

# Word Order Change

---

Edited by

ANA MARIA MARTINS

and

ADRIANA CARDOSO

**OXFORD**  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

# OXFORD

UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford, OX2 6DP,  
United Kingdom

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.  
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,  
and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of  
Oxford University Press in the UK and in certain other countries

© editorial matter and organization Ana Maria Martins and Adriana Cardoso 2018  
© the chapters their several authors 2018

The moral rights of the authors have been asserted

First Edition published in 2018

Impression: 1

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in  
a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the  
prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted  
by law, by licence or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics  
rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the  
above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the  
address above

You must not circulate this work in any other form  
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

Published in the United States of America by Oxford University Press  
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, United States of America

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Data available

Library of Congress Control Number: 2017962197

ISBN 978-0-19-874730-7

Printed and bound by  
CPI Group (UK) Ltd, Croydon, CRO 4YY

Links to third party websites are provided by Oxford in good faith and  
for information only. Oxford disclaims any responsibility for the materials  
contained in any third party website referenced in this work.

# Contents

<i>Series preface</i>	vii
<i>List of figures and tables</i>	viii
<i>List of abbreviations</i>	x
<i>Notes on contributors</i>	xx
1. Word order change from a diachronic generative syntax perspective <i>Ana Maria Martins and Adriana Cardoso</i>	1
<b>Part I. Targets for movement: Changes in the functional architecture of the clause</b>	
2. Configurational change in Indo-European coordinate constructions <i>Moreno Mitrović</i>	19
3. Discontinuous noun phrases and remnant-internal relativization in the diachrony of Portuguese <i>Adriana Cardoso</i>	45
4. The relative cycle in Hungarian declaratives <i>Julia Bacskai-Atkari</i>	68
5. Word order change at the left periphery of the Hungarian noun phrase <i>Barbara Egedi</i>	88
<b>Part II. Triggers for movement: Changes in nature or stability</b>	
6. Particle-verb order in Old Hungarian and complex predicates <i>Veronika Hegedűs</i>	107
7. An effect of residual T-to-C movement in varieties of English <i>Judy B. Bernstein</i>	123
8. Word order and information structure in the Würzburg Glosses <i>Cara M. DiGirolamo</i>	143
<b>Part III. Verb movement into the left peripheries</b>	
9. Subject inversion in transitive sentences from Classical to Modern European Portuguese: A corpus-based study <i>Charlotte Galves and Alba Gibrail</i>	163
10. Analyticization and the syntax of the synthetic residue <i>Chris H. Reintges and Sonia Cyrino</i>	179

11. Loss of <i>laten</i> -support in embedded infinitivals in fifteenth-century Low Saxon <i>Gertjan Postma</i>	202
12. The distribution of quantifiers in Old and Modern Italian: Everything or nothing <i>Jacopo Garzonio and Cecilia Poletto</i>	221
<b>Part IV. Types of movement and its constraints: Word order change in Latin</b>	
13. The decline of Latin VOAux: Neg-incorporation and syntactic reanalysis <i>Lieven Danckaert</i>	243
14. On the decline of edge-fronting from Latin to Romance <i>Adam Ledgeway</i>	264
<i>References</i>	279
<i>Index of names</i>	307
<i>Index of languages</i>	311
<i>Index of subjects</i>	313

## List of abbreviations

0	a head-level category
'	an intermediate-level category (within X-bar theory)
^	a movement triggering feature
*	an asterisk marks an ungrammatical sentence
&	Coordination (head)
&P	Coordination Phrase
μ	coordinating functional head
√	Root
√P	Root Phrase
[ε]	a [EPP]-like feature, which, unlike [EPP], attracts and induces movement of the closest and the smallest syntactic object, a terminal/head
[±ε]	a notation that refers to whether a particle is a Wackernagel element, requiring second-position ([+ε]), or not ([−ε])
[F]/+F/−F	Focus feature; diacritic used to mark focused elements
φ-features	person-number features
[+N]	nominal feature
$X^{min}$	a minimal syntactic category
$X_{\pi}^0$	a phasal head
$X_{\pi}P$	a phasal complement
∅	empty / empty category
0	a notation for phonological silence
1	first person
2	second person
3	third person
2BoTU	<i>Die Boğazköy Texte im Umschrift</i> (see end of Chapter 2)
A-movement	argument(al) movement
A'-movement	non-argument(al) movement
ABL	Ablative
ABS	Absolutive
ACC/Acc	Accusative
AcI	<i>Accusativus cum Infinitivus</i>
ACT	Active
AD	Anno Domino
ADE	Adessive

---

Adv	Adverb
<i>Aen.</i>	<i>Aeneid</i> (see end of Chapter 2)
AGR	Agreement
AGR <sub>C</sub>	Agreement in complementizer
AgrOP	Object Agreement Phrase
AgrSP	Subject Agreement Phrase
AGR <sub>T</sub>	Agreement in tense
Alb	Albanian
ALL	Allative
<i>Anecd.</i>	<i>Anecdota from Irish Manuscripts</i> (see end of Chapter 2)
AOR	Aorist
ARG	Argument
Asp	Aspect
AspP	Aspect/Aspectual Phrase
Aux	Auxiliary
AuxNegSOV	Auxiliary-Negation-Subject-Object-Verb order
AuxSO-Neg-V	Auxiliary-Subject-Object-Negation-Verb order
AuxSOV	Auxiliary-Subject-Object-Verb order
AuxVP	Auxiliary-Verbal Phrase order
b.	born
BC	Before Christ
BCE	Before the Common/Current Era
BHR	Biberauer, Holmberg, and Roberts (2014)
<i>BP</i>	<i>Bhāgavatapurāṇa</i> (see end of Chapter 2)
c.	century
C	Complementizer
c-command	constituent command
C-NSR	Nuclear Stress Rule (sensitive to asymmetric c-command)
c-selection	category selection
ca.	<i>circa</i>
CA.	<i>Codex Argenteus</i> (see end of Chapter 2)
Jn.	<i>John</i>
Mk.	<i>Mark</i>
Mt.	<i>Matthew</i>
Caes.	Caesar
B. C.	<i>De Bello Ciuili</i>
Gal.	<i>De Bello Gallico</i>
Cal.	Calabrian (dialects of extreme south of Italy)
Cat.	Catalan

CCC	<i>CompertCon Culainn</i> (see end of Chapter 2)
CE	Common/Current Era
Celtib.	Celtiberian
CEP	Contemporary European Portuguese
Cic.	Cicero
Att.	<i>Epistulae ad Atticum</i>
Cat.	<i>In Catilinam</i>
De Or.	<i>De oratore</i>
Diu.	<i>De diuinatione</i>
Fam.	<i>Epistulae ad familiares</i>
Nat. D.	<i>De natura deorum</i>
Phil.	<i>Orationes Philippicae</i>
Off.	<i>De officiis</i>
Or.	<i>De oratore</i>
<i>prou. cons.</i>	<i>De prouinciis consularibus</i>
<i>Rab. Perd.</i>	<i>Pro Rabirio Perduellionis Reo</i>
<i>S. Rosc.</i>	<i>Pro Sexto Roscio Amerino</i>
<i>Sen.</i>	<i>De senectute</i>
CIL	<i>Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum</i>
CIL <sup>2</sup>	<i>Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum</i> , 2nd edition
CL	Clitic
Class	Classifier
ClassP	Classifier Phrase
CIP	Classical Portuguese
CLuw	Cuneiform Luwian
CM.	<i>Codex Marianus</i> (see end of Chapter 2)
Jn.	<i>John</i>
Mt.	<i>Matthew</i>
COM	Comitative
COMP	Comparative / Complementizer
Comp	Complementizer
COND	Conditional
CONJ	Conjunction
COP	Copula
CP	Complementizer Phrase / the set of functional projections of the CP field
CRH	Constant Rate Hypothesis
(CS)OVAux	Complementizer-Subject-Object-Verb-Auxiliary order
D	Determiner
DAT	Dative

---

DEF	Definite
DEL	Delative
DEM/Dem	Demonstrative
DemP	Demonstrative Phrase
DEON	Deontic
DEP	Dependent
DET/Det	Determiner
DIM	Diminutive
DIR	Directional
Dist	Distributive quantifier
DistP	Distributive-quantifier phrase
DL	Dual
DP	Determiner Phrase
DSL	<i>Dictionary of the Scots Language</i>
E/CSR	Emphatic/Contrastive Stress Rule
E-language	External language
EA	External Argument
ECM	Exceptional Case Marking
EL	Elativ
EMP	Emphatic Particle
EP	Extended Projection / European Portuguese
EPP	Extended Projection Principle
ESP	Earlier stages of Portuguese
EXT	External
F	Feminine / unspecified functional head / Focus feature
Fin	Finiteness
FinP	Finiteness Phrase
Foc	Focus
FocP	Focus Phrase
FOFC	Final-over-Final-Constraint
ForceP	Force Phrase
FP	unspecified functional projection
FPR	Focus Prominence Rule
Fr.	French
FR	<i>Fiore di rettorica</i> (see end of Chapter 12)
FUT	Future
Gai.	Gaius
<i>Inst.</i>	<i>Institutiones</i>
Gaul.	Gaulish

GEN	Genitive
Goth.	Gothic
Gr.	Greek
Hist. Aug.	<i>Historia Augusta</i>
Hit.	Hittite
HMC	Head Movement Constraint
Hom.	Homer
<i>Il.</i>	<i>Iliad</i>
HPP	Head Preference Principle
I-language	Internal-language
IA	Internal Argument
IE	Indo-European
Iir.	Indo-Iranian
Il.	<i>Iliad</i> (see end of Chapter 2)
ILL	Illative
IMP	Imperative
IMPERF	Imperfect
IMPERS	Impersonal clitic <i>se</i>
IMPF	Imperfect
IND	Indicative
INDEF	Indefinite
INE	Inessive
INF/inf	Infinitive
INST/INSTR	Instrumental
INT/Int	Interrogative
int. al.	<i>inter alia</i>
INT.ARG	Internal Argument
IO	Indirect Object
IP	Inflection Phrase / the set of functional projections of the IP field
IpI	<i>Imperativus pro Infinitivo</i>
IS	Information Structure
It.	Italian
IV <sub>2</sub>	Infinitival verb-second
IX	ninth class
J	Junction (head)
JP	Junction Phrase
Kal.	<i>Kalauz</i> (see end of Chapter 5)
KUB	<i>Keilschrifturkunden aus Boğazköy</i> (see end of Chapter 2)
Lat.	Latin

---

LBC	Left Branch Condition
LCA	Linear Correspondence Axiom
Lex	Lexical
lh	The Irish prefaces from the Liber Hymnorum (in POMIC)
LMP	Late Merge Principle
LOC	Locative
M	Masculine
MAND	<i>Morphological Atlas of the Dutch Dialects</i> (MAND)
Mart.	Martial ( <i>Epigrammata</i> )
Mbh	<i>Mahābhārata</i> (see end of Chapter 2)
MID	Middle
MI	Milan Glosses
Mod	Modal
ModP	Modal Phrase
MS.	Manuscript
Myc.	Mycenaean
N	Noun / Neuter
n-word	negative word
NAI	Negative Auxiliary Inversion
NEG/Neg	Negation / Negative Particle
Neg-SOVAux	Negation-Subject-Object-Verb-Auxiliary order
NegP	Negation Phrase
NOM	Nominative
Nov.	<i>Il Novellino</i> (see end of Chapter 12)
NP	Noun Phrase
NREL	Negative Relative Particle
NSR	Nuclear Stress Rule
NumP	Number Phrase
O/OBJ	Object
OBL	Oblique
OCS	Old Church Slavonic
OI	Old Italian
OIr.	Old Irish
OP	Old Portuguese
Op	Operator
Or.	<i>De Oratore</i> (see end of Chapter 2)
OSV	Object-Subject-Verb order
OV	Object-Verb order
Ov.	Ovid

<i>Met.</i>	<i>Metamorphoses</i>
OVI	<i>Opera del Vocabolario Italiano</i>
OVNegAux	Object-Verb-Negation-Auxiliary order
OVS	Object-Verb-Subject order
OVSAux	Object-Verb-Subject-Auxiliary order
P	Phrase / Preposition
p-movement	prosodically motivated movement
PART	Participle
PASS	Passive
PassP	Passive Past Participle
PastP	Past Participle
PCL	Particle
PERF	Perfect
PERL	Perlative
PF	Phonological Form
PIC	Phase Impenetrability Condition
PIE	Proto-Indo-European
PJ	<i>Punyavanta-Jātaka</i> (see end of Chapter 2)
PL/pl	Plural
PLD	Primary Linguistic Data
POA	Porto Alegre (Brazil)
Pol	Polarity
POMIC	Parsed Old and Middle Irish Corpus
POSS	Possessive / Possessee/Possessum (suffix on the head noun that encodes its being possessed)
PossP	Possession Phrase
PP	Prepositional Phrase / Adpositional Phrase
pP	particle Phrase
PPRF	Pluperfect
Pred	Predicative
PredP	Predicative Phrase
PREP	Preposition
PRES	Present
PRET	Preterite
PRF	Perfect
<i>pro</i> /PRO	Null Pronoun
PROGR	Progressive
PRS	Present
PRT	Particle / Preterite

PrtP	Particle Phrase
P.S.	<i>Post Scriptum</i> corpus (see end of Chapter 3)
PST	Past
Pt.	Portuguese
PTCL	Particle
PTCP	Participle
PV	Preverb
Q	Quantifier / Interrogative / Question Particle
Q. Curt.	Quintus Curtius
<i>Hist.</i>	<i>Historiae Alexandri Magni</i>
QP	Quantifier Phrase
QUOT	Quotative
R	reference time
REFL	Reflexive
REL/rel	Relative
RRC	Restrictive Relative Clause
RV	<i>R̥gveda saṃhitā</i> (see end of Chapter 2)
S	Subject
S-NSR	Nuclear Stress Rule (sensitive to selectional ordering)
s-selection	semantic selection
S-structure	Surface structure
SBJ	Subject
SBJV	Subjunctive
SC	Small Clause
Sen.	Seneca
<i>Ben.</i>	<i>De Beneficiis</i>
seq.	sequential
SG/sg	Singular
Skt.	Sanskrit
Sl.	Slavonic
SO-Neg-VAux	Subject-Object-Negation-Auxiliary order
SOV	Subject-Object-Verb order
SOVAux	Subject-Object-Verb-Auxiliary order
Sp.	Spanish
Spec	Specifier
Srd.	Sardinian
STAT	Stative
StBoT	<i>Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten</i> (see end of ch- 2)
SU	Subject

SUB	Sublative
SUBJ/subj	Subjunctive / Subject
SubjP	Subject(-of-Predication) Phrase
SUBS	Substantive
SUP	Superessive
SUPPL	Suppletive base
SV	Subject-Verb order / <i>Sposizione di Vangeli</i> (see end of Chapter 12)
SVO	Subject-Verb-Object order
SVOAux	Subject-Verb-Object-Auxiliary order
SXO	Subject-unspecified constituent-Object order
SXV	Subject-unspecified constituent-Verb order
T	Tense
t	trace
TA	Tocharian A
Tac.	Tacitus
<i>Hist.</i>	<i>Historiae</i>
TB	Tocharian B
TERM	Terminative
THT	<i>Die Speisung des Bodhisattva vor der Erleuchtung</i> (see end of Chapter 2)
TAME	Tense-Aspect-Mood-Evidentiality
TN	Tennessee
TochA	Tocharian A
TOP/Top	Topic
TopP	Topic Phrase
TP	Tense Phrase
TYC	<i>Tycho Brahe Parsed Corpus of Historical Portuguese</i> (see end of Chapter 3)
u	uninterpretable (feature)
v/v	light verb
V	Verb
V <sub>1</sub>	Verb-first
V <sub>2</sub>	Verb-second
VAuxO	Verb-Auxiliary-Object order
Var.	Varro
<i>R.</i>	<i>De re rustica</i>
VC	<i>Vita Constantini</i> (see end of Chapter 2)
Ven.	Venetic
VeV	<i>Il Libro de' Viz e delle Virtudi</i> (see end of Chapter 12)
Vir.	Virgil

---

<i>Aen.</i>	<i>Aeneid</i>
VM	Verbal Modifier
VNegAux	Verb-Negation-Auxiliary order
VO	Verb-Object order
VOAux	Verb-Object-Auxiliary order
VOC	Vocative
VONegAux	Verb-Object-Neg-Auxiliary order
VOS	Verb-Object-Subject order
<i>v</i> P	Light verb Phrase
VP	Verb/Verbal Phrase
VPAux	Verbal Phrase-Auxiliary order
VS	Verb-Subject order
VSO	Verb-Subject-Object order
VT	<i>Vetus Testamentum Arminiacae</i> (see end of Chapter 2)
Mt.	<i>Matthew</i>
VXS	Verb-unspecified phrase-Subject order
w	word(s)
<i>wh/wh-/WH/WH-</i>	words such as <i>who, which, what, why, when, etc.</i>
X	unspecified head or constituent or feature
X-movement	Head movement
XP	unspecified Phrase
XP-movement	Phrasal movement
XSV	unspecified phrase-Subject-Verb order
YH	<i>Yasna Haptanghāiti</i> (see end of Chapter 2)
YP	unspecified phrasal complement of a head
ZP	unspecified phrasal specifier

# The distribution of quantifiers in Old and Modern Italian

## *Everything or nothing*

JACOPO GARZONIO AND CECILIA POLETTO

### 12.1 Introduction

This chapter<sup>1</sup> considers the distribution of VO and OV orders in Old Italian when the object is represented by a quantified constituent. Since Old Italian is a V2 language in the sense that the inflected verb moves to the left periphery of the clause, and therefore, cases of movement in the IP domain cannot be detected looking at the position of the inflected verb, we will take into consideration cases of VO/OV variation with complex analytic verb forms where V is the past participle and O contains a universal or a negative quantifier. While OV with non-quantified DPs and complex QPs is optional, we will show that universal bare quantifiers always precede the past participle (section 12.2). This fact is evidence that pragmatic factors, which are usually called into question to explain the optionality of OV in VO languages, are not the only factors determining VO/OV variation. We argue that this distribution is a consequence of the obligatory movement of the bare quantifier to a dedicated position, which is a function of the internal structure of bare quantifiers. Moreover, it can be argued that the modern stage of the language has preserved the movement of the quantifier, but this is not always visible because of a change in the movement properties of the verb (sections 12.3–12.4). Our proposal is also tested in the domain of negative quantifiers (section 12.5).

<sup>1</sup> The chapter is the work of two authors: Jacopo Garzonio is responsible for sections 12.1, 12.3, and 12.5, while Cecilia Poletto is responsible for sections 12.2, 12.4, and 12.6.

## 12.2 Universal quantifiers in Old Italian

If compared with the situation of Modern Italian, OV orders are rather common in Old Italian (OI). A subset of the OV orders found in the texts can be derived through the V2 property by moving the object to SpecC (or, following Benincà (2006) and subsequent work, to SpecFocus or SpecOperator) and the inflected verb to C° (i.e. Focus°/Op°). Even if we factor out these cases, there is a rather frequent ‘residue’ of OV orders where the object is realized between the auxiliary and the past participle. Poletto (2014, ch. 2) has compared the frequencies of VO and OV only in compound tenses<sup>2</sup> in some early Florentine texts, showing that an argument XP between the auxiliary and the past participle appears in a number of cases ranging from 14 per cent to 49 per cent of the total depending on the type of texts selected. The examples in (1) provide cases of the two orders from the same text:

- (1) a. Io ho tessuta una storia VO  
 I have.1SG woven a story  
 ‘I have woven a story’ (*Pagani* 135)
- b. i nimici avessero già il passo pigliato OV  
 the enemies had.SUBJ.3PL already the pass taken  
 ‘the enemies had already occupied the pass.’ (*Pagani* 88)

This distribution can be explained assuming that OV was motivated by the syntactic encoding of pragmatic factors. Poletto (2014, ch. 2) analyses cases like (1b) as scrambling movement to the Focus position in the left periphery of *vP*, which, as proposed by Belletti (2004) contains Topic and Focus projections. Sentences like (1b) can be captured by assuming that pre-participial objects have access to the *vP* left periphery where they can be marked as either Focus or Topic. Structure (2) illustrates Poletto’s proposal:

- (2) [<sub>CP</sub> *che* [<sub>TP</sub> [<sub>SpecTP</sub> *i nimici*] [<sub>T°</sub> *avessero*] ... [<sub>vP</sub> [<sub>FocusP</sub> [<sub>SpecFocus</sub> *il passo*]<sub>i</sub>] [<sub>Focus°</sub> *pigliato*] [<sub>VP</sub> [<sub>V°</sub> *pigliato*] [<sub>t<sub>i</sub></sub>]]]]]]

In the case of quantified objects, however, the same analysis does not go through, because the distribution is different and does not seem to be related to pragmatic factors, but rather to the internal structure of the quantified object.<sup>3</sup> In this section we concentrate on the distribution of universal quantifier *tutto/tutti/tutta/tutte* ‘everything, all’. We will show that the frequencies of VO and OV change drastically depending on whether the quantifier is paired with a nominal expression or is bare.

<sup>2</sup> Compound tenses are the only ones that exclude the ambiguity with V2 constructions, i.e. cases in which the projections involved are located in the CP and not lower in the *vP* area. Old Italian does not obey the typical V2 linear restriction found in Germanic, due to the fact that it has what has often been dubbed ‘recursive topics’ since the first attestation and still preserves this feature nowadays. Hence, the only clear cases that do not involve the CP left periphery are those that present the order Aux-O-Past Participle.

<sup>3</sup> The different distribution between non-quantified and quantified objects in OV structures mirrors what Pintzuk and Taylor (2006: 258ff.) have observed in the history of English.

In the first case, when *tutto* is found in a complex quantified expression, the cases of OV are not more frequent than those of referential DPs or PPs. Poletto (2014, ch. 5) has examined the first 2,000 occurrences of *tutto* in the *Opera del Vocabolario Italiano* (OVI) database: of the 34 relevant cases (clauses with a complex verbal form and no movement of the object to the CP), 26 are VO cases, with *tutto*-DP following the past participle, and 8 are OV cases, with the quantified expression at the left of the past participle.<sup>4</sup> In other words, when *tutto* is paired with a DP, its position is variable and it behaves in the same way DPs behave in Old Italian. The two possibilities are exemplified in (3):

- (3) a. e hannovi messo tutto loro ingegno e forza VO  
 and have.there put all their intelligence and force  
 ‘they put there all their intelligence and strength’ (VeV 24)
- b. ch’egli ebbe tutto questo fatto, e molte altre cose OV  
 that.he had.3SG all this done and many other things  
 ‘that he had done all this and many other things’ (*Tesoro* a286)

However, in the case of bare *tutto*, in all the 23 relevant occurrences (complex verb, no movement to the left periphery of the clause), the quantifier precedes the past participle, as in (4a) and (4b).<sup>5</sup> Cases like (4c) are not attested:

- (4) a. e come l’à tutto perduto OV  
 and how it.ACC.has all lost  
 ‘and how he lost it all’ (*FR* 75)
- b. seguire Idio chi à tutto venduto OV  
 follow.INF God who has everything sold  
 ‘(he can) follow God who sold all his possessions’ (*Fiore* 232)
- c. \*l’à perduto tutto \*VO  
 it.ACC.has lost all  
 ‘he lost it all’

This split is reminiscent of similar oppositions in French or in some German dialects (Kayne 1975; Grewendorf and Poletto 2005). In French, object bare quantifiers, with

<sup>4</sup> We leave aside the case of *tutto* paired with a demonstrative heading a relative clause. With this configuration, the order is almost always VO, as in (i):

- (i) e ffue fatto tuttoe ccioe che lo ree comandoe  
 and was done all that that the king required.3SG  
 ‘All that the king required was done’ (*Tristano* 25)

This requires an explanation based on the peculiar position that elements modified by a relative clause display in OI, a complex topic we cannot deal with here for reasons of space.

<sup>5</sup> Notice that the order OV is found both with the pronominal use of *tutto*, as in (4b), and with adjectival bare *tutto*, as in (4a), where it refers to the clitic pronoun *lo* ‘it’ in pre-auxiliary position. Here we will concentrate on pronominal *tutto* as the two constructions are not completely analogous.

the exception of *personne* ‘nobody’, are allowed to precede the past participle, while complex quantified expressions are always post-participial, as shown in (5):

- (5) a. Je n'ai rien/tout vu OV  
 I not.have nothing/everything seen  
 ‘I have not seen anything/everything’
- b. \*Je n'ai {aucun garçon / tout ça} vu \*OV  
 I not.have any boy / all that seen
- c. Je n'ai vu {aucun garçon / tout ça} VO  
 I not.have seen any boy / all that  
 ‘I have not seen any boy/all that’

The fact that a split between the position of bare quantifiers and the position of quantified DPs can be observed in living languages as well strengthens the idea that the distinction found between bare and non-bare *tutto* is a real property of Old Italian and not some frequency or stylistic effect caused by the choice of our texts. One possible analysis for this phenomenon is to assume that bare *tutto* has a specific syntax because it is morphosyntactically weak, as has been proposed for French *tout/tous* and *rien* (which are deficient in their internal functional structure; see Cardinaletti and Starke 1999 on this) as opposed to *personne*. However, this hypothesis does not hold for Old Italian because bare *tutto* is pre-participial even when it is embedded in a PP and has a determiner, as in the following examples:

- (6) a. s'i' mi fosse al tutto a tte gradato PP-V  
 if.I me were.1SG to.the everything to you adapted  
 ‘if I had adapted to you in everything’ (*Fiore* 86)
- b. Anzi t'avrà del tutto rifiutato PP-V  
 to.the.contrary you.will.have.3SG of.the all refused  
 ‘On the contrary he will have refused you completely’ (*Fiore* 112)

This is impossible with *tout/tous* and *rien* in French:

- (7) a. \*J'ai de tout parlé avec mon amie Emilie. \*PP-V  
 I.have of everything talked with my friend Emilie  
 ‘I talked about everything with my friend Emilie.’
- b. \*Vous n'avez à rien pensé. \*PP-V  
 you not.have to nothing thought  
 ‘You have thought about nothing.’

This distribution indicates that OV with *tutto* in Old Italian is obligatory when the restrictor NP of the quantifier is null and is not related to morphosyntactic weakness. On the other hand, *tutto* does not fit into the proper definition of morphologically ‘weak’, as it displays full number/gender agreement and in Old Italian it could definitely be focused in the CP left periphery.

Interestingly the same split found between bare and non-bare *tutto* is also replicated by the plural *tutti* ‘all’ (and the feminine forms *tutta/tutte* ‘all’), which obligatorily occurs before the past participle if it is bare, but not if it is paired to a DP:

- (8) a. Il Demonio ci avea tutti presi OV  
 the Devil us had.3SG all taken  
 'The Devil took all of us' (SV 279)
- b. ma parve che fussero tutti vinti con lui OV  
 but seemed.3SG that were.3PL all won with him  
 'it seemed that they were all won with him' (Pagani 135)
- c. e dove avea tutti i lor beni fatti sequestrare OV  
 and where had.3SG all the their goods made confiscated  
 'where he had all their possessions confiscated' (Marchionne di Coppo 18)
- d. comandò che fossero isbanditi tutti gli sbanditi d'ogne provincia VO  
 ordered that were.3PL pardoned all the exiled of.every province  
 'he ordered the pardon of all the exiles of every province' (Pagani 182)

The perfect parallelism between the distributions of the singular form *tutto* and the plural one *tutti* is relevant also because in Old Italian *tutto* has a widespread adverbial usage, which is impossible with the plural (and feminine) forms.<sup>6</sup> Since bare *tutti* behaves like bare *tutto*, the obligatory OV order is not directly linked to the adverb versus argument distinction. Hence, we state that universal bare quantifiers behave differently from universal complex QPs in that they are always pre-participial irrespective of their status as arguments or adverbs.

Interestingly, Old Italian provides us with two further arguments that point towards an analysis which distinguishes the position of bare *tutto* from the one of *tutto*-DP. The first argument concerns the order of these QPs with respect to other elements in pre-participial position. When there is more than one XP in pre-participial position, bare *tutto* always precedes all the other phrases (see 9a), while the complex quantified expression can also follow them, as shown by (9b).

- (9) a. Vedemmo che fue tutta in quattro parti divisa *tutta*-PP-V  
 saw.1PL that was.3SG all in four parts split  
 'We saw that the whole was split in four parts' (VeV 56)
- b. alla quale hanno prima tutti i nodi forati Adv-*tutti* DP-V  
 to.the which have.3PL before all the junctions pierced  
 'whose junctions were first perforated' (Crescenzi 29)

This divergence can be explained assuming that *tutto*-DP behaves exactly like non-quantified DPs, which can be scrambled to the *vP* left periphery to topic and/or focus

<sup>6</sup> In the case of *tutto*, the adverbial usage is even more widespread than in Modern Italian, as *tutto* can even modify a gerund in Old Italian, while it cannot in Modern Italian:

- (i) a. elli disse tutto ridendo  
 he said.3SG all laughing  
 'he said, laughing heartily' (Tristano 383)
- b. e poi rispuose tutto piangendo  
 and then answered.3SG all crying  
 'and then he answered, crying desperately' (Tristano 405)

positions and which do not have a fixed word order, as their ordering depends on the pragmatic effect to be achieved (see Belletti 2004 for the proposal that the  $\nu P$  left periphery also contains both Topic and Focus positions). On the other hand, bare *tutto* (or *tutti/tutta/tutte*), which always precedes other DPs and PPs in pre-participial position must be located in a position higher than the  $\nu P$ . An indication of what this position might be is provided by the second argument that shows that complex QPs are different from bare quantifiers. Only bare quantifiers precede manner adverbs like *bene* ‘well’ (10):<sup>7</sup>

- (10) è quello che [l']amore fa possante, ch'è tut[t]o ben provato  
 is that that the.love makes strong that.is all well demonstrated  
 ‘it is that thing that makes love strong, which is all well shown’  
 (C. Davanzati XXXII, 119)

This distribution strongly suggests that bare *tutto* is obligatorily moved to the aspectual field in the IP layer located immediately above adverbs like *bene* in Cinque’s (1999) cartographic structure of the low IP area. Our preliminary proposal is thus to assume that bare *tutto* (that is *tutto* with an empty restrictor) always moves to a dedicated position in the IP, similarly to what Cinque (1999) proposes for Modern Italian object *tutto*, which must also move to an adverbial position and occupies a Completive projection in the IP precisely because it occurs in front of low aspectual adverbs. Assuming Cinque’s hierarchy of aspectual projections, we analyse the distribution of universal quantifiers in Old Italian as in the following structures:

- (11) a. [... [<sub>AspP</sub> prospective (*almost*) [<sub>AspP</sub> completive *tutto*] [<sub>Voice</sub> [<sub>Topic</sub> [<sub>Focus</sub> [ <sub>$\nu P$</sub> ] ...]] ...]  
 b. [... [<sub>AspP</sub> prospective (*almost*) [<sub>AspP</sub> completive [<sub>Voice</sub> (*well*) [<sub>DP</sub> Topic *tutto*] [<sub>DP</sub> Focus *tutto*] [ <sub>$\nu P$</sub> ] ...]] ...]

This means that the syntax of bare universal quantifiers in Old Italian is not different from Modern Italian, and that in both stages even the argument *tutto* moves beyond the  $\nu P$  to the aspectual field, whose specifiers are generally occupied by adverbs. However, while Modern Italian consistently has the order past participle-*tutto*, Old Italian has the order *tutto*-past participle.

The analysis above raises the following questions: first, it must be explained why the movement of bare *tutto* is obligatory while it is not when *tutto* is paired to a DP; second, it must be explained why bare *tutto* always occurs to the left of other pre-participial elements while quantified nominal expressions do not; third, we have to explain why the distribution described in this section is lost in Modern Italian, i.e. what the difference between the two stages is; finally, the analysis should be tested with other bare quantifiers. In the following section we start by discussing the third

<sup>7</sup> Compare this example with cases like the following, which shows that a pre-participial *tutto*-DP follows *bene*:

- (i) non sono bene tutte le cose che nuocere possono considerate  
 not are.3PL well all the things that harm.INF can.3PL considered  
 ‘all the things that can harm one are not considered well’ (VeV 59)

problem, since it is crucial to understanding the other two. Section 12.5 presents another case of bare quantifiers, namely the n-word *niente* ‘nothing’.

### 12.3 From Old to Modern Italian

Let us first describe the situation we find in modern Italian. Contrary to Old Italian, in Modern Italian, both bare and complex QPs appear after the past participle:

- (12) a. Maria ha comprato tutto. VO  
 Mary has bought all
- b. \*Maria ha tutto comprato. \*OV  
 Mary has all bought  
 ‘Mary has bought everything.’
- c. Maria ha comprato tutto il pane. VO  
 Mary has bought all the bread
- d. \*Maria ha tutto il pane comprato. \*OV  
 Mary has all the bread bought  
 ‘Mary has bought all the bread.’

Thus, from this point of view bare and complex QPs behave like non-quantified object DPs: in Modern Italian there are no OV cases with object DPs, or PPs (both arguments and adjuncts), appearing between the auxiliary and the past participle:

- (13) a. \*Maria ha il pane comprato. \*OV  
 Mary has the bread bought  
 ‘Mary (has) bought the bread.’
- b. \*Maria è nel museo entrata. \*PP-V  
 Mary is in.the museum entered  
 ‘Mary (has) entered the museum.’
- c. \*Maria ha in un ristorante mangiato. \*PP-V  
 Mary has in a restaurant eaten  
 ‘Mary {has eaten / ate} in a restaurant.’

This is also true of post-verbal subjects (14a–b) and both ‘new-information’ and contrastively focalized objects (14c–d).

- (14) a. \*Ha Maria parlato.  
 has Mary spoken  
 ‘Mary spoke.’
- b. Ha parlato Maria.  
 has spoken Mary  
 ‘Mary spoke / It is Mary who spoke.’
- c. A: Cosa ha comprato Maria?  
 what has bought Mary  
 ‘what has Mary bought?/what did Mary buy?’

- B: \*Maria ha [<sub>Focus</sub> il pane] comprato. \*OV  
 Mary has the bread bought  
 ‘Mary (has) bought the bread.’
- d. \*Maria ha IL PANE comprato (, non le uova). \*OV  
 Mary has the bread bought not the eggs  
 ‘Mary (has) bought the bread (not the eggs).’

We follow here Belletti’s (2004) idea that in Modern Italian there also exists a *vP* peripheral topic/focus field, where post-verbal subjects of transitive and real intransitive verbs are realized. However, post-verbal focalized subjects with complex verbal forms are always post-participial (see (14a–b)) in Modern Italian, i.e. the past participle must raise outside the *vP* also in these cases. In other words, the ungrammaticality of all the cases above can be explained simply by adopting Cinque’s theory of past participle movement in modern Italian, which predicts that the past participle must always move out of the *vP* and reach the aspectual low IP field, while this is not the case in other languages, like modern French. Nonetheless, there is evidence that in Modern Italian the position of bare quantifiers is also different from the one of quantified nominal expressions, although they all occur after the past participle. First of all, as already mentioned above, Cinque (1999) observes that in Modern Italian bare *tutto* precedes low adverbs like *bene*, while this is not the case for quantified nominal expressions:

- (15) a. Ha fatto tutto bene.  
 has done all well  
 ‘S/He has done all well.’
- b. \*Ha fatto tutto il compito bene.<sup>8</sup>  
 has done all the exercise well
- c. Ha fatto bene tutto il compito.  
 has done well all the exercise  
 ‘S/He has done all the exercise well.’

Furthermore, Belletti (2004) points out that the VOS order with a focalized subject is marginal if not fully ungrammatical in Modern Italian:<sup>9</sup>

- (16) a. ??Capirà il problema Gianni. VOS  
 will.understand.3SG the problem John  
 ‘John will understand the problem.’ (Belletti’s 2004, (41a))
- b. ??Ha chiamato Maria Gianni. VOS  
 has called Mary John  
 ‘John has called Mary.’ (Belletti’s 2004, (41b))

<sup>8</sup> This sentence is possible only if the element *bene* is strongly focused, otherwise it is ungrammatical.

<sup>9</sup> According to Belletti (2004) this derives from the impossibility of the object being assigned Accusative Case in the topic position.

However, the same order is fully acceptable if the object corresponds to the universal quantifier *tutto*:

- (17) a. Capirà tutto Maria. VOS  
 will.understand.3SG all Mary  
 ‘Mary will understand everything.’ (Belletti’s 2004, (45))
- b. Ha capito tutto Maria. VOS  
 has understood all Mary  
 ‘Mary has understood everything.’

These examples provide evidence for the hypothesis that *tutto* in Modern Italian also occupies a dedicated position different from the usual object one. More importantly, they are in accordance with Cinque’s hypothesis mentioned above and suggest that *tutto* has kept a specific syntactic distribution in the modern stage of the language and that its position is above the *vP* periphery. This means that *tutto* raises to the same aspectual projection in both Old and Modern Italian and that the lack of OV in the latter is to be explained by the different position of the past participle. Cinque (1999) points out that in Modern Italian the past participle can raise to different heads inside the aspectual layer of projections, and crucially, has to raise at least higher than *tutto* ‘everything’ and *bene* ‘well’, which in his analysis occupy Completive Aspect and Voice projections respectively. Cinque’s proposal also predicts that in some languages the past participle can stay lower. The prediction is borne out, as there are Italo-Romance varieties where the past participle can be preceded by the quantifier corresponding to ‘everything’ but not by the item corresponding to ‘well’ (Cinque 1999, § 2.2, Sardinian examples):

- (18) a. Apo tottu mandigadu. OV  
 have.1SG all eaten  
 ‘I have eaten everything.’
- b. Apo mandigadu bene. V-Adv  
 have.1SG eaten well  
 ‘I have eaten well.’
- c. \*Apo bene mandigadu. Adv-V  
 have.1SG well eaten  
 (Logudorese Sardinian)

The examples in (18) show that Completive Aspect is encoded higher than Voice and, more importantly for our discussion, that ‘everything’ is in IP also in Sardinian. If we now compare these data with the distribution of adverbs with complex verb forms in Old Italian, the latter displays a different pattern: in Old Italian the adverbs of the low IP area often appear in the CP left periphery of the sentence, a configuration explained in terms of focus movement to the CP by the standard analysis of Old Italian V2 (see Benincà 2006, and more recently Ledgeway 2011). However, when low adverbs are not fronted, they usually follow the auxiliary but precede the past participle (the two possibilities are shown in (19a–b)); crucially,

*bene* ‘well’ and other manner adverbs located in Voice behave like the aspectual adverbs (19c, d, e, f):

- (19) a. la quale elli ancora non ha manifestato con lingua  
 the which he yet not has manifested with tongue  
 ‘which he has not spoken about yet’ (*Ottimo Commento* 171)
- b. dicea che non avea ancora trovato marito  
 said.3SG that not had.3SG yet found husband  
 ‘he said that she had not found a husband yet’ (*FSI* 149)  
 <*bene* ‘well’: Aux—*bene*—PastP>
- c. colui che poi che elli àe bene appresa l’arte  
 who that after that he has well learned the.art  
 ‘who, after he has learned the art well’ (*Rettorica* 5)
- d. nasce questione, se colui avea bene consigliato o no  
 raises question if who had.3SG well advised or not  
 ‘Here raises the question whether he had advised them well or not’  
 (*Rettorica* 146)  
 <*male* ‘badly’: Aux—*male*—PastP>
- e. Quel guadagno onde l’uomo è male infamato, si dee  
 that gain from.which the.man is badly disgraced REFL must.3SG  
 veracemente perdita appellare  
 truly loss call-INF  
 ‘A gain by which one is badly disgraced must be called a loss’ (*VeV* 14)
- f. se una pietra margarita è male disposta  
 if a stone pearl is badly placed  
 ‘if a pearl is badly placed’ (*Convivio* 387)

This distribution is explained in a split-IP framework assuming that the past participle remains lower than the aspectual field in the IP, while adverbials can optionally undergo XP-movement to the CP, where they are located in a Focus/Operator position. More precisely, the past participle does not move higher than the Voice head, as represented in (20), which shows the lower part of the general IP cartographic hierarchy proposed by Cinque (1999):<sup>10</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Cinque (1999) discusses also the case of passive past participles in Modern Italian, showing that passive complex verbs allow for the pre-participial position of the bare quantifier *tutto*, a configuration not allowed with active forms, as argued in the first part of this section.

- (i) Il muro è stato tutto pitturato. Aux-PassP-*tutto*-PastP  
 the wall is been all painted  
 ‘All the wall has been painted.’

Similar examples have been thoroughly analysed in works about floating quantifiers. Here, we wish to point out that these cases are further evidence that *tutto* has a dedicated position in Modern Italian; in other words, this position, identified as the one encoding completive aspect by Cinque (1999), is one of the possible positions for floating quantifiers in Modern Italian. As for the distinction between ‘AspP sg completive I’ and ‘AspP pl completive II’, see Cinque (1999: 100ff.).

- (20) [<sub>AspP</sub> perfect *always/never* [<sub>AspP</sub> retrospective *just* [<sub>AspP</sub> proximative *soon*  
 [<sub>AspP</sub> durative *briefly* [<sub>AspP</sub> generic/progressive *characteristically*  
 [<sub>AspP</sub> prospective *almost* [<sub>AspP</sub> sg completive I *completely*  
 [<sub>AspP</sub> pl completive II *tutto* [<sub>Voice</sub>well **V**... ]... ]

On this basis we can conclude that the loss of OV orders, both with quantifiers and definite and quantified DPs is not due to the loss of the access to low left periphery (which is indeed still accessible to post-verbal subjects, as Belletti (2004) shows), but to the fact that the past participle raises higher in the modern language than in Old Italian. This explains a) why in both Old and Modern Italian bare *tutto* precedes low adverbs like *bene*; b) why in both Old and Modern Italian bare *tutto* precedes XPs located in the *vP* left periphery (as scrambled objects in Old Italian and post-verbal subjects in Modern Italian). We thus propose that the only distinction between Old and Modern Italian is that the past participle has started raising higher after the medieval period.

However, this is not a straightforward assumption, and is actually in contrast with what we know about language change: generally languages change because they lose (verb) movement, not because they acquire it, unless the change is related to some particular type of reanalysis of syntactic elements becoming morphological affixes or lexical verbs becoming functional, i.e. auxiliary verbs. Nevertheless, we believe that our assumption is still fundamentally correct and has to be explained as follows: adopting the proposal in Poletto (2014) concerning the parallelism of phases, we assume that the strong features requiring movement of the verb are set in the grammar and acquired independently from the phase where the head is inserted. For instance, Focus requires in Old Italian to have its head lexicalized independently from whether the Focus is in the CP or the *vP* phase. This is based on the idea that there is a fundamental symmetry between the left periphery of all phases in Old Italian: the CP, the *vP* and the DP left peripheries all allow for movements of the head to Focus<sup>o</sup> which are banned in Modern Italian and require that the verbal (or nominal) head moves at least to the lowest position of the left periphery of the phase when this position is free. Following Benincà's original proposal for the CP area, it is shown that both in the CP and in the *vP* the Focus/Operator head is occupied by the verb: in the CP it is the inflected verb that moves to Focus<sup>o</sup>, in the *vP* it is the past participle. The parallelism found among phases can be captured by assuming that the properties of a given functional head (in our case Focus) are stated in the grammar independently from the phase where this F<sup>o</sup> is merged. If Focus in Old Italian requires filling by a lexical head, this will happen in all phases and will trigger obligatory movement of the verb to the left periphery in the CP as well as in the *vP* areas. This means that in Old Italian the phenomena found in the CP stem from the same property that allows for scrambling in the *vP* area, although this does not mean that any V2 language should also allow for scrambling, as V2 can target different positions in the CP area, not simply Focus. The idea of establishing the properties of functional heads independently of the phase where they occur explains why the past participle moves less in Old Italian than it does in Modern Italian: it is the Focus head that keeps it trapped inside the low *vP* phase. If the hypothesis is

correct, this means that the Old Italian past participle must always reach the  $\nu P$  peripheral Focus, but poses the problem of what happens with simple tenses. When a sentence only has a simple verbal form, this also contains inflectional features that have to be checked in the TP area, therefore the simple verb raises higher than the Focus<sup>o</sup> in  $\nu P$ . On the contrary, the past participle does not have any additional features to be checked in the higher phase, and thus remains trapped inside the low left periphery. Hence, the reason why the past participle cannot move further than Focus is not that the  $\nu P$  Focus position is criterial. Belletti (2004) already states that the  $\nu P$  Focus position is indeed different from the one in CP because it does not induce freezing effects, and this also works for Old Italian. The distinction between the past participle and the inflected verb must be due to the type of features they check, not to any criterial freezing effect.<sup>11</sup>

The assumption that the past participle remains in Focus in Old Italian derives a) the order we observe with the bare quantifiers *tutto* and *tutti*, b) the order found with aspectual adverbs that always occur before the past participle in Old Italian differently from Modern Italian, and c) the fact that you can find OV orders also with definite objects or PPs in Old Italian but not in Modern Italian. The structure of the low IP area and  $\nu P$  phase with OV orders in Old Italian is illustrated in (21):

- (21) [<sub>AspP</sub> sg completive I (*completely*) [<sub>AspP</sub> pl completive II *tutto* [<sub>Voice</sub> (*well*)... [ <sub>$\nu P$</sub>  [<sub>FocusP</sub> [<sub>SpecFocus</sub> DP/PP/Q+DP<sub>j</sub>] [<sub>Focus<sup>o</sup></sub> past participle<sub>i</sub>] ... [ <sub>$\nu P$</sub>  [<sub>V<sup>o</sup></sub> t<sub>i</sub>] [t<sub>j</sub>]]]]]]]]]

#### 12.4 The dichotomy between bare and non-bare universal quantifiers

In the previous section we have analysed the distinction between Old and Modern Italian with respect to the movement of the past participle which is ultimately to be derived as a consequence of the V<sub>2</sub>-like properties of all left peripheries in Old Italian but not in the modern language. There is, however, another problem that remains unsolved: namely, why bare quantifiers behave differently from Q-DPs. In the above we have assumed that the reason why bare *tutto* has to move higher than quantified nominal expressions is that only bare quantifiers have access to the adverbial positions. This is not enough as an explanation, but must be derived from some deeper property related to the internal structure of quantifiers. Notice that, as discussed above, this property cannot be formulated in terms of a supposed weakness of the functional projections internal to the bare quantifier as proposed by Cardinaletti and Starke (1999) for modern French: the reason for this is that in Old Italian bare quantifiers which are introduced by a preposition also have to occur in the adverbial position. This shows rather clearly that they cannot be considered as weak pronouns in Old Italian.

We rather propose that the internal structure of bare quantifiers is different from that of quantified nominal expressions in the following sense: bare quantifiers are not

<sup>11</sup> Ultimately, this will probably have to be related to the different pattern of past participle agreement found in Old Italian where agreement is obligatory with pre-participial objects but only optional with post-participial objects. We leave this matter open for the moment and rather concentrate on the distribution of bare quantifiers, which is the central topic of this article.

paired to a whole DP which remains silent (a sort of *pro*) as it is normally assumed (see, among others, Doetjes 2007; Baunaz 2011), but to a much more reduced element, namely a classifier-like noun, as is visibly the case in English if we consider forms like *everything*, *everybody*, *anything*, *anybody*, *nothing*, *nobody*, etc. The two structures of bare and non-bare quantifiers respectively are illustrated in (22):

- (22) a. [<sub>UniversalQP</sub> *every* [<sub>ClassP</sub> *thing* ]]  
 b. [<sub>UniversalQP</sub> *every* [<sub>DP</sub> [<sub>NP</sub> N ] ]]

There is evidence that a classifier Noun is also present in Romance, as several modern Southern Italian dialects display a lexical classifier like English:

- (23) a. Tu kə stai kà può vərə tuttə-cosə. (Gragnano, NA)  
 you that are here can.2SG see.INF all-things  
 b. Ma tu ca sta qua pu vadè tuttə-cosə. (Lesina, FG)  
 but you that are here can.2SG see.INF all-things  
 c. Mo ca staje, pu vərə tottə-cosə. (Venosa, PZ)  
 now here are can.2SG see.INF all-things  
 d. Ma, tu chi sì cca, pò vīdiri tutti-cosi. (Palermo)  
 but you that are here can-2SG see-INF all-things  
 ‘You are here. You can see everything.’

Furthermore, in these varieties the classifier is not always visible, as its realization depends on the position of the quantifier: the following examples show that when the quantifier is in front of the past participle in a passive form, the classifier is not realized, but it is present when the quantifier is located after the past participle.<sup>12</sup>

- (24) a. Ha statu tuttu fattu bonu. (Palermo)  
 has been all done well  
 b. Hannu statu fattu bonu tutti-cosi.  
 have.3PL been done well all-things  
 c. \*Hannu statu tutti-cosi fattu bonu.  
 have.3PL been all-things done well  
 ‘Everything has been done well.’

The examples above show that only when it is paired with a null classifier can the bare quantifier raise to an adverbial position; when the noun is lexically realized, the adverbial position is not available. In other words, only quantifiers paired with a null classifier can be ambiguous between an argumental and an adverbial reading. Therefore, we would like to tentatively propose that the reason why bare quantifiers can be reinterpreted as adverbial forms is precisely that these bare quantifiers are not paired to a nominal restrictor, and as such can be hosted by an adverbial position (see

<sup>12</sup> The same might possibly be true for Old Italian; which also has an alternative form *tutte cose* to bare *tutto*. However, at a first quick investigation, it seems that *tutte cose* is used when the context requires a real lexical restrictor and not simply a classifier noun. We leave a more detailed investigation of *tutte cose* to future research.

Garzonio and Poletto (2017) for a more detailed analysis of the derivation of the movement of bare quantifiers to the aspectual field).

We can conclude that there is a fundamental asymmetry between bare quantifiers and complex QPs made up by a quantifier followed by a whole DP: the bare quantifier can be paired with a null classifier, not with a whole DP containing a lexical restrictor, while a complex QP always contains its lexical restrictor. Notice that this proposal still capitalizes on the idea that bare quantifiers are ‘weaker’ forms, but it is not their functional layers which are pruned, as proposed by Cardinaletti and Starke, it is the lexical part which is entirely missing, as its morphological make-up clearly indicates. If the idea that the reason why bare quantifiers can raise higher than non-bare quantifiers is correct, we predict that all bare quantifiers, not only universal ones, behave the way *tutto* and *tutti* do. In the next section we investigate the distribution of another bare quantifier, namely the n-word corresponding to ‘nothing’ and show that due to its ambiguous nature, it can either be analysed as a bare quantifier or as a quantifier paired with a lexical restrictor. This determines the positions where it can occur.

### 12.5 Negative quantifiers

The element *niente/neiente/neente*, meaning ‘nothing’ can have an argumental (as in (25)) or an adverbial usage (as in (26)), like the adverb *tutto*. When it is used as an adverb, its meaning is roughly the one of ‘at all’: In what follows we will distinguish the two usages as they do not behave alike.

(25) e non hanno potuto avere niente  
and not have.3PL been.able get.INF nothing  
‘...and they couldn’t get anything’ (VeV 24)

(26) Elli non si ispezzerebbe niente...  
he not REFL would.break.3SG nothing  
‘It would not break at all’ (*Tesoro* 11)

Notice that the adverbial usage of *niente* is compatible with a direct object, which excludes an analysis in the terms proposed by Bayer (2009) for German and English:

(27) a. Molte cose dissero di che non mostrano niente  
many things said.3PL of which not show.3PL nothing  
la veritate... *niente-DP*  
the truth  
‘They said many things about which they did not show the truth at all’  
(*Tesoro* b53)

b. Tempo non appartiene niente alle creature che sono  
time not belongs nothing to.the creatures that are  
sopra ’l cielo... *niente-PP*  
over the sky  
‘Time does not belong at all to the creatures that are in heaven’ (*Tesoro* a30)

Furthermore, adverbial *niente* occurs systematically in front of low adverbs, as shown by the following example:

- (28) Sì no lo potero niente bene schifare... niente-well  
 thus not it could.3PL nothing well avoid.INF  
 ‘They couldn’t dodge it well at all’ (*Binduccio* 574)

This clearly suggests that adverbial *niente* is located in the aspectual field, as already shown for universal quantifiers. Our analysis predicts that this should be the case also for argumental *niente*, because the universal quantifier *tutti*, which never has an adverbial interpretation, is also nonetheless always in the adverbial field.

Unfortunately in the whole Old Italian corpus (i.e. the OVI database) there are no examples of argumental *niente* combined with low adverbs, which prevents us from testing whether argumental *niente* occurs in a different position.

However, there are at least two facts that lead us to doubt that argumental *niente* is always located in the aspectual area as our analysis predicts if we extend it from universal quantifiers to n-words. The first is that argumental direct object *niente* can occur after a dative or another PP, but this order is not attested with the adverbial usage.

- (29) a. perchè non fa a questo fatto niente  
 because not does to this fact nothing  
 ‘because it does not do anything to this’ (FR 23)
- b. e non vede in lui niente perchè sia degno del pane  
 and not sees in him nothing because is worth of.the bread  
 ‘and does not see anything in him that would make him worthy of the bread’  
 (*Paternostro* 25)

The second fact is that argumental *niente* can occur either in front of or after the past participle, contrary to our expectations, if we want to assume that bare quantifiers are always located higher than the *vP* area. Recall that we proposed that the past participle in Old Italian remains inside the left periphery of the *vP* phase and does not raise to the aspectual field in the low IP area. If *niente* can occur after the past participle, this means that it can remain inside the VP, i.e. in its argumental position and in this position it is invisible to any direct probing coming from the phase above *vP*.

- (30) a. ch’io non t’ho tolto niente  
 that.I not from.you.have.1SG removed nothing  
 ‘that I have taken nothing from you’ (Nov. LXXII, 294)
- b. Dimmi, Merlino, dell’ avere d’Atene fu trovato niente?  
 tell.me Merlin of.the.possessions of.Athens was found nothing  
 ‘Tell me, Merlin, was anything from the goods of Athens discovered?’  
 (*Merlino* 48)
- c. ...l’altre parti della diceria, delle quali non è detto niente...  
 the.other parts of.the message of.the which not is said nothing  
 ‘...the other parts of the message, about which nothing is said...’  
 (*Rettorica* 142)

- (31) a. Il mercatante non mi insegnò neente: no· lli era neente tenuto  
 the merchant not me taught nothing not him was nothing obliged  
 ‘The merchant taught me nothing, and nothing was due to him.’ (Nov. VII, 144)
- b. Non avea neente perduto  
 not had.3SG nothing lost  
 ‘He lost nothing’ (*Seneca* 17)
- c. Sì che non era nostra intenzione essere che ce ne sia neente  
 so that not was our intention be.INF that us of.it is nothing  
 renduto  
 given.back  
 ‘So that we did not want that anything of it would be given us back’  
 (*Giachino* 17)

One further fact that leads us to keep the adverbial and the argumental usages apart is provided by the distribution of negative concord: while adverbial *niente* always triggers negative concord, like all other negative adverbs like *mai* ‘never’ or the post-verbal negative marker *mica*, argumental *niente* can also occur without any pre-verbal negative marker in the clause. The asymmetry between the two usages is quite striking:

- (32) Egli non si dee niente disperare...  
 he not REFL must.3SG nothing give.up.to.despair.INF  
 ‘He must not despair at all’ (*Tesoro* d300)

No cases are found in the sample where negative concord is not present, so the percentage of non-negative concord is 0 per cent. The argumental usage displays 35.1 per cent of lack of negative concord (total 233, cases without negative concord 82). Here we provide two examples, one with and one without negative concord.

- (33) a. ...l'altre parti della diceria, delle quali non è detto neente...  
 the.other parts of.the message of.the which not is said nothing  
 ‘... the other parts of the message, about which nothing is said ...’ (*Rettorica* 142)
- b. E fede senza opera, ovvero opera senza fede, è neente a potere  
 and faith without deeds or deeds without faith is nothing to can.INF  
 aver paradiso  
 have.INF heaven  
 ‘And faith without deeds or deeds without faith are worth nothing for going to heaven.’ (VeV 14)

All these facts lead us to reject an extension of the analysis of bare universal quantifiers to the bare n-word *niente*: contrary to bare universal quantifiers, which are always located in the aspectual field higher than the *vP* phase, independently of their status as adverbs or arguments, the bare n-word *niente* can remain lower than the aspectual area, i.e. in its argumental position within VP, when it is an argument,

but crucially not when it is an adverb. This assumption explains a) why adverbial *niente* occurs higher than other adverbs located in the low aspectual area (like for instance *bene* ‘well’), b) why argumental *niente* can occur after a dative or a PP while adverbial *niente* cannot, c) why the order *niente*-past participle alternates with the order past participle-*niente* when *niente* is an argument and, finally, d) why adverbial *niente* triggers obligatorily negative concord, while argument *niente* can but need not trigger it. Hence, we propose that only argumental *niente* can remain inside the VP. Assuming as proposed by Zeijlstra (2004) that negative concord is an instance of the operation Agree, we expect it to be blocked across phases (hence when argumental *niente* is in the vP area while the pre-verbal negative marker is in the higher phase) but not when the pre-verbal negative marker and the n-word are in the same phase (as it is the case with the adverb).

At this point we are left with the following questions: why is it the case that the bare n-word *niente* behaves differently from universal quantifiers in that only the adverbial usage is bound to occur in the aspectual field? And why is it the case that the argument can either be found in the VP or in the aspectual area? We believe that the solution to both problems is to be found in the morphological composition of the element *niente*, which in Old Italian was still ambiguous between an interpretation as a single morpheme and a composition of *ne* + *ente* (possibly meaning ‘thing’)<sup>13</sup> and in this case had a lexical classifier. The item *niente* would thus have two possible internal structures:

- (34) a. [<sub>NegP</sub> *ni* [<sub>ClassP</sub> *ente* ]]  
 b. [<sub>NegP</sub> *niente* ]

On the other hand, the internal morphological make-up of the adverb would only be of the second type, as adverbs cannot be paired to any sort of nominal category, not even a functional one like the classifier *-ente*.

Hence, the position of the bare argumental n-word *niente* crucially depends on the lexical realization of the classifier-like category with which it is associated: when there is no lexical classifier, the bare n-word raises to the aspectual field and occurs in front of the past participle and triggers negative concord. When the other morphological analysis is chosen, the n-word is not bare any more, i.e. it cannot be probed by an aspectual feature, and it can behave as an argument: it remains in the VP, it occurs after the past participle, it can occur after PPs and does not trigger negative concord. The two alternative analyses give rise to the following structures:

- (35) a. [<sub>AspP</sub> perfect *mai* [<sub>AspP</sub> completive *tutto* [<sub>XP</sub> [<sub>VoiceP</sub> *bene* [<sub>VP</sub> *ni* [<sub>Class</sub> *ente*]]]]]]]  
 b. [<sub>AspP</sub> perfect *mai* [<sub>AspP</sub> completive *tutto* [<sub>XP</sub> [*niente*] [<sub>VoiceP</sub> *bene* [<sub>VP</sub> *niente*]]]]]]]

Hence, Bayer’s (2009) original intuition that there is a link between the argumental and the adverbial usage of this n-word is correct, but in Old Italian it is the argument

<sup>13</sup> The etymology of *niente/neente/neiente* (Rohlf’s 1968) suggests that the element is complex, as it consists of the negative morpheme *ne(c)* plus an item that could derive from Latin: a) *ente(m)*, lit. ‘thing’; b) *inde* ‘from there’; c) *gente(m)* ‘people’. We will not attempt to resolve this problem and give a unique solution here. In any case, all three possibilities are compatible with our claim.

that exploits the adverbial position rather than the opposite, as he proposes for German varieties and English.

## 12.6 Conclusive remarks

In this work we have analysed the distribution of universal quantifiers and shown that it is sensitive to the bare versus complex dichotomy. Bare quantifiers must raise to an adverbial position in Old Italian as well as in Modern Italian, while complex QPs do not and behave as DPs, i.e. they can either remain in the argumental position or be raised to a *vP* peripheral Focus position. The distinction between Old Italian and Modern Italian has to do with the raising properties of the past participle, which remains inside the *vP* area in Old Italian (as agreement patterns with the direct object seem to suggest). We have further compared bare universal quantifiers with the *n*-word *niente* and shown that the raising properties of bare quantifiers are related to their internal morphosyntactic composition: when no lexical classifier appears, the quantifier raises to an adverbial position, when it contains a lexical classifier, it cannot be handled as an adverb and therefore it does not raise. *Niente* is ambiguous between two possible morphological decompositions, one where the classifier is *-ente* and the other where there is no classifier and *niente* is monomorphemic. This work is only the first step towards a more thorough investigation of quantifiers in Old Italian, and leaves out the analysis of cases like *tutte cose* ‘all things’ and *neuna cosa* ‘not one thing’, which exist and can provide further insights into the internal structure of ‘bare’ quantifiers. However, the investigation of those forms is related to a) a detailed analysis of pre-verbal and post-verbal Focus in Old Italian, b) the syntax of relative clauses, which generally appear after the lexicalized classifier *cose/a*. Therefore, we leave this interesting further development of our investigation to future work.

## Sources

**Binduccio:** Binducio dello Scelto, *La storia di Troia* (ed. Maria Gozzi, Milan and Trento: Luni, 2000).

**C. Davanzati:** Chiaro Davanzati, *Rime*, ed. Aldo Menichetti (Bologna: Commissione per i testi di lingua, 1965).

**Convivio:** Dante Alighieri, *Il Convivio*, vol. III, ed. Franca Brambilla Ageno (Florence: Le Lettere, 1995).

**Crescenzi:** *Trattato della Agricoltura di Piero de' Crescenzi*, ed. Bartolomeu Sorio (Verona: Vicentini e Franchini, 1851–2).

**Fiore:** Dante Alighieri (attrib.), *Il Fiore (Il Fiore e il Detto d'Amore attribuibili a Dante Alighieri)*, ed. Gianfranco Contini (Milan: Mondadori, 1984).

**FR:** Bono Giamboni, *Fiore di retorica (redazione beta)*, ed. Gian Battista Speroni (Pavia: Dipartimento di Scienza della Letteratura e dell'Arte medioevale e moderna, 1994).

**Giachino:** *Lettera di Giachino a Baldo Fini e fratelli in Florence (Sette lettere inedite del secolo XIV)*, ed. Pietro Dazzi (Florence: Sodi, 1867).

**Marchionne di Coppo:** Marchionne di Coppo Stefani, *Cronaca fiorentina (Cronaca fiorentina di Marchionne di Coppo Stefani)*, ed. Niccolò Rodolico, in *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*,

*Raccolta degli storici italiani dal cinquecento al millecinquecento*, ordinata da L. A. Muratori, vol. XXX (Città di Castello: Lapi, 1903).

**Merlino**: Paolino Pieri, *Soria di Merlino (La)*, ed. Mauro Cursiotti (Rome: Zauli, 1997).

**Nov.**: Anonimo, *Il Novellino*, ed. Guido Favati (Genoa: Bozzi, 1970).

**Ottimo Commento**: *Ottimo Commento della Commedia, Inferno*, ed. Alessandro Torri (Pisa: Capurro, 1827).

**Pagani**: Bono Giamboni, *Delle Storie contra i Pagani di Paolo Orosio libri VII*, ed. Francesco Tassi (Florence: Baracchi, 1849).

**Paternostro**: Zuccherò Bencivenni, *Esposizione del Paternostro* (Luigi Rigoli, *Volgarizzamento dell'Esposizione del Paternostro*, Florence: Piazzini, 1828).

**Rettorica**: Brunetto Latini, *La Rettorica*, ed. Francesco Maggini (Florence: Le Monnier, 1968).

**Seneca**: Anonimo, *Pistole di Seneca volgarizzate (Volgarizzamento delle Pistole di Seneca e del Trattato della Provvidenza di Dio)*, ed. Giovanni Bottari (Florence: Tartini e Franchi, 1717).

**SV**: Franco Sacchetti, *Sposizione di Vangeli* (Franco Sacchetti, *La battaglia delle belle donne. Le lettere. Le Sposizione di Vangeli*, ed. Alberto Chiari, Bari: Laterza, 1938).

**Tesoro**: Brunetto Latini. *Il Tesoro*, ed. François A. P. Chabaille as *Il Tesoro di Brunetto Latini volgarizzato da Bono Giamboni*. Bologna: Romagnoli. 1878. [Contemporary Italian translation of *Li Livres du Trésor*].

**Tristano**: Anonimo, *Il Tristano Riccardiano*, ed. Ernesto Giacomo Parodi (Bologna: Romagnoli-Dall'Acqua, 1896).

**VeV**: Bono Giamboni, *Il Libro de'Vizi e delle Virtudi (Il Libro de'Vizi e delle Virtudi e Il Trattato di Virtù e Vizi)*, ed. Cesare Segre, Turin: Einaudi, 1968).

# References

- Abels, Klaus (2003). *Successive Cyclicity, Anti-locality, and Adposition Stranding*. PhD dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- Abels, Klaus (2012). *Phases: An Essay on Cyclicity in Syntax*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Aboh, Enoch (2004). 'Snowballing movement and generalized pied-piping', in Anne Breitbarth and Henk van Riemsdijk (eds), *Triggers*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 15–47.
- Ackema, Peter, and Ad Neeleman (2003). 'Context-sensitive spell-out'. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 21: 681–735.
- Ackerman, Farrell, and Gert Webelhuth (1998). *A Theory of Predicates*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Adams, James Noel (1971). 'A type of hyperbaton in Latin prose', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 197: 1–16.
- Adams, James Noel (1976a). 'A typological approach to Latin word order', *Indogermanische Forschungen* 81: 70–99.
- Adams, James Noel (1976b). *The Text and Language of a Vulgar Latin Chronicle (Anonymus Valesianus II)*, Bulletin Supplement (University of London, Institute of Classical Studies) no. 36. London: Institute of Classical Studies.
- Adams, James Noel (1994a). 'Wackernagel's Law and the position of unstressed pronouns in Classical Latin', *Transactions of the Philological Society* 92: 103–78.
- Adams, James Noel (1994b). *Wackernagel's Law and the Placement of the Copula Esse in Classical Latin*. Cambridge: The Cambridge Philological Society.
- Adams James Noel (2005). 'The accusative + infinitive and dependent *quod-/quia*-clauses: the evidence of non-literary Latin and Petronius', in Sander Kiss, Luca Mondin, and Giampaolo Salvi (eds), *Latin et langues romanes: études de linguistique offertes à József Herman à l'occasion de son 80<sup>ème</sup> anniversaire*. Tübingen, Germany: Niemeyer, 195–206.
- Adams, Marianne (1987). *Old French, Null Subjects and Verb Second Phenomena*. PhD dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Agbayani, Brian, and Chris Golston (2010). 'Second-position is first-position: Wackernagel's law and the role of clausal conjunction', *Indogermanische Forschungen: Zeitschrift für Indogermanistik und allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft* 115: 1–21.
- Alexiadou, Artemis, and Elena Anagnostopoulou (1998). 'Parametrizing AGR: word order, V-movement, and EPP checking'. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16: 491–539.
- Alexiadou, Artemis, and Elena Anagnostopoulou (2001). 'The subject-in-situ generalization and the role of case in driving computations'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32: 193–231.
- Algeo, John (2003). 'The origins of Southern American English', in Stephen J. Nagle and Sara L. Sanders (eds), *English in the Southern United States*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 6–16.
- Amaral, Patrícia, and Fabio Del Prete (2014). 'On truth persistence: a comparison between European Portuguese and Italian in relation to *sempre*', in Marie Héléne Côté and Eric Mathieu (eds), *Romance Languages: Linguistics Symposium on Romance Languages (LSRL), Ottawa, 5–7 May 2011*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 135–54.

- Ambar, Manuela (1992). *Para uma Sintaxe da Inversão Sujeito-Verbo em Português*. Lisboa: Colibri.
- Ambar, Manuela, Manuela Gonzaga, and Esmeralda Negrão (2002). 'Tense, quantification and clause structure in EP and BP: evidence from a comparative study on *sempre*'. Paper presented at Going Romance 2002, University of Groningen (28–30 November 2002). <[http://www.academia.edu/777183/Tense\\_quantification\\_and\\_clause\\_structure\\_in\\_EP\\_and\\_BP](http://www.academia.edu/777183/Tense_quantification_and_clause_structure_in_EP_and_BP)>.
- Ambar, Manuela, Manuela Gonzaga, and Esmeralda Negrão (2004). 'Tense, quantification and clause structure in EP and BP: evidence from a comparative study on *sempre*', in Reineke Bok-Bennema, Bart Hollebrandse, Brigitte Kampers-Manhe, and Petra Sleeman (eds), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2002: Selected Papers from 'Going Romance', University of Groningen (28<sup>th</sup>–30<sup>th</sup> November 2002)*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 1–16.
- Anagnostopoulou, Elena (2003). 'Participles and Voice', in Artemis Alexiadou, Monica Rathert, and Arnim von Stechow (eds), *Perfect Explorations*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1–36.
- Anderson, Gregory D. S. (2006). *Auxiliary Verb Constructions*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Androutopoulou, Antonia (1997). 'Reduced relatives in DPs: evidence from adjective extraction in modern Greek', *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 31: 19–40.
- Antonelli, André (2011). *Sintaxe de posição do verbo e mudança gramatical na história do português europeu*, PhD dissertation, University of Campinas, São Paulo, Brazil.
- Antonelli, André (2014). 'Orações subordinadas sem o complementizador *Que* no português clássico'. *D.E.L.T.A.* 30: 197–212.
- Bacscai-Atkari, Julia (2011). 'A komparatív operátor esete a mondatbevezetővel: szintaktikai változások a magyar hasonlító mellékmondatokban' [The comparative operator's affair with the complementiser: syntactic changes in Hungarian comparative subclauses], in Katalin É. Kiss and Attila Hegedűs (eds), *Nyelvelmélet és diakrónia* [Language theory and diachrony]. Budapest/Piliscsaba: Szent István Társulat, 103–19.
- Bacscai-Atkari, Julia (2014). *The Syntax of Comparative Constructions: Operators, Ellipsis Phenomena and Functional Left Peripheries*. Potsdam, Germany: Universitätsverlag Potsdam.
- Bailey, Natalie, Guy Maynor, and Patricia Cukor-Avila (1991). *The Emergence of Black English: Text and Commentary*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Baker, Mark (1985). 'Mirror theory and morphosyntactic explanation', *Linguistic Inquiry* 16: 373–415.
- Baker, Mark C. (1988). *Incorporation: A Theory of Grammatical Function Changing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Baker, Mark C. (2002). 'Building and merging, not checking: the non-existence of (Aux)-S-V-O languages'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33: 321–8.
- Baker, Mark C. (2003). *Lexical Categories: Verbs, Nouns and Adjectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Baker, Mark C. (2008). 'The macroparameter in a microparametric world', in Theresa Biberauer (ed.), *The Limits of Syntactic Variation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 351–73.
- Bakró-Nagy, Marianne (1999). 'A magyar határozott névelő kialakulásának szintaktikai vonatkozásai' [Syntactic aspects of the development of the Hungarian definite article], in

- Büky, László, and Tamás Forgács (eds), *A nyelvtörténeti kutatások újabb eredményei I. Magyar és finnugor mondattörténet*. Szeged, Hungary: JATE Magyar Nyelvészeti Tanszék, 5–13.
- Bartos, Huba (2000). 'Az inflexió jelenségek szintaktikai háttere' [The syntactic background of the inflectional phenomena], in Ferenc Kiefer (ed.), *Strukturális magyar nyelvtan 3. Morfológia*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 653–762.
- Bartos, Huba (2001). 'Mutató névmási módosítók a magyar főnévi szerkezetben: egyezés vagy osztozás?' [Demonstrative modifiers in the Hungarian noun phrase: agreement or share], in Marianne Bakró-Nagy, Zoltán Bánréti, and Katalin É. Kiss (eds), *Újabb tanulmányok a strukturális magyar nyelvtan és a nyelvtörténet köréből*. Budapest: Osiris, 19–41.
- Bašić, Monika (2004). *Nominal Subextractions and the Structure of NPs in Serbian and English*. MA dissertation, University of Tromsø, Norway.
- Basilico, David (1996). 'Head position and internally headed relative clauses', *Language* 72: 498–533.
- Batllori, Montse, Maria-Lluïsa Hernanz, Carme Picallo, and Francesc Roca, eds (2005). *Grammaticalization and Parametric Variation*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Battye, Adrian, and Ian Roberts (eds) (1995). *Clause Structure and Language Change*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bauer, Brigitte (1995). *The Emergence and Development of SVO Patterning in Latin and French*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bauer, Brigitte (2009). 'Word order', in Philip Baldi and Pierluigi Cuzzolin (eds), *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax*. Volume 1: *Syntax of the Sentence*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 241–316.
- Bauer, Laurie (2001). *Morphological Productivity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Baunaz, Lena (2011). *The Grammar of French Quantification*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Bayer, Joseph (2009). 'Nominal Negative Quantifiers as Adjuncts', *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 12: 5–30.
- Beekes, Robert S. P. (2010). *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*, Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Belletti, Adriana (1990). *Generalized Verb Movement*. Turin: Rosenberg and Sellier.
- Belletti, Adriana (2001). 'Inversion as focalization', in Aafke Hulk and Jean-Yves Pollock (eds), *Subject Inversion in Romance and the Theory of Universal Grammar*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 60–90.
- Belletti, Adriana (2004). 'Aspects of the low IP area', in Luigi Rizzi (ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Volume 2*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 16–51.
- Benincà, Paola, and Cecilia Poletto (2004). 'Topic, focus, and V2. Defining the CP sublayers', in Luigi Rizzi (ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Volume 2*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 52–75.
- Benincà, Paola (2006). 'A detailed map of the left periphery of medieval romance', in Raffaella Zanuttini, Héctor Campos, Elena Herburger, and Paul Portner (eds), *Negation, Tense and Clausal Architecture: Cross-linguistics Investigations*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 53–86.
- Bergin, Osborn (1938). 'On the syntax of the verb in Old Irish,' *Ériu* 12: 197–214.
- Bergin, Osborn J., Richard Irvine Best, Kuno Meyer, and James George O'Keefe (eds) (1907–13). *Anecdota from Irish Manuscripts*. 5 volumes. Halle: Max Niemeyer.

- Bernstein, Judy B., and Raffaella Zanuttini (2012). 'A Diachronic Shift in the Expression of Person', in Charlotte Galves, Sonia Cyrino, Ruth Lopes, Filomena Sandalo, and Juanito Avelar (eds), *Parameter Theory and Linguistic Change*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 157–75.
- Bertinetto, Pier Marco, and Valentina Bianchi (2003). 'Tense, aspect, and syntax: a review of Giorgi and Piansesi (1977)'. *Linguistics* 41: 565–606.
- Berwick, Robert C., and Noam Chomsky (2011). 'The biolinguistic program: the current state of its development', in Anna Maria Di Sciullo and Cedric Boeckx (eds) *The Biolinguistic Enterprise: New Perspectives on the Evolution and Nature of the Human Language Faculty*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 19–41.
- Bianchi, Valentina (1999). *Consequences of Antisymmetry: Headed Relative Clauses*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Biberauer, Theresa (2003). *Verb Second (V2) in Afrikaans: A Minimalist Investigation of Word Order Variation*. PhD dissertation, University of Cambridge.
- Biberauer, Theresa, Anders Holmberg, and Ian Robert (2008). 'Structure and linearization in disharmonic word orders', in Charles Chang, and Hannah Haynie (eds), *Proceedings of the 26<sup>th</sup> West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project, 96–104.
- Biberauer, Theresa, Anders Holmberg, and Ian Roberts (2009). 'Linearization and the architecture of grammar: a view from the final-over-final constraint'. *StiL—Studies in Linguistics (Proceedings of XXXV Incontro di Grammatica Generativa)* 3: 78–91.
- Biberauer, Theresa, Anders Holmberg and Ian Roberts (2014). 'A syntactic universal and its consequences', *Linguistic Inquiry* 45: 169–225.
- Biberauer, Theresa, Glenda Newton, and Michelle Sheehan (2009). 'Limiting synchronic and diachronic variation and change: the final-over-final constraint', *Language and Linguistics* 10: 701–43.
- Biberauer, Theresa, and Ian Roberts (2005). 'Changing EPP parameters in the history of English: accounting for variation and change', in William van der Wurff (ed), *Journal of English Language and Linguistics (Special Issue on Word Order Change)* 9: 5–46.
- Biberauer, Theresa, and Ian Roberts (2008). 'Cascading parameter changes: internally-driven change in Middle and Early Modern English', in Þorhallur Eypósson (ed.), *Grammatical Change and Linguistic Theory*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 79–133.
- Biberauer, Theresa, and Ian Roberts (2010). 'Subjects, tense and verb movement', in Theresa Biberauer, Anders Holmberg, Ian Roberts, and Michelle Sheehan (eds), *Parametric Variation: Null Subjects in Minimalist Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 263–302.
- Biberauer, Theresa, and Ian Roberts (2017). 'Conditional inversion and types of parametric change', in Bettelou Los and Pieter de Haan (eds), *Verb-Second Languages: Essays in Honour of Ans van Kemenade*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 57–77.
- Biberauer, Theresa, and Michelle Sheehan (2012). 'Disharmony, antisymmetry, and the final-over-final constraint', in Valmala Elguea and Myriam Extebarria (eds), *Ways of Structure Building*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 206–44.
- Biberauer, Theresa, and George Walkden (eds) (2015). *Syntax Over Time: Lexical, morphological and information-structural interactions*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Birner, Betty J. (1998). 'Recency effects in English inversion'. in Marilyn Walker, Aravind K. Joshi, and Ellen F. Prince (eds), *Centering Theory in Discourse*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 309–26.

- Bisagni, Jacopo (2014). 'Prolegomena to the study of code-switching in the Old Irish Glosses'. *Peritia* 24–25 [2013–14]: 1–58.
- Blümel, Rudolf (1914). *Einführung in die Syntax*, Heidelberg: C. Winter.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan David, and Dianne Jonas (1996). 'Subject positions and the roles of TP'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 27: 195–236.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan D. (2002). 'Realizing Germanic inflection: why morphology does not drive syntax'. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Languages* 6: 129–167.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan D., and Susi Wurmbrand (2005). 'The domain of agreement'. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 23: 809–865.
- Boisacq, Emile (1916). *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque étudiée dans ses rapports avec les autres langues indo-européennes*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Bošković, Željko (1994). 'D-structure,  $\theta$ -criterion, and movement into  $\theta$ -positions'. *Linguistic Analysis* 24: 247–86.
- Bošković, Željko (1997). *The Syntax of Nonfinite Complementation: An Economy Approach*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bošković, Željko (2001). *On the Nature of the Syntax-Phonology Interface: Cliticization and Related Phenomena*. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science.
- Bošković, Željko (2002). 'On multiple wh-fronting'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33: 351–83.
- Bošković, Željko (2003). 'On left branch extraction', in Peter Kosta, Joanna Błaszczak, Jens Frasek, Ljudmila Geist, and Marzena Żygis (eds), *Investigations into Formal Slavic Linguistics*. Berlin: Peter Lang, 543–77.
- Bošković, Željko (2004a). 'On the clitic switch in Greek imperatives', in Olga Tomić (ed.), *Balkan Syntax and Semantics*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 269–291.
- Bošković, Željko (2004b). 'PF merger in stylistic fronting and object shift', in Arthur Stepanov, Gisbert Fanselow, and Ralf Vogel (eds), *Minimality Effects in Syntax*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 37–71.
- Bošković, Željko (2004c). 'Topicalization, focalization, lexical insertion, and scrambling'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35: 613–38.
- Bošković, Željko (2005a). 'On the locality of left branch extraction and the structure of NP'. *Studia Linguistica* 59: 1–45.
- Bošković, Željko (2005b). 'Left branch extraction, structure of NP, and scrambling', in Joachim Sabel, and Mamoru Saito (eds), *The Free Word Order Phenomenon: Its Syntactic Sources and Diversity*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 13–73.
- Bošković, Željko (2008). 'What will you have, DP or NP?', in Emily Elfner and Martin Walkow (eds), *Proceedings of the Thirty-Ninth Annual North East Linguistic Society*. University of Massachusetts, Amherst: GLSA, 101–14.
- Bošković, Željko (2009). 'More on the no-DP analysis of article-less languages'. *Studia Linguistica* 63: 187–203.
- Bošković, Željko, and Jon Gajewski (2011). 'Semantic correlates of the NP/DP parameter', in Suzi Lima, Kevin Mullin, and Brian Smith (eds), *Proceedings of the Thirty-Ninth Annual North East Linguistic Society*. University of Massachusetts, Amherst: GLSA, 121–34.
- Bošković, Željko, and Jairo Nunes (2007). 'The copy theory of movement: a view from PF', in Norbert Corver, and Jairo Nunes (eds), *The Copy Theory of Movement*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 13–74.

- Breitbarth, Anne, and Liliane Haegeman (2009). 'Not continuity, but change: stable Stage II in Jespersen's Cycle'. Manuscript. University of Cambridge; Ghent University, Belgium.
- Breitbarth, Anne, and Henk van Riemsdijk (eds) (2004). *Triggers*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Brito, Ana Maria (2001). 'Clause structure, subject positions and verb movement: about the position of *sempre* in European and Brazilian Portuguese', in Yves D'Hulst, Johan Rooryck, and Jan Schroten (eds), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 1999: Selected Papers from 'Going Romance' 1999, Leiden, 9–11 December 1999*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 63–85.
- Broekhuis, Hans, and Veronika Hegedűs (2009). 'Predicate movement'. *Lingua* 119: 531–563.
- Brunet, Étienne, and Sylvie Mellet (n.d.). 'Hyperbase 5.5: Logiciel hypertexte pour le traitement documentaire et statistique des corpus textuels'. *Base de littérature latine. Bases, Corpus & Langage* (Université de Nice—Sophia Antipolis) and LASLA (Université de Liège, Belgium).
- Bures, Anton (1992). '(Re)-cycling expletives and other sentences'. General papers, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA.
- Butler, Alastair, and Eric Mathieu (2004). *The Syntax and Semantics of Split Constructions: A Comparative Study*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Campos, Odete G. L. A. de Souza, and Ângela Rodrigues (2002). 'A flexão verbal modotemporal no português culto do Brasil: sufixos e auxiliares', in Ataliba Teixeira de Castilho, (ed.), *Gramática do Português Falado*. Volume 3: *As Abordagens*. Campinas, São Paulo: Editora Unicamp, 405–429.
- Cardinaletti, Anna (2001). 'A second thought on «emarginazione»: destressing vs. «right dislocation»', in Guglielmo Cinque and Giampaolo Salvi (eds), *Current Studies in Italian Syntax. Essays Offered to Lorenzo Renzi*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 117–35.
- Cardinaletti, Anna (2004). 'Towards a cartography of subject positions', in Luigi Rizzi (ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Volume 2*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 115–65.
- Cardinaletti, Anna, and Michael Starke (1999). 'The typology of structural deficiency: a case study of the three classes of pronouns', in Henk van Riemsdijk (ed.), *Clitics in the Languages of Europe*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 145–233.
- Cardoso, Adriana (2010). *Variation and Change in the Syntax of Relative Clauses: New Evidence from Portuguese*. PhD dissertation, University of Lisbon.
- Castilho, Ataliba Teixeira de (2010). *Nova Gramática do Português Brasileiro*. São Paulo, Brazil: Editora Contexto.
- Castillo, Juan Carlos, John E. Drury, and Kleantes K. Grohmann (2009). 'Merge over move and the extended projection principle: MOM and the EPP revisited'. *Iberia: An International Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 1.1: 53–114.
- Cecchetto, Carlo, and Renato Oniga (2002). 'Consequences of the analysis of Latin infinitival clauses for the theory of case and control', *Lingue e Linguaggio* 1: 151–89.
- Chesnutt, Charles, and Werner Sollors (2002). *Charles W. Chesnutt: Stories, Novels and Essays*. New York: Library of America.
- Chomsky, Noam (1977). 'On *wh*-movement', in Peter Culicover, Thomas Wasow, and Adrian Akmajian (eds), *Formal Syntax*. New York: Academic Press, 71–132.
- Chomsky, Noam (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding. The Pisa Lectures*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Chomsky, Noam (1993). 'A minimalist program for linguistic theory', in Kenneth Hale, and Samuel J. Keyser (eds) *The View from Building 20: Essays in Linguistics in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1–52.

- Chomsky, Noam (1995). *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam (2000). 'Minimalist inquiries: the framework', in Roger Martin, David Michaelis, and Juan Uriagereka (eds), *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 89–156.
- Chomsky, Noam (2001). 'Derivation by phase', in Michael Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: A Life in Linguistics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1–52.
- Chomsky, Noam (2005). 'Three factors in language design'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36: 1–22.
- Chomsky, Noam (2008). 'On phases', in Robert Friedin, Carlos P. Otero, and María Luisa Zubizarreta (eds), *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory: Essays in Honour of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 133–165.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (1994). 'On the evidence for partial N movement in the Romance DP', in Guglielmo Cinque, Jan Koster, Jean-Yves Pollock, Luigi Rizzi, and Raffaella Zanuttini (eds), *Paths towards Universal Grammar: Studies in Honor of Richard S. Kayne*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 85–110.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (1999). *Adverbs and Functional Heads: A Cross-linguistic Perspective*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (2001). 'A note on mood, modality, tense and aspect suffixes in Turkish', in Eser Erguvanlı Taylan (ed.), *The Verb in Turkish*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 47–59.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (2004). 'Restructuring and functional structure', in A. Belletti (ed.), *Structures and Beyond. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Volume 3*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 132–91.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (2005). 'Deriving Greenberg's universal 20 and its exceptions', *Linguistic Inquiry* 36: 315–32.
- Clackson, James, and Geoffrey Horrocks (2007). *The Blackwell History of the Latin Language*. Oxford/New York: Blackwell.
- Clark, Robin, and Ian Roberts (1993). 'A computational approach to language learnability and language change'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24: 299–345.
- Coelho, António Borges (1987). *Inquisição de Évora: Dos primórdios a 1668*. Volume 2. Lisboa: Caminho.
- Conradie, Simone (2007). 'The setting of the Split-IP parameter in Afrikaans: evidence from transitive expletive constructions and object shift constructions', *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics PLUS* 35, 53–86.
- Cook, Philippa, and Felix Bildhauer (2011). 'Annotating information structure: the case of topic', in Stephanie Dipper and Heike Zinsmeister (eds), *Beyond Semantics: Corpus based Investigations of Pragmatic and Discourse Phenomena (Proceedings of the DGfS Workshop Göttingen, February 23–25, 2011)*. Ruhr Universität Bochum, Bochumer Linguistische Arbeitsberichte, 45–56.
- Cormack, Annabel, and Neil V. Smith (2000). 'Fronting: the syntax and pragmatics of "focus" and "topic"'. *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics* 12, 387–416.
- Corver, Norbert (1992). 'Left branch extraction', in *NELS 22: Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society*, University of Delaware, Newark, 67–84.
- Costa, João (1998). *Word Order Variation: A Constraint-based Approach*. The Hague: Holland Academic Graphics.

- Costa, João (2004). *Subject Positions and the Interfaces: The Case of European Portuguese*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Costa, João, and Ana Maria Martins (2010). 'Middle scrambling with deictic locatives in European Portuguese'. in Reineke Bok-Bennema, Brigitte Kampers-Manhe, and Bart Hollebrandse (eds), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2008: Selected Papers from 'Going Romance', Groningen 2008*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 59–76.
- Costa, João, and Ana Maria Martins (2011). 'On focus movement in European Portuguese', *Probus* 23.2: 217–45.
- Crisma, Paola, and Giuseppe Longobardi (eds) (2009). *Historical Syntax and Linguistic Theory*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cruschina, Silvio (2011). *Discourse-Related Features and Functional Projections*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cyrino, Sonia (2013). 'On richness of tense and verb movement in Brazilian Portuguese', in Victoria Camacho-Taboada, Ángel L. Jiménez-Fernández, Javier Martín-González, and Mariano Reyes-Tejedor (eds), *Information Structure and Agreement*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 297–317.
- D. Mátaí Mária (1991). 'Az igekötők' [Particles], in Loránd Benkő (ed.), *A magyar nyelv történeti nyelvtana I. A korai ómagyar kor és előzményei* [The historical grammar of Hungarian. Volume 1: Early Old Hungarian and before]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 433–41.
- D. Mátaí Mária (1992). 'Az igekötők' [Particles], in Loránd Benkő (ed.), *A magyar nyelv történeti nyelvtana II/1. A kései ómagyar kor. Morfematika* [The historical grammar of Hungarian. Volume 2/1: Late Old Hungarian. Morphemics]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 662–95.
- D. Mátaí Mária (2003). 'Szófajttörténet' [The history of word classes], in Jenő Kiss and Ferenc Pusztai (eds) *Magyar nyelvtörténet* [Hungarian language history]. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó, 393–429.
- Danckaert, Lieven (2011). *On the Left Periphery of Latin Embedded Clauses*. PhD dissertation, Ghent University, Belgium.
- Danckaert, Lieven (2012). *Latin Embedded Clauses: The Left Periphery*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Danckaert, Lieven (2014). 'The derivation of Classical Latin Aux-final clauses: implications for the internal structure of the verb phrase', in Karen Lahousse and Stefania Marzo (eds), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2012: Selected Papers from 'Going Romance' Leuven 2012*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 141–59.
- Danckaert, Lieven (2017). *The Development of Latin Clause Structure. A Study of the Extended Verb Phrase*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- De Haan, Germen J. (1990). 'De friese imperativus-pro-infinitivo'. *Taal en Tongval Thema-nummer Dialectsyntaxis* 42: 87–107.
- De Haan, Germen J. (2010). *Studies in West Frisian Grammar: Selected Papers by Germen J. De Haan*, ed. Jarich Hoekstra, Willem Visser, and Goffe Jensma. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- De Vries, Mark (2002). *The Syntax of Relativization*. Utrecht: LOT.
- Demirdache, Hamida (1991). *Resumptive Chains in Restrictive Relatives, Appositives, and Dislocation Structures*. PhD dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA.

- Demirdache, Hamida, and Myriam Uribe-Etxebarria (2000). 'The primitives of temporal relations', in Roger Martin, David Michaels, and Juan Uriagereka (eds), *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 157–86.
- Den Besten, Hans (1983). 'On the interaction of root transformations and lexical deletive rules', in Werner Abraham (ed.), *On the Formal Syntax of the Westgermania. Papers from the '3rd Groningen Grammar Talks' Groningen, January 1981*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 3: 47–131.
- Den Dikken, Marcel (1995). *Particles: On the Syntax of Verb-Particle, Triadic, and Causative Constructions*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Den Dikken, Marcel (2006a). *Relators and Linkers: The Syntax of Predication, Predicate Inversion, and Copulas*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Den Dikken, Marcel (2006b). 'Either-float and the syntax of co-or-dination', *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 24.3: 689–749.
- Denison, David. (1985). 'The origins of periphrastic DO: Ellegård and Visser reconsidered', in Roger Eaton, Olga Fischer, Willem Koopman, and Frederike van der Leek (ed.), *Papers from the 4th International Conference on English Historical Linguistics*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 45–60.
- Derksen, Rick (2008). *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexicon*. Volume 4 of *Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Devine, Andrew, and Laurence Stephens (2006). *Latin Word Order: Structured Meaning and Information*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dias, Augusto Epifânio da Silva (1970 [1933]). *Sintaxe Histórica Portuguesa*. Lisbon: Clássica Editora.
- Dictionary of the Scots Language* (n.d.) Scottish Language Dictionaries Ltd. <<http://www.dsl.ac.uk/>>
- Dobrovie Sorin, Carmen (1994). *The Syntax of Romanian*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Doetjes, Jenny (1997). *Quantifiers and Selection: On the Distribution of Quantifying Expressions in French, Dutch and English*. The Hague: HAG.
- Doherty, Cathal (2000). 'Residual verb second in Early Irish: on the nature of Bergin's construction'. *Diachronica* 17: 5–38.
- Dömötör, Adrienne (2008). 'A főnévi névmási kijelölő jelző a középmagyar korban' [The demonstrative modifier in the Middle Hungarian period], in László Büky, Tamás Forgács, and Balázs Sinkovics (eds), *A nyelvtörténeti kutatások újabb eredményei V*. Szeged, Hungary: Szegedi Tudományegyetem Magyar Nyelvészeti Tanszék, 17–25.
- Dömötör, Éva, and Diána Varga (2014). Főmondati kötőmód diskurzuspártikulákkal [Matrix subjunctive with discourse particles], in Zsuzsanna Gécseg (ed.), *Lingdok 13. Nyelvészdoktoranduszok dolgozatai*. Szegedi Tudományegyetem Nyelvtudományi Doktori Iskola, Szeged, Hungary, 27–46.
- Don, Jan, Paula Fenger, and Olaf Koenenman (2013). 'Restricting language change through micro-comparative analysis'. Talk presented at GLOW, Lund.
- Dressler, Wolfgang U. (2003). 'Degrees of grammatical productivity in inflectional morphology'. *Rivista di Linguistica* 15: 31–62.
- Dryer, Matthew S. (1992). 'The Greenbergian word order correlations', *Language* 68: 81–138.
- Dryer, Matthew S. (2009). 'The branching direction theory of word order correlations revisited', in Sergio Scalise, Elisabetta Magni, and Antonietta Bisetto (eds), *Universals of Language Today*. Berlin: Springer, 185–207.

- Dryer, Matthew S. (2013). 'Position of tense–aspect affixes', in Matthew S. Dryer and Martin Haspelmath (eds), *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology.
- Duarte, Inês (2003). 'Algumas reflexões sobre ordem de palavras em línguas românicas de sujeito nulo', in Ana Maria Brito, Isabel Margarida Duarte, and Joana Guimarães (eds), *Língua Portuguesa: Estruturas, Usos e Contrastes*. Porto, Portugal: CLUP, 133–46.
- Dunkel, George E. (1982). 'IE conjunctions: pleonasm, ablaut, suppletion', *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 96: 178–99.
- É. Kiss, Katalin (1997). 'Discourse configurationality in the languages of Europe'. *Constituent Order in the Languages of Europe*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 681–727.
- É. Kiss, Katalin (1998). 'Identificational focus versus information focus', *Language* 74: 245–73.
- É. Kiss, Katalin (2000). 'The Hungarian noun phrase is like the English noun phrase', in Alberti, Gábor, and István Kenesei (eds), *Approaches to Hungarian 7*. Szeged, Hungary: JATE Press, 121–49.
- É. Kiss, Katalin (2002). *The Syntax of Hungarian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- É. Kiss, Katalin (ed.) (2006). *Event Structure and the Left Periphery: Studies on Hungarian*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- É. Kiss, Katalin (2010). 'Is free postverbal order in Hungarian a syntactic or a PF phenomenon?', in Nomi Erteschik-Shir, and Lisa Rochman (eds) *The Sound Patterns of Syntax*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 53–71.
- É. Kiss, Katalin (2011). 'Az ősmagyar SOV-tól az ómagyar (TQF)VSO-ig' [From Proto-Hungarian SOV to Old Hungarian (TQF)VSO], in Katalin É. Kiss and Attila Hegedűs (eds), *Nyelvelmélet és diakrónia* [Language theory and diachrony]. Piliscsaba: PPKE BTK elméleti Nyelvészeti Tanszék—Magyar Nyelvészeti Tanszék, 85–102.
- É. Kiss, Katalin (2013). 'From Proto-Hungarian SOV to Old Hungarian Top Foc V X\*', *Diachronica* 30: 202–31.
- É. Kiss, Katalin (2014a). 'The evolution of functional left peripheries in the Hungarian sentence', in Katalin É. Kiss (ed.), *The Evolution of Functional Left Peripheries in Hungarian Syntax*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 9–55.
- É. Kiss, Katalin (2014b). 'Ways of licensing Hungarian external possessors', *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 61: 45–68.
- Egedi, Barbara (2013). 'Grammatical encoding of referentiality in the history of Hungarian', in Anna Giacalone Ramat, Caterina Mauri, and Piera Molinelli (eds), *Synchrony and Diachrony: A Dynamic Interface*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 367–90.
- Egedi, Barbara (2014a). 'The DP-cycle in Hungarian and the functional extension of the noun phrase', in É. Kiss Katalin (ed.), *The Evolution of Functional Left Peripheries in Hungarian Syntax*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 56–82.
- Egedi, Barbara (2014b). 'A latin forrásszövegek hatása az ómagyar szintaktikai jelenségekre' [The influence of Latin sources on Old Hungarian syntax], in É. Kiss Katalin (ed.), *Magyar generatív történeti mondattan*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó: 280–5.
- Egedi, Barbara, and Eszter Simon (2012). 'Gradual expansion in the use of the definite article: Checking a theory against the Old Hungarian Corpus'. Talk given at the conference 'Exploring Ancient Languages through Corpora', 14 June 2012, Oslo.

- Eide, Kristine (2006). *Word Order Structures and Unaccusative Verbs in Classical and Modern Portuguese: The Reorganisation of Information Structure*. PhD dissertation, University of Oslo, Norway.
- Eide, Kristine (2010). 'Prosody, information structure and word order changes in Portuguese', in G. Ferraresi and Rosemarie Luhr (eds), *Diachronic Studies on Information Structure: Language Acquisition and Change*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 143–60.
- Elenbaas, Marion (2006). *The Synchronic and Diachronic Syntax of the English Verb-Particle Combination*. PhD dissertation, Radboud University, Nijmegen, Netherlands.
- Ellegård, Alvar (1953). 'The auxiliary do: the establishment and regulation of its use in English', in Frank Behre (ed.), *Gothenburg Studies in English*. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell.
- Emonds, Joseph (1985). *A Unified Theory of Syntactic Categories*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Enkvist, Nils Erik (1980). 'Marked focus: function and constraints', in Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik (eds), *Studies in English Linguistics for Randolph Quirk*. London: Longman, 134–52.
- Ernout, Alfred, and Antoine Meillet (1985). *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine: histoire des mots (retirage de la 4<sup>e</sup> édition augmentée d'additions et de corrections par Jacques André)*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Eska, Joseph (2007). 'Bergin's Rule'. *Diachronica* 24: 253–78.
- Fanselow, Gisbert (1988). 'Aufspaltung von NPn und das Problem der "freien" Wortstellung', *Linguistische Berichte* 114: 91–113.
- Fanselow, Gisbert, and Caroline Féry (2006). 'Prosodic and morphosyntactic aspects of discontinuous noun phrases: a crosslinguistic perspective'. Manuscript. University of Postdam; Goethe-Universität Frankfurt.
- Fanselow, Gisbert, and Damir Čavar (2002). 'Distributed deletion', in Artemis Alexiadou (ed.), *Theoretical Approaches to Universals*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 65–107.
- Farkas, Donka, and Henriette de Swart (2003). *The Semantics of Incorporation: From Argument Structure to Discourse Transparency*. Stanford, CA: CSLI.
- Feagin, Crawford (1979). *Variation and Change in Alabama English: A Sociolinguistic Study of the White Community*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Fiéis, Alexandra (2002). '(XP)VS em português medieval'. in Maria Helena Mira Mateus, Anabela Gonçalves, and Clara Nunes Correia (eds), *Actas do XVII Encontro Nacional da Associação Portuguesa de Linguística*. Lisbon: Colibri/APL, 175–87.
- Fiéis, Alexandra (2010). 'On the position of *sempre* in Medieval Portuguese and in Modern European Portuguese'. *The Linguistic Review* 27: 75–105.
- Fiengo, Robert (1977). 'On trace theory', *Linguistic Inquiry* 8: 35–61.
- Fitzgerald, Colleen M. (2007). 'An optimality treatment of syntactic inversions in English verse.' *Language Sciences* 29: 203–17.
- Foreman John, (1999). 'Syntax of negative inversion in non-standard English', in Shahin, Kimary N., Blake, Susan, and Kim, Eun-Sook (eds), in Kimary N. Shahin, Susan Blake, and Eun-Sook Kim (eds), *WCCFL 17: Proceedings of the 17th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*. Stanford, CA: CSLI.
- Forrer, Emil (1922–1926). *Die Boğazköy Texte im Umschrift*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrich.
- Fowlie, Meaghan (2013). 'Multiple multiple spellout', in Theresa Biberauer and Ian Roberts (eds), *Challenges to Linearization*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 129–69.

- Franks, Steven, and Ljiljana Progovac (1994). 'On the displacement of Serbo-Croatian clitics', *Indiana Linguistic Studies* 7: 69–78.
- Frascarelli, Mara, and Roland Hinterhölzl (2007). 'Types of topics in German and Italian', in Suzanne Winkler and Kerstin Schwabe (eds), *On Information Structure, Meaning and Form*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 87–116.
- Frota, Sónia (1998). *Prosody and Focus in European Portuguese*. PhD dissertation, University of Lisbon.
- Frota, Sónia (2002). 'Nuclear falls and rises in European Portuguese: a phonological analysis of declarative and question intonation', *Probus* 14: 113–46.
- Frota, Sonia, Charlotte Galves, Marina Vigário, Verónica González-López, and Maria Bernadete Abaurre (2012). 'The phonology of rhythm from Classical to Modern Portuguese'. *Journal of Historical Linguistics* 2: 173–207.
- Fruyt, Michèle (2011). 'Grammaticalisation in Latin', in Philip Baldi and Pierluigi Cuzzolin (eds), *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax*. Volume 4: *Complex Sentences, Grammaticalization, Typology*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 661–857.
- Galambos, Dezső (1907). 'Tanulmányok a magyar relatívum mondatánáról'. [Studies on the syntax of Hungarian relatives]. Budapest: Athenaeum.
- Gallasy, Magdolna (1992). 'A névelők' [The articles], in Loránd Benkő (ed.), *A magyar nyelv történeti nyelvtana II/1. A kései ómagyar kor. Morfematika*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 716–770.
- Galves, Antonio, and Charlotte Galves (1995). 'A case-study of prosody-driven language change: from Classical to Modern European Portuguese'. Manuscript. University of São Paulo, University of Campinas, Brazil.
- Galves, Charlotte (1996). 'Clitic-placement and parametric change in Portuguese', in Claudia Parodi, Carlos Quicoli, Mario Saltarelli, and María Luisa Zubizarreta (eds). *Aspects of Romance Linguistics: Selected Papers from the 24th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages, 1994*. Georgetown University Press, 227–40.
- Galves, Charlotte (2000). 'Agreement, predication and pronouns in the history of Portuguese', in João Costa (ed.), *Portuguese Syntax: New Comparative Studies*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 143–68.
- Galves, Charlotte, Helena Britto, and Maria Clara Paixão de Sousa (2005). 'The change in clitic placement from Classical to Modern European Portuguese: results from the Tycho Brahe Corpus'. *Journal of Portuguese Linguistics* 4: 39–68.
- Galves, Charlotte, and Maria Clara Paixão de Sousa (2005). 'Clitic placement and the position of subjects in the history of Portuguese', in Twan Geerts, Ivo van Ginneken, and Haïke Jacobs (eds), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory: Selected Papers from 'Going Romance' 2003, Nijmegen 20–22 November*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 93–107.
- Galves, Charlotte, and Maria Clara Paixão de Sousa (2017). 'The change in the position of the verb in the history of Portuguese: subject realization, clitic placement, and prosody'. *Language* 93: e152–e180 (online only).
- Galves, Charlotte, Sonia Cyrino, Ruth Lopes, Filomena Sandalo, and Juanito Avelar (eds) (2012). *Parameter Theory and Linguistic Change*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Garzonio, Jacopo, and Cecilia Poletto (2017). 'How bare are bare quantifiers? Some notes from diachronic and synchronic variation in Italian', *Linguistic Variation* 17: 44–67.

- Geldner, Karl Friedrich (1896). *Avesta, the Sacred Books of the Parsis*. Stuttgart, Germany: W. Kohlhammer.
- Gergel, Remus (2010). 'Towards notions of comparative continuity in English and French', in Anne Breitbarth, Christopher Lucas, Sheila Watts, and David Willis (eds), *Continuity and Change in Grammar*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 119–44.
- Gibrail, Alba. (2010). *Contextos de formação de estruturas de tópico e foco no português clássico*. PhD dissertation, University of Campinas, São Paulo, Brazil.
- Giorgi, Alexandra, and Fabio Pianesi (1997). *Tense and Aspect: From Semantics to Morphosyntax*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Giusti, Giuliana (2001). 'The birth of a functional category: from Latin ILLE to the Romance article and personal pronoun', in Guglielmo Cinque, and Giampaolo Salvi (eds), *Current Studies in Italian Syntax: Essays Offered to Lorenzo Renzi*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 157–71.
- Giusti, Giuliana, and Renato Oniga (2006). 'La struttura del sintagma nominale latino', in Renato Oniga and Luigi Zennaro (eds), *Atti della Giornata di Linguistica Latina, Venezia, 7 maggio 2004*. Venice: Cafoscarina, 71–99.
- Giusti, Giuliana, and Renato Oniga (2007). 'Core and periphery in the Latin noun phrase', in Gérald Purnelle and Joseph Denooz (eds), *Ordre et cohérence en latin: communications présentées au 13<sup>e</sup> colloque international de linguistique latine (Bruxelles-Liège, 4–9 avril 2005)*. Geneva: Droz, 81–95.
- Giusti, Giuliana, and Iovino, Rossella (2011). 'Evidence for a Split DP in Latin', *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics* 21: 111–29.
- Goldstein, David M. (2016). 'Variation versus change: clausal clitics between Homer and Herodotus', *Indo-European Linguistics* 4: 53–97.
- Gonda, Jan (1954). 'The history and original function of the Indo-European particle \**k<sup>w</sup>e*, especially in Greek and Latin', *Mnemosyne* 4.7: 177–214.
- Gonzaga, Manuela (1997). *Aspectos da sintaxe do advérbio em português*. MA dissertation, University of Lisbon.
- Götze, Michael, Thomas Weskott, Cornelia Endriss, Ines Fiedler, Stefan Hinterwimmer, Svetlana Petrova, Anne Schwarz, Stavros Skopeteas, and Ruben Stoel (2007). 'Information structure.', in Stefanie Dipper, Michael Götze, and Stavros Skopeteas (eds), *Interdisciplinary Studies on Information Structure*, volume 7 of *Working Papers of the SFB 632*. Potsdam, Germany: Universitätsverlag Potsdam, 147–87.
- Green, Lisa (2002). *African American English: A Linguistic Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Green, Lisa (2014). 'Force, focus, and negation in African American English', in Zanuttini, Raffaella and Laurence Horn (eds), *Micro-Syntactic Variation in North American English*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 115–42.
- Greenberg, Joseph H. (1963). *Universals of Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Grewendorf, Günther, and Cecilia Poletto (2005). 'Von OV zu VO: ein Vergleich zwischen Zimbrisch und Plodarisch', in Ermenegildo Bidese, James Dow, and Thomas Stolz (eds), *Das Zimbrische zwischen Germanisch und Romanisch. Diversitas Linguarum vol. 9*. Bochum, Germany: Brockmeyer Verlag, 114–28.
- Griffith, Aaron (2008). 'The animacy hierarchy and the distribution of the notae augentes in Old Irish'. *Ériu* 58: 55–75.

- Griffith, Aaron (2011a). 'Old Irish pronouns: agreement affixes vs. clitic arguments', in Andrew Carnie (ed.), *Formal Approaches to Celtic Linguistics*. Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 65–94.
- Griffith, Aaron (2011b). *Dictionary of the Old Irish Glosses in the Milan MS Ambr. C301 inf.* <[http://www.univie.ac.at/indogermanistik/milan\\_glosses.htm](http://www.univie.ac.at/indogermanistik/milan_glosses.htm)>.
- Grimshaw, Jane (1997). 'Projections, heads, and optimality'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28: 373–422.
- Grimshaw, Jane (2005). 'Extended projection', in Jane Grimshaw, *Words and Structure*. Stanford, CA: Center for the Study of Language and Information, 1–73.
- Grohmann, Kleanthes (2000). *Prolific Peripheries: A Radical View from the Left*. PhD dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.
- Grohmann, Kleanthes (2003). *Prolific Domains: On the Anti-locality of Movement Dependencies*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Haader, Lea (1991). 'Az alárendelő mondatok: Az alanyi, állítmányi, tárgyi és határozói mellékmondatok' [Subordinate clauses: subjective, predicative, objective and adverbial sub-clauses], in Loránd Benkő (ed.), *A magyar nyelv történeti nyelvtana I.: A korai ómagyar kor és előzményei*. [The diachronic grammar of the Hungarian language I: The Early Old Hungarian period and its antecedents]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 728–41.
- Haader, Lea (1995). 'Az alárendelő mondatok: Az alanyi, állítmányi, tárgyi és határozói mellékmondatok' [Subordinate clauses: subjective, predicative, objective and adverbial sub-clauses], in Loránd Benkő (ed.), *A magyar nyelv történeti nyelvtana II/2.: A kései ómagyar kor: Mondattan. Szöveggrammatika*. [The diachronic grammar of the Hungarian language II/2: The Late Old Hungarian period: syntax. Textual grammar]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 506–665.
- Haader Lea (2001). 'Mikrodiakrónia és változásvizsgálat (az összetett mondatokban)' [Microdiachrony and the analysis of changes (in complex sentences)], *Magyar Nyelvőr* 125: 354–71.
- Haader, Lea (2003). 'Az ómagyar kor: Mondattörténet: Az összetett mondat' [The Old Hungarian period: the history of sentences: the complex sentence], in Jenő Kiss and Ferenc Pusztai (eds), *Magyar nyelvtörténet*. [The history of the Hungarian language]. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó, 500–60.
- Haegeman, Liliane (2010). 'Evidential mood, restructuring, and the distribution of functional *sembrare*', in Paola Benincà and Nicola Munaro (eds), *Mapping the Left Periphery. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Volume 5*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 297–326.
- Hale, Ken (1983). 'Warlpiri and the grammar of non-configurational languages', *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 1: 5–47.
- Hale, William, and Carl Buck (1966). *A Latin Grammar*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama.
- Halle, Morris, and Alec Marantz (1993). 'Distributed morphology and the pieces of inflection', in Kenneth Hale and S. Jay Keyser (eds). *The View from Building 20*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 111–76.
- Halle, Morris, and Alec Marantz (1994). 'Some key features of distributed morphology', *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 21, 275–88.
- Hancock, W. Neilson, Thaddeus O'Mahony, Alexander George Richey, and Robert Atkinson (eds) (1865–1901). *Ancient Laws of Ireland*. Dublin: Stationery Office.

- Harley, Heidi (2013). 'External arguments and the mirror principle: on the distinctness of Voice and v', *Lingua* 125: 34–57.
- Harley, Heidi (2014). 'On the identity of roots', *Theoretical Linguistics* 40: 225–76.
- Hegedűs, Veronika (2015). 'The grammaticalization of postpositions in Old Hungarian', in Theresa Biberauer, and George Walkden (eds), *Syntax over Time: Lexical, Morphological and Information–Structural Interactions*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 72–85.
- Heine, Bernd, and Tania Kuteva (2002). *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hellwig, Oliver (2010–11). *The Digital Corpus of Sanskrit (DCS)*. University of Heidelberg: Department of Classical Indology.
- Hendrickson, George Lincoln, and Harry Mortimer Hubbell (1939). *Brutus: Orator, Cicero*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Henry, Alison, and Siobhan Cottell (2007). 'A new approach to transitive expletives: evidence from Belfast English', *English Language and Linguistics* 11: 279–99.
- Herman, József (1985). 'La disparition de la déclinaison latine et l'évolution du syntagme nominal', in Christian Touratier (ed.), *Syntaxe et latin: actes du II<sup>ème</sup> congrès international de linguistique latine, Aix-en-Provence, 28–31 mars 1983*. Marseille: Université de Provence, 345–60.
- Herman, József (2000). *Vulgar Latin*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus P. (2001). 'Articles', in Martin Haspelmath, Ekkehard König, Wulf Oesterreicher, and Wolfgang Raible (eds), *Language Typology and Language Universals: An International Handbook*. Volume. Berlin: De Gruyter, 831–41.
- Hoeksema, Jack (2003). 'Verb movement in Dutch present-participle clauses', in Jan Koster and Henk van Riemsdijk (eds), *Germania et alia: A Linguistic Webschrift for Hans den Besten*. Electronic publication. Groningen University, Netherlands. <<http://odur.let.rug.nl/~koster/DenBesten/contents.htm>>
- Hoekstra, Eric, and Caroline Smits (1996). 'Everything you always wanted to know about complementizer agreement', in Elly van Gelderen and Vida Samii (eds) *Proceedings of WECOL 1998*, Fresno, CA: California State University, 189–200.
- Holmberg, Anders (2000). 'Deriving OV order in Finnish', in Peter Svenonius (ed.), *The Derivation of OV and VO*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 123–52.
- Holmberg, Anders, Aarti Nayudu, and Michelle Sheehan (2009). 'Three partial null–subject languages: a comparison of Brazilian Portuguese, Finnish and Marathi'. *Studia Linguistica* 63: 59–97.
- Holmberg, Anders, and Christer Platzack (1995). *The Role of Inflection in Scandinavian Syntax*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Holmberg, Anders, and Christer Platzack (2005). 'The Scandinavian Languages', in Guglielmo Cinque and Richard S. Kayne (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Syntax*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 373–419.
- Holmberg, Anders, and Ian Roberts (2013). 'The syntax–morphology relation'. *Lingua* 130: 11–131.
- Hopper, Mike, and Elizabeth Traugott (1993). *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Horvath, Julia (1986). *FOCUS in the Theory of Grammar and the Syntax of Hungarian*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Huber, Joseph (2006). *Gramática do Português Antigo*. (Portuguese translation of *Altportugiesisches Elementarbuch*, Carl Winters, 1933). Lisbon: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian.
- Iatridou, Sabine, and Anthony Kroch (1992). 'The licensing of CP-recursion and its relevance to the Germanic verb-second phenomenon', *Working Papers in Scandinavian Linguistics* 50, 1–25.
- Ilari, Rodolfo (2002). 'Sobre os advérbios aspectuais', in Rodolfo Ilari (ed.), *Gramática do Português Falado*. Volume 2: *Níveis de análise linguística*. Campinas, Brazil: Editora Unicamp, 139–80.
- Ingham, Richard (2000). 'Negation and OV order in Late Middle English'. *Journal of Linguistics* 26: 13–38.
- Ingham, Richard (2003). 'The development of Middle English expletive negative sentences', *Transactions of the Philological Society* 101: 411–52.
- Iovino, Rossella (2011). 'Word order in Latin nominal expressions: the syntax of demonstratives', in Renato Oniga, Rossella Iovino, and Giuliana Giusti (eds), *Formal Linguistics and the Teaching of Latin: Theoretical and Applied Perspectives in Comparative Grammars*. Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 51–64.
- Iovino, Rossella (2012a). *La Sintassi delle Espressioni Nominali Latine*. PhD dissertation, University of Venice.
- Iovino, Rossella (2012b). *La Sintassi dei Modificatori Nominali in Latino*. Munich: Lincom.
- Ishii, Toru (1999). 'Cyclic spell-out and the that-t effects', in Sonya Bird, Andrew Carnie, Jason Haugen, and Peter Norquest (eds), *Proceedings of the West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics* 18. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla, 220–31.
- Jackendoff, Ray (1977). *X'-Syntax: A Study of Phrase Structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Jackson, John James (2008). *The Iliad of Homer: a Parsed Interlinear Text*. <<http://www.textkit.com/greek-latin-forum/viewtopic.php?t=8146>>.
- Jäger, Agnes (2008). *History of German Negation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Jagić, Vatroslav I. (ed.) (1883). *Quattuor evangeliorum versionis palaeoslovenicae codex Marianus glagoliticus*. St Petersburg, Russia: Berolini.
- Jelinek, Eloise (1984). 'Empty categories, case, and configurationality', *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 2: 39–76.
- Jespersen, Otto (1966<sup>2</sup> [1917]). *Negation in English and Other Languages*. Copenhagen: A. F. Høst.
- Jøhndal, Marius L., Dag T. T. Haug, and Anders Nøklestad (2014). *PROIEL: Pragmatic Resources in Old Indo-European Languages*. University of Oslo. <<http://foni.uio.no:3000>>
- Jonas, Dianne (1996). *Clause Structure and Verb Syntax in Scandinavian and English*. PhD dissertation, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.
- Jonas, Dianne, John Whitman, and Andrew Garrett (eds) (2012). *Grammatical Change: Origins, Nature, Outcomes*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Juhász, Dezső (1991). 'A kötőszók' [Conjunctions], in Loránd Benkő (ed.), *A magyar nyelv történeti nyelvtana I.: A korai ómagyar kor és előzményei*. [The diachronic grammar of the Hungarian language I: The Early Old Hungarian period and its antecedents]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 476–500.

- Juhász, Dezső (1992). 'A kötőszók' [Conjunctions], in Loránd Benkő (ed.), *A magyar nyelv történeti nyelvtana II/1.: A kései ómagyar kor: Morfematika*. [The diachronic grammar of the Hungarian language II/1: The Late Old Hungarian period: Morphology]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 772–814.
- Julien, Marit (2001). 'The syntax of complex tenses'. *The Linguistic Review* 18: 125–67.
- Julien, Marit (2002). *Syntactic Heads and Word Formation*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kahane, Ahuvia, and Martin Mueller (2014). *The Chicago Homer*. Electronic corpus. Chicago: Northwestern University. <<http://digital.library.northwestern.edu/homer/>>.
- Kaiser, George (1999). 'A ordem de palavras e a posição do verbo finito no Português Antigo', in *Actas do Congresso Internacional Organizado por Motivos dos Vinte Anos do Português no Ensino Superior*, Budapest: University Eötvös Loránd, 248–61.
- Kálmán, László (1985a). 'Word order in neutral sentences', in István Kenesei (ed.), *Approaches to Hungarian 1*. Szeged, Hungary: JATE, 13–23.
- Kálmán, László (1985b). 'Word order in non-neutral sentences', in István Kenesei (ed.), *Approaches to Hungarian 1*. Szeged, Hungary: JATE, 25–37.
- Kayne, Richard (1975). *French Syntax: The Transformational Cycle*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kayne, Richard (1991). 'Romance clitics, verb movement and PRO', *Linguistic Inquiry* 22: 647–86.
- Kayne, Richard (1992). 'Italian negative infinitival imperatives and clitic climbing', in Liliane Tasmowski and Anne Zribi-Hertz (eds), *Hommages à Nicolas Ruwet*, 300–12. Ghent, Belgium: Communication and Cognition.
- Kayne, Richard (1994). *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kayne, Richard (2005). 'Some notes on comparative syntax, with special reference to English and French', in Guglielmo Cinque and Richard S. Kayne (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Syntax*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 3–69.
- Kayne, Richard (2013). 'Comparative syntax'. *Lingua* 130: 132–51.
- Kenesei, István (1986). 'On the logic of word order in Hungarian', in Werner Abraham and Sjaak de Meij (eds), *Topic, Focus and Configurationality*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 143–59.
- Kenesei, István (1994). 'Subordinate Clauses', in Ferenc Kiefer and Katalin É. Kiss (eds), *The syntactic structure of Hungarian*. San Diego/New York: Academic Press, 275–354.
- Kessler, Brett (1995). 'Discontinuous constituents in Latin'. Manuscript. Washington University in St Louis. MO. <<http://spell.psychology.wustl.edu/~bkessler/latin-discontinuity/>>
- Keverling Buysman, F. (ed.) (1987). *Ordelen van de Etstoel van Drenthe 1399–1447 and 1450–1504*. Zutphen, Netherlands: Walburgpers.
- Kiparsky, Paul (2012). 'Grammaticalization as optimization', in Dianne Jonas, John Whitman, and Andrew Garrett (eds), *Grammatical Change: Origins, Nature, Outcomes*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 15–51.
- Klein, Jared S. (1985a). *Toward a Discourse Grammar of the Rigveda*. Part 1, Volume 1, Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Klein, Jared S. (1985b). *Toward a Discourse Grammar of the Rigveda*. Part 2, Volume 2, Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Klein, Jared S. (1988). 'Coordinate conjunction in Old Persian', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 108: 387–417.

- Klein, Jared S. (1992). 'Some Indo-European systems of conjunction: Rigveda, Old Persian, Homer', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 94: 1–51.
- Klein, Jared S. (1997). 'Indefinite pronouns, polarity and related phenomena in Classical Armenian: a study based on the Old Armenian gospels', *Transactions of the Philological Society* 95: 189–245.
- Koenenman, Olaf (2010). 'Verb movement in Germanic and Celtic languages: a flexible approach'. *Lingua* 120: 210–231.
- Komlósy, András (1994). 'Complements and adjuncts', in Ferenc Kiefer and Katalin É. Kiss (eds), *The Syntactic Structure of Hungarian*. San Diego/New York: Academic Press, 91–178.
- Koster, Jan (1987). *Domains and Dynasties: The Radical Autonomy of Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Koster, Jan (1994). 'Predicate Incorporation and the Word Order of Dutch', in Guglielmo Cinque, Jan Koster, Jean-Yves Pollock, Luigi Rizzi, and Raffaella Zanuttini (eds) *Paths Towards Universal Grammar: Studies in Honor of Richard S. Kayne*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 255–76.
- Kratzer, Angelika (1996). 'Severing the external argument from its verb', in J. Rooryck and L. Zaring (eds), *Phrase Structure and the Lexicon*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 109–37.
- Krifka, Manfred (2007). 'Basic notions of information structure', in Caroline Féry, Gisbert Fanselow, and Manfred Krifka (eds), *Working Papers of the SFB632, Interdisciplinary Studies on Information Structure (ISIS) 6*. Potsdam, Germany: Universitätsverlag Potsdam, 13–56.
- Kroch, Anthony (1989). 'Reflexes of grammar in patterns of language change'. *Language Variation and Change* 1: 199–244.
- Kroch, Anthony, and Taylor, Ann (1997). 'Verb movement in Old and Middle English: Dialect variation and language contact', in Ans van Kemenade and Nigel Vincent (eds), *Parameters of Morphosyntactic Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 297–325.
- Kroch, Anthony, and Ann Taylor (2000). 'Verb-object order in Early Middle English', in Susan Pintzuk, George Tsoulas, and Anthony Warner (eds), *Diachronic Syntax: Models and Mechanisms*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 132–63.
- Kroch, Anthony, Ann Taylor, and Don Ringe (2000). 'The Middle English verb-second constraint', in Susan C. Herring, Pieter van Reenen, and Lene Schøsler (eds), *Textual Parameters in Older Languages*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 353–91.
- Kühner Raphael, and Stegmann Karl (1966<sup>2</sup>). *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*. Hannover, Germany: Hahn.
- Labov, William, Cohen, Paul, Robins, Clarence, and Lewis, John (1968). *A Study of the Nonstandard English of Negro and Puerto Rican Speakers in New York City*. Final Report, Cooperative Project No. 3288, United States Office of Education.
- Lamova, Mariana (2004). 'On triggers of movement and effects at the interfaces', in Anne Breitbarth and Henk van Riemsdijk (eds), *Triggers*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 231–58.
- Landau, Idan (2007). 'EPP extensions', *Linguistic Inquiry* 38: 485–523.
- Langslow, David (2012). 'Praetor Urbanus—Urbanus Praetor: some aspects of attributive adjective placement in Latin', in Philomen Probert and Andreas Willi (eds), *Laws and Rules in Indo-European*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 279–312.
- Lane, George S. (1947). 'The Tocharian Punyavantajātaka: text and translation'. *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 67.1: 33–54.

- Larrivée, Pierre, and Richard Ingham (eds) (2011). *The Evolution of Negation: Beyond the Jespersen Cycle*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Lash, Elliott (2014). *POMIC: The Parsed Old and Middle Irish Corpus, Version 0.1*. Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, School of Celtic Studies, 2014–present. <<https://www.dias.ie/celt/celt-publications-2/celt-the-parsed-old-and-middle-irish-corpus-pomic/>>
- Lausberg, Heinrich (1972). *Elementos de Retórica Literária*. (Portuguese translation of *Elemente der Literarischen Rhetorik*, Munich, Max Hueber, 1967). Lisbon: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian.
- Ledgeway, Adam (2011). ‘Syntactic and morphosyntactic typology and change in Latin and Romance’, in Martin Maiden, John Charles Smith, and Adam Ledgeway (eds), *The Cambridge History of the Romance Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 382–471, 724–34.
- Ledgeway, Adam (2012). *From Latin to Romance: Morphosyntactic Typology and Change*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ledgeway, Adam (2017). ‘Syntheticity and analyticity’, in Andreas Dufter and Elisabeth Stark (eds), *Manual of Romance Morphosyntax and Syntax*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter. 837–84.
- Legate, Julie Anne (2014). *Voice and v: Lessons from Acehnese*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Lightfoot, David (1999). *The Development of Language: Acquisition, Change and Evolution*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Lightfoot, David (ed.) (2002). *Syntactic Effects of Morphological Change*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Longo, Beatriz Nunes de Oliveira, and Odette G. L. A. de Souza Campos (2002). ‘A auxiliabilidade: perífrases de tempo e aspecto no português falado’, in Maria Bernadete M. Abaurre and Angela C. S. Rodrigues (eds), *Gramática do Português Falado*. Volume 8: *Novos estudos descritivos*. Campinas, Brazil: Editora da Unicamp, 455–77.
- Longobardi, Giuseppe (1994). ‘Reference and proper names: a theory of n-movement in syntax and logical form’, *Linguistic Inquiry* 25: 609–65.
- Lopes, Ana Maria M. (1998). ‘Contribuição para o estudo dos valores discursivos de *sempre*’, in Maria Antónia Mota and Rita Marquilhas (eds), *Actas do XIII Encontro Nacional da Associação Portuguesa de Linguística*. Volume 2. Lisbon: Colibri, 3–14.
- Lopes-Rossi, Maria Aparecida Garcia (1993). ‘Estudo diacrónico sobre as interrogativas do português do Brasil’, in Ian Roberts and Mary A. Kato (eds), *Português Brasileiro: Uma viagem diacrônica—Homenagem a Fernando Tarallo*. Campinas, Brazil: Editora Unicamp, 307–42.
- MacCana, Proinsias (1973). ‘On Celtic word-order and the Welsh “abnormal” sentence’. *Ériu* 24: 90–120.
- MacCana, Proinsias (1996). ‘Narrative openers and progress markers in Irish’, in Kathryn A. Klar, Eve E. Sweetser, and Claire Thomas (eds), *A Celtic Florilegium: Studies in Memory of Brendan O Hehir*, Celtic Studies Publications 2, Lawrence, MA: Celtic Studies Publications, 104–20.
- MacCoisdealbha, Pádraig (1998 [1976]). *The Syntax of the Sentence in Old Irish: Selected Studies from a Descriptive, Historical and Comparative Point of View*. Buchreihe der Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie 16. Tübingen, Germany: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- MacGiolla Easpaig, Dónall (1980). ‘Aspects of variant word order in Early Irish’. *Ériu* 31: 28–38.

- Macafee, Caroline (2002). 'A history of Scots to 1700'. *DSL—Dictionary of the Scots Language/ Dictionar of the Scots Leid*. <<http://www.dsl.ac.uk/about-scots/history-of-scots/>>.
- Mackenzie, Ian, and Wim van der Wurff (2012). 'Relic syntax in Middle English and Medieval Spanish: parameter interaction in language change'. *Language* 88: 846–76.
- Manzini, Rita, and Leonardo Savoia (2011). *Grammatical Categories: Variation in Romance Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Martin, Stefan E. (1992). *Topics in the Syntax of Nonstandard English*. PhD dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.
- Martins, Ana Maria (1994). *Clíticos na História do Português*. PhD dissertation, University of Lisbon. <[http://www.clul.ulisboa.pt/bigfiles/Martins\\_Tese\\_1994c.pdf](http://www.clul.ulisboa.pt/bigfiles/Martins_Tese_1994c.pdf)>.
- Martins, Ana Maria (2001). *Documentos Portugueses do Noroeste e da Região de Lisboa: Da produção primitiva ao século XVI*. Lisbon: Imprensa Nacional—Casa da Moeda.
- Martins, Ana Maria (2002). 'The loss of IP scrambling in Portuguese: clause structure, word order variation and change', in David Lightfoot (ed.), *Syntactic Effects of Morphological Change*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 232–48.
- Martins, Ana Maria (2004). 'A emergência do português escrito na segunda metade do século XII', in Rosario Álvarez, and Antón Santamarina (eds), *(Dis)curso da Escrita: Estudos de Filoxía Galega Ofrecidos en Memoria de Fernando R. Tato Plaza*. A Coruña, Spain: Fundación Pedro Barrié de la Maza, 491–526.
- Martins, Ana Maria (2011). 'Scrambling and information focus in Old and Contemporary Portuguese'. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 10: 1–26.
- Martins, Ana Maria (2012). 'Deictic locatives, emphasis and metalinguistic negation', in Charlotte Galves, Sonia Cyrino, Ruth Lopes, Filomena Sandalo, and Juanito Avelar (eds), *Parameter Theory and Linguistic Change*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 213–36.
- Martins, Ana Maria (2014). 'How much syntax is there in metalinguistic negation?' *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 32: 635–72.
- Martins, Ana Maria (forthcoming). 'Against V2 as a general property of Old Romance languages', in Martin Elsig, Ingo Feldhausen, Imme Kuchenbrandt, and Mareike Neuhaus (eds), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 12: Selected Papers from 'Going Romance' 30, Frankfurt*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Marvin, Tatjana (2003). *Topics in the Stress and Syntax of Words*. PhD dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA.
- Massam, Diane (2010). 'On the left in Niuean'. *Lingua* 120: 284–302.
- Matushansky, Ora (2011). *No More No Less: Existential Comparatives Revisited*. Manuscript, Utrecht University.
- Mioto, Carlos, and Mary A. Kato (2005). 'As interrogativas Q do português europeu e do português brasileiro atuais'. *Revista da ABRALIN* 4: 171–96.
- Mitrović, Moreno (2014). *Morphosyntactic Atoms of Propositional Logic: A Philological Programme*. PhD dissertation, University of Cambridge.
- Mitrović, Moreno, and Uli Sauerland (2014). 'Decomposing coordination', in Jyoti Iyer and Leland Kusmer (eds), *NELS 44: Proceedings of the 44<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society*. Volume 2. University of Connecticut, Storrs, 39–52.
- Mitrović, Moreno, and Uli Sauerland (2016). 'Two conjunctions are better than one'. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 63: 471–92.

- Miyagawa, Shigeru (2010). *Why Agree? Why Move? Unifying Agreement-based and Discourse Configurational Languages*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Montgomery, Michael (1989). 'Exploring the roots of Appalachian English'. *English World-Wide* 10: 227–78.
- Montgomery, Michael (1997). 'Making transatlantic connections between varieties of English: the case of plural verbal-s'. *Journal of English Linguistics* 25: 122–41.
- Montgomery, Michael (2006). 'Notes on the development of existential *they*'. *American Speech* 81: 132–45.
- Montgomery, Michael, and Joseph S. Hall (eds) (2004). *Dictionary of Smoky Mountain English*. Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press.
- Moraes, Maria Aparecida Torres (1995). *Do português clássico ao português europeu moderno: um estudo diacrônico da cliticização e do movimento do verbo*. PhD dissertation, University of Campinas, Brazil.
- Moran, Pádraic (2015). 'Language interaction in the St Gall Priscian Glosses'. *Peritia* 26: 113–42.
- Motapanyane, Virginia (1995). *Theoretical Implications of Complementation in Romanian*. Padua: Unipress.
- Motut, Alexandra (2010). 'Merge over move and the empirical force of economy in minimalism'. *Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics* 33: 1–54.
- Munn, Alan (1993). *Topics in the Syntax and Semantics of Coordinate Structures*, PhD dissertation, University of Maryland.
- Myler, Neil (2012). 'A note on Den Dikken's (2006) arguments for a J(unction) head'. Manuscript. New York University.
- Nakamura, Chiye (2004). 'On the cleft sentence and the nominalized sentence in Irish'. 京都大学言語学研究 [Kyoto University Linguistic Research] 23: 47–62. <<https://repository.kulib.kyoto-u.ac.jp/dspace/handle/2433/57301>>.
- Neu, Erich (1980). *Studien zu den Božazköy-Texten*. Althethitische Ritualtexte in Umschrift, 25. Wiesbaden, Germany: Harrassowitz.
- Newton, Glenda (2006). *The Development and Loss of the Old Irish Double System of Verbal Inflection*. PhD dissertation, Cambridge University.
- Nunes, Jairo (1999). 'Linearization of chains and phonetic realization of chains links', in Samuel Epstein and Norbert Hornstein (eds), *Working Minimalism*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 217–49.
- Nunes, Jairo (2004). *Linearization of Chains and Sideward Movement*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- O'Donovan, John (1845). *A Grammar of the Irish Language*. Dublin: Hodges and Smith.
- Oniga, Renato (2004). *Il Latino: Breve introduzione linguistica*. Milan: Franco Angeli.
- Oosterhout, Meinte (1960). *Snitser Recesboeken 1490–1517*. Assen, Netherlands: Van Gorcum.
- Overdiep, Gerrit Siebe (1937). *Stilistische grammatica van het moderne Nederlandsch*. Zwolle, Netherlands: Tjeenk Willink.
- Paixão de Sousa, Maria Clara (2004). *Língua barroca: Sintaxe e história do português nos 1600*. PhD dissertation, University of Campinas, São Paulo, Brazil.
- Parrott, Jeffrey K. (2000). 'Negative inversion in African American Vernacular English: a case of optional movement?' in Nancy Mae Antrim, Grant Goodall, Martha Schulte-Nafeh, and Vida Samiian (eds), *Proceedings of the 28th Western Conference on Linguistics*

- (WECOL). Volume 11. Fresno, CA: Department of Linguistics, California State University, 414–27.
- Pesetsky, David, and Esther Torrego (2005). ‘Tense, case, and the nature of syntactic categories’, in Jacqueline Guéron and Jacqueline Lecarme (eds), *The Syntax of Time*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 495–537.
- Picallo, Carme (1994). *Opaque Domains*. PhD Dissertation, City University of New York.
- Piel, Joseph (1948). *Livro dos ofícios de Marco Tullio Ciceram, o qual tornou em linguagem o Ifante D. Pedro, duque de Coimbra. Edição crítica, segundo o MS. de Madrid, prefaciada, anotada e acompanhada de glossário*. Coimbra, Portugal: Universidade de Coimbra.
- Pimpão, Álvaro Júlio da Costa (2000<sup>4</sup> [1972]). *Os Lusíadas, de Luís de Camões*. Lisbon: MNE, Instituto Camões.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean (2008). *Chrestomathie tokharienne: textes et grammaire*. Leuven, Belgium: Peeters.
- Pinkster, Harm (2005). ‘Changing patterns of discontinuity in Latin’. Paper presented at Latling—13e Colloque International de Linguistique Latine, Facultés Universitaires Saint-Louis, 4–9 April.
- Pintzuk, Susan (1993). ‘Verb seconding in Old English: verb movement to Infl’, *The Linguistic Review* 10: 5–35.
- Pintzuk, Susan, George Tsoulas, and Anthony Warner (eds) (2000). *Diachronic Syntax: Models and Mechanisms*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Pintzuk, Susan, and Ann Taylor (2006). ‘The loss of OV order in the history of English’, in Ans van Kemenade and Bettelou Los (eds), *The Handbook of the History of English*. Oxford: Blackwell, 249–78.
- Pirvulescu, Mihaela (2006). ‘Agreement paradigms across moods and tenses’, in Chiyo Nishida and Jean-Pierre Y. Montreuil (eds), *Morphology, Syntax, Semantics, and Pragmatics: New Perspectives on Romance Linguistics*. Volume 1. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 229–46.
- Poletto, Cecilia (2014). *Word Order in Old Italian*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Pollock, Jean-Yves (1989). ‘Verb movement, universal grammar, and the structure of IP’. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20: 365–424.
- Postal, Paul M. (1969). ‘On so-called «Pronouns» in English’, in David A. Reibel and Sanford A. Schane (eds), *Modern Studies in English: Readings in Transformational Grammar*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 201–24.
- Postma, Gertjan J. (2006a). ‘IV2 in het Middeldrents en de Subjunctief’, *Taal en Tongval* 57.1: 126–66.
- Postma, Gertjan J. (2006b). ‘IV2 in het Middelnederlands, IPI in het Fries en de distributie van subjunctieven’, *Taal en Tongval* 58.2: 205–24.
- Postma, Gertjan J., and Hans J. Bennis. (2006). ‘Variatie in negatie—Het gedrag van het negatieve cliticum in het Middeldrents van rond 1400’, *Taal en Tongval* 58.1: 148–66.
- Postma, Gertjan J. (2010). ‘The impact of failed changes’, in Anne Breitbarth, Christopher Lucas, Sheila Watts, and David Willis (eds), *Continuity and Change in Grammar*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 269–302.
- Postma, Gertjan J. (2011a). ‘Language contact and linguistic complexity – the rise of the reflexive pronoun *zich* in a 15th century Netherlands’ border dialect’, in Dianne Jonas and

- John Whitman (eds), *Grammatical Change—Origins, Nature, Outcomes*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 139–59.
- Postma, Gertjan J. (2011b). ‘Het verval van het pronomen *du* – dialect geografie en historische syntaxis’. *Nederlandse Taalkunde* 16: 56–87.
- Postma, Gertjan J. (2013). ‘Clause-typing by [2]—the loss of the 2nd person pronoun *du* “you” in Dutch, Frisian and Limburgian dialects’, in Victoria Camacho-Taboada, Ángel L. Jiménez-Fernández, Javier Martín-González, and Mariano Reyes-Tejedor (eds), *Information Structure and Agreement*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 217–54.
- Powell, Jonathan (2010). ‘Hyperbaton and register in Cicero’, in Eleanor Dickey and Anna Chahoud (eds), *Colloquial and Literary Latin*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 163–85.
- Predolac, Nikol (2009). ‘Information structure and Serbian bipartite NPs’, in Wayles Browne, Adam Cooper, Alison Fisher, Esra Kesici, Nikola Predorac, and Draga Zec (eds), *Proceedings of Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 18*. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications, 435–54.
- Prince, Ellen (1981). ‘Towards a taxonomy of given-new information’, in Peter Cole (ed.), *Radical Pragmatics*. New York: Academic Press, 223–56.
- Progovac, (1994). *Negative and Positive Polarity: A Binding Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Quer, Josep (1998). *Mood at the Interface*. PhD dissertation, LOT, Utrecht University.
- Ramchand, Gillian, and Peter Svenonius (2002). ‘The lexical syntax and lexical semantics of the verb-particle construction’, in Line Mikkelsen and Christopher Potts (eds), *WCCFL 21: Proceedings of the 21<sup>st</sup> West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press, 387–400.
- Reinhart, Tanya (1981). ‘Pragmatics and linguistics: an analysis of sentence topics’. *Philosophica* 27: 53–94.
- Reintges, Chris H. (2011a). ‘High analyticity and Coptic particle syntax: a phase-based approach’. *The Linguistic Review* 28: 533–99.
- Reintges, Chris H. (2011b). ‘The evolution of the Ancient Egyptian Stative: diachronic stability besides inflectional change’. *Folia Orientalia* 48: 7–97.
- Reintges, Chris H. (2012). ‘Macroparametric change and the synthetic-analytic continuum: the case of Ancient Egyptian’, in Charlotte Galves, Sonia Cyrino, Ruth Lopes, Filomena Sandalo, and Juanito Avelar (eds), *Parameter Theory and Linguistic Change*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 133–57.
- Reintges, Chris H. (2013). ‘Sapirian “drift” towards analyticity and long-term morphosyntactic change in Ancient Egyptian’, in Ritsuko Kikusawa and Laurence A. Reid (eds), *Historical Linguistics 2011: Selected Papers from the 20<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Osaka (25–30 July 2011)*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 289–328.
- Reintges, Chris H., and Sonia Cyrino (2016). ‘Rethinking parameter theory diachronically: A macrocomparative approach to the analyticization of the verbal tense–aspect systems of Brazilian Portuguese and Coptic Egyptian’, in Luis Eguren, Olga Fernández Soriano, and Amaya Mendikoetxea Pelayo (eds), *Rethinking Parameters*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 329–85.
- Remberger, Eva-Maria (2010). ‘Left peripheral interactions in Romance’. Paper presented at the Workshop on Focus, Contrast and Givenness in Interaction with Extraction and Deletion, University of Tübingen, Germany, 26–27 March 2010.

- Ribeiro, Ilza (1995). 'Evidence for a verb-second phase in Old Portuguese' in Adrian Battye and Ian Roberts (eds) *Clause Structure and Language Change*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 110–39.
- Richards, Norvin (2014). *Uttering Theory*. Unpublished monograph, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA.
- Richards, Marc David (2004). *Object Shift and Scrambling in North and West Germanic: A Case Study in Symmetrical Syntax*. PhD dissertation, University of Cambridge.
- Richards, Marc David (2007). 'On feature inheritance: an argument from the phase impenetrability condition', *Linguistic Inquiry* 38: 563–72.
- Rinke, Esther (2009). 'Verb-placement in Old Portuguese', in Daniel Jacob and Andreas Dufter (eds), *Focus and Background in Romance Languages*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 309–32.
- Rissanen, Marti, and Anneli Meurman-Solin (1996). *The Helsinki Corpus of Older Scots*. [Electronic resource: 1450–1700]. Oxford: University of Oxford Text Archive.
- Rizzi, Luigi (1982). *Issues in Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Rizzi, Luigi (1990). *Relativized Minimality*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Rizzi, Luigi (1996). 'Residual Verb Second and the *wh*-criterion', in Adriana Belletti and Luigi Rizzi (eds), *Parameters and Functional Heads: Essays in Comparative Syntax*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 63–90.
- Rizzi, Luigi (1997). 'The fine structure of the left periphery', in Liliane Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of Grammar: Handbook in Generative Syntax*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 281–337.
- Rizzi, Luigi (2001). 'On the position of 'Int(errogative)' in the left periphery of the clause', in Guglielmo Cinque, and Giampaolo Salvi (eds) *Current Studies in Italian Syntax: Essays Offered to Lorenzo Renzi*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 287–96.
- Rizzi, Luigi (2006). 'On the forms of chains: criterial positions and ECP effects', in Lisa Lai-Shen Cheng and Norbert Corver (eds), *Wh-movement: moving on*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 97–133.
- Roberts, Craige (1996). 'Information structure in discourse: towards an integrated formal theory of pragmatics', in Jae-Hak Yoon and Andreas Kathol (eds), *OSU Working Papers in Linguistics 49: Papers in Semantics*. Columbus: The Ohio State University, 91–136.
- Roberts, Ian (1985). 'Agreement parameters and the development of English modal auxiliaries', *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 3: 21–58.
- Roberts, Ian (1993). *Verbs and Diachronic Syntax: A Comparative History of English and French*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Roberts, Ian (2005). *Principles and Parameters in a VSO Language: A Case Study in Welsh*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Roberts, Ian (2010). *Agreement and Head Movement: Clitics, Incorporation, and Defective Goals*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Roberts, Ian (2012a). 'Phases, head movement and second-position effects', in Ángel J. Gallego (ed.), *Phases: Developing the Framework*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 385–440.
- Roberts, Ian (2012b). 'Macroparameters and Minimalism: a program for comparative research', in Charlotte Galves, Sonia Cyrino, Ruth Lopes, Filomena Sandalo, and Juanito Avelar (eds), *Parameter Theory and Linguistic Change*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 320–35.

- Roberts, Ian, and Anna Roussou (2003). *Syntactic Change: A Minimalist Approach to Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rögnvaldsson, Erikur, and Höskuldur Thráinsson (1990). 'On Icelandic word order once more', in Joan Maling, and Annie Zaenen (eds), *Modern Icelandic Syntax*. San Diego/New York: Academic Press, 3–40.
- Rohlf, Gerhard (1968). *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti*. Volume 2: *Morfologia*. Turin: Einaudi.
- Rooth, Mats (1985). *Association with Focus*. PhD dissertation, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.
- Rooth, Mats (1992). 'A theory of focus interpretation', *Natural Language Semantics* 1: 75–116.
- Ross, John (1967). *Constraints on Variables in Syntax*. PhD dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA.
- Rouveret, Alain (2010). 'On verb–subject languages'. *Lingua* 120: 232–63.
- Rowlett, Paul (1998). *Sentential Negation in French*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Saito, Mamoru, and Keiko Murasugi (1999). 'Subject predication within IP and DP', in Kyle Johnson and Ian Roberts (eds), *Beyond Principles and Parameters*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 167–88.
- Samuels, Bridget D. (2009). *The Structure of Phonological Theory*, PhD dissertation, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.
- Schachter, Paul (1973). 'Focus and relativization', *Language* 53: 19–49.
- Schmitt, Cristina (2001). 'Cross-linguistic variation and the present perfect: the case of Portuguese'. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 19: 403–53.
- Schwegler, Armin (1983). 'Predicate negation and word-order change: a problem of multiple causation', *Lingua* 61: 297–334.
- Schwegler, Armin (1988). 'Word-order changes in predicate negation strategies in Romance Languages', *Diachronica* 5: 21–58.
- Sekerina, Irina (1999). 'The scrambling complexity hypothesis and processing of split scrambling constructions in Russian', *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 7: 265–304.
- Sells, Peter, John Rickford, and Thomas Wasow (1996). 'An optimality theoretic approach to variation in negative inversion in AAVE', *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 14: 591–627.
- Seuren, Pieter (1973). 'The comparative', in Ferenc Kiefer and Nicolas Ruwet (eds), *Generative Grammar in Europe*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel, 528–64.
- Shearer, Kathy (1997–8). *Dante Oral History Project*. Recorded oral history interviews collected in Dante, VA, housed in the Archives of Appalachia, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City.
- Sieg, Emil, and Wilhelm Siegling (1921). *Tocharische Sprachreste, I. Band: Die Texte, A. Transcription*. Berlin/Leipzig: De Gruyter.
- Silva, Rosa Virgínia Mattos e (2006). *O Português Arcaico: Fonologia, Morfologia e Sintaxe*. São Paulo, Brazil: Contexto.
- Simonyi, Zsigmond (1914). *A jelzők mondattana. Nyelvtörténeti tanulmány* [The syntax of attributes. A diachronic study]. Budapest: MTA.
- Slade, Benjamin M. (2011). *Formal and Philological Inquiries into the Nature of Interrogatives, Indefinites, Disjunction, and Focus in Sinhala and Other Languages*, PhD dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

- Sommerer, Lotte (2011). *Old English 'se': from demonstrative to article: A usage-based study of nominal determination and category emergence*. PhD dissertation, Universität Wien, Vienna, Austria.
- Spevak, Olga (2009). 'L'hyperbate en latin tardif'. Paper presented at Latin Vulgaire, Latin Tardif, IX<sup>e</sup> Colloque International, 2–6 September.
- Stenson, Nancy. (1981). *Studies in Irish Syntax*. Tübingen, Germany: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Stifter, David (2006). *Sengoidelc: Old Irish for Beginners*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Stjepanović, Sandra (2007). 'Free word order and copy theory of movement', in Norbert Corver, and Jairo Nunes (eds), *The Copy Theory of Movement*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 219–48.
- Stokes, Whitley (ed.) (1887). *The Old-Irish Glosses at Würzburg and Carlsruhe*. Hertford: Stephen Austin and Sons.
- Stowell, Tim (1993). *The Syntax of Tense*. Manuscript, University of California at Los Angeles.
- Sulger, Sebastian (2009). *Irish Clefing: The LFG Perspective*. PhD dissertation, Universität Konstanz, Germany.
- Surányi, Balázs (2006). 'Hungarian as a Japanese-type scrambling language', in Christopher Davies, Amy Rose Deal, and Youri Zabbal (eds) *NELS 36: Proceedings of the 36<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society*. Amherst, MA: GLSA, 561–74.
- Surányi, Balázs (2009). 'Verbal particles inside and outside vP'. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 56: 201–49.
- Sybesma, Rint P. E. (2007). 'Whether we tense-agree overtly or not'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 38: 580–7.
- Szabolcsi, Anna (1994). 'The noun phrase', in Ferenc Kiefer and Katalin É. Kiss (eds), *The Syntactic Structure of Hungarian*. San Diego/New York: Academic Press, 179–274.
- Szabolcsi, Anna (2015). 'What do quantifier particles do?' *Linguistics and Philosophy* 38: 159–204.
- Takita, Kensuke (2010). *Cyclic Linearization and Constraints on Movement and Ellipsis*, PhD dissertation, Nanzan University, Japan.
- Tanaka, Tomoyuki (2000). 'On the development of transitive expletive constructions in the history of English'. *Lingua* 110, 473–95.
- Taylor, Ann, and Susan Pintzuk (2011). 'The interaction of syntactic change and information status effects in the change from OV to VO in English'. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 10: 71–94.
- Teyssier, Paul (1976). *Manuel de Langue Portugaise*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Teyssier, Paul (1980). *Histoire de la Langue Portugaise*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Thráinsson, Höskuldur (2007). *The Syntax of Icelandic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thurneysen, Rudolf (2003). *A Grammar of Old Irish*. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
- Tortora, Christina (2006). 'The case of Appalachian expletive *they*'. *American Speech* 81: 266–96.
- Travis, Lisa (1984). *Parameters and Effects of Word Order Variation*. PhD Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA.
- Uriagereka, Juan (1988). *On Government*. PhD dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- Väänänen, Veikko (1982). *Introduzione al Latino Volgare*. Bologna: Pàtron.

- Van Gelderen, Elly (2004). *Grammaticalization as Economy*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Van Gelderen, Elly (2007). 'The definiteness cycle in Germanic'. *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 19: 275–308.
- Van Gelderen, Elly (2008a). 'Negative cycles'. *Linguistic Typology* 12: 195–243.
- Van Gelderen, Elly (2008b). 'Linguistic cycles and economy principles: the role of universal grammar in language change', in Eythórsson, Thórhallur (ed.), *Grammatical Change and Linguistic Theory. The Rosendal Papers*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 245–64.
- Van Gelderen, Elly (2009). 'Renewal in the left periphery: economy and the complementiser layer'. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 107.2: 131–95.
- Van Gelderen, Elly (2011). *The Linguistic Cycle: Language Change and the Language Faculty*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Van Hamel, Anton Gerard (1933). *Compert Con Culainn and other stories*. MMIS 3. Dublin: The Stationery Office.
- Van Kemenade, Ans, and Los Bettelou (2003). 'Particles and Prefixes in Dutch and English', in Geert Booij and Jaap van Marle (eds), *Yearbook of Morphology 2003*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 79–119.
- Van Kemenade, Ans, and Nigel Vincent (eds) (1997). *Parameters of Morphosyntactic Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Nooten, Barend A., and Gary B. Holland (eds) (1994). *Rig Veda: A Metrically Restored Text*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Van Riemsdijk, Henk (1989). 'Movement and regeneration', in Paola Benincá (ed.), *Dialect Variation and the Theory of Grammar*. Dordrecht: Foris, 105–36.
- Van Riemsdijk, Henk (1990). 'Functional prepositions', in Harm Pinkster and Inge Genee (eds) *Unity in Diversity: Papers Presented to Simon C. Dik on his 50th Birthday*. Dordrecht: Foris, 229–41.
- Vangsnes, Øystein Alexander (2002). 'Icelandic expletive constructions and the distribution of subject types', in Peter Svenonius (ed.) *Subjects, Expletives, and the EPP*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 43–70.
- Varga, Diána (2011). 'A mód, a modalitás és az imperatív operátor viszonya magyar felszólító mondatokban' [The relation of mood, modality, and the imperative operator in Hungarian imperative sentences], in Andrea Parapatics (ed.) *Félúton 7. Konferencia Kötet*. [Proceedings of the student conference 'Félúton', volume 7]. Budapest, ELTE—BTK.
- Verdenius, Andries Anton (1924). 'De ontwikkeling der Hollandse voornaamwoorden *je en jij*'. *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse taal- en letterkunde* 43: 81–104.
- Verdenius, Andries Anton (1925). 'Over de aanspreekvorm *ie (i-j)* in onze oostelijke provincieën'. *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse taal- en letterkunde* 45: 23–32.
- Verdenius, Andries Anton (1942). 'De laatste sporen van *du* in Noord-Holland', *De Nieuwe Taalgids* 36: 223–27.
- Vergnaud, Jean-Roger (1974). *French Relative Clauses*. PhD dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA.
- Vergnaud, Jean-Roger (1985). *Dépendences et niveaux de représentation en syntaxe*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Vermeulen, Reiko (2010). 'Non-topical *wa*-phrases in Japanese', in Rafaella Folli and Christiane Ulbrich (eds), *Interfaces in Linguistics: New Research Perspectives*. Oxford/New York: Oxford/New York University Press, 135–48.
- Vikner, Sten (1995). *Verb Movement and Expletive Subjects in the Germanic Languages*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Visser, Fredericus Theodorus (1963). *An Historical Syntax of the English Language*. The Hague: Brill.
- Wackernagel, Jacob (1892). 'Über ein Gesetz der indo-germanischen Wortstellung'. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 1: 333–436.
- Ward, Gregory, and Betty J. Birner (2001). 'Discourse and Information Structure', in Deborah Schiffrin, Deborah Tannen, and Heidi Hamilton (eds), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 119–37.
- Waters, Cathleen (2009). 'The preposition cycle in English', in Elly van Gelderen (ed.), *Cyclical Change*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 285–300.
- White-Sustaíta, Jessica (2010). 'Reconsidering the syntax of non-canonical negative inversion', *English Language and Linguistics* 14: 429–55.
- Willis, David (1998). *Syntactic Change in Welsh: A Study of the Loss of Verb-Second*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wilson, Horace Hayman (2002). *R̥gveda Saṃhitā*. Volumes 1–4. Varanasi, India: Indica.
- Winter, Yoad (1998). *Flexible Boolean Semantics: Coordination, Plurality and Scope in Natural Language*. PhD dissertation, Utrecht University.
- Wolfe, Sam (2015). *Microvariation in Medieval Romance Syntax: A comparative study*. PhD dissertation, University of Cambridge.
- Wolfram, Walt, and Donna Christian (1976). *Appalachian Speech*. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Yang, Charles (2002). *Knowledge and Learning in Natural Languages*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Zanuttini, Raffaella (1997). *Negation and Clausal Structure: A Comparative Study of Romance Languages*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Zanuttini, Raffaella (2010). 'La negazione', in Giampaolo Salvi and Lorenzo Renzi (eds), *Grammatica dell'Italiano Antico*. Volume 1. Bologna: Il Mulino, 569–82.
- Zeijlstra, Hedde (2004). *Sentential Negation and Negative Concord*. PhD Dissertation, University of Amsterdam.
- Zhang, Niina Ning (2010). *Coordination in Syntax*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zimmermann, Malte (2007). 'Contrastive focus', in Caroline Féry, Gisbert Fanselow, and Manfred Krifka (eds), *Working Papers of the SFB632, Interdisciplinary Studies on Information Structure* 6. Potsdam, Germany: Universitätsverlag Potsdam, 147–60.
- Zubizarreta, María Luisa (1998). *Prosody, Focus and Word Order*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Zubizarreta, María Luisa (1999). 'Las funciones informativas: tema y foco', in Ignacio Bosque and Violeta Demonte (eds), *Gramática Descriptiva de la Lengua Española*. Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 4215–44.
- Zumpt, Karl (1832). *A Grammar of the Latin Language*. London: B. Fellowes.
- Zwart, Jan-Wouter (1993). *Dutch Syntax: A Minimalist Approach*. PhD dissertation, University of Groningen, Netherlands.