

# Evidence for a Split DP in Latin<sup>1</sup>

Giuliana Giusti & Rossella Iovino

University of Venice

## 1. Introduction

In the last two decades, the DP-hypothesis has opened up the possibility of extending the projection of Nominal Expressions (from now on NEs) with a (number of) functional head(s) above the NP-level. There are many reasons for assuming a DP in UG, most of them reside in the analogies between NEs and clauses. (For a detailed overview, cf. Alexiadou, Haegeman and Stavrou 2007). Parallel to clauses, NEs have subjects. For this reasons, the DP is often considered parallel to IP. Adverbs and Adjectives both modify the lexical head and are not selected by it. For this reason, they are conceived by competing theories either as adjoined to NP, or as filling the specifiers of dedicated functional heads. Both clauses and NEs can be arguments of an external head. For this reason, the DP is often considered parallel to CP. In the spirit of these and many more parallels, a number of functional nominal projections have been proposed in a tension between a cartographic approach which tends to assume functional heads in UG on the evidence of individual languages, and the minimalist approach which tends to minimize merging of features and proliferation of structure.

In some literature (from Longobardi 1994 onwards), the DP layer is taken to be the syntactic counterpart of argumenthood and to convey definiteness and referentiality. In this respect, the existence of articleless languages, like Latin and most Slavic languages, poses the problem of whether the same relation between syntax and semantics can be

---

<sup>1</sup>. We would like to thank Renato Oniga, Nicola Munaro and Guglielmo Cinque for helpful comments on a previous version of this paper. All remaining errors are obviously only ours.

maintained assuming a null article or whether a parameterized theory of functional structure and its semantic correlate could be more explanatory.

Chierchia (1998) on the semantic side and Bošković (2005, 2008, 2009, 2010) on the syntactic side propose a DP/NP parameter according to which argument/referring NEs are NPs in articleless languages and DPs in article languages. Bošković's proposal is of particular interest for the numerous apparently unrelated facts it claims to derive from the presence or absence of the DP projection in a given language.

This paper has the twofold goal of providing a descriptive account of the syntax of Latin nominal modifiers (demonstratives and adjectives) based on quantitative and qualitative data, and to establish, in the frame of the DP/NP parameter, if Latin can be considered a DP-language. We will come to the conclusion that despite appearances, there is strong evidence internal to the DP/NP parameter theory to assume a highly developed functional nominal structure in Latin including a DP and a further left-peripheral projection for discourse-driven movement, in the spirit of Giusti (1996, 2006) applied to Latin by Giusti and Oniga (2007).

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 briefly presents the NP/DP parameter and shows that only some of the predictions are met in Latin. Section 3 focuses on the distribution of Latin demonstratives and claims that they are the highest modifiers in the unmarked case (differently from Spanish, cf. Brugè 2002), but can be crossed by DP-internal movements (parallel to what happens in Romanian). Section 4 deals with adjectives and shows that Cinque's (2010) distinction between direct and indirect modification can elegantly capture all orders apart from some statistically quite rare cases, which can be reasonably derived assuming discourse-driven movement to the left periphery of the NE. Section 5 spells out the properties of this projection on the basis of previous work by Giusti and Oniga (2007), and draws some conclusions in diachronic perspective.

We will exclusively rely on attested data. We base our observations on a corpus of data collected by Iovino (in progress) from a selection of authors active from the end of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC to the beginning of the 4<sup>th</sup> century AD. We consider simple nominal expressions (SNEs) and complex nominal expressions (CNEs) separately. The former consist of just N and a modifier (e.g., *ille vir*; *omnis homo*). The latter include at least two elements modifying the same N (e.g., *haec magna diligentia*; *omne id medium tempus*; etc.). As for CNEs, which are less frequent in Latin, we extend our comparative survey to a larger corpus extracted from the *B(ibliotheca) T(eubneriana) L(atina)*, constituted by 262 CNEs including a DEM and 109 CNEs including at least two adjectives and a noun.

## 2. Latin and the NP/DP parameter

Bošković (2005, 2008) observes that left-branch extraction is possible in articleless languages like Serbo-Croatian (1a) and impossible in article languages like Bulgarian (1b). This is also true in Latin vs. Romanian (2):

- (1) a. nova<sub>i</sub>/ta<sub>i</sub> je prodao [t<sub>i</sub> kola]  
 new/that is [he] sold car  
 b. \*novata<sub>i</sub>/tazi<sub>i</sub> prodade Petko [t<sub>i</sub> kola]  
 new.the/this sold Petko car
- (2) a. maximam habet opinionem virtutis  
 greatest.ACC.SG has opinion.ACC.SG. virtue.GEN.SG.  
 “He has the greatest consideration of the Virtue” (Caes. *Gall.* 7,83)  
 b. \*maxima/ă are opinie (a) virtutii  
 greatest-the has opinion virtue-the.gen

The same occurs with wh-modifiers. Example (3) contrasts Latin with Italian:

- (3) a. quales<sub>i</sub> legimus [t<sub>i</sub> panegyricos]?  
 what.ACC.PL. read.pres/1PL. panegyric.ACC.PL  
 “What kind of panegyrics do we read?” (Quint. *Inst.* 2,10,11)  
 b. \*quali leggiamo panegirici? (Italian)

Bošković (2008) derives the blocking effect of DP with three assumptions:

- (4) a. DP is a phase, while NP is not.  
 b. For an element to be extracted out of a phase, it needs to move through the left edge. (Phase Impenetrability Condition (PIC))  
 c. Movement out of SpecDP is excluded by anti-locality.

In DP-languages, PIC forces movement out of DP to take the intermediate step in SpecDP, which is however banned (5a) by anti-locality. This is not the case in NP-languages (5b):

- (5) a. ... [DP  $\left[ \begin{array}{l} \uparrow \\ \text{[D}^0 \text{ D [NP [XP] N]]} \end{array} \right]$  ]
- b. ... [NP [XP] N]
- 

This proposal makes a number of predictions. For reasons of space we only review those that are relatively easy to check in a corpus language such as Latin.<sup>2</sup> First of all, lack of DP should bring with it lack of the morphological category D, with the consequence that determiners be morphologically and syntactically adjectival in nature. This is apparently the case in Latin, where most quantifiers, wh-modifiers, demonstratives, possessives display a paradigm that is very similar or identical to adjectives. For this reason, a demonstrative and a possessive can co-occur, as in (6), and can be predicates, as the possessive in (7). Notice, however, that this is also the case of Italian, a DP-language:

- (6) a. *illam meam cladem*  
 that.ACC.SG. my.ACC.SG misfortune.ACC.SG.  
 “that my misfortune” (Cic. *Sext.* 31)
- b. *quella mia sventura* (Italian)
- (7) a. *suam esse hereditatem defendit*  
 his.ACC.SG. to-be the inheritance.ACC.SG. claim.3SG.PRES.  
 “[he] claims that the inheritance belongs to him” (Cic. *Inv.* 2,23)
- b. *sostiene che l'eredità è sua*

A second property that could set Latin among NP-languages is freedom of NE-internal word order. For Bošković, this is due to adjunction of APs to NP. In Section 4, we will observe that different orders can also be captured by a constraint theory of functional structure.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup>. For example, since adnominal PPs are quite rare in Latin (cf. Wharton 2009), extraction of nominal adjuncts would be very difficult to find even if it was possible.

<sup>3</sup>. In his response to Pereltsvaig (2007), Bošković (2009) observes that his proposal does not imply that the NE has no functional projections. The issue of adjunction of adjectives is therefore not clearly related to the DP/NP parameter. We have no space to discuss the theoretical issue of the difference between D and other functional heads in a minimalist framework that tends to eliminate labels from its primitives.

Bošković (2010), revising his proposal on the phase status of NP, claims that NP is a phase and this is why NP-languages do not allow for extraction of a complement of N. This is the case of Serbo-Croatian (cf. Zlatić 1997), but not of Latin, which allows extraction of a genitive like Italian:

- (8) a. \*Ovog studenta sam pronašla [knjigu t] (Serbo-Croatian Zlatić 1997)  
 this student.GEN. am found book  
 b. summi oratoris habuit laudem  
 great.GEN.SG. orator.GEN.SG. had reputation.ACC.SG.  
 “He had the reputation of the great orator” (Cic. *Brut.* 110)  
 c. Di questo studente ho corretto il compito (Italian)  
 of this student [I] have checked the assignment

A third property that casts doubts on the NP-nature of Latin is the possibility of two argument genitives.<sup>4</sup> According to Willim (2000), a second structural case could only be assigned in the upper DP-layer. The assumption of the lack of DP in this language would account for the impossibility of two genitives, as in (9a), while (9b) would be well-formed because the subject is expressed by the instrumental case:

- (9) a. \*zničení Říma barbarū  
 destruction Rome.GEN. barbarians.GEN.  
 b. zničení Říma barbary  
 destruction Rome.GEN. barbarians.INSTR.

But Giusti and Oniga (2007) show that Latin transitive nouns can have two genitives. Furthermore they argue that subject genitives are in prenominal position and object genitives are in postnominal position, in their term Latin is therefore a SNO language:

- (10) a. *omnium* expectatio *visendi* *Alcibiadis*  
 everybody.GEN.PL. expectatio.NOM.SG. to see.GER.GEN. Alcibiadis.GEN.SG.  
 “everybody’s expectation to see Alcibiadis” (Nep. 7, 6,1)  
 b. *veteribus Helvetiorum iniuriis populi Romani*  
 old.ABL.PL. Helvetii.GEN.PL. injuries.ABL.PL. people.GEN.SG. Roman.GEN.SG.  
 “the old offences by the Helvetii to the Roman people” (Caes. *Gall.* 1,30,2)

---

<sup>4</sup> Contrary to what is claimed by Bošković (2008) who however gives no attested data for this claim.

Devine and Stephens (2006) and Gianollo (2007) who work on single-genitive occurrences, further show that subject genitives tend to precede the noun even in the absence of an object genitive, while object genitives usually follow it. This shows that the upper genitive position is always available, regardless of how many arguments are projected.

A fourth property that sets Latin among DP-languages is the possibility for a pronominal possessor to co-refer with a lower antecedent. The contrast in (11) is derived assuming that DP in English (11b), but not in Serbo-Croatian (11a), shields the possessive (in, say, PossP) from c-commanding its antecedent. As is clear from (11c), Latin is like English:

- (11) a. \*njegovi najnoviji film je zaista razočarao Kusturicui  
           his latest movie is really disappointed Kusturica  
       b. his latest movie really disappointed Kusturica  
       c. omnes qui sunt eius<sub>i</sub> ordinis,  
           all.NOM.PL. who NOM.PL. are his.GEN.SG. orders.DAT.PL.  
           a Pompeio<sub>i</sub> evocantur  
           by Pompeius<sub>i</sub>. ABL.SG. called.PASS.  
           “all of those who are at his orders were called by Pompeius” (Caes. *Civ.* 1,3,1)

Finally, despite the free order of adjectives (12), Serbo-Croatian displays a fixed upper position for the demonstrative (13):

- (12) a. Jovanova bivša kuća/bivša Jovanova kuća  
           “Jovan’s former house”  
       b. Jovanova skupa slika /skupa Jovanova slika  
           “John’s expensive picture”  
       c. Marijina omiljena kola/omiljena Marijina kola  
           “Mary’s favorite car”
- (13) a. ova skupa kola/?\*skupa ova kola  
           “This expensive car”  
       b. ova Jovanova slika/?\*Jovanova ova slika  
           “This Jovan’s picture”

Bošković (2009) affirms that the semantics of the demonstrative ensures that no modifier is further adjoined after reference to an individual has been picked.

This is not the case in Latin. In the following section we focus on the syntax of Latin demonstratives and show that in 20% of the cases they are not the topmost modifier of the NE, apparently contradicting Bošković's semantic argument.

### 3. The syntax of Latin Demonstratives

In this section, we base our discussion on a previous study by Iovino (2011) who claims that demonstratives (DEMs) are high in the nominal structure but can be crossed by a dislocated constituent.

Simple Nominal Expressions (SNEs), consisting of just a DEM and an N, clearly show an overwhelming prenominal position of DEM. Tables 1 and 2 present this in a diachronic perspective. The marked postnominal position of DEM in the archaic and classical-imperial period (3<sup>rd</sup> BC-2<sup>nd</sup> AD) increases in the late imperial period (3<sup>rd</sup>-4<sup>th</sup> AD) but never reaches a number that could justify the assumption of a change in the structure of the language.

Table 1 (3<sup>rd</sup> BC-2<sup>nd</sup> AD)

<i>Hic, haec, hoc</i> 131 (47%)		<i>Ille, illa, illud</i> 125 (46%)		<i>Iste, ista, istud</i> 21 (7%)	
<i>Hic</i> > N (94%) 123	N > <i>hic</i> 8 (6%)	<i>Ille</i> > N 101 (81%)	N > <i>ille</i> 24 (19%)	<i>Iste</i> > N 16 (76%)	N > <i>iste</i> 5 (24%)
DEM > N 240 (86,6%)			N > DEM 37 (13,4%)		

Table 2 (3<sup>rd</sup> – 4<sup>th</sup> AD)

<i>Hic, haec, hoc</i> 137 (48%)		<i>Ille, illa, illud</i> 87 (31%)		<i>Iste, ista, istud</i> 59 (21%)	
<i>Hic</i> > N 118 (87%)	N > <i>hic</i> 19 (13%)	<i>Ille</i> > N 48 (55%)	N > <i>ille</i> 39 (45%)	<i>Iste</i> > N 39 (66%)	N > <i>Iste</i> 20 (34%)
DEM > N 205 (72,4%)			N > DEM 78 (28,6%)		

CNEs are more telling with respect to the relative position of different elements. In our corpus of 262 CNEs consisting of three elements, DEM can appear in first or second position, never third or last. It can precede (14), or be preceded (15) by any nominal modifier, e.g. possessive, numeral, or descriptive adjectives of any class (in the

sense of Cinque 1994, 2010, also cf section 4 below). It can precede a N followed by a modifier (16), but it is almost never preceded by N and followed by a modifier (17):<sup>5</sup>

- (14) a. *hunc suum dolorem* DEM>POSS>N  
 this.ACC.SG. his.ACC.SG. pain.ACC.SG.  
 “this pain of his” (Cic. *Sext.* 32)
- b. *huic uni crimini* DEM>NUM>N  
 this.DAT.SG. one.DAT.SG. crime.DAT.SG.  
 “for this unique crime” (Cic. *Cluent.* 48)
- c. *his novis<sub>[age]</sub> civibus* DEM> ADJ>N  
 this.DAT.PL. new.DAT.PL. citizen.DAT.PL.  
 “to those new citizens” (Liv. 6,4,4)
- d. *illum dentatum<sub>[physical property]</sub> virum*  
 that.ACC.SG. toothed.ACC.SG. man.ACC.SG.  
 “that toothed man” (Plaut. *Pseud.* 1040)
- (15) a. *ex vetere<sub>[age]</sub> illa disciplina* ADJ>DEM>N  
 from old.ABL.SG. that.ABL.SG. discipline.ABL.SG.  
 “from that old discipline” (Cic. *Cluent.* 76)
- b. *noster hic populus* POSS>DEM>N  
 our.NOM.SG. this.NOM.SG. people.NOM.SG.  
 “this people of ours” (Cic. *rep.* 3,24)
- c. *una haec pugna* NUM>DEM>N  
 one.NOM.SG. this.NOM.SG. battle.NOM.SG.  
 “this only battle” (Liv. 8,30,7)
- (16) a. *hanc virginem adultam<sub>[age]</sub>* DEM>N>ADJ  
 this.ACC.SG. girl.ACC.SG. adult.ACC.SG.  
 “this adult girl” (Liv. 3,44,4)
- b. *haec urbs praeclara<sub>[evaluation]</sub>*  
 this.NOM.SG. city.NOM.SG. famous.NOM.SG.  
 “this famous city” (Cic. *Mil.* 93)

---

<sup>5</sup>. For reason of space, we do not give complete data with *ille* or *iste* which are however attested in our *corpus* and fully contribute to our quantitative analysis.



- c. *hic*            *pagus*            *unus*            DEM>N>NUM  
 this.NOM.SG. village.NOM.SG. one.NOM.SG.  
 “this unique village” (Caes. *Gall.* 1,12,5)
- d. *huius*            *iudicis*            *nostri*            DEM>N>POSS  
 this.GEN.SG. judge.NOM.SG.our.GEN.SG.  
 “this judge of ours” (Cic. *Mil.* 16)
- (17) a. *Cato*            *ille*            *noster*            N> *ILLE* > POSS  
 Caton.NOM.SG. that.NOM.SG. our.NOM.SG.  
 “Caton, the one of ours” (Cic. *Att.* 2,5,1)
- b. *bello*            *illo*            *maximo*<sub>[dimension]</sub>            N> *ILLE* > ADJ  
 war.ABL.SG. that.ABL.SG. very big.ABL.SG.  
 “that very big war” (Cic. *rep.* 1,25)

Only *ille* appears in second position preceded by N (proper name or common noun) and followed by a possessive or an adjective. Iovino (2011) shows that the construction in (17) can only contain a predicative adjective, and refer to a topical referent. She suggests that N-*ille*-Adj is the same construction as the Romanian N-*cel*-Adj construction (Cornilescu 1992, Coene 1999). *Ille* introduces an appositive DP with a null N, which is inserted in the specifier of a functional projection selected by the DP containing the noun. In this structure, DEM is the leftmost specifier of the appositive DP. For reasons of space we cannot discuss this construction any further here. But it is interesting to observe that in this construction N is not moved to the left periphery of its own DP, but it is only moved across an appositive DP, much in the same fashion as it can move across an appositive AP. In our analysis the left periphery is only occupied by maximal projections that are modifiers of the noun and not be the noun itself.<sup>6</sup>

Table 3 reports the frequency of the orders found in (14)-(17) above, to be quantitatively compared with Tables 1-2 above:

---

<sup>6</sup>. We do not enter the discussion of whether N-movement is X<sup>o</sup> or XP movement, it seems that only a complete extended projection can A-bar move to the left-periphery of the DP and not a subpart of the extended projection.

Table 3 Dem position in CNEs

Dem in first position			Dem in second position			
Dem Poss N	16	6.0%	Poss Dem N	8	3%	
Dem Num N	30	12.0%	Num Dem N	6	2%	
Dem A N	97	37.5%	A Dem N	35	13.5%	
Dem Modifier N	143	55.5%	Modifier Dem N	49	18.5%	192; 74%
Dem N A	40	15.0%				
Dem N Num	3	1.0%				
Dem N Poss	12	4.0%				
Dem N Modifier	55	20.0%				55; 20%
			N <i>ille</i> Modifier	15	6%	15; 6%
Total	198	75.5%	Total	64	24.5%	262; 100%

DEM is in initial position at basically the same rate in CNE (75.5%) as in SNE (which present an average of 80%); but we cannot omit to notice that this piece of data is the result of very different combinations. The postnominal position of DEM in SNEs is solidly attested in the 20% of the cases and reaches a peak of 45% for *ille* in the late imperial period, while DEM is almost never postnominal in CNEs (only 6%). The 18.5% of DEM in second position in CNE is due to a preceding adjective, an order which is not allowed in Serbo-Croatian (13). Notably, the third position that could be expected by, say, a right-branching adjunction of DEM is not found in our corpus. This may mean that it is not ungrammatical *tout court*, but that it is rare and cannot represent a basic order.

Neither the cartographic approach, nor the NP/DP-parameter or the semantic approach adopted with it can provide a good reason why DEM can follow N only if N has no modifier. This can be explained comparing Latin with other Romance languages. In (18) the postnominal position of DEM is found in Spanish and Romanian, but not in Italian, which shares the prenominal position with Spanish and Romanian:

- (18) a. el (ultimo) cuadro redondo *este* suyo (Spanish)  
the last picture round this her/his
- b. tabloul *acesta* rotund al său (Romanian)  
picture-the this round AL her/his
- c. *questo* (ultimo) quadro tondo suo (Italian)  
*este* (ultimo) cuadro redondo suyo (Spanish)  
*acest* (ultim) tablou rotund al său (Romanian)  
*this* last picture round AL her/his

The NEs in (18) include a prenominal AP (“last”), a postnominal AP (“round”) and a postnominal possessive in order to test the relative position of DEM with respect to other modifiers. What is of interest for our discussion is that DEM is first in all Romance languages, but can also be second in Romanian and low (crucially after the lowest adjective and before the possessive) in Spanish.

According to Brugè (1996, 2002) and Giusti (1997, 2002), demonstratives are maximal projections, first-merged in a low portion of nominal structure and moved to SpecDP where the referential index can be valued. Parametric variation regards the realization of DEM. Spanish can realize the low copy in the first merge position (19a). The second position of Romanian *acesta* is analysed by Giusti (2005), as (re)merging of DEM to SpecDP and movement of N° to TOP° (19b). In both cases the highest functional projection is made visible by the definite article, a last resort, semantically void element. (19c) shows that a DEM in the leftmost specifier is in complementary distribution with an article. This is also the case in Spanish, Romanian and English (18c) above:

- (19) a. [DP **este** el [ultimo cuadro [redondo ~~cuadro~~ [**este** ~~cuadro~~ [NP suyo ~~cuadro~~]]]]]  
 b. [TopP tabloul [DP *acesta* [D° ~~tabloul~~] [rotund ~~tabloul~~ [~~acesta~~ ~~tabloul~~ [NP al său ~~tabloul~~]]]]]  
 c. [DP *questo* D° [ultimo quadro [tondo ~~quadro~~ [~~questo~~ ~~quadro~~ [suo ~~quadro~~]]]]]

In (19) we see that Romanian is parallel to Italian in having DEM in a high position, but contrary to Italian this high position may not be the highest of the NE. Here we claim that this is the case of Latin as well. DEM is realized in SpecDP but a further “left edge” of the NE can be projected to host displaced constituents or to function as an escape hatch, as argued for by Giusti and Oniga (2007). Before spelling out the details of this proposal in section 5, we investigate in the section 4, whether there is evidence for this position independently from the distribution of DEMs, focusing on adjectival modifiers.

#### 4. Direct and indirect modification in Latin

As noted by De Sutter (1986) and Devine and Stephens (2006) among many, in Latin the adjective closest to the noun more closely restricts the denotation, while an external adjective takes scope above the whole constituent. This “functional/semantic” consideration, which corresponds to Bošković (2009) semantic explanation of adjectival order, can derive the unmarked orders and some pragmatically marked orders, but

cannot derive those in which an adjective precedes a demonstrative. In this section we adopt a syntactic approach.

Following current minimalist proposals, we assume that a NE is formed by merging the head N with a modifying constituent, then the merger may continue with a second modifier, and so on. Following Cinque (2010), we distinguish direct and indirect modification. Direct modification adjectives are inserted in a low layer while indirect modification adjectives are higher and correspond to reduced relative clauses. In our corpus of Latin CNEs consisting of 109 NEs containing N and at least two APs, these two positions may occur in their first-merge order, as depicted in (20a). In (20b) a direct modification AP follows N and this constituent is restricted by a preceding indirect modification AP. In (20c) N precedes both APs in their first-merge order:<sup>7</sup>

- (20) a. [parvulis [equestribus [proeliis]]]  
 [AP<sub>ind</sub> [AP<sub>dir</sub> [NP]]]  
 little.ABL.PL. equestrian.ABL.PL. battle.ABL.PL.  
 “little equestrian battles” (Caes. *Gall.* 5,50,1)
- b. [veteres [cives [Romanos [cives]]]  
 [AP<sub>ind</sub> [NP [AP<sub>dir</sub> [NP]]]]]  
 old.ACC.PL. citizen.ACC.PL. Roman.ACC.PL.  
 “old Roman citizens” (Liv. 8,11,14)
- c. [libro [vetere ~~libro~~ [lino libro]]]  
 [NP [AP<sub>ind</sub> NP [AP<sub>dir</sub> [NP]]]]]  
 book.ABL.SG. old.ABL.SG. linen.ABL.SG.  
 “old linen book” (Liv. 10,38,6)

The position of the noun in (20) is easily derived by Cinque’s (2010) proposal that NP can move (in one or two steps), optionally pied-piping a larger remnant, so that we find a structure like (21a) with no movement yielding (20a); in (21b) remerger of NP yields (20b), two applications of remerger yields (20c):

---

<sup>7</sup>. For reasons of internal coherence in the account, we follow the antisymmetric perspective (Kayne 1994) according to which specifiers can only be left branching. For this reason (20b) is derived with one application of NP movement in (21b). However, nothing of what is discussed here hinges on this assumption. Our proposal is compatible with right-branching specifiers (cf. Bouchard 2000), which is more “minimal” in dispensing with the first NP-movement.

- (21) a. [FP AP<sub>ind</sub> [FP AP<sub>dir</sub> [NP]]]  
 b. [NP [FP AP<sub>ind</sub> [FP NP [FP AP<sub>dir</sub> [NP]]]]]

The indirect modification AP can follow the constituent formed by the NP preceded or followed by a direct modification AP, as exemplified in (22) and analyzed in (23):

- (22) a. [[de patriis fortunis amplissimis] [[AP<sub>dir</sub> NP] AP<sub>ind</sub>]  
 familiar.ABL.PL. richness.ABL.PL. very big.ABL.PL.  
 “about the very big familiar richness” (Cic. *Cluent.* 31)  
 b. [[ova anserina pilleata] [[NP AP<sub>dir</sub>] AP<sub>ind</sub>]  
 egg.ACC.PL. of goose.ACC.PL. with pilleum.ACC.PL.  
 “goose eggs with *pilleum*” (Petr. *Sat.* 65,2)

- (23) a. [FP [AP<sub>dir</sub> NP] [FP AP<sub>ind</sub> [FP AP<sub>dir</sub> [NP]]]]  
  
 b. [FP [NP AP<sub>dir</sub>] [FP AP<sub>ind</sub> [FP NP [FP AP<sub>dir</sub> [NP]]]]]

The optional remnant movement *à la Cinque*, however, cannot account for (24), where the referential AP (unambiguously of direct modification) appears to the left of *longa* (either of indirect modification or higher in the hierarchy of direct modification):

- (24) *Plautina longa fabula*  
 of Plautus.NOM.SG. long.NOM.SG. comedy.NOM.SG.  
 “Plautus’ long comedy” (Plaut. *Pseud.* 2)

A close inspection of the context<sup>8</sup> confirms the interpretation of *Plautina* in (24) as referential “by Plautus” contra a possible, but in this case inappropriate, descriptive

<sup>8</sup>. The Prologue of the comedy by Plautus starts with the exact words: *Exporgi meliust lumbos atque exurgier: Plautina longa fabula in scaenam uenit*. “It is better to stretch the kidneys and get up: a Plautus’ long comedy is performed” (Plaut. *Pseud.* 1-2).

reading “à la Plautus, in Plautus’ fashion”. The unexpected order can be explained assuming that the identity of the author is shared knowledge and the displacement of the adjective is due to contrastive topicality<sup>9</sup>. The two further examples of displaced adjectives present in the corpus are given in (25):

- (25) a. **Alexandrina**                      beluata                      tonsilia                      tappetia  
           of Alexandria.NOM.PL. decorated.NOM.PL. trimmed.NOM.PL. carpet.NOM.PL.  
           “decorated shaved carpets of Alexandria” (Plaut. *Pseud.* 143)
- b. **Homerico**                      annuo                      partu<sup>10</sup>  
           in Homerus.ABL.SG. in one year.ABL.SG. childbirth.ABL.SG.  
           “about the childbirth in one year in Homerus” (Gell. 3,16,22)

The proposal to be spelled out in next section is that also for these cases a left-peripheral position is needed to account for this undoubtedly statistically and pragmatically marked order.

## 5. A Split DP-layer for Latin

That quantitatively marked orders in Latin have pragmatically marked interpretation is common knowledge since the seminal work by Marouzeau (1922). Recently, Devine and Stephens (2006) derived this through displacement of (sub)constituents to Foc/Top projections. Giusti and Oniga (2007) argue that Latin NEs display the unmarked order

---

<sup>9</sup>. The possibility for a topic to occur in the second line of a comedy, in the absence of a textual antecedent, is due to the strict connection between the drama and the context in which it is played. In this sense, the so-called “shared knowledge” is to be researched in the situational context and not (only) in the text.

<sup>10</sup>. *Faciam ut valide [vestra latera] varia sint, ut ne peristromata quidem aequae picta sint Campanica, neque Alexandrina belvata tonsilia tappetia.* (Plaut. *Pseud.* 145-147) “I will make your hips in such a state that they will be so variegated that even the blankets of Campania or the decorated trimmed carpets of Alexandria will have such a variety of colors“. *Sed quoniam de Homerico annuo partu ac de undecimo mense diximus quae cognoveramus, visum est non praetereundum, quod in Plinii Secundi libro septimo naturalis historiae legimus.* (Gell. 3,16,22) “Since I quoted the passage of Homer about the childbirth in one year and at the eleventh month, I think I must not omit a curious fact that I have read in Pliny, in the seventh book of his Natural History”.

found in many other languages and that a peripheral projection derives marked orders, as in (26):

- (26) [Foc/Top [Dim [Poss [Num [A [N]]]]]]
- a. *meus hic ~~meus~~ forensis labor*  
 my.NOM.SG. this.NOM.SG. forensic.NOM.SG. work.NOM.SG.  
 “This forensic work of mine” (Cic. *Cael.* 6)
- b. *tres eos ~~tres~~ libros*  
 three.ACC.PL. this.ACC.PL. book.ACC.PL.  
 “those three books” (Cic. *Att.* 13,32,2)
- c. *militaris illa ~~militaris~~ virtus*  
 militar.NOM.SG. that.NOM.SG. virtue.NOM.SG.  
 “that military virtue” (Cic. *leg. Manil.* 64)
- d. *vetus nostra ~~vetus~~ similtas*  
 old.NOM.SG. our.NOM.SG. hostility.NOM.SG.  
 “Old hostility of ours” (Cic. *fam.* 3,12,4)

According to Giusti and Oniga (2007), the proposal of a left periphery inside the NE, can also account for split genitives (27a) and split AP-coordination (27b), and more generally all discontinuous orders also discussed by Bolkenstein (2001):

- (27) a. [<sub>NE</sub> *reliquorum* [<sub>nutriculas</sub> [~~*reliquorum*~~ *praediorum*]]] (Cic. *Phil.* 11,12)  
 b. [<sub>NE</sub> *magna* [<sub>aliqua</sub> [~~*magna*~~ *ac nobilis*] *virtus*]]] (Tac. *Agric.* 1)

Our proposal can capture the first three of the four properties discussed in the previous sections:

1. When present, DEM is the highest modifier in the unmarked case but not in all cases, contrary to what a bare NP structure constrained by the semantic approach would predict.
2. When DEM is in second position, we can find any class of modifier preceding it. This is captured by the assumption that the left periphery hosts discourse features and is a sort of A-bar position.
3. Only one element at a time can precede DEM. This supports the proposal that we are dealing with a syntactic and not phonological rearrangement of the elements.
4. N precedes DEM only if no other modifier is present.

The fourth property can be briefly explained as follows. Movement to the left of DEM is constituent movement. NP movement to its own left periphery is blocked by the presence of an intervening AP due to the necessity that such AP come into a proper configuration with the concordant N(P). This solution admittedly needs further elaboration which cannot be carried out in the space allowed to our contribution.

## **6. Conclusion**

In this paper we argued in favor of the existence of a DP in Latin. In section 2 we showed that most of Bošković's (2005) generalizations suggest that Latin is a DP-language. Lack of articles, full adjectival-like inflection of demonstratives and determiners and their morpho-syntactic behavior are not sufficient conditions for the NP-parameter, since they are all present in Italian as well. The NE-internal free word order and the discontinuous orders of NEs are derived by the well-grounded assumption of a left peripheral phrase above DP. There is no evidence to assume that Latin has a single phase NP structure.

In the diachronic perspective, our hypothesis can explain why all Romance languages developed an article: having a DP projection, they had better chances to develop a filler for the head D (a last resort process) than Slavic languages had (if we assume that proto-slavic was not DP-language). It is left for future research to investigate how the left peripheral phrase has evolved into a projection lower than DP (Giusti 1996, 2006), which does not allow extraction.

A final remark regards the nature of labels of functional structure as D, Agr, *etc.* in the current minimalist framework. If they are just phantoms and are not primitives, it may well be the case that the DP/NP parameter can dissolve into a theory of how functional features are bundled (and overtly realized) in different languages.



## References

- Alexiadou, A., L. Haegeman and M. Stavrou. 2007. *Noun Phrase in the Generative Perspective*. Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bolkestein, A. M. 2001. "Random Scrambling? Constraints on Discontinuity in Latin Noun Phrases". In C. Moussy (ed.) *De lingua Latina novae quaestiones*, Actes du Xe Colloque international de Linguistique Latine, Paris-Sèvres, 19-23 avril 1999. 245-258. Louvain-Paris, Peeters.
- Bošković, Ž. 2005. "On the locality of left branch extraction and the structure of NP". *Studia linguistica* 59:1-45.
- Bošković, Ž. 2008. "What will you have DP or NP?". In *Proceedings of NELS 37*. 101-114. GLSA, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Bošković, Ž. 2009. "More on the No-DP Analysis of article-less languages". *Studia Linguistica* 63:187-203.
- Bošković, Ž. 2010. "Phases beyond clauses". Paper available online at: <http://web.uconn.edu/boskovic/papers.html>
- Bouchard, D. 2002. *Adjectives, Number and Interfaces: Why Languages Vary*. Amsterdam, North Holland Publisher.
- Brugè, L. 1996. "Demonstrative Movement in Spanish: A Comparative Approach". *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics* 6(1): 1-53.
- Brugè, L. 2002. "The positions of Demonstratives in the Extended Nominal Projection". In G. Cinque (ed.) *Functional Structure in the DP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures vol. 1*. 16-80. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Chierchia, G. 1998. "Reference to Kinds across Languages". *Natural Language Semantics* 6:339-405.
- Cinque, G. 1994. "On the Evidence for Partial N-Movement in the Romance DP". In G. Cinque, J. Koster, J. Pollock, L. Rizzi and R. Zanuttini (eds) *Paths Towards Universal Grammar. Studies in Honor of Richard Kayne*. 85-110. Washington, Georgetown University Press.
- Cinque, G. 2010. *The Syntax of Adjectives. A Comparative Study*. Cambridge MA, MIT Press.
- Coene, M. 1999. "Definite Null Nominals in Romanian and Spanish". PhD dissertation, Universiteit Antwerpen.
- Cornilescu, A. 1992. "Remarks on the determiner system of Romanian: The demonstratives 'AL' and 'CEL'". *Probus* 4:180-260.

- De Sutter, M. 1986. "A Theory of Word Order within the Latin Noun Phrase, based on Cato's *De agri cultura*". In C. Deroux (ed.) *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History IV*. 171-183. Bruxelles, Latomus.
- Devine, A. M. and L. D. Stephens. 2006. *Latin Word Order. Structure Meaning and Information*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Gianollo, C. 2007. "The Internal Syntax of the Nominal Phrase in Latin. A Dyachronic Study". In G. Purnelle and J. Denooz (eds.) *Ordre et cohérence en Latin*. Communications présentées au 13<sup>o</sup> Colloque International de Linguistique Latine, (Bruxelles-Liège, 4-9 avril 2005). 65-80. Genève, DROZ.
- Giusti, G. 1996. "Is there a FocusP and a TopicP in Noun Phrase Structure?". *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics* 6.2:105-128.
- Giusti, G. 1997. "The categorial status of determiners". In L. Haegeman (ed.) *The New Comparative Syntax*. 95-123. London, Longman.
- Giusti, G. 2002. "The functional structure of determiners. A bare phrase structure approach". In G. Cinque (ed.) *Functional structure in DP and IP: The cartography of syntactic structures*, vol. 1. 54-90. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Giusti, G. 2005. "At the left periphery of the Romanian Noun Phrase". In M. Coene and L. Tasmowski (eds.) *On Space and Time in Language*. 23-49. Cluj, Clujum.
- Giusti, G. 2006. "Parallels in clausal and nominal periphery". In M. Frascarelli (ed.) *Phases of Interpretation*. 163-184. Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter.
- Giusti, G. and R. Oniga. 2007. "Core and Periphery in the Latin Noun Phrase". In G. Purnelle and J. Denooz (eds.) *Ordre et cohérence en Latin*. Communications présentées au 13<sup>o</sup> Colloque International de Linguistique Latine, Bruxelles-Liège, 4-9 avril 2005. 81-95. Genève, DROZ.
- Iovino, R. In progress. "L'ordine delle parole nelle espressioni nominali latine". PhD dissertation, University Ca'Foscari of Venice.
- Iovino, R. 2011. "Word order in Latin nominal expressions. The syntax of demonstratives". In R. Oniga, R. Iovino and G. Giusti (eds.) *Formal Linguistics and the Teaching of Latin. Theoretical and Applied Perspectives in Comparative Grammars*. 51-63. Newcastle Upon Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Kayne, R. 1994. *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge MA, MIT Press.
- Longobardi, G. 1994. "Reference and proper names: A theory on N-movement in syntax and logical form". *Linguistic Inquiry* 25.4: 609-655.
- Marouzeau, J. 1922. *L'ordre de mots dans la phrase latine. I: Les groupes nominaux*. Paris, Champion.

- Pereltsvaig, A. 2007. "The universality of DP: A view from Russian". *Studia Linguistica* 61: 59-94.
- Wharton, D. B. 2009. "On the distribution of adnominal Prepositional Phrases in Latin prose". *Classical Philology* 104: 184-207.
- Willim, E. 2000. "On the grammar of Polish nominals". In R. Martin, D. Michaels and J. Uriagereka (eds.) *Step by Step. Essays in Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*. 319-346. Cambridge MA, MIT Press.
- Zlatić, L. 1997. "The structure of the Serbian Noun Phrase". PhD dissertation, University of Texas at Austin.