The internal and external syntax of bare quantifiers in Old Italian

Cecilia Poletto & Silvia Rossi (Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main)

1. The aim of the work is to investigate the internal structure of bare quantifiers and show that their internal syntax determines their position in the clause. Across languages negative and universal quantifiers differ quite markedly with respect to definite DPs as regards their sentence position and/or their interaction with general clausal phenomena (see for instance the obligatory OV orders with negative QPs and the optional OV orders with other quantified DPs in Icelandic, Svenonius 2000). A second split is found between quantified DPs and bare quantifiers, see among others preparticipial *tout* 'everything' and *rien* 'nothing' in French (Kayne 1975 a. o.). Old Italian in this is no exception and the special syntax of bare QPs manifests some interesting asymmetries, which we argue are directly linked to the internal make-up of the various quantifiers. In this paper, we consider the bare quantifier *molto* 'much' in Old Italian and compare it to universal and negative quantifiers, showing that it targets dedicated projections at the edge of the CP and vP phases. The different distribution exhibited by *molto* with respect to *tutto* and *niente* will be accounted for in terms of a difference in its internal make-up: while *niente* contains *–ente*, i.e. a lexical classifier-like n° category, *molto* does not contain any nominal category in its internal structure. This absence of a n° category is in turn directly responsible for its nature as an adjectival and adverbial modifier.

2. In OI *molto* 'much' can occur either before the past participle or immediately before the inflected verb: in the vP area, out of the 105 relevant cases of *molto* found in the OVI data base for OI up to 1320, 90% of cases have *molto* in front of the non-finite form of a verbal compound.

(1)   e hammi ***molto*** migliorato e rallevato de la mia malatia, [...]
        and have.2sg=me much improved and of the my disease
        and you have much relieved my pain, ….'
        (Bono Giamboni, *Libro de' Vizi e delle Virtudi,* chap. 11)

Furthermore, *molto* usually precedes various types of arguments and vP-internal material (including low subjects) thus showing that its position is at the edge of the vP area.

3. *Molto* can also be found immediately before the finite verb in V2 structures:

(2)   a.   [A pigliare il muro] ***molto*** valgono le scale, e...
                to take.int the wall much help the stiars, ...
                'Stairs are very helpful when trying to breach the wall and ...'
                (Bono Giamboni, *Arte della Guerra*, IV, 30)
        b.   Maestra delle Virtudi, ***molto*** m'hai consolato delle mie tribulazioni,
                Teacher of Virtues, much to.me=have.2sg comforted of.the my tribolations
                'Oh Mistress of Virtues, you have much comforted me in my hardships, …'
                (Bono Giamboni, *Libro de' Vizi e delle Virtudi,* chap. 11)

In such cases, *molto* is never followed by enclisis on the finite verb, cf. (2b), and is usually only separated from it either by clitics or by the negation marker We thus propose that *molto* occupies an Operator position in what the cartographic approach considers as the lower part of the CP layer. Such analysis can be supported by cases like (2a) above where other constituents precede *molto* (cases of *molto* separated from the finite verb by other constituents are rather infrequent, just 6 cases in the OVI texts till 1320, which could all be accommodated as cases of preposing of a vP-remnant). These data can be explained by arguing that *molto,* on a par with *tutto,* which displays a similar distribution, lacks the classifier-like category in its

internal structure and therefore needs to c-command the subtree it takes scope on. This is the reason why it can target the edge of both phases, and interact with the V2 syntax of Old Italian like other Operators (cf. Focus and the *si* particle, Benincà 2006). This has the (in our view welcome) result that Topics are outside the CP phase in OI and is compatible with the idea that phase edge might vary across languages (a further issue we will deal with in the talk).

4. Additional facts support the idea that *molto* targets the edge of a phase: adverbial *molto* can be extracted out of an adjective, a DP or even an adverb it modifies yielding cases of split-quantification which are impossible in the modern language. Interestingly though, all cases of extraction out of an AdjP are when *molto* modifies an adjective in a predicative position (the typical case is with copular sentences):

(3)   Maestra de le Virtudi, ***molto*** è ***bella creatura*** questa Fede, …
        Lady of the Virtues, much is beatiful creature this faith…
        'Lady of Virtues, this Faith is a very beautiful creature, … '
        Bono Giambini, *Libro de' Vizi e delle Virtudi,* chap. 19)

What is striking is that there is no case of *molto* extracted out of a non-predicative DP and showing agreement with the noun it is paired with:

(4)   ****Molta*** arrivava gente.
        Much.fsg came people.fsg   Intended 'Many people were coming.'

Notice however that here *molto* displays agreement with the N and this might be the reason of the block.

5. Summing up, we have argued that the position of bare quantifiers in the clause depends on their internal syntax. Since bare Qs require a category to quantify over, they can find it in their external structure. Since elements like *molto* do not contain an internal classifier-like n° over which they can quantify, they have to move to the edge of the next phase at their disposal to c-command the chunk of structure they quantify over. This is thus an interesting euristics to determine phase edges and can help us determine which types of nominal expressions are phases and where the phase edge really lies in a split left periphery. If our analysis is on the right track, this means that in OI the phase edge is not ForceP but a lower Operator position (targeted by Focus, wh-items and more generally other operators).

References: Beninca, P. (2006). 'A detailed map of the left periphery of Medieval Romance', in R. Zanuttini, H. Campos and E. Herburger (eds.) *Crosslinguistic research in syntax and semantics: negation, tense, and clausal architecture*, 53-86. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press; Kayne, R. S. (1975). *French Syntax.* Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press; Svenonius, P. (2000) "Quantifier Movement in Icelandic", in P. Svenonius (ed.) *The Derivation of VO and OV*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam and Philadelphia.