Abstract. This paper deals with three phenomena specific to old Romanian: prehead complements to adjectives (i.e. head-final adjectival structures), postadjectival degree markers, and discontinuous adjectival and degree phrases. Following recent work by Ledgeway, we defend the hypothesis that the old Romanian adjectival phrase preserves relics of the head-final and non-configurational syntax of Latin. The fact that prehead complements of adjectives and postadjectival degree markers represent a genuine instance of head-finality (i.e. roll-up movement) is reinforced by the existence of discontinuous adjectival phrases (the hallmark of non-configurationality), discontinuous structures being unavailable in harmonic head-initial systems (Ledgeway forthcoming b).
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1. Aim of the paper

This paper analyses certain patterns specific to the old Romanian (OR) Adjectival Phrase (AP): the preadjectival position of the complement (1a), degree markers (such as foarte ‘very’) placed after the adjective (1b), and discontinuous APs, either with a dislocated complement (1c) or with a dislocated degree marker (1d). When compared to their canonically linearized counterparts, these structures appear not to involve semantic or pragmatic differences. They are all disallowed in modern Romanian (MR), at least in the standard language.

(1) a. arme de moarte purtătoare poartă
   weapons of death.ACC carrying.F.PL carry
   ‘they carry lethal weapons (lit. death-bearing weapons)’  
   (CII.~1705: 3)

   b. era amu bogat foarte
   was now rich.M.SG very
   ‘he was very rich’  
   (CC2.1581: 482)

   c. poftitoriu mai multe decât atâtea a ști
   eager.M.SG more many than so.much AINF know.INF
   ‘eager to know more than this’ 
   (Clst.1700–50: 35”)

---
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Following recent work on Latin and the passage from Latin to Romance (mainly Ledgeway 2012 and forthcoming b) we set our goal to show that the syntax of the AP in OR – similarly to the syntax of nominal phrase (Nicolae forthcoming) – displays a certain amount of head-finality and non-configurationality, most probably inherited from Latin.

The paper is structured as follows: in section 2, we briefly illustrate the main features of the AP in OR, throwing into prominence the differences from MR; in section 3, we present the relevant data illustrating the phenomena investigated in our paper; in section 4, we compare the Romanian data to Latin and old Italian; in section 5, we present the analysis, while section 6 is dedicated to the conclusions.

2. The main features of the AP in OR

In contrast to MR, the syntax of old Romanian APs shows a higher degree of variation. The main differences – relevant to our research – can be summarised as follows (see, for details, Brăescu forthcoming).

(i) Definite article and case marking. In OR, the association of the adjective with the definite article did not observe strict rules. In MR definite DPs, the adjective occupying the first position of the nominal phrase obligatorily hosts the definite article; by contrast, in OR, the definite article may be enclitic either to the DP-initial adjective (2c) or to the postadjectival noun (2a, b); the latter construction has been dubbed the “low definite article” (Cornilescu and Nicolae 2011). The adjective may also appear in polydefinite constructions, some of which are only specific to OR ((2c, d); see Stan forthcoming); only relics of these constructions have been preserved in the passage to MR (see Nicolae 2013 b); in the passage from its old to its modern stage, Romanian has been gradually drawn closer to the typological make-up of the other Romance languages in which the grammatical categories (case, number, definiteness) are typically marked on the constituent occupying the DP-initial position (Repina 1971, Stan 2013: 93). Moreover, agreement with the noun was not consistent in the OR AP (2e).

(2) a. mare frămâncăta ta
great beauty-DEF your.F.SG
‘your great beauty’

b. supă putearnică mâna lui Dumnezău
under strong-F.SG hand-DEF LUI.GEN God
‘under God’s strong hand’

c. sfânta besearea aceasta
holy-DEF.F.SG church.DEF this.F
‘this holy church’
(ii) Complementation and word order. In OR, complement-taking adjectives (heavy APs) are also attested in the prenominal position (3), whereas in MR complementation is authorised only if the adjective is postnominal.

(3) a. \[ascuţitele la auzire\] urechi
Keen-DEF.F.PL at hearing ears
‘the keen ears’

b. \[făcătoare de minuni\] icoane
working-F.PL of miracles icons
‘miracle worker icons’

In contrast to MR, where relational adjectives are constrained to the postnominal position, in OR (as in other old Romance languages – Ledgeway 2012: 56), certain relational adjectives can also appear prenominally ((4); Brăescu and Dragomirescu 2014).

(4) a. glăsi evreiasca limbă
speak.PS.3SG Jewish-DEF language
‘he spoke in Hebrew’

b. ȋnnaintea alor noştri moldoveneşti boiari
before AL-GEN.PL our Moldavian boyars
‘before our Moldavian boyars’

It is also worth mentioning that there are certain differences in the serialization of (relational) adjectives (see also Brăescu and Dragomirescu 2014). Example (5a) shows that in OR a qualifying adjective may precede a relational one, and (5b) demonstrates that two relational adjectives depending on the same noun may be placed on both sides of the noun.

(5) a. un veşmentu mohorâtu împărătescu
a robe sober royal
‘a sober royal robe’

vs MR: un veşmânt împărătesc mohorât
b. ce pământeşti suflete drăceşti (CV.1563–83: 63)  
but earthly souls devilish  
‘but earthly devilish souls’  
vs MR: suflete pământeşti drăceşti/suflete drăceşti pământeşti

The changes form OR to MR are not random. The loss of the prenominal position of relational adjectives represents a parametric change (defined as in Roberts 2012: 320): higher N(P)-movement, to the left of relational adjectives, in modern Romanian, as opposed to very low N(P)-movement in OR (see Ledgeway 2012: 50-57, forthcoming a, on variation in Romance; Andriani (forthcoming) for high N(P)-movement in Barese). Together with the low position of the definite article, of the demonstratives and of the genitive, this phenomenon illustrates an essential diachronic change in the OR nominal domain, the loss of long distance Agree (see, for details, Cornilescu and Nicolae 2011).

(iii) Degree marking. Degree marking shows significant variation in OR. The degree markers were not (fully) grammaticalised, and this state of affairs has significant influence on the syntax of these words: more than one degree marker could appear in the same context (6a), word order was not rigid (6b-d), i.e. the degree marker could have been separated from the adjective (6b) or stranded, either in preadjectival (6c) or in postadjectival position (6d).

(6) a. şi mai nalt foarte  
and more tall very  
‘and very tall’  
(CC\(^2\).1581: 306)  
b. multu easte milostiv şi ieftinu  
much is merciful and moderate  
‘he is very merciful and moderate’  
(CV.1563–83: 67)  
c. fiind foarte cu orânduială bună  
being very with order good-F.SG  
‘being in very good order’  
(Prav.1780: 110)  
d. ghizdăvă la față foarte  
beautiful-F.SG at face very  
‘with a very beautiful face (lit. very beautiful at face)’  
(BB.1688: 21)

All these features have been lost in the transition to MR. Therefore, in the passage from OR to MR a major syntactic change occurred, which is at least in part related to the loss of head-final structures and the generalisation of a fully configurational syntax.

3. Head-finality and non-configurationality in OR

In this section, we present the data related to the syntax of the adjective in OR which illustrate the existence of the residual head-final and non-configurational syntax.
3.1. Head-finality and non-configurationality

The theoretical framework, which will be detailed in section 5, is represented by recent work by Ledgeway (2012, forthcoming b), who has shown that in the passage from archaic Latin (to classical and late Latin and then) to the Romance languages the most important syntactic change is the switch in the directionality of the head-parameter, from head-finality to head-initiality, in correlation with the establishment of a fully configurational syntax.

It is generally accepted that, in configurational languages, the relations between the constituents are encoded by the syntactic position they occupy, whereas non-configurational languages display a lexicocentric syntactic organisation: the relations between constituents are almost exclusively encoded by their form (affixes for case, agreement, etc.), and word order is almost free; thus non-configurational languages (Warlpiri and, as claimed by some, (archaic) Latin) appear to be characterised by a “flat” phrase structure (see Baker 2001, Ledgeway 2012: 10-29, 284-309). Ledgeway (2012, forthcoming) convincingly demonstrates that the non-hierarchical (/flat) syntactic organisation of Latin is only apparent, and results from the mixed setting of the head parameter, with classical Latin representing a transitional stage with both conservative head-final and innovative head-initial orders. Furthermore, Ledgeway (forthcoming b) shows that discontinuous constituents and head-final structures are tightly connected, representing actually different sides of the same phenomenon: the availability of antilocal movement; roll-up movement is a “too-short”, antilocal type of movement by default (Comp-to-Spec), while discontinuous structures are derived by the exploitation of the edge of individual functional projections which subsequently function as escape hatches in apparent violation of Ross’s (1967) Left Branch Condition (LBC). Ledgeway’s (forthcoming b) conclusion, to which we adhere, is that antilocal movement should be parameterized as being available only in head-final configurations. We will elaborate more on this issue in section 5.

In sum, we can conceive classical Latin as representing an intermediate stage in which two systems (head-initial and head-final) are in competition; two of the hallmarks of non-configurational syntax (Hale 1983), free word order and discontinuous structures, result this mixed parametric setting. Our goal is to show that OR still preserves residual head-final structures (see also Nicolae forthcoming); we will explore the syntax of the AP and argue that prehead complements to adjectives are derived via roll-up movement, taking as strong evidence for this claim the various attested discontinuous APs which reinforce the roll-up movement analysis.

3.2. The data from OR

In what follows we will present the data from OR which illustrate the existence of head-final and discontinuous structures. Our main interest lies in the analysis of the AP

---

2 “there is nonetheless an inescapable fundamental difference in the grammatical organizations of Latin and Romance syntax which simply cannot be overlooked: whereas in the former grammatical relations are encoded by the forms of the words themselves through case and agreement morphology, so-called lexicocentricity […], in the latter grammatical relations are encoded through the syntactic context of individual words organized into hierarchical phrase structure configurations” (Ledgeway 2012: 71).
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but nevertheless, at the end of the section, we bring supporting evidence from other types of phrases as well, in order to show that head-finality and discontinuity are regular syntactic phenomena in OR, not limited to phrases headed by adjectives.

As we have already mentioned in the introduction, in the analysis of the OR AP, we pay attention to three relevant phenomena: prehead complements to adjectives, postadjectival degree markers, and discontinuous structures involving either complements or degree markers.

(i) Preadjectival complements. Ordered according to their frequency, the preadjectival complements are: PPs (7)-(9), datives (10)-(11) and comparative complements (12). Many of the adjectives taking (preposed) complements are derived with the suffix -tor, which displays a high degree of categorial ambiguity; words obtained via -tor suffixation may be thus interpreted either as adjectives or as nouns (see Pană Dindelegan 2015). Certain types of adjuncts are also attested in preadjectival positions.

The examples in (7) illustrate prehead complements to adjectives derived from verbs with the suffix -tor. Except for the adjectives from these examples (născătoare < a naște ‘give birth’, aducătoare < a aduce ‘to bring’, poftitoriu < a pofti ‘to want’, lovitoare < a lovi ‘to hurt’), we have also identified in this type of construction adjectives such as: tocmitoare < a tocmi ‘to produce’ (CII.~1705: 35), îmblătoare < a îmbla ‘to walk’, tărătoare < a târî ‘to creep’ (CII.~1705: 38), purtătoriu < a purta ‘to bear’ (CII.~1705: 51), băutoriu < a bea ‘to drink’ (CII.~1705: 90), iubitioriu < a iubi ‘to love’ (SVI.~1670: 151', CD.1698: 1’). Preadjectival domain adjuncts are also attested with this type of adjectives (7e).

(7) a. feateei de Dumnezeu născătoare
girl-DEF.GEN of god.ACC birth-giving-ADJ.F.SG
‘of the girl who gave birth to God (lit. of the God birth-giving girl)’
(CC2.1581: 553)

b. de grabnică moarte aducătoare iaste
of sudden-F.SG death.ACC bring-ADJ.F.SG is
‘she can bring a sudden death (lit. she is bringer of sudden death)’
(CII.~1705: 23)

c. ca un om de oști pururea poftitoriu
like a man of armies always want-ADJ.M.SG
‘like a man always eager for armies’

(CLM.1700−50: 164′)

d. cuvintele așea la înimă lovitoare
words-DEF such at heart hurt-ADJ.F.PL
‘the words hurting the heart’

(CII.~1705: 52bis)

e. fiind în trup muritoriu
being in body mortal
‘being mortal, as far as its body is concerned’

(CC1.1567: 74′)

In (8), we list past participial adjectives taking a preposed complement: a by-phrase in (8a, b), and a bona fide prepositional complement in (8c). The same
configuration is also available with domain adjuncts (8d, e). Participial adjectives taking a preposed complement are also attested in DRH.A.1645–6: 19 (îndemnat < a îndemna ‘advise’), 30 (îmbiaț < a îmbia ‘urge’), 31 (asupriții < a asupri ‘to oppress’), 31 (săliții < a săliții ‘to compel’), DDL.1679: 38 (dăruiț < a dărui ‘to give a present’), 45 (slavoslovit < a slavoslov ‘to glorify’), CD.1698: III (obiciții < a obișnui ‘to get used’), AAM.1713: 7’ (învățat < a învăța ‘to teach’), ACP.1714: 5’ (veghiții < a veghea ‘to watch’).

(8)  a. și de toți lăudații apostoli
    and by all praised-DEF.M.PL apostles
    ‘and the apostles praised by all’
    (CL.1570: 5’)

    b. de nime nevoită
    by nobody forced-F.SG
    ‘forced by nobody’
    (DRH.A.1645–6: 12)

c. de stârvurile împuțite totdeauna însătate
    of carcasses-DEF putrid-F.PL always thirsty-F.PL
    și nesăturate
    and unsatiated-F.PL are
    ‘and they are always thirsty and hungry for putrid carcasses’
    (CII.~1705: 38–39)

d. la mânie iute, la foame nesăturată
    at rage quick at hunger unsatiated-F.SG is
    ‘she is irascible and always hungry’
    (CII.~1705: 54)

e. micii în scutece învățăți copilași
    little-DEF.M.PL in napkins covered-M.PL children
    ‘the little children covered with napkins’
    (CII.~1705: 83)

Non-derived adjectives are also able to take preposed complements: plin ‘full’ ((9a); SVI.~1670: 100’), vreadnic ‘worthy’ ((9b); CII.~1705: III, 23, 73; CD.1698: IV’), destoinic ‘worthy’ ((9c); CC1.1567: 48; 51’). Domain adjuncts (9d) and causal adjuncts (9e) are also attested preadjectivally.

(9)  a. de oameni plinu
    of people full-M.SG
    ‘full of people’
    (CSv.1590–602: 16’)

    b. de toată probozirea vreadnic să fiu
    of all-F.SG admonition-DEF worthy-M.SG SĂ be.SUBJ
    ‘I should be worthy of all admonition’
    (CII.~1705: II)

c. de pomenire destoinice
    of remembering worthy-F.PL
    ‘worthy of remembering’
    (CD.1698: IV’)
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The adjectives taking a preposed dative complement are either derived, with the suffix -tor (folositoare < a folosi ‘to use’, iubitori < a iubi ‘to love’ in (10); cunoscător < a cunoaște ‘to know’ (CII.~1705: IV), dăruitoriu < darui ‘to give a present’ (CII.~1705: 55)), of participial origin (11) or non-derived (12).

(10) a. toate ceale sufletului și trupului folositoare all those soul-DEF.DAT and body-DEF.DAT useful-F.PL

îți poftesc CL.DAT.2SG wish-1SG

‘I wish you all the things useful to the soul and body’

(CII.~1705: V)

b. credincioșii și lui Hristos iubitorii faithfull-DEF.M.PL and LUI.DAT Christ loving-DEF.M.PL

ai noștri împărați AL-M.PL our emperors

‘our faithful emperors who love God’

(DDL.1679: 84)

c. sufletului stricătoare soul-DEF.DAT damaging-F.PL

‘things damaging to the soul’

(CD.1698: 1’)

(11) însăși îngerilor necunoscută even angels-DEF.DAT unknown-F.SG

‘unknown even to the angels’

(ACP.1714: 11’)

(12) a. va fi lui milostivnic AUX.FUT.3SG be.INF he.DAT merciful

‘he will be merciful to him’

(CC.1567: 31’)

b. un mielu la hire, nelacom, nemăruia rău a lamb at character ungreedy nobody.DAT mean

‘a kind, generous man, mean to no one’

(CL.1700–50: 210’)

The preposed comparative complement (i.e. the standard of comparison), the occurrence of which is conditioned by the degree markers of the adjectives, is attested
with adjectives such as: *slabă* ‘thin’, *pământeancă* ‘pale’ (13a), *dulce* ‘sweet’ (13b), *cu minte* ‘wise’, *cu socoteală* ‘cautious’ (CII.~1705: 21).

(13) a. *decât un iepure mai slabă și mai pemintiană*  
than a rabbit more thin-F.SG and more pale-F.SG  
*a fi*  
A-INF be.INF  
‘being thinner and paler than a rabbit’  
(CII.~1705: 32)

b. *decât stârvul împuțit tot mai dulce* iaste  
than carcass-DEF putrid-M.SG still more sweet is  
‘it is still sweeter than the putrid carcass’  
(CII.~1705: 38)

A non-prepositional accusative preadjectival complement of *dator* ‘indebted’ is also rarely attested (14a). Accidentally, adjectives suffixed by *-tor* can take a preposed direct object (14b), which alternates with a prepositional object (illustrated in (7)).

(14) a. *nemică datoriu* nefiiind  
nothing.ACC indebted-M.SG NEG-being  
‘not being indebted with anything’  
(CC2.1581: 485)

b. *bunului și viață făcătoriului* Tău Duh  
kind-DEF.DAT and life.ACC giving-DEF.DAT your spirit  
‘to your kind and life giving spirit’  
(DDL.1669: 50)

The example in (15) illustrates the genitival complement of adjectives derived with *-tor*, which is also rarely attested:

(15) *aceaia au fost a lucrurilor*  
they AUX.PERF.3PL be.PPLE AL.GEN things-DEF.GEN  
făcători  
creators-ADJ.M.PL  
‘they were the creators of these things’  
(CII.~1705: 80)

(ii) Postadjectival degree markers. When compared to MR, the ordering of degree markers shows certain anomalies. In OR, the degree marker *foarte* (which was not completely grammaticalised) can be postadjectival (1b), (16) (see also Brăescu 2015).

(16) a. *om de cinste și de folos foarte*  
man of honour and of help very  
‘a honourable and very helpful man’  
(ULM.~1725: 93)
b. **mare foarte** groapă făcând
   big very pit making
   ‘making a very big pit’

   (Clst.1700−50: 37)

(iii) Discontinuous structures. Discontinuous structures, rarely attested in our
corpus, contain either an adjective and its complement (17a-c) (see also (1c)), or and
adjective and its degree marker (17d-f).

(17) a. **Plinu** e ceriu și pământul
   full is heaven-DEF.NOM and earth-DEF.NOM
   de slava Lui
   of glory-DEF.ACC his
   ‘The heaven and the earth are full of his glory’

   (SVI.~1670: 247v)

b. Bețișor scurticel, carile **obicinuiți** sint împărații în mâna
   small-stick short which accustomed-M.PL are emperors in hand
   a- l ținea
   AINF CL.ACC.M.SG keep.INF
   ‘A small, short stick which emperors are accustomed to keeping in their
   hand’

   (CII.~1705: XVII)

c. Și așea **mântuiți** boierii și țara
   and like this saved-M.PL boyars-DEF and country-DEF
   de domniia lui Alexandru vodă Iliaș
   of reign-DEF LUI.GEN Alexandru vodă Iliaș
   ‘And like this the boyars and the country have been saved by the reign of
   Alexandru vodă Iliaș’

   (CLM.1700−50: 214v)

d. acum **foarte** se strângu turci mulții
   now very CL.REFL.3PL gather Turks many-M.PL
   ‘very many Turks are gathering now’

   (DÎ.1599: XVII)

e. **mare nevoie foarte**
   big need very
   ‘a very big need’

   (CC².1581: 591)

f. **foarte grije mare**
   very care big
   ‘a very big care’

   (CC².1581: VIII)

Apparently, the AP does not differ from other phrases, such as the nominal phrase
and the verbal phrase (the sentence). In OR, different types of complements could appear
preverbally (18) or prenominally (19):
Nevertheless, despite the surface resemblance between the NP, AP and IP, we should mention that the preverbal complements in Romanian do not represent a genuine case of head-finality. There is evidence that in OR the lexical verb raises out of the v-VP domain (Nicolae forthcoming), just like in MR (see Nicolae 2013a, 2015, Schifano 2014 for recent accounts); hence, preverbal complements are actually displaced to the left periphery (cf. Rizzi 1997, 2004) of the clause. This account is directly supported by the fact that in the examples above the preverbal complements occur to the left of the Fin-head  să (18a) or to the clausal negator nu (18b), functional elements which have been analysed as representing the lower border of the C-domain and the higher border of the inflectional domain, respectively (see Ledgeway 2015, Nicolae 2015 for discussion).

Moreover, in our corpus survey, we did not identify head-final Complementiser Phrases or Prepositional Phrases. This result is in perfect agreement with Ledgeway’s (2012: 237-242) analysis, according to which the head-final to head-initial diachronic change is gradual, and the directionality of change is top-to-bottom (CP // PP → IP → VP → NP → AP). Thus, phrases headed by nouns and adjectives are predicted to be the last projections to undergo the head-final to head-initial parametric change, a conclusion supported by our findings which show that APs (and NPs) are subject to a mixed parametric setting in OR (the head-final option is already rare in OR and is gradually eliminated in compliance with cross-categorial harmony). Further support for the existence of head-final NPs is given by discontinuous NPs:

---

3 “The passage from Latin to Romance is characterized by a principle of cross-categorial harmonization, such that once head-initiality becomes established in the topmost CP and PP layers, it is then free to percolate down harmonically to the phrases that these in turn embed” (Ledgeway 2012: 242).

4 Note that examples like the ones given here (which depict discontinuous definite DPs) validate Ledgeway’s (forthcoming) analysis of discontinuous structures, which divorces the availability of discontinuous structures
In this section, we have seen that prehead complements and discontinuous structures characterise not only the OR AP but also other phrases, especially the NP. The examples illustrating these phenomena are attested not only in translations, but also in original documents, hence they cannot be considered loan translations (calques) from foreign texts. Nevertheless, we have noticed that in certain texts the structures we are interested in are not attested at all (for example, CCat.1560, CPrav.1560−2, CM.1567, etc.), whereas in other texts (such as CD.1698, CII.~1705, and CLM.1750) they are richly attested. In sum, head-final structures and discontinuous constituents must have been inherited from Latin (recall that the mixed setting of the directionality parameter and discontinuous structures are the hallmarks of the perceived non-configurationality of Latin); they are rarely attested in the first period of OR, and they were massively used and revived by authors strongly influenced by Latin texts, such as Dimitrie Cantemir (CD.1698, CII.~1705) and Miron Costin (CLM.1700–50).

In what follows, we will turn to the Latin data, in order to show that the constructions investigated here are also attested in Latin and in other old Romance languages.

4. Latin and old Italian

4.1. The Latin data

As already mentioned, Latin had a relatively free word order, derived from the mixed setting of the directionality parameter and the availability of discontinuous structures (Ledgeway 2012). In the literature dedicated to word order in Latin, we have identified relevant data related to the adjectival phrase only in Devine and Stephens (2006: 391-396), who mention that, as with the complements of nouns, complements to adjectives can either follow or precede the head, or they can be separated from the head in hyperbaton (the label of phrasal discontinuity in classical studies).

The examples in (21) illustrate preadjectival complements to adjectives, whereas in (22) the standard of comparison (i.e. the comparative complement) occurs in preadjectival position.

(21) a. toată acmu lumasca să lepădăm grije
   all-F.SG now worldly-F.SG SĂ hurl-SUBJ.1PL anxiety.F.SG
   ‘let us now hurl all the worldly anxiety’
   (DDL.1679: 63)

   b. lacomul a cuiva într-adevăr dragostea
   greedy-DEF AL.F.SG someone.GEN really love-DEF.ACC
   SĂ keep.SUBJ.3SG
   ‘the greedy one should really keep someone’s love’
   (CII.~1705: 39)

(22) greedy-DEF AL.F.SG someone.GEN really love-DEF.ACC
    SĂ keep.SUBJ.3SG
    ‘the greedy one should really keep someone’s love’

from the availability of articles; the correct correlation, as established by Ledgeway (forthcoming), links discontinuous structures to the availability of roll-up, antilocality, movement (see section 5).
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(21) a. caelum stellis ardentibus
    sky-NEUT.SG.ACC stars-F.PL.ABL burning-ADJ.F.PL.ABL
    aptum provided-NEUT.SG.ACC
    ‘the sky full of burning stars’
    (Virgil, in Guțu, s.v. aptus)

b. locus castris idoneus
    place.M.SG.NOM camps-NEUT.DAT suitable-M.SG.NOM
    ‘a place suitable to lay out a camp’
    (Caesar, in Guțu, s.v. idoneus)

c. alia rationis expertia sunt
    others-NEUT.PL.NOM reason-F.SG.GEN devoid-PL.NOM are
    ‘other are devoid of reason’
    (Cicero, in Devine and Stephens 2006: 394)

d. audacia odio digna
    bravery-F.SG.NOM envy-NEUT.SG.ABL worthy-F.SG
    ‘a bravery worthy of envy’
    (Cicero, in Gaffiot, s.v. dignus)

e. nihil a me alienum
    nothing to me.ABL unknown-NEUT.SG.ACC
    ‘nothing unknown to me’
    (Terence, in Gaffiot, s.v. alienus)

(22) a. Nihil est bello civili
    nothing is war-NEUT.SG.ABL civil-NEUT.SG.ABL
    miserius more.awful.NEUT.SG.NOM
    ‘Nothing is more awful than the civil war’

b. melle dulcior
    honey-NEUT.SG.ABL sweeter
    ‘sweeter than the honey’
    (Cicero, in Lavency 1985: 60)

The examples below illustrate Latin discontinuous structures with complements to adjectives (23a) and with the standard of comparison (23b).

(23) a. nec earum rerum quemquam funditus natura
    nor these things-F.GEN anyone completely nature
    esse voluit expertem
    be.IND want-IND.PERF.3SG devoid-ADJ.ACC
    ‘And nature has wanted no one to be outright devoid of these faculties’
    (Cicero, in Devine and Stephens 2006: 395)

b. longior fui quam vellem
    longer be.IND.PERF.1SG than want-SUBJ.IMPERF.1SG
    ‘I was longer than I would have wanted’
    (Cicero, in Guțu, s.v. longus)
The main difference between the Latin and the OR parallel structures is that apparently, the Latin word order appears to be driven by pragmatic/information structure factors (according to Devine and Stephens 2006), whereas the OR word order variation (at least with respect to the structures investigated here) does not seem to express information such as topic, focus, etc.

4.2. Data from old Italian

The data from old Italian are extracted from Giusti (2010: 596−598). Unfortunately, we have not been able to identify relevant data for other old Romance languages (in the grammars of old French – Buridant 2000; Lardon and Thomine 2009 – there is no relevant information for this topic).

As in OR, in old Italian head-final structures are attested alongside the regular head-initial ones (Poletto 2014: 76). Giusti (2010: 596–598) mentions that in the AP, the order adjective-complement and complement-adjective are both possible, without semantic and pragmatic differences:

(24) a. similitudini a noi manifeste
   Resemblances to us clear
   ‘resemblances clear to us’
   b. la cittade fosse d’ uomini vuota
   the city be.SUBJ.IMPERF of people empty
   ‘the city would be empty of people’

   (Bono Giamboni, in Giusti 2010: 597)

Degree markers are also attested in postadjectival position in old Italian:

(25) a. piacevole molto
   pleasant very
   ‘very pleasant’
   b. uno rivo chiaro molto
   a river clear very
   ‘a very clear river’

   (Bono Giamboni, in Giusti 2010: 596)
   (Dante, in Giusti 2010: 597)

As in OR, in old Italian discontinuous structures with complements (26a) and with degree markers (26b) are also attested.

(26) a. in più acconcio luogo per te…
   in more suitable place for you
   ‘in a place more suitable for you’
   b. di gentile aspetto molto
   of nice look very
   ‘with a very nice look’

   (Bono Giamboni, in Giusti 2010: 598)
   (Dante, in Giusti 2010: 598)
Data from old Italian support our claim that the head-final and non-configurational structures of Latin survived to a certain extent in old Romance.

5. Analysis

Several explanations have been put forth for the correlation between prehead complements and discontinuous structures in the analysis of different languages. A very interesting hypothesis, which gave rise to many debates in the literature, belongs to Bošković (2005, 2009). He analyses phenomena similar to the ones investigated in this paper as involving Left Branch Extraction and formulates the following generalisation: this type of movement is only allowed in languages without articles (e.g. Latin, certain Slavic languages) but impossible in languages with articles (such as the Romance languages). This correlation proves inconsistent since, of the Romance languages, at least old Romanian and old Italian allow for Left Branch Extraction, but also have articles.

As already mentioned, our analysis for the OR AP follows the one proposed by Ledgeway (2012, forthcoming b) for similar phenomena from Latin or early Romance. Ledgeway considers that the major parametric change which was on its way already in archaic Latin and continued in Romance is related to the head-directionality parameter: the head-final syntax is progressively replaced by the head-initial syntax, this overall change also triggering the establishment of fully configurational syntax in Romance.

Contrary to what traditional studies mention, Latin was not a non-configurational language (Ledgeway 2012, forthcoming b; Giusti and Iovino 2014). The perceived non-configurationality of Latin can be actually broken down into two main phenomena (Ledgeway 2012: 235, Ledgeway, forthcoming b): (i) a variable word order, with complements preceding or following the head (Ledgeway, forthcoming b) and (ii) pragmatically driven word order, allowed because of the higher accessibility towards the Topic and Focus projections located in the left periphery of certain functional projections (see also Rizzi 1997, 2004); massive left-edge accessibility often produces discontinuous structures, with the edge of individual projections functioning as escape hatches which feed further movement to the clausal (CP) or clause-internal (vP) left peripheries.

This characterisation is also suitable for the head-final and discontinuous structures of OR. In what follows, we offer a more technical analysis of these data, in the spirit of Ledgeway (2012, forthcoming b).

The variation between head-final and head-initial structures is explained by Adam Ledgeway using the concept of “roll-up”: “when the primary complement of a verb, for example, surfaces to the left of its head, as in OV languages, it must have moved leftwards across the verb from its base-generated complement position to a derived (inner) left-peripheral modifier/Spec(ifier) position (viz. Compl → Spec movement)” (Ledgeway 2012: 236). This account of head-final structures is largely accepted; Kayne (1994) assumes a Universal Base Hypothesis (Spec – Head – Comp) and derives head-final configurations from underlyingly head-initial configurations via Comp-to-Spec movement. Roll-up movement has been more recently advocated, among others, by Sheehan (2009) in her movement account for head-final orders, and by Nevins (2011) in the derivation of postnominal adjectives in Catalan.
Coming back to Latin, the so-called free word order can be explained by the application of the roll-up strategy (which, in its turn, feeds further information-structure driven movement), whereas the rigid word order of the Romance languages is the effect of the loss of this type of movement.

The AP data from OR also prove that roll-up movement, illustrated in (27), and previously used to explain the structure of the Latin sentence and NP, is also used for the derivation of the OR structures presented in the previous sections. Therefore, we claim the OR allowed roll-up (i.e. head-final structures), whereas MR lost the roll-up option and is harmonically head-initial. The representation in (27) schematically illustrates the derivation of preadjectival complements like, for example, the one in (1a). Representation (28) depicts the derivation of postadjectival degree markers via roll-up (for an example such as 1b), where the adjective is raised in Spec,DegP (see also Poletto 2014: 83).

This analysis faces the following problem: this instance of movement is extremely short and it violates antilocality (i.e. the principle which bans costly movement considered to short/ local and forces the movement to pass at least a phrasal node – Grohmann 2000, 2003; Abels 2003; Bošković 2005). However, Ledgeway (forthcoming a) shows that antilocality is parametrisable, that is, languages which allow for head-final structures also allow for antilocal movement (roll-up movement being, by definition, an antilocal type of movement); by contrast, consistently head-initial languages observe antilocality and thus ban roll-up. Summing up, the generalisation of a configurational syntax in the passage from Latin to Romance is equivalent to the setting of the head parameter as head-initial and the loss of the roll-up movement.
The analysis above only accounts for the first two structures we have investigated in this paper. The existence of discontinuous structures is tightly connected to the existence of antilocality: Ledgeway (forthcoming a) shows that only the phrasal categories which allow for the violation of antilocality also allow for the LBC violations; thus, only under the violation of antilocality may the left edge of individual functional projections function as an escape hatch which feeds “further fronting operations to more remote and pragmatically more salient LP [left periphery] positions within the nominal and clausal superstructures” (Ledgeway 2012: 183). This fact, coupled with the idea that there is a certain directionality of change in the setting of the head parameter which places adjectives and nouns in conservative end of the scale of change, provides a straightforward explanation for the existence of discontinuities only in phrases headed by adjectives and nouns.

6. Conclusions

The results of our research can be summarised as follows:

(i) We have shown the OR AP displays a residual head-final and non-configurational grammar: head-final structures (with preadjectival complements and postadjectival degree markers) as well as discontinuous structures with complements separated from the adjective or with (AP-external) constituents intervening between the adjective and the degree marker are consistently attested. It is hard to relate these phenomena to particular pragmatic/information-structure effects, a fact which consolidates the roll-up movement analysis advocated above.

(ii) The phenomena investigated here are also attested in Latin. Thus, they have been inherited from Latin (as in other old Romance languages, such as old Italian). They are scarcely attested in the first OR texts (both translations and original documents from 16th century), but they have been extensively used by authors influenced by Latin texts, at the beginning of the 17th century. In this respect, we support the hypothesis that, in spite of the influence of Latin grammar on style of the authors who extensively use head-final and discontinuous structures, these structures are indicative of a genuine, residual, option of the grammar of OR. This perspective has also been advocated in the analysis of old Italian by Poletto (2014: 77): “[t]he authors writing in this period “mimic” the structure of Latin in the only possible way they have in their own grammar”.

(iii) Following mostly the work of Ledgeway (2012, forthcoming b), we have provided a unitary account for the existence of the phenomena investigated in OR as well as for their disappearance in the transition to MR: the loss of roll-up movement and, as a consequence, the enforcement of antilocality.

(iv) In the light of the recent literature and of the facts presented here, the changes from Latin to early Romance does not seem as radical as previously considered: Latin was a language in which the competition between head-final (archaism) and head-initial (innovation) was at play, and early Romance languages inherited this mixed grammar, albeit with different degrees in the proportion of head-final and head-initial structures. Latin appears to be radically different form modern Romance, but in this development we should see a stage (early Romance) in which the differences were considerably less significant. The analysis of Romanian data presented above is illustrative of the fact that
the jettisoning of conservative head-final structures by innovative head-initial structures did not have the same rhythm in the entire Romance-speaking area, as conservative head-final structures are still attested in 16-17th century Romanian.

Corpus

References


