

Demonstrative-reinforcer constructions: variation in Italo-Romance

Silvia Terenghi & Jan Casalicchio

Introduction. This paper proposes a diachronic analysis for Italo-Romance demonstrative-reinforcer constructions (henceforth, ‘DRCs’), i.e. constructions formed by a (pronominal or adjectival) demonstrative followed by a locative element (Brugè 1996, 2002; Bernstein 1997, 2001; Roehrs 2010):

- (1) **quella casa là** (Standard Italian)
‘that house there’

In some Italo-Romance varieties DRCs are obligatory (e.g. some Emilian varieties), while in others they are optional or restricted to focus contexts. We propose that this distribution mirrors different stages of a grammaticalisation process that can also be observed by analysing texts of different periods. In this process, the locative element starts out as full adverb and ends up as part of a ‘Big DemP’ (along the lines of Big DPs, see below), through an intermediate stage in which it is used as focus marker.

DRCs as (reduced) relative clauses. Although DRCs are nowadays widespread across Italo-Romance varieties, they are a quite recent innovation. In the Middle Ages, combinations of demonstratives and locative elements are rarely found in the OVI corpus (which is mainly focused on Tuscan texts, though): only 8 occurrences (6 from Tuscany, 2 from Venetian) are directly comparable to the construction we find today (2a), whereas, in most cases, the locative form is embedded in a relative clause (29 occurrences), as in (2b):

- (2a) Li loro pensieri sono d’altre cose che di **queste qui**. (Dante, *VN*, 40.3)
the their thoughts are of other things that of these here
‘Their thoughts are about things other than these here.’
- (2b) A **questi** omini che ssono schritti **qui** di sotto. (*Doc. prat.*, 1293-1306)
to these men that are written here of under
‘To these men, which are written below.’

In cases like (2b), a demonstrative can even co-occur with a deictically incompatible locative (e.g. *in quella medesima pena che si contiene qui di sopra* ‘in **that** same punishment that is contained up **here**’, *Stat. Fior.*, 1284, II.27). The structure we put forward for (2b) includes a demonstrative element (DemP, as labelled in Giusti 1997) modified by a relative clause containing a ‘true’ locative adverb (3):

- (3) [DP D [... [FP DemP F [... [NP N [CP (che) [... [AdvP Locative Adv]]]]]]]]

A similar picture emerges from later stages of Italo-Romance: Machiavelli’s *Mandragola* (1515 ca.), Ruzante’s *Betìa* (1524-5) and Basile’s *Lo cunto de li cunti* (1634-6) show in total only 3 possible occurrences of DRCs. We propose that they derive from reduced relative clauses: (4) is a clear example that, at this stage, locative elements were not integrated into DemP (and therefore directly linked to the structure in (3)), as the mismatch between the proximal demonstrative and the distal locative shows (example from Ruzante, *Betìa* V, 460):

- (4) El no ghe acaziva zà no / che el diesse **quele** parole **chì**.
it.CL not him.CL.DAT occurred yet not / that he.CL said those words here
‘It had never occurred to him before / to say those words.’

In addition, one synchronic piece of evidence for DRCs originating from reduced relative clauses is the form of Romagnolo reinforcers, which incorporates the relative marker *ke* as a relic: e.g. *kwěš kękwé* ‘this here’ and *kwěl kęlé* ‘that there’, as opposed to true locative adverbs *kwé* ‘here’ and *lā* ‘there’ (Meldola, AIS 1587, 1609, 1610).

DRCs as focal constructions. In the first half of the 20th century, we find a different picture. In the AIS (maps: 42, 853, 1045, 1247, 1587, 1589, 1670, 1674, 1678) DRCs are more widespread: the areal distribution of DRCs covers Gallo-Italic varieties and some limited areas in

Veneto, Tuscany and the area around Naples. In this period, the primary context in which they occur is contrastive focalisation (cf. map 1587: *questo e non quello*): out of 368 points, 236 do not display reinforcers in contrastive contexts, while 132 do so. DRCs are found in non-contrastive contexts as well, but in less varieties: in most cases a reinforcer is used in non-contrastive contexts only when it is also used in contrastive contexts. Most notably, in 144 points the reinforcer is not even produced when it was present in the stimulus (maps 1519 f.: *vorrei di questa qui... e non di quella lì*).

These data suggest that, in most of the varieties that display DRCs at this stage, the construction is associated with a focus interpretation, in line with Bernstein's hypothesis of DP-final reinforcers as focalised elements in Romance (Bernstein 2001, which we redirect to for details about the proposal). Following Bernstein (1997), we assume the structure in (5) for focal DRCs:

(5) [DP D [... [FP DemP Reinf [... [NP N]]]]]

In (5), the erstwhile locative adverb of (3) has become a particle, moving higher up in the structure and losing its phrasal status to become a head F°. Discontinuous patterns, where the demonstrative adjective and the reinforcer are not adjacent (*this N here*), are derived by leftward movement of the demonstrative (moving as a phrase, *contra* Bernstein 1997) and of the noun. Evidence for this structure comes again from deictic compatibility: in the AIS, DRCs generally combine a demonstrative with deictically compatible locatives only (with only 7 exceptions).

DRCs as 'Big DemPs'. We turn now to the last stage of the grammaticalisation process. In the AIS, we find six points between Southern Lombardy and the province of Piacenza (263, 273, 275, 282, 286 and 412) already showing a more advanced stage: in these varieties, demonstratives only occur as DRCs. This means that reinforcers have become obligatory and are no longer linked to a contrastive focus interpretation, as in (6). Similar data are attested for some Emilian dialects as well (see for instance points 401, 414 and 424 in the ALI), and for some contemporary Venetan varieties (data collected by the authors).

(6) zbad vĩa **ki** ġerũn lę (Bozzolo, AIS 1674)
'Throw away those rocks there!'

The obligatory use of the reinforcer suggests that the particle has been structurally reanalysed as part of the demonstrative form. We propose that, in this last stage, the reinforcer is integrated into DemP and heads the resulting 'Big DemP' structure (7); the reinforcer is then stranded when the demonstrative moves higher up, as happens with Big DPs (Torrego 1992, 1994, Uriagereka 1995, Belletti 1999, Cecchetto 2000) and with Floating Quantifiers (Sportiche 1988). Even in this case, N crosses the stranded reinforcer, yielding the discontinuous pattern.

(7) [DP D [... [FP [BigDemP [DemP Reinf]]] [FP [... [NP N]]]]]

Conclusions. We have provided evidence for the diachronic development of DRCs, which also accounts for the synchronic variation. The path we have traced for the locative element is "(reduced) relative > focal marker > obligatory element", and these different stages are still visible in different Italo-Romance varieties. In future research we will address the question whether the same grammaticalisation process can be identified in other Romance varieties with DRCs.

Selected references: Belletti (1999). Italian/Romance clitics: Structure and derivation. In van Riemsdijk (ed.), *Clitics in the Languages of Europe*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 543-579. | Bernstein (1997), 'Demonstratives and reinforcers in Romance and Germanic languages', *Lingua* **102**, 87-113. | Bernstein (2001), 'Focusing the "right" way in Romance Determiner Phrase', *Probus* **13**, 1-29. | Brugè (1996). 'Demonstrative movement in Spanish: A comparative approach', University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics **6/1**, 1-61. | Cecchetto (2000). 'Doubling Structures and Reconstruction', *Probus* **12/1**, 1-34. | Giusti (1997). The categorial status of determiners. In Haegeman (ed.), *The New Comparative Syntax*, London: Longman, 95-124. | Torrego (1994). 'On the nature of clitic doubling', *ASJU*, **28/1**, 199-213.