king full of lust'

    c. e contento di te medesimo
        (An. Tesoro di Brunetto Latini c 331)
        being glad of you same
        'being glad of yourself'

    d. tu sarai contento di queste lagrime
        (An. Rimedid'Amore di Ovidio 358)
        you will.be glad of these tears

---

[14] In modern Italian the only possible cases are fixed expressions with the adjective *caro*
'dear' and a pronoun like *a me caro* 'to me dear which however have a high style flavor.

'you will be glad of these tears'

Furthermore, there are cases where part of the complement is left on the right side of the adjective, thus showing that the base position of the complement is to the right of the adjective and not directly to the left as one would expect from OV languages:

(39)   egl'era di grande misericordia pieno verso i bisognosi.
          (An. Storia del Santo Gradale,36)
          he was of big mercy full towards the needing.people
          'he was full of great mercy for people in need'
      The scrambled complements can probably target various positions, as

they can be located either before modifiers like *tanto* 'much' or *solo* 'only'

but also after them:

(40)   ch' è tanto di valor pieno   (Cavalcanti Rime 561)
          that is much of valor full
          'who is really full of valor'
(41)   Fu di questo accidente tanto contento in se medesimo Tarolfo
          (Boccaccio, Filocolo 399)
          was of this event very glad in him self
          'was himself very glad of this event'
(42)   esser dovresti sol di ciò contento (Boccaccio, Filostrato 122)
          be should only of this glad
          'you should only be glad of this'

Furthermore, there is evidence that also the adjectival head moves, as

it can be found on the left of modifiers which are typically pre-adjectival in

Modern Italian:

(43)   perocché fu ricco maravigliosamente.
          (An. Pistole di Seneca 311)
          because was rich wonderfully

'because he was wonderfully rich'

Therefore, we can conclude that the scrambling operation feeds further movement of a) the adjectival head (as in (44) *ricco* 'rich')or b) the modifier (see (46) *molto* 'very') or c) of the complement (see (45 '*di poco*' 'with few things') to a higher position outside of the AdjP, which can be observed inside the DP of which the AdjP is a modifier or directly in the clausal spine (generally in the left periphery of the CP):

(44)   Ricchi sono degli altrui danni, ricchi de l'altrui miserie
        (Valerio Massimo volg. 466)
        Rich are of.the other damages, rich of the other's miseries
        'They are rich of others' damages rich of the miseries of
        other people'
(45)   Loda colui, che di poco è ricco, e che stima le ricchezze,
        secondo che l'uso richiede (An. Pistole di Seneca 296)
        Prize him-there, that of little is rich and who estimates the
        richnesses accordin to the use requires
        'Prize the one, who is rich with few things, and who evaluate
        richness according to its usage'
(46)   ma molto è piccola cosa dire dell'arte
        (Brunetto Latini, Rettorica 70)
        but very is little thing to.say of the art
        'but it is a little thing to say about the art'

These observations lend support to the idea that the same type of scrambling phenomenon observed in the vP and in the DP phases is also possible within AdjP. So far, I have analyzed scrambling in the same vein as I think the OI V2-like property should be analyzed, i.e. as movement of the verbal head to the left periphery triggered by a requirement related to the projections that encode information structure in the CP. Now, the fact that

also the AdjP displays the same set of phenomena points towards the idea that also AdjPs are phases, since they have a left periphery similar to the one of the other phases.

7. Conclusion

In this work I have tried to pursue the idea that phases are built in a parallel fashion with respect to the left periphery they display at their edge and with respect to the movements allowed to this area. In OI the left periphery is articulated in two sets of projections, a lower one for Operators/Focus, and a higher one for Topics. As first proposed by Rizzi (1997) we find a position related to the internal phase lower than the Focus/Operator field and a position related to the external structure on top of the Topic layer. I have shown that in all phases it is possible to move elements that cannot be moved in Modern Italian: in the CP we have movement to Informational Focus, in the vP we can scramble any sort of constituent occurring within the vP, direct and indirect objects, passive subjects but also verbal modifiers. Crucially the scrambling phenomenon found in the vP has exactly the same distributional properties found in the CP: movement is

optional, there can be more than one element moved, and the ordering of the moved elements is not fixed. I have also shown that in the DP it is also possible to observe optional scrambling phenomena to the edge of the DP, though it is more difficult to pin down exactly which projection in the left periphery is targeted in the various types of movements, since it is not clear in which position the definite article is merged, either D° or a lower position with subsequent movement to D°; as recently proposed for complementizers like *che* 'that'. In order for the hypothesis to be made more precise independent research is needed on the path of the definite article in OI. The DP presents also a striking similarity with the clausal and vP phases, as it has a structural genitive position similar to SpecT (and Specv where the subject is merged) immediately below the left periphery. Since scrambling phenomena are also found in the AdjP, I have proposed that AdjPs must also be phases with their own left periphery which is the target of these scrambling phenomena. If the view I have presented here is correct, then the type of V2-like property of OI is fundamentally different from the one of modern German and rather looks as the last step of a change which started in Latin and turned the basic word order of the constituents from OV to VO. The fact that the phenomenon has disappeared in Italian (and in general in Romance except for Rhaetoromance) while it has stabilized in Germanic (other than English) indicates that the two phenomena should be kept distinct in terms of triggers and probably also in terms of target position for movement. Another interesting effect found is that in OI there was more structural distance between the past participle and the

auxiliary than there is in modern Italian, this might also be a development related to the loss of scrambling, hence of V2, since they are two sides of the same coin. Furthermore in the study of the progressive loss of V2 in Romance, we should also investigate the way scrambling has progressively decreased in the various phases (vP, DP and AdjP), since the loss of the V2-like property must be related to a general loss of movement to the left periphery of all the other phases. Future research will establish whether scrambling phenomena have been lost in different phases at the same speed (as the constant rate hypothesis put forth by Kroch (1989) suggests), but in case we were to find slightly different developmental paths, they could be a precious indication of the differences found among the various left peripheries that must stem from the types of features each phase possesses.

References

Adams, Marianne. 1987. From Old French to the Theory of pro-drop. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 5: 1-32.

Andreose, Alvise. 2010. Il sintagma preposizionale. In *Grammatica dell'italiano antico*, Lorenzo Renzi & Giampaolo Salvi (eds), 617-714. Bologna: Il Mulino.

Belletti, Adriana. 1999. Inversion as focalization and related questions. *Catalan Working Papers in Linguistics* 7: 9-45.

Belletti, Adriana. 2004. Aspects of the low IP area. In *The Structure of CP and IP*, Luigi Rizzi (ed), 16-51. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Benincà, Paola. 2006. A Detailed Map of the Left Periphery of Medieval Romance. In *Negation, Tense and Clausal Architecture: Cross-linguistics Investigations*, Raffaella Zanuttini, Héctor Campos, Elena Herburger & Paul Portner (eds), 53-86. Georgetown: Georgetown University Press.

Benincà, Paola & Cecilia Poletto. 2004. Topic, Focus and V2: defining the CP sublayers. In *The structure of CP and IP*, Luigi Rizzi (ed), 52-75. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Caha, Pavel. 2009. The Nanosyntax of Case. PhD dissertation, CASTL, University of Tromsoe.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and Functional Heads*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 2002. Functional Structure in DP and IP. In *The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, Guglielmo Cinque & Luigi Rizzi (eds), 1- 233. New York: Oxford University Press.

Cinque, Guglielmo & Iliana Krapova. 2013. The Case for Genitive Case in Bulgarian. In *The Nominal Structure in Slavic and Beyond*, Lilia Schürcks, Anastasia Giannakidou & Urtzi Etxeberria (eds), 237-274. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Cruschina, Silvio. 2012. *Discourse-related features and functional projections*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Giusti, Giuliana. 2006. Parallels in clausal and nominalperiphery. In *Phases of Interpretation,* Mara Frascarelli (ed), 163-84. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Giusti, Giuliana. 2010. Il sintagma aggettivale. In *Grammatica dell'italiano antico,* Lorenzo Renzi & Giampaolo Salvi (eds), 593-616.Bologna: Il Mulino.

Holmberg, Anders & Christer Platzack. 1995. *The Role of Inflection in Scandinavian Syntax*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kaiser, Georg. 2002. *Verbstellung und Verbstellungswandel in den romanischen Sprachen* [Linguistische Arbeiten; 465]. Tübingen: Niemeyer Verlag.

Koopman, Hilda. 1997. The Doubly Filled C Filter, the Principle of Projection activation and historical change. Ms. UCLA.

Kroch, Anthony. 1989. Reflexes of grammar in patterns of language change. *Language Variation and Change* 1: 199–244.

Longobardi, Giuseppe. 1978. Problemi di sintassi gotica. Tesi di laurea, Università di Pisa.

Longobardi, Giuseppe. 1991. Extraction from NP and the proper notion of head government. In *The Syntax of Noun Phrases.Configuration, parameters and empty categories,* Alessandra Giorgi & Giuseppe Longobardi (eds), 57-112. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Poletto, Cecilia. 2006. Parallel Phases: a study on the high and low left periphery of Old Italian. In *Phases of Interpretation*, Mara Frascarelli (ed), 261-94. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Poletto, Cecilia. 2014. *Word Order in Old Italian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Poletto, Cecilia. 2015. Word orders in the Old Italian DP. In *Beyond functional Sequence,* Ur. Shlonsky (ed.), 109-127. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Renzi, Lorenzo. 2010. L'articolo. In *Grammatica dell'italiano antico*, Lorenzo Renzi & Giampaolo Salvi (eds), 297-347. Bologna: Il Mulino.

Rinke, Esther. 2007. *Syntaktische Variation aus synchronischer und diachronischer Perspektive: die Entwicklung der Wortstellung im Portugiesischen*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery. In *Elements of Grammar,* Liliane Haegeman (ed), 281-337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Rizzi, Luigi. 2002. Locality and Left Periphery. In *Structures and Beyond. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures,* Adriana Belletti (ed), 223-251. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Roberts, Ian. 1993. *Verbs and Diachronic Syntax: a Comparative History of English and French*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Roehrs, Dorian & Marit Julien. 2014. Adjectives in German and Norwegian: Differences in Weak and Strong Inflections. In *Adjectives in Germanic and Romance* [Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistic Today-Series 212], Petra Sleeman, Freek Van de Velde & Harry Perridon (eds), 245-261. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Szabolcsi, Anna. 1994. The noun phrase. In *Syntax and Semantics: The Syntactic Structure of Hungarian* (vol. 27), Ferenc Kiefer & Katalin Kiss (eds), 179-275. San Diego: Academic Press.

Tomaselli, Alessandra. 1990. *La sintassi del verbo finito nelle lingue germaniche*. Padova: Unipress.